

BANU TERKAN

Selcuk University Communication Faculty, Turkey

NURULLAH TERKAN

Selcuk University Communication Faculty, Turkey

**ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL DISCOURSES OF THE RULING AND
OPPOSITION PARTIES REGARDING THE NEW REGULATIONS IN
THE INTERNET LAW IN TURKEY****Abstract:**

Basic regulations regarding the internet in Turkey consist of the law no. 5651 which was accepted and went into effect in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TGNA) in 2007. Along with the law no. 6158 "The Law About Amending the Decree-Law Concerning the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of Family and Social Policy and Changes in Some Laws and Decree-Laws" which went into effect by being released in the Official Gazette at February 19 2014, a set of new regulations also were made regarding the law no. 5651.

This study aims to put forth how the new internet law is given meaning in the political discourses of the ruling and opposition parties. The TGNA minutes of general meeting were examined in the study so that the discourses of the ruling and opposition parties regarding the regulations made in the internet law could be analyzed. In the sessions realized between December 17, 2013 and February 28, 2014, all assessments conducted regarding the subject at hand were included in the study. The reason why the minutes of general meeting in between the suggested years were examined is due to the fact that a proposed law regarding a set of changes made concerning the internet law was presented to the general meeting by some congressmen of the ruling party at December 17, 2013 and that another proposed law was also presented to the general meeting by some congressmen of the ruling party at January 6, 2014. These proposed laws form a significant aspect of the discussions made regarding the new internet law. The study also contains an approximate 10-day process after the release date of the bill in order to set forth the reactions given subsequent to it taking effect by becoming a law.

In order to put forth how the new internet law is given meaning in the political discourses of the ruling and opposition parties, the minutes of general meeting that provide an important data in examining the political speeches of politicians were analyzed pursuant to the relations put forth by the ideological discourse analysis. In the political speeches which is a form of political communication, how the subject is handled in the political discourses of politicians, how the actors are defined, how the politicians present their policies and the reality attempted to be created on these discourses were tried to be established.

Keywords:

Political discourse, political communication, internet law, discourse analysis.

INTRODUCTION

All political speech-forms and political discourses have an important function in realizing different political purposes by political agents. When focusing on parliamentary speeches, it is required to emphasize that parliaments are one of the basic foundations of political speeches, along with their functions such as making new law and/or inspecting the system (Özdemir, 2004: 87). Parliament is one of the central elements of the system and not only do they relay political tendencies that are made up in different places, they also make up new political tendencies by taking basis from the electors they represent. At the same time, by criticizing and expressing opinions about the activities of the government and ongoing social developments, they allow the information to recycle back to the elector, thus informing the public about the problems and opportunities regarding the issues that concern the public and the options coming with them (Poggi, 2002: 134). While parliamentary meetings allow some discussions to be made between parties, they also relay the statements back to the public via media as a public audience (Moosmüller, 1989: 168-169). Thereby media helps the citizens become a part of the political process (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002: 8; Elspaß, 2002: 84). Parliaments volunteering to open their ever-increasing meetings to the television cameras enable themselves to reach to the public eye as a discussion arena and an inspection agency (Heywood, 2006: 472-473). Upon taking a look at the roles and functions of a parliament within the political and social life, although the parliamentary rhetoric and discourse have been a vital research subject in the field of sociology and science of politics for so long, it is clear that there is an interdisciplinary interest through linguistic and rhetorical means (Ilie, 2010a: 880).

This study focuses on the parliamentary discourse and rhetoric, and tries to put forth how these new internet law regulations are explained in the discourses of the ruling and opposition parties within parliamentary discussions. Study relates to different interpretations of the political discourse and basic discourses of liberal and critical approaches on the democratic potential of the internet, also attempts to analyze the political discourses of the members of parliament in the meetings regarding the new internet law regulations, by discussing the relation between political sphere and internet.

1. DEFINING THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Meanings attributed to political terms being varying and that its content can be shown differently in view of expert networks, groups and individuals make defining the terms harder. As Chilton (2008: 233) stated, comprehending only the nature of political terms is not enough, one should also pay attention to how political terms are interpreted during political communications, as well as their functions. In studies of political and cultural theorists and critics, their political discourse and functions are viewed as them forming and projecting their future comprehensions and ideological implications (Dunmire, 2005: 483). One part of the evaluations regarding the political discourse describes the political one so extensively that almost every discourse, in the end, might be regarded as political. Whereas another part represents the political discourse as a matter concerning only politicians and real political events, thus leaving the daily discourse of politics out of people's everyday lives (Wilson, 2001: 411). Van Dijk (1997b: 13) defines the participators in the political sphere as including people, citizens, masses, other groups or categories. Within a larger point of view, political discourse in fact includes all these agents. Definitely not a field restricted to the

discourse of politicians only. Political discourse and its functions become clear when we think about the vital role of a text or a speech in applying power. Discourse can simulate the power directly and in a non-compulsive way through the means of imperative acts of speech via text types such as laws, regulations or constitutions. Discursive power is generally either directly or non-directly persuasive, thus the reason why discursive power includes factors, arguments, promises, examples or other rhetorical means that help the perceivers to construct their desired intellectual designs (Van Dijk, 1989: 49). Since political agents use instrumental means for the rhetoric, also fully knowing that keeping silent will not bring about any success, they think that political speeches will motivate the people, which they want to impress, into supporting them (Stuckey, 2010: 293).

Van Dijk (1997b: 12) states that a big majority of political discourse studies refers to the texts and speeches of professional politicians such as the president, prime minister, other members of the government, parliament and political parties or political institutions on local, national and international scales. Political discourse, political speech¹ and political discussion contain interactions between parliamentarians or between parliamentarians and emissaries (Van Dijk, 2000: 75; Van Dijk, 2002: 233-234). In the end, parliaments are where the talks take place. Parliament members investigate legislative proposals and examine the studies of the government deeply through questions. They also are a party to explaining the government policies and its approval (Bayley, 2004:1). When looked at the roles and functions of a parliament and its members, it can be observed that why research is of paramount importance in understanding how the current political issues are determined, discarded or defended; in understanding the role of parliamentary applications, the rhetorical instruments and argumentation strategies, which are preferred by the members of parliament, and recurring institutionalized linguistic patterns that can shed light upon hidden agendas, ideological beliefs, persuasion/dissuasion strategies (Ilie, 2010a: 880). Determination of the contextual properties of speeches is important, as well as detecting these strategies (Van Dijk, 2004: 339). Discourse studies relate closely to the relation between the text and the context. Because the nature of political conflict discourses is often closely related to the agitation of conflicts, providing basic arguments and the context in forming the dynamics of their parameters (Shenhav & Sheaffer, 2008: 709). On the note that texts and discourses are not formed without a reason, the fact that individual texts are always associated with antecedent and current texts can be understood; thus intertextuality. Discourses are nothing different and they are always interconnected; thus interdiscursivity (Wodak & Weiss, 2005: 127; Fairclough, 2001: 124). Based on the prevalent ideological principles of a society in its change of history and politics, speech form types and exclusive uses give shape to and relay the socio-cultural prerequisites of hypothetical discourse and its power balance interaction, owing to that the parliamentary discourse is given shape to by social and cultural environments (Wilson & Stapleton, 2012: 74). The fact that the political usage of speech forms can help affect the beliefs and ideas of groups, institutions, political parties, people; motivate individuals or dissuade them from an action, strengthen their ideological points of view and articulate their opinions to improve support for concrete actions (Ilie, 2010b: 885-886) puts forth the power of political discourse, as well as showing that the political discourse is very extensive and there are a lot of factors that affect it.

As defining the political discourse is not that possible, as well as putting forth the mechanisms that it interacts with; there is another similarly discussed issue, which is

the democratic potential of internet. This issue, which researchers spend a keen-time on and try to explain differently in varying paradigms, can at the same time be interpreted in different ways in all the perceived angles of political discourse within itself.

2. LIBERAL AND CRITICAL DISCOURSES ON THE DEMOCRATIC POTENTIAL OF INTERNET

There are different approaches on the democratic potential of internet. While some groups claim that internet is democratic, some others claim it to be a new instrument of oppression and a control device (Hacker, 1996: 213). Speculations regarding the democratizing potential of internet become clearer among liberal discourses, whereas the discourses of it being a new type of sovereignty are discussed among the network of critical paradigm.

Critical approaches specifically aim to examine the behaviors of commercial and non-commercial communication institutions, interference of public bodies and the government on the field of communication (Geray, 2005: 31). It is seen that three main camps especially come into prominence among the views of people defining the internet, which is rather apparent among liberal paradigm, as a contribution factor to democracy. First one is the communitarian camp, it focuses on the possibility that internet can strengthen communal soul and values. Second is the liberal individual camp, it takes to the idea that internet helps express individual interests. Third is the deliberative camp, this camp desires to further develop internet as an expansion tool for the public sphere of rational critical citizen discourse (Dahlberg, 2001: 615-616). Hacker (1996: 229-230) analyzed the conditions of enablement of a political interaction network via internet and emphasized that finding a correct way to meet the democratizing potential of internet is linked to various factors. No matter how much he emphasizes this potential of internet; there are problematic sides to the sense of democracy. Street (1997: 31-32) expressed that technology is not enough to solve the problems in democracy, that when it comes to representing the democratic citizens' choice, it is not viable to simply do it through different methods. He also underlines that there are differences between promising electronic participation and its actual usage. It is clear that with the development of internet, there come discussions regarding the potential outcomes of this new media on the political process. Though many researches were dubious about the potential effects of internet, Van Aelst and Walgrave (2002: 465-466) emphasize that participation to political activities became easier, globalized and accelerated thanks to internet, as well as putting forth that expenditures and inhibitions of social movements decreased due to these technologies.

