

Turkish Journalists as the “Chivalry” of Democracy: The Case of the Co-emergence of Democrat Party and Turkish Journalists’ Association in 1946

Saadet Yilmaz*

Abstract:

This study aims to depict the interrelationship and interdependency between the media and the politics. Specifically, it explores the direct and positive correlation between the pluralism in press and democracy. In Turkey, in 1946, people had encountered new reforms in the political tradition and passes through the path of “immature” multiparty politics in addition; the foundations of the organizations against mono-party affiliated; “government motivated newspapers”. Turkish newspapers were the field of battle of deputies and mostly dominated by the Republican People’s Party. (In fact the situation is not weird since every bureaucrat and the civil servant were the natural members of the party). The emergence of Democrat Party led to the opposition in the people of media who immediately founded Turkish Journalists’ Association seeking freedom of press.

Keywords:

Democracy, Media, Pluralism, Democrat Party, Turkish Journalists’ Association

* Fatih University, Istanbul/Turkey. ssadetyilmaz@fatih.edu.tr

Introduction

There is a strong relationship between democracy and pluralism in media. If democracy works efficiently in a country, the organs of media, in particular press; could display diverse attitudes freely against the government without any sanction. Freedom of expression is correlated with the press freedom. The negotiations in public sphere should be far from any restriction from the government in order to be an effective field of democracy.

Democracy and pluralism in media go hand in hand; since pluralism as being an existence of free press; is the very signifier of the popular will. Pluralism is the diversification of media organs; in other words, it is the existence of a variety of different and independent voices, and of differing political opinions and representations of culture within the media (Doyle, 2002: 11). Habermas' argument on public space which "fundamentally alters the nature of political power itself by transforming how power is exercised" (Barnett, 2004: 185); is coincided the correlation between the press freedom and democracy. Furthermore, accessibility of information by public could break down the political domination and the rights of individuals could be guaranteed by the assembly, in terms of their participation to public discussion and debates (Barnett, 2004: 185). The participants of communicative action concern the normative expectations of representative, accessible public and social space in order to make the political issues as general ones (Bohman, 2009: 156). To make the table clear; Barnett (2004: 186) introduces the public space according to Habermas:

...The public sphere is defined as an intermediating zone between these two realms: the concept refers to the set of practices through which public opinion is formed and articulated... complex pattern of cross-cutting relationships: a private realm of communicatively integrated lifeworld relations (the family); a private realm of system relations (the capitalist market economy); a public realm of system relations (the state); and a public realm of lifeworld relations (the literary and political public spheres)...

According to Bohman (2009: 155), modern societies need technological mediation for public communication rather than face to face interactions of multiple forms dialogical exchange; also free citizens need challenging the censor mechanism of political authority. While political public space in Turkey realized itself as the agency of newspapers with which democracy comes to stage. In this respect, the transition to

democracy in Turkey; which is absolutely not more than the birth of a new oppositional party in the assembly, was done with the pens of the journalists in expanding ideas to public. Also, as Bektaş (2000:7) asserts that Chomsky's point of view includes the fact that media institutions are the very tools of political agents and they are guided. The new sphere of "the public" was a bourgeois public sphere. (Craig 2004: 50). "The purpose of the public sphere was to enable people to reflect critically upon itself and on the practices of the state. In Turkey, in particular, 1940s; mono-party regime, newspapers are the official spokesmen of the Republican People's Party. Media mind of Turkey operates as a delegate of political parties in the Grand National Assembly in the processes of political life. All the columnists were the members of the current "sovereign" power. It could easily be understood that emerging status quo in media organs as the product of an intense and multifaceted political fight with obvious winners and losers (Mc Chesney, 1993: 5). According to Bektaş (2000: 5), media which is the accumulation of information and enlargement of the area of politics; is the indispensable unit of democracy. As Katz (1998) argues; participatory democracy requires a citizenry and flow of information is the medium of communication.

"Communicative freedom" of Habermas, requires acting subjects whose actions depends on a basis of consensus in terms of making their claims reciprocally (1996: 119). Liberty of people is an ascribed thing and every single individual has the right of participation to the establishment of the legal code and assembly decisions. In this context, when considering "power elite" (Mills, 2000: 267) of Turkey, military class functioned as the political elite who were responsible from the "checks and balances"; in addition, newspapers were just the "governmentalization" of the political lobby (Mills, 2000: 267). Turkish columnists were "very the brokers of power, compromisers of interests, negotiators of issues, they are no longer at the top of the state, or at the top of the power system as a whole" (Mills, 2000: 267).