While internet can increase personal liberties by providing new information, enabling consumer preference and creating some sort of transparency in governments, it is also stated that especially among critical discourses, it provides more information regarding personal tastes and that surveillance increase with the usage of internet. This makes it easier for the firms to interfere with the personal liberties of others. Numerous internet activities can be controlled and monitored. Government, media and commercial networks can literally possess information (O'Loughlin, 2001: 605-606). Today, where differences are eliminated and there is an ongoing system sustaining modernism, everything of ambiguity, possibility and danger has become a threat to the existence of communities. That is the reason why governments increasingly use digital

surveillance methods to possess full information of its citizens, to supervise them and secure them (Arslantaş-Toktaş, Binark, Dikmen, Fidaner, Küzeci & Özyaygen, 2012: 36).

No matter how much of an acceptance is shared by a liberal point of view towards the fact that new communication technologies create a different freedom sphere than traditional ones; from a critical point of view, the power of these technologies to create new sovereignty, power area and to sustain it is debated. The ones supporting the idea that internet created a new surveillance space benefit from a surveillance approach named as panopticon² constituting Foucault's model of how a power is sustained, this approach take from the architectural simile of Jeremy Bentham (Timisi, 2003: 227-228). Lyon (2006: 231) states that Foucault was the source of inspiration for new radical approaches on digitalized surveillance. Like panopticon, another discussed matter was synopticon. Today mass communication devises, where majority watches minority, are evaluated within its framework (Bauman & Lyon, 2013: 73). But in superpanopticon, "minority" watches "majority" too, and also "majority watches majority" and minority watches minority"³ (Öztürk, 2013: 140).

In conclusion, the discourses upon internet are in the position leading progress and pornography, having possible dangers of free circulation, attack against fundamental freedoms through carding individuals, concerning poorer communities surrounded by the concern as the communities will come apart through forming individuals only connected internet (Maigret, 2011: 328). Supervision and auditing capacity of internet, regulations which may signify censoring the content on internet, are as important as shaping as a consumption and entertainment media. However, it should not escape from the attentions that the internet creates opportunities of globalizations related to labor and alternative powers against capitalism (Başaran, 2005: 52).

3. POLITICAL SPACE AND INTERNET

Internet is a tool having different features compared to previous forms of mass medium. It is in a position of tool for information and of network for communication with its features as mobilization through e-mail, discussions by means of chat rooms and collecting data through online news. In this relationship established among technology, communication and participation, it is specified that these different usages also have different effect on political participation however new communication technologies will be at the fore in more democratic systems (Mossberger, Tolbert & McNeal, 2007: 69). Jakubowicz (1994: 93) indicates that it should be careful against optimistic thoughts developed related to new communication technologies, draws attention on the opinions asserting new technologies serve for governments, military organizations, commercial interests and cybernetic capitalism as dominant social system. By indicating the relation between the state and society is quiet complicated in the information age, Jakubowicz (1994: 94) emphasizes that the state is closely interested in new information and telecommunication technologies developments and this interest remains as in favor of bigger commercial companies. Blumler and Gurevitch (2001: 8-9) also specify that powerful interests tried to bend the internet towards their purposes as the functions and usage of internet is still under research, and weak potential of interactive media towards developing public communication and enriching democracy became marginal in the end. Habermas (2006: 411-412) describes that mediated political communication in public sphere may facilitate deliberative legitimation in case especially media system can regulate itself as

independent from its social environment and feedback can be ensured between a sensitive civil society and a conscious elite discourse with anonym audiences.

However, opinions stating that one of the most important social and political processes in parallel with the emergence and application of new information and communication technologies are to undermine all basic dimensions of civil society should be considered. This problem can be thought as a result of increasing intervention of state and their dependence (Splichal, 2004: 69-70). Nowadays, public authorities having power realized the importance of internet and relevant technologies in strengthening cyber sphere and oppressive regimes create new tools and methods in order to filter social media tools. Even if new laws are presented in order to regulate cyber sphere in some circumstances, the dimensions of internet censorship towards legitimizing surveillance and quietening actions also draw attention (Deibert, Palfrey, Rohozinski & Zittrain, 2011: 4-11). It is also known that there is a tendency towards cyber regionalization started with national filtering and being strengthened through economic strategies. Countries are aware of economic barriers are more effective than traditional censor with their lower political cost and state support also increases behind national cyber development projects defined as a critical economic sector (Deibert & Rohozinski, 2011: 36). As an implicit assumption, while it is discussing that the growth of internet will continue together with the modern powers of economic and technologic globalization (DeNardis, 2009: 1), especially non democratic regimes consider free and unregulated internet formations as a threat. Tactics used by the regimes in order to suppress internet freedom are closely related with their bonds with internal and external structures to keep, maintain ruler ship. The regimes are increasingly using internet for spying their opponents and democracy movements (Tkacheva, Schwartz, Libicki, Martini & Baxter, 2013: 2-3). Tkacheva et. al (2013: 4-7) indicate that political space in an entirely democratic community is a sphere which political authorities do not disregard people's will by using the structures of state and there are many types of suppression in non democratic regimes. By expressing the importance of ruling environment in the relation between internet and social mobilization, the authors specify that these technologies cannot have same effect on political space as in the democratic ruling system since internet is under strict state control in more oppressive regimes (Tkacheva, Schwartz, Libicki, Martini & Baxter, 2013: 28). In the countries having authoritarian political systems or ruling dictatorship, it is mentioned that there has been an optimist cooperation for a long time between observers related to increasing internet usage and it has been proven that there are certainly strong enemies against autocratic political applications in the world related to internet and relevant communication technologies however it is also underlined that this technological determinant thought is dominant in new media discourse of 1990s and politics. In the first decade of 21st century, it is indicated that deterministic observations were falsified in the countries as Saudi Arabia, Singapore, and China. For example, new propaganda strategies, personal censor in public and censor together with state control in China are considered as a reality (Lagerkvist, 2010: 25) of internet usage in China.

By considering the discussions about whether internet is changed civil, political and social participation at the moment, it is obvious that it is not only a simple question it was faced. There are many aspects of civil, political and social participation. Because, new communication technologies have effect on ensuring positive and negative change in civil and social participation and also maintain the status quo (Katz & Rice, 2002: 133). Binark (2007: 25) expresses that together with increasing democratic

usage opportunities of internet⁴ in the context of developing citizen rights and intervening to every sphere in daily life with increasing intensity, the requirement for regulating and supervising new media for the survival of hegemonic relations given by political elites in Turkey was emerged. According to Binark (2007: 25) institutions as Ministry of Transportation, Telecommunications Communication Presidency (TİB) in Turkey are requested to authorize as having the power of regulate internet both technically and legally. “Law on Regulating Publications Made Through Internet and Fighting Against Crime Committed Through These Publications” (Law No: 5651) was entered into force by issuing on Official Gazette dated 23 May 2007. By making some new amendments on this law, new internet law was entered into force by issuing on Official Gazette dated 19.02.2014. The law numbered 5651 and accepted in 2007 was criticized in many respects and especially the issue about catalogue crimes⁵ sparked many debates. The catalogue crimes regulate in which circumstances web site access can be blocked. Another aspect sparking debate is the regulation providing opportunity for administration about blocking access without requiring any judicial decision. Essential areas sparking debate in the new amendment made in this law are especially giving judgement about increasing the authorization of administration about blocking access to any web site without requiring any judicial decision and delivering all traffic information of internet users to the administration, in other word to TİB⁶ as soon as requested. Through an attachment made in article 9 of current law, extending the blocking authorization of administration with unclear definitions sparked debates. Through an attachment made in article 9 of the law numbered 5651, the phrase “persons asserting their rights of privacy have been violated through the content of a publication on internet may request the application of blocking access to this content through directly applying the Presidency” again became an issue being highly debated. The determinant position of TİB before the stage of judicial decision especially increased the question marks. The key issue related to traffic information is; “Hosting service provider keeps the traffic information related to the hosting services provided for a period to be determined in the regulation as not less than one year and more than two years” was held responsible and the phrase as the traffic information preservation period cannot be less than one year instead of six months was included. The phrase which was not included in the law numbered 5651 as “Hosting service provider is liable to deliver the information requested by the Presidency in a form requested and take precautions notified by the Presidency” sparked another debate. In the new amendment, it is foreseen that court or administration’s decisions as gathering access providers under a single roof and banning, ceasing broadcast will be executed by this union from now on. Being liable to block access and hosting service providers within 4 hours in any circumstances, also being responsible to “block alternative access points” to the web sites being blocked by access providers were the fundamental aspects of the debates generated in the basis of state- observation and supervision.

Having extensive actors of political discourse brings about the process of discussion in different dimensions. In this study, the essential actors being focused are the ruling and the opposition party’s parliamentarians and their discourses under the roof of parliament.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study aims to put forth how the new internet law is given meaning in the political discourses of the ruling and opposition parties. The TBMM (Grand National Assembly of Turkey) minutes of general meeting were examined in the study so that the

discourses of the ruling and opposition parties regarding the regulations made in the internet law could be analyzed. The examined minutes belong to the 24th Cycle 4th Legislative Year. In the sessions realized between December 17, 2013 and February 28, 2014, all assessments conducted regarding the subject at hand were included in the study. The reason why the minutes of general meeting in between the suggested years were examined is due to the fact that a proposed law regarding a set of changes made concerning the internet law was presented to the general meeting by some congressmen of the ruling party at December 17, 2013 and that another proposed law was also presented to the general meeting by some congressmen of the ruling party at January 6, 2014. These proposed laws form a significant aspect of the discussions made regarding the new internet law. There many subjects mentioned within “Bill About Amending the Decree-Law Concerning the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of Family and Social Policy and Changes in Some Laws and Decree-Laws” and the regulations regarding internet were jointed into the bill. The cycle, where the clauses regarding the internet included within this bill were discussed, also contains this process. This bill was accepted at February 6, 2014 in TBMM, went into effect at February 19, 2014 by being released in the Official Gazette and the discussions regarding the internet law continued on even after it taking effect. The study also contains an approximate 10-day process after the release date of the bill in order to set forth the reactions given subsequent to it taking effect by becoming a law.

In order to put forth how the new internet law is given meaning in the political discourses of the ruling and opposition parties, the minutes of general meeting that provide an important data in examining the political speeches of politicians were analyzed pursuant to the relations put forth by the discourse analysis. In the study, the themes coming forward within the framework of the subject dealt primarily have been determined and these themes have been analyzed by depending on the discourse analysis approach of Van Dijk. Macro and micro based analyses coming prominence in the analyses of parliament discussions of Van Dijk (2004) were considered in the study. At the same time, rhetorical and ideological⁷ strategies⁸ of Van Dijk (1995; 2000; 2004) which he was trying to make them visible were also tried to determine in the study. Since the study is focused on political discourse, it carries importance with regard to the form of interpreting political discourse analysis of Van Dijk (1997a; 1997b). Van Dijk (1997b: 24) states that when certain features of political discourse will be analyzed, political discourse analysis resembles other types of discourse analysis in many respects. Political discourse analysis tries to present the relation between discourse structures and political context structures.

5. THE FORM OF REFLECTION RELATED TO NEW REGULATIONS IN INTERNET LAW TO PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES IN TURKEY

5.1. Positioning Style of Internet Law in Ruling Party Discourses

5.1.1. Interaction and Context

When focusing on parliamentary debates, it is obvious that the discussions are carried out as an interaction among parliamentarians or between the parliamentarians and government representatives. Major part of the features related to discussion can only be defined and explained within the framework of a transactional framework. In other words, an implicit part (legislation) of a context consisting of general political action categories, environment (parliament sessions), various types of interaction (discussing

a law draft, opposing government), participants in many different roles (speaker, audience, parliamentarians, regional representatives, government or opposition members etc.) are within a framework (Van Dijk, 2000: 75). Parliamentary debates are passing with accusing other parliamentarians, agreeing or disagreeing with a parliamentarian, answering a question, asking questions to create a certain effect, attaching a party or member of another party, calling other parliament members to order, challenging other parliament members, criticizing government, provoking the group, self defending against the attack of another parliamentarian, refusing to receive or provide the right to speak, interrupting the speech of a speaker, suggesting a policy etc, referring to previous discussions, referring to desired and undesired results of the policies in force, asking for the floor, supporting government and all these actions also include interactions which may be called ideological (Van Dijk, 2000: 75-76). When ruling and opposition party's parliamentarians are dealing with this subject in terms of this study, there is a law draft handled a set of regulations related to internet within an omnibus bill under the roof of parliament. This draft has been discussed in the 53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58. Sessions of 4th Legislative Year in 24th Period and accepted in the 58th session. It was sent to the Presidency on 10.02.2014 and issued in Official Gazette on the date of 19.02.2014.

The ruling party is the Justice and Development Party (AKP) and during the discussions, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan is the party leader and prime minister. While this law draft was discussing, the ruling party members brought the speeches forefront related to the deficiencies in the policies in force and why these regulations are important, they did not embrace a rather offensive language, an impression as reaching a common conclusion was tried to emerge. By assessing that the amendment will be enriched and matured with the valuable contributions of opposing party and groups when the time for amendment has come (Mehmet Doğan Kubat, AKP, 28 January 2014), an impression as the regulation was made in a situation receiving everyone's and participant's opinions was tried to emerge. During the speeches made by opposing party, the ruling party applied some action as interruption the speech and asking for the floor when they consider that it is an attack to them. When assessing the speeches made in the parliament related to this law draft, the number of ruling party parliamentarian making speech about this subject is rather lower than the opposing parties. The most important feature drawing attention in the speeches of ruling party is the usage of argumentation strategies prominently. However, the reactions of opposing party left the mark on parliamentary debates. While generating the majority of parliament as the ruling party ensures great power to them, the attitudes and behaviors supporting the policies of government by the end within the ruling party are rather apparent and it is not possible to say there is a different voice raising within the ruling party.

5.1.2. Definitions

It is an important matter how to define what in the discourse analyses. Because these definitions are an important part of ideological establishment processes and it tried to create a reality in the requested direction with the denomination and labeling in compliance with the defining styles. In the discourse of ruling party, the amendments made in internet law are positioned as a "really important" amendment and new regulations are defined as "a regulation towards protecting the rights of victim". At the same time, by emphasizing that "law" exists for the happiness of society and "legal

regulations” were made for this purpose, new regulations related to internet law are matched with the “happiness of community”.

5.1.3. Actors

Actor analysis is important in the discourse analyses. Because the arguments of proposals may be actors in different roles, in other words the offenders, ones being affected from the action or the ones benefitting from the action. All discourses upon people and action include various types of actors. Therefore the actors can be considered as members of groups or their individual name and surnames, functions, role or group names, their certain or uncertain actions or so-called qualifications, positions or relations with other people etc. (Van Dijk, 2000: 62). Above all, fundamental actors of this political speech analysis are the ruling and opposing party’s parliamentarians. By considering new regulations in internet law, the most fundamental actors in the ruling party discourse are framed as “victims” and “ones violating their rights” as in compliance with defining style. Such a framing style also facilitates the causing and justifying the action desired to perform. Because choosing the language for making causality also serves for the justifying discourse by the provision of redefining and hiding the problematic situation with choosing rational discourse language for making causality and legitimizing and justifying actions and phrases considered as taboo (Alver, 2003: 219).

5.1.4. Topics and Themes

Discourse also has global meanings as topics or themes. The subjects represent the substance and the most important information of discourse. They describe what the discourse is all about. Ideological functions (Van Dijk, 2000: 45) of themes, in other words a range of proposals being formulized in subjects and simple sentences are also important for discourse analyses. Essential subject focused by the study is the new regulation in internet law. However, this subject was tried to make sense within the framework of different themes in the discourse of both ruling and opposition parties. The themes coming into prominence in the discourse of ruling party were determined as follows:

5.1.4.1. An Extremely Important Regulation Brought On The Right of Privacy

One of the themes coming into prominence in the political discourse of ruling party were the discourses indicating that the new regulation takes the right of privacy under protection. Within this theme, by emphasizing “the right of privacy” and being “victim”, in case private scenes of a person is broadcasting and the scenes related to a part of private life is broadcasting with the intention of humiliating before public, the discourse indicating this unjust treatment should be immediately eliminated were frequently repeated and it was tried to justify through this discourse that the application of administrative sanction before the judicial decision of the court. “Violations of right”, “abrasive” broadcasts related to the honor and human dignity, commercial, political, social, all kind of discourses about “discrediting” were come into prominence. The words of violation of right, reputation, honor, dignity came into forefront in the texts as much as unjust treatment.

5.1.4.2. Problem Solving and Not Prohibitive Regulation

Another theme coming into prominence by ruling party in the new regulation related to internet is the emphasis on refusing prohibitive and censorship discourses focused by opposing party while defining this regulation, being problem solving regulation instead of prohibition.

It was emphasized that decision taking and implementation processes were shortened in order to eliminate “victimhood”, as per the legislation provisions, the problem of being late in preventing the content which may be considered against human dignity and as offending within the context of the biggest weakness against crimes as virtual harassments, reputation attempt which “all of us” may be the “victim” in one day was amended in favor of “people” and “humanity” with this draft. It is specified that all decisions can be objected, there is no application in any circumstances as collective “blocking” or “prohibiting”, there is no regulation which may be considered as “censorship” within this regulation (Zeynep Karahan Uslu, AKP, 30 January 2014). It is tried to make this regulation visible instead of being a censor (Recep Özel, AKP, 19 February 2014). Within this theme, “being victim” and “victimhood” discourses were come into prominence and “generalizing” phrases took place.

5.1.5. Arguments

It is a reality that people need to have a proof concerning why this idea, thought, application etc is necessary or important in order to accept any idea or thought. In this respect, Van Dijk (2000) draws attention on the arguments as evidentiality, counterfactuals and wrong arguments, consensus, classification, comparison, value and norm expression, specifying opinion and attitude, explaining, authority and quotation, history as lesson and numeric information etc. In the ruling part discourse, strategies as “evidentiality”, “counterfactuals”, “comparison”, “quotation”, “numeric information”, “specifying opinion and attitude” were come into prominence. For example, in the 53rd session dated 28 January 2014, Necdet Ünüvar positioned the law numbered 5651 as a law “far from satisfying requirements” for protecting personal rights especially as of today and fighting against the crimes except catalogue crimes. Therefore, it is specified that that is an “obligation” to make some regulation in the law. Essential argument was based on the construction of thought asserting that this law is “wide of satisfying requirements” and it is an inevitable consequence to amend the provisions of law in compliance with “changing requirements of community” in time. In this direction, it is realized that the strategy of “evidentiality” was tried to use effectively. Evidentiality is to provide making the world views and assertions more reasonable in cases the speakers present a couple of evidences or proofs related to the information and their thoughts (Van Dijk, 2000: 69). By “showing” the speeches made by Osman Coşkunoglu who was the parliamentarian in main opposing party CHP during 22. and 23. periods and Mevlüt Aslanoğlu⁹ (died on 16.05.2014) who is the parliamentarian in CHP during the negotiations made on new regulation “as proof” during the negotiations on the law numbered 5651, in his speech, Ünüvar tried to create an impression for “rendering meaningless” the reactions of main opposing party and having a “self contradictory” structure in his speech. In the same speech, Ünüvar actually positioned this regulation as “a regulation directed towards correcting an issue also criticized in the past” and indicated that there were 4 million 609 thousand internet subscribers in that period, this number reached 33 million 700 thousand at present with an increase as 7-8 fold approximately and the velocity is extremely

increased as a news which may impair human dignity can be spreading rapidly in the period. Essential argumentation strategies were to benefit the power of “comparison” and “numeric information”.