Media also functions as the inculcation of dominant values, the source of false consciousness and public inutility (Katz, 1998: 88). According to Turam (1994: 65), when the corruption in the public values emerged within the society which is fragmented into parts; local features gained importance. In this sense; it could be said that modernization; basically "secularization", did not work in Turkey at least, as a homogenization process; ruling party gave birth a new oppositional wing which seeks the localities and will of "others"; in the newspapers firstly. This trend really goes through the fashion of "hunting" of deputies from the interior pages of the newspapers. It was apparent that in Turkey, democratization means the multiparty politics and this reality is constructed in the columns of the journalist-deputies (Yılmaz, 2009a: 183). As Yılmaz (2009a) argues the legitimization of republic in the public would be done by

the institutions of media; in which journalists transformed into the protectors of the interests of the state. The politics of national modernization requires the censorship and direct control in freedom of press which is accepted as the strong castle of the new thoughts of the new republic by Atatürk himself (Yilmaz, 2009a).

Either consent or opposition to the establishment of new party is created by the Turkish columnists, themselves in 1946. Surprisingly, the foundation of Turkish Journalists' Association and the establishment of Democrat Party happen simultaneously. Turkish Journalists' Association has organic links with the Turkish Press Union that is the guardian of the principles of "revolution", the mean of the defender against reactionaries, the school for public and the control mechanism to the revolutionary government (İnuğur, 1992). Media in particular, journalism was used as a social engineering tool of strengthening the republic which could not be considered as a democratic one; instead, it had some Jacobin features in Turkey (Yilmaz, 2009a, for more on this see in detail Yilmaz 2002, 2005, 2009b). As Feroz Ahmad (1993: 77) argues Jacobin tradition affected Kemalists deeply.

After stating the main characteristics of democracy and pluralism in media in Turkey, in order to understand the roots of "Democrats", a general reading from the columns should be done which is the second section of the paper.

Democratization and the Establishment of Democrat Party: The Account of Turkish Columnists

In this section, the historical background of Turkish democratization in terms of transition to multi party regime would be evaluated regarding to the articles of Turkish journalists. After stating the characteristics of Turkish political life and the establishment of Democrat Party, specific illustrations from the columns of several newspapers would be analyzed.

It is worth to say that Turkish people encountered with a "primitive" kind of democracy before the establishment of republic and this period continued to some extent. According to Kalaycıoğlu, (2005: 61) although **charismatic** leader of Turkey, Atatürk, could be accepted as a dictator in the early republic, it could not be proved that he was like his counterparts such as Lenin, Mussolini; rather he was dedicated to create a modernized national culture instead of a liberal democracy. So, the "stillborn" Progressive Republican Party and Free Republican Party were founded and "abolished" with the same politicians who were deeply affected from the conjunctural

politics in the world (Emrence, 2000). The opposition of both politics and organization, as well, the freedom of expression; were ended due the Kurdish Revolt or the necessity of state-led industrialization of Great Depression (Koçak, 2005). It is crucial to say again that until 1946, Turkey had a monophthong type of press which was RPP affiliated journalism.

At the end of World War II, Turkey evolved into a different phase since Turkey signed the United Nations Charter, which sought international cooperation in "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all; so president İnönü faced pressure to liberalize the regime which was in a closed environment and authoritarian style; having martial laws, press censorships and etc (Howard, 2001: 116). It is vital to mention the discrepancies within the RPP itself. Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Refik Koraltan and Fuat Köprülü were planning to split from the party and emancipate from the heavy bureaucracy of the Kemalist elites who were ruling the country with extraordinary competence. In addition, it should be noted that Bayar was the former president of İnönü and loyal commander of Atatürk; Menderes was both a landlord in Western part of Anatolia and lawyer; Köprülü was a history professor and Koraltan was a politician who was involved in War of Liberation.

Soviet demands on Straits, the Soviet threats on northeastern provinces of Turkey caused the government of İnönü to build good relations with United States of America which could present financial aid to Turkey and Greece with Truman Doctrine; consequently Turkey had welcomed to the western club of democracy (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005: 67, 68).

It is worth to consider that Turkish type of democracy, the multi party system which is generally based on two parties; one is the central wing and the other one is the oppositional. Here, oppositional wing represents the control mechanism of the government and not any more from that; as it could be understood from the own words in November, 1st in the opening speech of the parliamentary year:

... The only deficiency of us is the absence of an oppositional party against to the government... if the climate of freedom and democracy works well in the country, the foundation of other political parties would be possible... (Gürkan, 1998: 183)

The direction of İnönü was clearly seen in his promises on May 19th of 1945 in order to make the regime more democratic even if what were these promises could not be known (Zurcher, 2004: 204). İnönü promoted a Kemalist democracy which

based on the assumption that no Turkish parties could be adverse to the six principles of Atatürk (Republicanism, Nationalism, Statism, Secularism, Populism and Revolutionism).