One of the most criticized issue related to opposition parties is the “timing” of this regulation and the subject of “censor”. Especially the allegations of corruption against the ruling party, tapes published over social media created question marks in the eyes of opposing party about the timing of regulation related to the internet law. As a response related to these criticisms, it is seen that argumentation strategies were applied once again. Necdet Ünüvar (AKP, 28 January 2014) expresses in his speech that when attending to the information within that web site, it will be realized that it is a study started in the middle of the year 2011; it was a study made for two years, and it is never considered as a censor. It was benefitted from the strategy of “evidentiality” here. A point of criticism received from opposing party about legal regulations was the discourses asserting that the provisions presented in this regulation are not “an inclusive study” and “an imposition executed by the government”. In order to prevent these criticisms, the ruling party especially tried to operate the strategy of “consensus”. “Consensus” became an indicator showing more inclusive politics are carried out and it was tried to generate a thought as it is the opinion of “everyone” and the action of “everyone” and everybody is the part of this. Ünüvar (AKP, 28 January 2014) positioned the regulation in his speech that they made a rather efficient study with the ruling and opposing party’s parliamentarians in Information and Internet Research Commission in 2012, this new regulation is a regulation made both through receiving the “opinions” of the representative of whole sector by Information Technologies and Communication Institution for two and a half years and the opinions of Information and Internet Research. Conflicting discourses were tried to prevent over “consensus” and “generalizing” strategies by emphasizing it is a regulation which may be required by anyone, the issues handles are the problem of “76 million citizens” not “only” the problem of “AKP”.

Moreover, it was come into prominence that this regulation was not a regulation made “only” by Turkey, in contrary it is a regulation made “all” around the world by “all” developed, developing and undeveloped countries, there are many regulations present in many countries from Germany to Italy, United Kingdom to United States of America, France to Finland. It was indicated that as per article 20 of the Constitution, it was obviously ordered to prevent violation of personal rights and protects the right of privacy and this regulation was made in this direction (Necdet Ünüvar, AKP, 19 February 2014). By this was, the regulations desired to make are tried to “legitimize” and “naturalize” with the argumentation strategies as “consensus”, “generalizing”, “explaining” with examples”. At the same time, the discourse was tried to strengthen depending upon a fundamental text as Constitution. “Applying authority” is an important discourse strategy and in the parliament, many speakers tried to benefit from some authorities generally as institutions or party policies, credited people, experts or persons being known as moral leaders in order to support their examples. International organizations, scientists, mass media, church or the courts generally possess this role (Van Dijk, 2000: 63).

5.1.6. Rhetorical Elements

While presenting anything, a situation, event, fact etc positively, rhetorical analysis of ideological discourse is an important mechanism in generating an effect on cognitive

processes, creating a behavior and attitude in that direction, convincing people towards desired direction by benefitting from the strategies as repeating, metaphor numeric information, irony, dramatization, euphemism, exaggerating (Van Dijk, 2000: 62-85) in presenting the other one negatively (Van Dijk, 2000: 59). In the ruling party's discourse, rhetorical elements were used effectively. For example, Zeynep Karahan Uslu (AKP, 30 January 2014) indicated in her speech that Turkey will continue strengthening the context of "social state", "democracy" and "freedom" since it is the correct and fair one, not because "somebody is requested", as in all areas being a country with an important place in the virtual world with by gliding her discourse against all criticisms brought to the government in internet regulation within a "populist" discourse to the discourse of "Turkey" as being frequently applied as an important political strategy and convincing method. "Irony" that we confronted as a rhetorical element is an important strategy as not being accusive on other opinions in order to strengthen own argument and used for weakening other arguments through trying to present that there is a conflicting situation by using a sarcastic wording (Van Dijk, 2000: 76). In his speech, Ahmet Aydın (AKP, 6 February 2014) expressed through calling out to opposing parties that he could not understand "while they were harping on the same string about the right of privacy, stating in every circumstances that they did not justify an attack against personal rights, no one did and should justify, why they were annoyed about the regulation in the internet law". While an "ironic" expression draws attention, it was also benefitted from the power of "metaphor". Abstract, complicated, mysterious, new or sentimental meanings can be turned into a more familiar and concrete form through metaphors (Van Dijk, 2000: 77). The phrase of "harping on the same string" means "keeping on saying the same thing" and an impression as the opposing party contradicted themselves is tried to create through using this metaphor and an effort for presenting "fallacies" as an important "reasoning strategy" came into prominence. "Fallacies" is a strategy frequently confronted in the parliamentary debates. It may be related about any element of discussion, in other words the nature of proposal and the relation between the proposals and results etc. It can be referred many fallacies which cannot be specified here (Van Dijk, 2000: 71).

5.2. Positioning Style Of Internet Law In The Discourses Of Opposition Parties

5.2.1. Interaction and Context

On the date negotiating new regulations related to internet law, the parties representing opposition in the parliament are Republican People's Party (CHP) (main opposition party), Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) and Peace and Democracy Party (BDP). On the dates negotiating new regulations related to internet law, People's Democratic Party (HDP) confronts us as a party represented in the parliament even if they do not have sufficient number of parliamentarian constituting a group in the parliament. BDP participated in HDP by terminating itself by taking a decision taken in June 2014. In the negotiations made in the parliament related to new regulation in internet law, "all" opposing parties approached the regulations requested to make as "regulations of ruling party" and criticized many provisions. There is a rejection of discourses indicating these regulations emerged within the framework of mutual decisions as it was asserted by the ruling party. Speakers of the parties representing opposition in the parliament asserted that the regulations related to

internet was brought into the agenda since internet was perceived as a “threat” and “in order to prevent some situations being contrary with the interest of ruling party”. The parliamentarians of opposition parties have performed their speeches during the discussion within an interaction as accusing the parliamentarians of ruling party , generating an opposing power by sharing with the same opinions with other parties in opposition, responding a question, asking question to create a certain effect, verbal attack to a member of ruling party, calling other parliamentarians to order, challenging the ruling party, criticizing government, provoking the group, interrupting the speech of a speaker, suggesting a policy etc, referring to previous discussions, referring to undesired conclusions of current policies, asking for the floor.

When assessing the speeches made upon the law draft in the parliament, the parliamentarians of ruling party took the floor more than the parliamentarians of ruling party and the discussions were actually shaped within the framework of opposing party’s discourses. When assessing political speeches made by opposition parties, it is realized that the phrases being harder and sometimes accusing the ruling party are dominant. The speeches expecting for an explanation from ruling party are at the forefront. By continuously keeping certain issues in the regulation at forefront, new regulation was tried to be framed in line with these issues. They refrained from a discourse in favor of the regulation and the key issue in terms of opposition was to criticize ruling party continuously within the framework of this regulation. The most important feature drawing attention in the speeches of the parliamentarians of opposition parties is the obvious usage of argumentation strategies and rhetorical strategies. Attitudes and behaviors criticizing the policies of government are very obvious and it is not possible to say that a different voice in favor of the regulation is raised within the opposition side. The opposition handled the issue within a consensus on discourse.

5.2.2. Definitions

When considering the interpretation styles of opposition parties related to new regulations in internet law, CHP positioned new regulations in the law as a regulation which will darken internet and recede to a backward position in terms of internet freedom and the rights of internet users. They asserted that it is a regulation made for concealing several things in line with the own will of ruling side. It is asserted that the purpose of this regulation is to prevent the allegation of corruptions circulating over internet. The omnibus bill was defined as a spoiled law impairing the reputation of TBMM shadowing democracy, leading the unhappiness of all citizens and there will be no citizen remaining happy when it becomes law. New regulations related to internet were presented as the work of an issue of trust between the state and citizens. MHP tried to constitute this regulation as a regulation prepared solely as rulership-oriented, with the intention to protect the Prime Minister and everybody around, which will reinforce the arbitrary and tyrant regime and a regulation suitable for being an apparatus of fear empire which can be used as a tool for threat and blackmail (Erkan Akçay, MHP, 5 February 2014). The 17 December operation related to the government was continuously tried to keep on the agenda. New law was defined as a “law handcuffing internet”. While criticizing new regulations, MHP also defined the law as spoiled law and mentioned that there are many relevant or irrelevant things inside the bill. The omnibus bill was once again labeled with the words as “omnibus bill curiosity”, “freak”, “huge bag”. Moreover, omnibus bills are defined as unfair, illegal and unlawful. BDP positioned new regulation related to internet as an indicator

receding each and every passing day. BDP handled omnibus bill as an application having an understanding as “it is allowable to include everything in case it is an omnibus bill” and positioned as an application ruining the lawful feature and law technique of the assembly. Moreover, it was emphasized that the assembly became a law factory, sub-laws were enacted, many wrong laws were enacted inside the omnibus bills and the wrong action was tried to be corrected with wrongs again. HDP defined new regulations as a freak regulation. The articles related to internet access in internet regulation expressed as “very dangerous” articles. The regulation was defined as “not worth a cent” which can take social media under control by maintaining the attitude as “Pharaoh”.

Another issue which the opposition went into the effort of defining is the style of interpretation related to existing “rulership”. CHP interpreted Turkey with AKP as a country which the freedom of speech was continuously restricted and AKP was portrayed as a “prohibitive” ruling party. MHP also went into the effort of defining the rulership within the framework of these regulations and a table of rulership was portrayed fettering citizens, questioning and supervising themselves and the things done through internet. A reference was desired to make towards “captivity” and “prohibitive state” with the metaphoric expression used. The Prime Minister Erdoğan positioned as a person who cannot stand criticism, being in quarrel with everyone and hysterical as applying censor and discontinuing television broadcast about the leader of opposing party (Erkan Akçay, MHP, 5 February 2014). BDP positioned ruling party as a party committing more than one crime (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 21 February 2014) against citizens and against public when this omnibus bill and previous omnibus bills were considered altogether. HDP expressed their opinions as fearing and escaping from realities cannot save the government from final consequence, the regime implemented by the government of AKP will find itself in the “wastes of history” as all other “tyrant governments” (Ertuğrul Kürkcü, HDP, 5 February 2014).

5.2.3. Actors

Within the framework of the subject which the study focused, basic actors are the ruling and opposing party’s parliamentarians as mentioned before. When looking from the opposition party's point of view, basic actors being brought forefront in the speeches is the ruling party and all regulations made on the internet law were tried to make meaningless by correlating with ruling party. Another actor focused on within the framework of this regulation in terms of the opposition is the citizens to be affected from all these regulations adversely and they emphasized especially on the young population and a perception related to the rulership being afraid of young citizens especially as the effective users of social media was tried to make visible.

5.2.4. Topics and Themes

Essential subject focused by the study is new regulations on the internet law. However, as it is mentioned before, these regulations were tried to make sense within the framework of different themes both in the discourse of ruling and opposition parties. The themes coming into prominence in the discourses of opposition were determined as follows:

5.2.4.1. A Regulation Which Will Bring Several Censor Foundations Under The Control Of Government

The opposition parties were tried to make the regulations related to new internet law sense within the framework of the right of privacy discourse coming into prominence by the government. As they tried to emphasize the importance of this subject, they also continuously underlined that the purpose of the ruling party was totally different. From the side of CHP, it was indicated that it is a regulation brought several censor foundations which will “actually” carry out under the control of government but “seemingly” called as the auto censor of the sector (Mehmet Akif Hamzaçebi, CHP, 28 January 2014). It was emphasized that the novel of George Orwell which was written in 1940s and called “1984” simply became the reality (Aytuğ Atıcı, CHP, 5 February 2014) in Turkey.

This draft was considered as the “product of guiltiness rush” forcing them to negotiate the subjects collectively which are totally irrelevant from one another. It was handled as a regulation trying to constitute a “prohibitive” network, “being focused on censoring the corruption and bribery scandals” and mainly excluding the demands and expectations of public. While this regulation is defined as “outdated”, it was emphasized that the purpose is to prevent access to information and social resistance related to social media. It was alleged that this is a draft based on “arbitrary censor” and the opposing sides were “carded” virtually (Sakine Öz, CHP, 29 January 2014). Words coming into prominence together with censor were “prohibitive”, “carding”, “preventing resistance” and it was continuously emphasized that this law is a “penalty law”, a “censor law” (Erdal Aksünger, CHP, 5 February 2014). Moreover, it was asserted that this regulation is nothing more than creating intelligence services for AKP, and the draft is the “censor and exile enactment of AKP” (Durdu Özbolat, CHP, 5 February 2014). The criticisms came into prominence in the discourses of CHP that TİB was tried to become as a new MİT (National Intelligence Service) with this law. The authorities ensured to TİB especially without requiring any judicial decision were being criticized and the action as tracing the traffic of companies providing hosting service was considered as “carding with state hand” (Erdal Aksünger, CHP, 4 February 2014). Allegations were asserted about the intention on TİB as transforming into (Erdal Aksünger, CHP, 5 February 2014). With the establishment of Access Providers Union, it was indicated that actually “the union of access censor” was established in a sense (Umut Oran, CHP, 5 February 2014). It was reminded that an example for this union was existing in Italy in 1928, the similar union compared to the one established under the title of “Aleo Professionale” in the period of Mussolini in Italy was established in Turkey under the title of “Basın Birliği (Union of Press)” in 1938 (Osman Oktay Ekşi, CHP, 5 February 2014). The importance of the problem was tried to make more obvious through the argument as “learning from history”. “Explaining with examples” is an important discourse strategy. Giving concrete examples instead of general realities has the power of both easily imagining with remembering better and being associated with compelling experimental evidence forms (Van Dijk, 2000: 69-70).

MHP handled new regulation as an application trying to bring “restriction” on the right of intelligence of citizens and “censor to internet” (Yusuf Ziya İrbeç, MHP, 4 February, 2014). It was emphasized that AKP rulership took the press in Turkey as “hostage” and it was expressed that Erdoğan is the biggest obstacle before the freedom of expression (Özcan Yeniçeri, MHP, 20 February 2014). It is indicated that the ruling party presents with this censor and regulations how they constituted their own

“autocratic regime” (Yusuf Halaçoğlu, MHP, 4 February 2014). In the discourse of MHP, it was criticized with an ironic language that the discourse of the government as “advanced democracy” by bringing the “autocratic structure” forefront which is going far from democracy. Since the regulations of government criticized with censor, by referring to the censor applications made in the period of Abdülhamit, the Prime Minister was tried to come into prominence as “a personality supporting censor” (Erkan Akçay, MHP, 4 February 2014). It was emphasized that the dangers as tracing the activities of persons in the internet, carding, supervising and spying will emerge in a country having no law on protecting personal information (Yusuf Halaçoğlu, MHP, 5 February 2014). In the discourse of MHP, the discourses upon “surveillance” and “control” also became obvious. The regulation was handled as a censor infrastructure study bringing Telecommunication Communication Presidency under the sole control of government as an autonomous public institution (Kemalettin Yılmaz, MHP, 5 February 2014). HDP advocated that this regulation seized and censored the right of public related to access information (Abdullah Levent Tüzel, HDP, 5 February 2014). BDP criticized the “right of privacy” as an ambiguous context being left under the assessment of a bureaucrat assigned by the government according to the amendments (Erol Dora, BDP, 5 February 2014). It was underlined that internet is a common area of citizens all around the world, having not central government and administrative system, and prohibitions and rules towards the freedom of expression became null and void in this area (Erol Dora, BDP, 5 February 2014).

5.2.4.2. A Prohibitive Regulation Against Democratic Structure, Preventing Freedoms

Another theme problematized by the opposition in the new regulation related to internet was realized in the surface of prohibitions and freedoms. The side of CHP emphasized that if this draft passes into law, Turkey will go down in history as the forth country censoring internet after Iran, China and Malaysia (Haydar Akar, CHP, 5 February 2014). It was indicated that the democracy receded through an “autocratic” regime in Turkey instead of progressing forward together with AKP, and this law has serious contradictions with fundamental rights and freedoms (Umut Oran, CHP, 5 February 2014). It was alleged that the way started with the intention of democracy seems to finalize with “dictatorship” (Hasan Ören, CHP, 5 February 2014). While the Prime Minister resembles to Hitler, it was tried to come the transformation from democracy to dictatorship into prominence. It was indicated that there are censors in the West but with the intention to protect the user’s rights. Especially defining catalogue crimes were left extremely ambiguous (Binnaz Toprak, CHP, 5 February 2014). It was underlined that in modern economies, while the balance of freedom and security takes the side with freedom, the security will not preferred instead of freedom under any circumstances (Rahmi Aşkın Türeli, CHP, 21 February 2014). It was also opened up for discussion that why the crimes except catalogue crimes were not taken under the definition of crimes (Erdal Aksünger, CHP, 5 February 2014) and an impression was tried to emerge as there is an “ironic” situation. It is indicated that applying censor firstly with an administrative decision, afterwards going to the court assessed as an application being insufficient in eliminating the violation of freedom of expression (Rıza Türmen, CHP, 25 February 2014).

MHP parliamentarians also alleged that the main purpose is to prevent the circulation of images, the documents related to corruption and bribery which will collapse AKP mentality through expressing those serious restrictions towards individual rights and

freedom in internet usage in this draft (Mustafa Kalaycı, MHP, 28 January 2014). It was underlined that democracy was always confronted within the discourse of “advanced democracy”, and all in the democracy was always tried to be prevented (Muharrem Varlı, MHP, 5 February 2014). The discourses as another step would be taken towards dictatorship, fascism and oppressive regime after the acceptance of this draft became more apparent and it was underlined that the real purpose of internet law is to restrict the freedom brought to press and freedoms in Turkey more (Lütfü Türkkan, MHP, 6 February 2014). It was also emphasized that the “auto censor” was applied in Turkey as the “most despicable” version of censor, and with the new law, this became more fatal (Osman Oktay Ekşi, CHP, 19 February 2014).

BDP parliamentarians also found this regulation with full of contradictions and was underlined that it will be the victim of a system as in “autocratic regimes”, even in “coup regimes” and this system will firstly strike them (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 4 February 2014). The criticism against rulership becomes apparent with these discourses and a discourse asserting the rulership has an authoritative structure is also emerged. HDP indicated that it is not possible to define this implementation within the framework of freedom and democracy by stating there is a burden and blockage brought on the rights and freedom of 40 million users and advocated that there is a blockage present (Abdullah Levent Tüzel, HDP, 5 February 2014).

5.2.5. Arguments

Essential matters which the opposition parliamentarians tried to constitute related to new regulation regarding internet are the discourses as the imposition of ruling party and establishment of a huge blockage before freedoms. CHP frequently repeated this regulation as the regulation of AKP. Basic argument of MHP is that the regulation was applied to conceal several things (Reşat Dođru, MHP, 5 February 2014) and in order to create an impression within a generalizing attitude towards it is the opinion of everyone, it was tried to come the discourse of “the public opinion was started to direct this way now” into prominence. BDP and HDP found the conceptualizing the violation of personal rights and the arguments which will support the opinion as this regulation is beyond censor were tried to come into prominence (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 28 January 2014; Adil Zozani, BDP, 28 January 2014; Abdullah Levent Tüzel, HDP, 5 February 2014).

In terms of the parliamentarians of opposition, the most basic strategy applied in order to present what new regulations in internet law are problematic was to enable the argumentation strategies. Basic argumentation strategies applied by the opposition were to make references from the structures as presenting evidence, counterfactuals, generalization, comparison, determining opinion and attitude, applying authorities.

The parliamentarians of CHP frequently used the quotation and applying authority strategies in their political discourses. By referring to an interview made with the President of Alternatif Bilişim Derneđi (Alternative Information Association) in the official gazette, it was forwarded that the president used the phrase of “Çinnet” (an expression referring to China) instead of “cinnet” (insanity) for the regulations referring as the internet in Turkey will become closed to the world as the internet in China, Iran and Saudi Arabia (Aykan Erdemir, CHP, 14 January 2014). By benefitting from the discourse of an “expert” institution about information technologies, the effect was tried to increase. Moreover, by giving the worst “examples” about the internet applications,

an impression as the situation will also develop in this direction in Turkey was tried to be created. In the political discussions, it was tried to benefit from the power of “counterfactuals” referring if precautions are not taken or policies or a law is not produced, what will emerge (Van Dijk, 2000: 66). A negative image was aimed to be generated through “creating fear, panic, and concern”. At the same time, these arguments were tried to strengthen rhetorically with the usage of metaphors as “cinnet” and “çinnet”. The assessment of Erdemir as “we are expressing once again that we will not allow this, we promise that we will do our best to free access of our citizens to internet” includes “a populist discourse” and constitution the discourse of “we” who are in the pursuit of events, taking sides with, protecting and favoring public on one hand; the “rulership” was tried to be positioned within a “censoring” structure preventing the free access of citizens to internet against all these aspects. It was realized that these “disclaimers” we encountered as presenting own positive, submitting other negative were applied (Van Dijk, 2000: 67).

In order to present that the discourses of ruling party as “there is no censor on press and internet, the press is free” are not realistic, it was forwarded that “all” international reports presented the non-liberal situation of press and Turkey turned out to be a “prison”, International Authors Union warned related to this law on internet that “if this law is enacted, Turkey become the country applying censor on the press at most in the world (Umut Oran, CHP, 5 February 2014). By indicating the report¹⁰ issued by Freedom House as an example (Rıza Türmen, CHP, 5 February 2014), it was tried to show that Turkey has a negative image abroad. It was specified that Freedom House shows Turkey within the countries as “partially free” due to the “authoritarian” tendencies (Sena Kaleli, CHP, 5 February 2014). The arguments were tried to strengthen by quoting from the discourses of persons and institutions accepted as “authority”. At the same time, the defining as “all” reports is a “generalizing” approach and it strengthens the thought of “it is the public opinion”. With the metaphor of “prison”, the discourse of blockages and censors before the freedom were tried to be strengthened.

In the discourse of MHP, a reference was also made to the report of Freedom House while criticizing the current situation of Turkey about democracy and the freedom of expression and by indicating that the media is faced with a substantial suppression applied by the government in Turkey according to the report, the discourses of a structure accepted as an “authority” are used as a tool in strengthening their own discourses (Özcan Yeniçeri, MHP, 5 February 2014). At the same time, the arguments were tried to be strengthened with a metaphoric expression by indicating the opinion and thought towards the effort for creating a “fear empire” (Reşat Doğru, MHP, 5 February 2014) in Turkey. By indicating the “opinion and attitude” related to the importance of in the channels of Twitter, Facebook and other virtual fields in terms of the freedom of expression and thought, an additional importance is attached to these fields and by indicating that these are the efforts for closing this resource to the transfer of information related to “thievery” and “corruption” operation in 17 December, tape and voice recordings to public or the efforts for leaving under the supervision of rulership, it is specified as the biggest example of “antidemocratic” “dictatorship” (Faruk Bal, MHP, 5 February 2014). It was stated it is not possible to qualify an understanding which are making illegal wiretapping, spying, carding in order to use for own interests and benefits as democratic. Going out of law and democracy for the ones who was elected were defined as “elected dictatorship” (Koray Aydın, MHP, 6 February 2014). By benefitting from the power of “statistical information”, the

discourse as Turkey is receding with each passing day in the sort of freedom of press due to “increasing censor” in the period of AKP was tried to be strengthened with the support of data received from “expertise institutions” as Sınır Tanımayan Örgütü (Organization Without Borders) (Erkan Akçay, MHP, 6 February 2014). By giving “examples from history”, the effect of discourse was tried to be increased. Especially with the period of Abdülhamit as a vicious example in terms of Turkey about censor, it was continuously “repeated” that the situation now is worse than the period of Abdülaziz who was issued Matbuat Nizamnamesi (The Regulation of Press) (Osman Oktay Ekşi, CHP, 19 February 2014). While the examples given from the history supported the thoughts as the lessons should be learnt from the history, repeating same things continuously can be assessed as an important strategy in terms of both rhetorical and the technique of propaganda.

In their emphasis especially on censor, BDP was tried to create an effect depending the position of Turkey in the world about the internet censor on the “statistics” (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 28 January 2014, Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 5 February 2014). By exemplifying the article 90 in the Constitution, the criteria of AİHM (European Court of Human Rights), the European Convention, the regulations in the laws (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 4 February 2014), they tried to support their arguments through benefitting from the power of institutions accepted as “authority”. While BDP especially considered the matter of executing the bill quia timet of access providers at latest within four hours related to the matter of violation against the right of privacy as really problematic (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 4 February 2014), they constantly tried to keep this subject on the agenda. While evaluating the position of rulership within this regulation, HDP tried to present the opinion as they actually put “themselves”, not Turkey in the same equation with authoritarian regimes and the arguments were tried to be strengthened through reminding the binding mechanisms in the decisions which Turkey will take by featuring that the matter related whether there is freedom of communication or censor cannot be considered as independent from the common dimensions reached through European Human Rights Convention, Universal Declaration of United Nations, all international conventions (Ertuğrul Kürkcü, HDP, 5 February 2014).

5.2.6. Rhetorical Elements

Rhetorical elements having an important effect mechanism during the establishment process of the discourse were a basic strategy applied by the opposition to strengthen their arguments. In the discourse of opposition, it is realized that especially the metaphors and the strategies as the discourses dramatizing, making victims, exaggerating, using ironic phrases, repetitions, benefitting from the power of numbers came into prominence in the discourses of opposition.

In the discourse of CHP, the metaphor of “prison” became obvious since the dimension of the regulations related to internet as prohibitive and restrictive. It was indicated that the country has turned out to be a prison with these prohibitions and moreover, by using a metaphoric expressions as “spoiled law” instead of omnibus bill, it was tried to explain that this law has a complicated as a labyrinth (Hülya Güven, CHP, 28 January 2014). It was tried to be presented that the law draft was rather far from its intention for enforcement by using a metaphoric expression as assembly went beyond a legislative power and turned out to be “a prentice tailor patching on the dress he casually sewed”. It was found “ironic” to release the approval of the President on censor on the internet through Twitter and to reach out public through a field which

was tried to be censored was deemed as “ironic” within a sarcastic attitude (Sakine Öz, CHP, 19 February 2014). It was assessed that in every country having high levels of corruption and poverty and exploitation, “police state” is also raising and became dominant regime, and Turkey is only a “police state” and by putting law into a bag cannot conceal these realities (Durdu Özbolat, CHP, 5 February 2014). While “police state” referring to suppression, control and supervision within this metaphoric expression, with the comparison made with the phrase of “putting law into a bag”, a reference was made both to “omnibus bill” and “disregarding law”. Since CHP considered the regulations related to internet law solely as a project of government, expressions presenting government adversely came into prominence in all assessments and it was frequently benefitted from metaphors at this point. It was alleged that the ruling party AKP is always using the “language of victimhood”, and now they linked arms with the persons who has considered as enemies once (Muharrem Işık, CHP, 29 January 2014). When considering the metaphors used, it is obvious that the government was tried to be presented adversely. One of the issues which was mainly emphasized is the authorities given to TİB, and it was criticized with an “ironic” expression, while TİB was defined in the position fulfilling the duty of “internet gendarmerie” again with a metaphoric expression (Durdu Özbolat, CHP, 5 February 2014). It is really effective in terms of rhetorical expressions being dramatized. It is a known method for exaggerating realities in favor of a person or situation with exaggerations (Van Dijk, 2000: 68). The results of effects in favor of someone surely cause the formation of a negative situation in terms of the others. While CHP is questioning ruling party through dramatizing discourses¹¹, CHP is positioned as a “savior” and “problem solver” against all these issues. While AKP is criticized with ironic expressions, by benefitting from the strategy of making victim, “young persons” were positioned as victims before these applications. In making a person victim; to ensure the embracement of discourse, the phrase we is defined as victim and by emphasizing the results of events, dramatized details are given related to the persons becoming victims (Van Dijk, 2000: 84).

The parliamentarians of MHP also used the strategies of applying authority and metaphoric elements in their speeches. By referring to the Constitution, the implementations of Constitution were found as inconsistent with the constitution. With metaphoric expressions, it was alleged that social media was considered as “enemy” and they could not “ensure the balance” in social media. With this style of expression, it was tried to be implied that there is a ruling party which does not know what they do and not being able to act consistent (Emin Haluk Ayhan, MHP, 4 February 2014). Ironic expressions are rather obvious in the discourses of MHP. It was stated that before the elections in 2011, while “unpleasant traps” made towards MHP and the government “did not move a muscle” against the ones spreading them over internet, when the same situation occurred about them, they started to apply censor, take jurisdiction, media, citizen under suppression and restrict the freedoms of citizens and they are not different from a “dictatorship”. On one hand while an impression as contradictory situations emerged was tried to be created, on the other hand, all implementations are tried to be defined within a metaphoric expression as “dictatorship” by assimilating these implementations with dictatorship (Kemalettin Yılmaz, MHP, 5 February 2014). The metaphor of “prison” was also used by MHP. It was expressed that Turkey is turned out to be an “open prison” during the period of AKP (Özcan Yeniçeri, MHP, 20 February 2014). The Union of Access Providers was positioned as “freak of nature”, both an ironic expression was embraced within the discourse as its title should be amended as “union of access blocking” (Mehmet

Günel, MHP, 5 February 2014) and it was also tied to be benefitted from the powers of metaphors. With the metaphor of the freak of nature, it was tried to present that there is an abnormal situation present. At the point of censor and freedoms, by stating even if Turkish and all accents of Turkish would come together, it is not possible to describe the situation in which AKP is found, it was tried to be benefitted from the power of “exaggerating” strategy in rhetorical means (Osman Oktay Ekşi, CHP, 19 February 2014). As an example for the rhetorical expression style of MHP, the struggle for discourse created over several authors and books suggested to the ruling party to read can be considered as an example for the rhetorical expression style. Through the references made for reading books related to the life of Al Capone who is a godfather, the book of Turgenyev called “Babalar ve Oğullar”, the work of Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar called Gulyabani, the story of Mucize Aynalar (Magical Mirrors) in the book of Aziz Nesin called Fil Hamdi (Erkan Akçay, MHP, 13 February 2014), on one hand the ruling party was portrayed adversely within this sarcastic expression; on the other hand it was tried to be benefitted from the power of “euphemism” which is an effective rhetorical strategy and being more polite and implicit style of expression (Van Dijk, 2000: 68-69) through softening several negative arguments. Another criticism ground of MHP was not to veto the regulations related to internet by the President. It was underlined that the President was entered into “negotiation with government”, there were 82 notaries of Ankara, at least notaries research the document being submitted, however the President was a candidate for being 83rd notary but he does not research the issue presented to him. By signing the “law of censor”, the President was accused of “scoring the goal against the public” (Sinan Oğan, MHP, 19 February 2014). While the attitude of the President was handled in a form of dramatizing and rather ironic related to the meetings of parliament, it was benefitted from the power of metaphors, and it was tried to create an impression as it is the President of government, not the public within the discourse of polarization”. Polarization confronts as an important strategy in creating two sides as us and them (Van Dijk, 2000: 80). Same criticism was also received from the side of BDP and the discourse of MHP as 83rd notary was also reflected to their discourses (Altan Tan, BDP, 19 February 2014).

BDP benefitted from the power of metaphors while criticizing the approach of government especially related to new regulations and within a metaphoric expression, an assessment was made as “when you do not separate the wheat from the chaff,” you create a “fear empire” in the country of “censors” (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 4 February 2014). Essential metaphors emerged in terms of BDP are to focus on the elements which will remind “fear” and “prohibitions”. In order to present the abnormal situation, it was specified that this issue will be captioned with an ironic language in comics as Leman, Girgir and Penguen (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 5 February 2014). Again, as an important rhetorical strategy “asking questions” confronts us as a rhetorical strategy preferred in the efforts of showing the existence of ambiguous situation and the unanswered questions. That question was forwarded to the ruling party: “Why do you feel the requirement of putting this law into this omnibus bill and bringing in a hurry? What are you trying to conceal at the very time when the images, tapes related to these corruptions emerged?” (Altan Tan, BDP, 5 February 2014). At the same time, with “euphemism” as a rhetorical strategy, a relation between this regulation and the allegations of corruption was actually tried to be established. By expressing that the timing of this regulation is “meaningful”, HDP (Abdullah Levent Tüzel, HDP, 5 February 2014) was again tried to present their thoughts with “euphemism” trying to soften and implying the discourse. HDP was tried to create the impression as there is

a contradictory situation by using an “ironic” expression by indicating that there is a government which does not trust public (Abdullah Levent Tüzel, HDP, 5 February 2014) but in contrary, the government always keeps on saying the phrase of public, by criticizing the “populist” discourse of the government with a “populist” expression style. After enacting the law, BDP handled current situation in a sarcastic manner with the metaphors by using basic contexts of fabricated production through the metaphors bringing mass production and mechanization forefront (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 21 February 2014). Lawmaking process was criticized with the metaphors as “speed, mass production, factory, fason, production errors”. In the discourses of BDP, a poetical and dramatized language was come into force at the same time and rhetorical effect was tried to be increased. In his speech focused on the freedom, Kaplan tried to present with a metaphoric expression that it is not possible to prevent freedom by saying “if you have love in your heart and mind related to freedom, you write it upon the stars, the sun, also to the walls of prison, or through the cyber world and social media in all respects” (Hasip Kaplan, BDP, 21 February 2014) and it is a totally different feeling to live liberally.

CONCLUSION

The relation between the political discourse and the types of context was analyzed in various respects in this study trying to present how new regulations related to the internet law in Turkey made sense and focusing on the discourse and rhetoric of parliament. New several regulations were made in 2014 on the law related to internet accepted in 2007 in Turkey. New regulations in the internet law has a particular concern to people from all strata and these regulations generated one of the issues discussed in the agenda of media, public and politics at most. The forms of making sense of ruling and opposition parties in Turkey related to new regulations regarding internet law were analyzed within the framework of speeches performed in the National Grand Assembly of Turkey.

As a result of analyses made, it is realized that the types of making sense of ruling and opposition parties related to new regulations in internet law are totally different one another. There is a consensus on speech among opposition parties in approaching the subject and likewise, there is not a different voice rising within the ruling party related to the amendments requested to apply during negotiations and a consensus on speech was ensured. New regulations are necessary for the happiness of society towards “protecting the rights of victim” according to the ruling party. The ruling party dealt the subject within the framework of two fundamental themes. It is a regulation “protecting the right of privacy” and as “not prohibitive, solving problem”. In the discourse of opposition, new regulation was defined as “preventing freedom”, “prohibitive”, “applying censors”, “serving for the interests of government”, and “creating fear empire”, “despotic. In the definitions of opposition and their approaches, there is completely a criticism against the ruling party and regulations in the law were assessed as a regulation excluding different discourse and thoughts, and rulership-oriented. The opposition also reacted against the implementation of “omnibus bill” and omnibus bill was tried to be positioned adversely with the metaphors as “bag”, “spoiled”, “freak”, “factory”, “fason”. While defining the rulership and the Prime Minister, the metaphors as “prohibitive”, “fettering public”, “showing the attitude of Pharaoh”, “fear from public” and “despotic” were frequently used. Two fundamental themes focused by the opposition related to regulation were the discourses as “several applications related to censor will be brought under the control of

government” and “it is a regulation prohibiting, constituting an impediment before freedoms and against democratic structure”. The parliamentarians of ruling party frequently applied strategies which will strengthen their arguments in line with the themes they focused related to the regulation. In order to present why this regulation was required; the discourse was tried to be strengthen with the power of strategies as evidentiality, counterfactuals, consensus, comparison, expressing value and norm, specifying opinion and attitude, generalizations, explaining, applying authority and quotation, lessons from the history and numeric information. The parliamentarians of opposition frequently gave place to the arguments which will support their thoughts as these regulations are the imposition of ruling party and constitute a huge impediment before freedoms in their political speeches. The strategies used by the opposition are also in same direction with the strategies used by the rulership. Both ruling and opposition parties brought the rhetorical strategies having a significant effect on constituting a thought in line with their request into their speeches. Exaggerating, euphemism, dramatizing, irony, using metaphor, numeric information, repeating were the most preferred rhetorical strategies. Since the regulation related to internet was dealt at the level of “censor”, “prohibitions”, “restricting freedom” especially in the discourse of opposition, references made to the metaphor “prison”, the metaphor “police-state”, the reference as “dictator” while positioning the Prime Minister and references to the personalities as Hitler, Mussolini and Al Capone and the references to the implementations related to censor in the period of Abdülhamit while matching new regulation with censor were become obvious. With the metaphors as “speed, mass production, factory, fason, production errors”, law making process was criticized.

It is obvious that political discourse was nurtured with many ideological and rhetorical strategies. All strategies which will strengthen the discourse and support the argument in the political speeches cannot make sense by disconnecting from its historical context. Therefore, without analyzing multi dimensional structure of political discourse and its mechanisms being connected, it is not possible to make an accurate reading of reality to be produced over the discourse.

NOTES

1 Please see the study of Reisigl (2008) related to the forms of political speech.

2 Foucault (2006: 307) underlines that the object of panopticon and its purpose are dealt as a general principle of a new “political anatomy” having discipline relations instead of sovereignty relation. Foucault (2006: 256) indicates that it is a regulation forcing the performance of discipline through views; the techniques enabling to see increases the possibilities of government and as a consequence, it requires a machinery which makes persons being exposed these pressures of the suppressing tools. The disutopic novel of Orwell (2012) called *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* (Nineteen Eighty Four) presents an important point of view in giving the meaning of surveillance, control, and discipline relations. Please see as a study assessing the analysis of Foucault, Deleuze, Hardt and Negri upon control and disciplinary (Guins, 2008).

3 Please see: (Öztürk, 2013: 140) about panopticon, sinopticon and superpanopticon.

4 Turkey was connected to internet on 12 April 1993. According to the results of Household Information Technologies Usage Research in 2014 made by Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK), computer and internet usage rates are 53,5 % and 53,8 % for the individuals between 16-74 age group respectively, these rates are 62,7 % and 63,5 % for males and 44,3 % and 44,1 % for women. The group of age having the highest usage rate of internet is 16-24. According to the results of Household Information Technologies Usage Research, the rate of households having the opportunity to access internet in Turkey was 60.2 % in April 2014. When considering the intent of use of internet, in the first quarter of 2014, while 78,8 % of individuals using internet was participated in the social media, it is followed by reading online news, newspapers or magazines with the rate of 74,2 %, searching information related to goods and services with the rate of 67,2 % and downloading or playing game, movie, film, display with the rate of 58,7 % and finally sending-receiving emails with the rate of 53,9 % (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=16198>).

5 In article 8 of the law numbered 5651; directing for committing suicide, sexual abuse of children, facilitating the usage of drugs and stimulants, provision of materials being dangerous for the health, vulgarity, prostitution, providing area and opportunity for gambling, crimes indicated in the Law about the Crimes Committed Against Atatürk are sorted among the catalogue crimes.

6 In the assessment of Binark & Bayraktutan Sütcü (2007) related to the duties and responsibilities of this presidency, they indicate that inhibitive regulations towards the access of this content which political will focused upon content supervision and censorship through the visible hand of the state limit the freedom of individual communication. According to them, individuals transfer their free wills to state authority/big brothers once again (Binark and Bayraktutan Sütcü, 2007).

7 The purpose of ideological discourse is not only to discover underlying aspect behind the ideologies, but also to establish a systematic relation between the structures of ideologies and structures of discourse (Van Dijk, 1995: 143). The discourse plays an important role on the production of prejudice and its reproduction (Van Dijk, 1997a: 31).

8 Van Dijk (2000: 62-85) indicates how the actors are defined in rhetorical and ideological analysis of text, the importance of presenting strategies as application methods to authority, generating consensus, disclaimers, distancing, dramatization, evidentiality, explaining with examples, ironies, metaphors, negative other-presentation, positive self-presentation, populist discourses.

9 “First of all, there is no serious penalty defined clearly against the attacks made towards the personality, dignity, honor, pride and personal right in the environment of internet. In the attacks made towards personal dignity and rights, there is not such a thing called contradiction mechanism, you cannot find who or what is this, I would like to draw your attention on this.”

10 “These amendment proposals are giving the authority to the public servants for closing web sites without requiring any judicial decision. You see, it has the

characteristics of a severe violation of European Human Right Convention. The government escalates attacks against the freedom of expression.”

11 “Did you become ruling party by mistake? Is that the reason of considering 50 percent of public as enemy, is it because you became ruling party by mistake? Generations which will save tomorrow grow with free internet, and you are afraid of the world of internet. If you are not, do you pass such a law? You are afraid. And you will learn from internet how much you fear. You are blocking internet with the excuse of protection. You were saying that you fight against censor. You were fighting against prohibitive mentality? Then why are you blocking internet, why? The government is trying to deprive young generations from their equals in the world and the right of competing with them. You want young generations do not use their mind. You are saying that “I will protect you, my child.” But you are suppressing them. As their grandfathers who were missing the Industrial Revolution, they will miss this revolution thanks to you but we will never let you” (Aytuğ Atıcı, CHP, 5 February 2014).

REFERENCES

- Alver, F. (2003). *Basında Yabancı Tasarımı ve Yabancı Düşmanlığı*, Der Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Arslandaş-Toktaş, S., Binark, M., Dikmen, E. Ş., Fidaner, İ. B., Küzeci, E. & Özaygen, A. (2012). *Türkiye’de Dijital Gözetim T.C. Kimlik Numarasından E-Kimlik Kartlarına Yurttaşın Siyasal Bedenlenişi, Alternatif Bilişim Derneği*, İstanbul, <http://ekitap1.alternatifbilisim.org/files/turkiyede-dijital-gozetim.pdf>, [Accessed 26 March 2014].
- Başaran, F. (2005). “İnternetin Ekonomi Politikası”, içinde M. Binark & B. Kılıçbay (der.), *İnternet Toplum Kültür*, Epos Yayınları, Ankara, 32-52.
- Bauman, Z. & Lyon, D. (2013). *Akışkan Gözetim*, Yılmaz, E. (çev.), Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bayley, P. (2004). “Introduction: The Whys and Wherefores of Analysing Parliamentary Discourse”, in P. Bayley (ed.), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1-44.
- Binark, M. & Bayraktutan Sütcü, G. (2007). “Toplumsal Sorunların Günah Keçisi: İnternet”, <http://www.bianet.org/bianet/bilisim/94265-toplumsal-sorunlarin-gunah-kecisi-internet>, [Accessed 26 March 2014].
- Binark, M. (2007). “Yeni Medya Çalışmalarında Yeni Sorular ve Yöntem Sorunu”, içinde M. Binark (der.), *Yeni Medya Çalışmaları*, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara, 21-44.
- Blumler, J. G. & Gurevitch, M. (2001). “The New Media and Our Political Communication Discontents: Democratizing Cyberspace”, *Information, Communication & Society*, 4(1), 1-13.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). “Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse”, in P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1-41.
- Chilton, P. A. (2008). “Political Terminology”, in R. Wodak & V. Koller (eds.), *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin 225-242.
- Dahlberg, L. (2001). “The Internet and Democratic Discourse: Exploring the Prospects of Online Deliberative Forums Extending the Public Sphere”, *Information, Communication & Society*, 4(4), 615-633.

Deibert, R. & Rohozinski, R. (2011). "Contesting Cyberspace and the Coming Crisis of Authority", in R. Deibert, J. Palfrey & R. Rohozinski (eds.), *Access Contested: Security, Identity, and Resistance in Asian Cyberspace*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 21-41.

Deibert, R., Palfrey, J., Rohozinski, R. & Zittrain, J. (2011). "Access Contested: Toward the Fourth Phase of Cyberspace Controls", in R. Deibert, J. Palfrey & R. Rohozinski (eds.), *Access Contested: Security, Identity, and Resistance in Asian Cyberspace*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 3-20.

DeNardis, L. (2009). *Protocol Politics: The Globalization of Internet Governance*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.

Dunmire, P. L. (2005). "Preempting the Future: Rhetoric and Ideology of the Future in Political Discourse", *Discourse & Society*, Vol 16(4): 481–513.

Elspeß, S. (2002). "Phraseological Units in Parliamentary Discourse", in P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 81-110.

Fairclough, N. (2001). "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research", in R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London, GBR, 121-138.

Foucault, M. (2006). *Hapishanenin Doğuđu, Kılıçbay, M. A. (çev.), İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara.*

Geray, H. (2005). "İktisat ve İletişim İlişkisi Üzerine", içinde F. Başaran & H. Geray (der.), *İletişim Ağlarının Ekonomisi, Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara, 9-33.*

Guins, R. (2008). *Technology and the Culture of Control*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN, USA.

Habermas, J. (2006). "Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research", *Communication Theory*, 16, 411–426.

Hacker K. L. (1996). "Missing Links in the Evolution of Electronic Democratization", *Media, Culture & Society*, 18(2), 213-232.

Heywood, A. (2006). *Siyaset*, Kalkan, B. (Ed.), Özipek B. B. ve diğeri (çev.), *Liberte Yayınları, Ankara.*

<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=16198>

Ilie, C. (2010a). "Introduction: Analytical Perspectives on Parliamentary and Extra-Parliamentary Discourses", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 879–884.

Ilie, C. (2010b). "Strategic Uses of Parliamentary Forms of Address: The Case of the U.K. Parliament and the Swedish Riksdag", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 885-911.

Jakubowicz, K. (1994). "Civil Society, Independent Public Sphere, and Information Society. An Impossible Combination?" in S. Splichal, A. Calabrese & C. Sparks (eds.), *Information Society and Civil Society*, Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Ind., 78-102.

Katz, J. E. & Rice, R. E. (2002). *Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.

Lagerkvist, J. (2010). *After the Internet, Before Democracy: Competing Norms in Chinese Media and Society*, Peter Lang AG, Berne, IN, USA.

Lyon, D. (2006). *Gözetlenen Toplum*, Soykan, G. (çev.), Kalkedon Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Maigret, É. (2011). *Medya ve İletişim Sosyolojisi*, Yücel, H. (çev.), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Moosmüller, S. (1989). "Phonological Variation in Parliamentary Discussion", in R. Wodak (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 165-180.

Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J. & McNeal, R. S. (2007). *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.

O'Loughlin, B. (2001). "The Political Implications of Digital Innovations: Trade-offs of Democracy and Liberty in the Developed World", *Information Communication & Society*, 4(4), 595-614.

Orwell, G. (2012). *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört*, Üster, C. (çev.), Can Sanat Yayınları, İstanbul.

Özdemir, İ. (2004). "TBMM'de Savaş Retoriği: Körfez ve Irak Savaşları", içinde Ü. Doğanay (ed.), *Savaşın Yüzleri Uzlaşmanın Aşamaları*, Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, Ankara, 87-116.

Öztürk, S. (2013). "Filmlerle Görünürlüğün Dönüşümü: Panoptikon, Süperpanoptikon, Sinoptikon", *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, Sayı 36 / Bahar, 132-151.

Poggi, G. (2002). *Modern Devletin Gelişimi*, Kut, Ş. & Toprak, B. (çev.), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.

Reisigl, M. (2008). "Rhetoric of Political Speeches", in R. Wodak & V. Koller (eds.), *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 243-269.

Shenhav, S. R. & Sheaffer, T. (2008). "From Inter-Party Debate to Inter-Personal Polemic: Media Coverage of Internal and External Party Disputes in Israel, 1949-2003", *Party Politics*, 14 (6), 706-725.

Splichal, S. (2004). "From Civil Society to Information Society?", Slavko Splichal, Andrew Calabrese and Colin Sparks (eds.), in S. Splichal, A. Calabrese & C. Sparks (eds.), *Information Society and Civil Society*, Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Ind., 50-77.

Street, J. (1997). "Remote Control? Politics, Technology and Electronic Democracy", *European Journal of Communication*, 12(1), 27-42.

Stuckey, M. E. (2010). "Jimmy Carter, Human Rights, and Instrumental Effects of Presidential Rhetoric", in S. J., Parry-Giles & J. M., Hogan, (eds.), *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA, 293-312.

Timisi, N. (2003). *Yeni İletişim Teknolojileri ve Demokrasi*, Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara.

Tkacheva, O., Schwartz, L. H., Libicki, M. C., Taylor, J.E., Martini, J. & Baxter, C. (2013). *Internet Freedom and Political Space*, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, USA.

Van Aelst, P. & Walgrave, S. (2002). "New Media, New Movements? The Role Of The Internet In Shaping The 'Anti-Globalization' Movement", *Information, Communication & Society*, 5(4), 465-493.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). "Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power", *Communication Yearbook* 12, 18-59.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). "Ideological Discourse Analysis", in E. Ventola & A. Solin (eds.), *the New Courant*, Vol 4. Special Issue Interdisciplinary Approaches to Discourse Analysis, University of Helsinki, The English Department Publications, 135-161.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997a). "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments" in S. H. Riggins (ed), *the Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 31-64.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997b). "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", in J. Blommaert, & C. Bulcaen (eds.), *Political Linguistics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 11-52.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and Discourse A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, English version of this book was used as an internet course for the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (Open University).

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). "Political Discourse and Political Cognition", in P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 203-237.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). "Text and Context of Parliamentary Debates", in P. Bayley (ed.), *Cross Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 339-372.

Wilson, J. & Stapleton, K. (2012). "Discourse in the Shadows: Discursive Construction and the Northern Ireland Assembly", *Discourse & Society*, 23(1) 69–92.

Wilson, J. (2001). "Political Discourse", in D. Schiffrin, D. Tanen & H. E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Blackwell, Oxford, 398-415.

Wodak, R. & Weiss, G. (2005). "Analyzing European Union Discourses: Theories and Applications", in R. Wodak & P. Chilton (eds.), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 121-135.