“Köprülü and Menderes published articles in the press critical of the RPP including in the İstanbul daily Vatan, whose editor, Ahmet Emin Yalman, opened the pages of his paper to the dissidents” (Howard, 2001: 117). As Zurcher (2004: 211) argues that liberal and American-orientated Vatan (Fatherland) of Ahmet Emin Yalman and the leftist Tan (Dawn) of Zekeriya Sertel began to support the Adnan Menderes, Fuat Köprülü, Refik Koraltan and Celal Bayar and gave them room in their columns to express their ideas. Furthermore, Zekeriya Sertel said in his column in August 30th of 1945 (the Day of Victory) that:

...we do not want charity... if freedom of speech and ideas; the democratic rights of citizens are guaranteed under the law; it is not talked about liberty and freedom...

Sertel was in favor of the establishment of a new opposition party and perceive that as a natural right in a democratic republic in the special day of victory. The opposition and analysis coming from writers; were found unacceptable by the RPP, so Menderes, Köprülü and Koraltan were expelled from the party in 1945 when Bayar eventually resigned (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005: 69).

Meanwhile, “Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) was stirred with the proposals of four members of its prominent members, known as Dörtlü Takrir (Proposal of the Four) on June 7, 1945” (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005: 69). Dörtlü Takrir (of Bayar, Menderes, Koraltan and Köprülü), includes the abolishment of martial law, freedom of press and political and economic liberty (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005: 69). TGNA was not accepted that proposal, however, press became existed about the new advancements of opposition tradition in the assembly.

In fact, after İnönü’ speech and Dörtlü Takrir, in June 5th, Turkey witnessed the birth of a new political party of the enterprising businessman and industrialist Nuri Demiraç’s Milli Kalkınma Partisi (National Development Party) (Kalaycıoğlu, 2005: 69) whose ideals were liberalization of economy and development of free enterprise (Zurcher, 2004: 211). The party had no experienced politician and not represented in national assembly (Zurcher, 2004: 211), what’s more there was no support from columnists and press which was the only way to convey political propaganda and party program to masses.

On the other hand, some journalists were opposed to the transition to multi party regime as claiming that the attempts to establish a different party from RPP was equal to the destroying the national unity of the state. To illustrate, the editor of newspaper *Vakit* wrote in his column in June 16th 1945:

...Nowadays, there are some newspapers who are trying to create new parties with artificial ways...their aim is to disrupt the national unity... the salvation of Turkey lies in a young Turkish generation who took a lesson from the disputes among parties... (Gürkan, 1998: 159).

After the establishment of Democrat Party in January 7th 1946, as Howard (2001: 117) what was advocating by DP was a surprise to İnönü since many members of RPP and even significant leaders accepted that the economy needed to be opened to market forces, and society to liberalization. However, according to Zurcher (2004: 221):

...When one looks at the social characteristics of the DP representatives, one is struck by a number of differences from those of the Kemalist period. The DP representatives were on average younger, more often had local roots in their constituencies, were less likely to have had a university education, and far more likely to have a background in commerce or in law. The most striking difference from the RPP was the virtual absence of representatives with a bureaucratic and/ or military background. It was clear that a significantly different section of Turkey's elite had come to power...

Journalists, who had read the party program, behaved the same way with İnönü who had let Bayar to establish a party without being reactionary and with having same foreign and ethnic policy. Journalists conceived the new party as an organ of RPP and placed it as a control mechanism rather than an opposition which seeks power. It can be seen in the Sadak's article which was written just after one day of the establishment of DP:

...The effect of Democrat Party at first glance, there is no difference from the principles of RPP...DP is born with a national concern as a responsibility of control in practice... (Gürkan, 1998: 188)

"The festival of democracy" was destroyed with the municipality elections of May 26th 1946 with the protest of Bayar due to the lack of secrecy during the voting and impartial supervision of elections and the destruction of actual ballots. Furthermore, the interview of Fuat Köprülü who declare the lacking reliability of Turkish elections; in *Chicago Tribune* and *New York Times*, affected the Turkish press deeply and he was labeled as an example of terrible citizen by Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın (Gürkan, 1998: 197). The chaos was extended with the article that "Is democracy is a dream or

intermediary?" which was known as "ŞAL" (scarf) by Nihat Erim who was deputy prime minister of RPP government. He wrote that:

...For a while, the declaration of liberty should be covered with a scarf and it should be necessary to build an authority from above...
(Gürkan, 1998: 198).

For the general elections, Fevzi Çakmak who was an experienced soldier (Field Marshal), joined DP and was a candidate of Democrat parliamentarian. This candidacy was responded negatively from press because Çakmak was perceived as a counter of İnönü who was already a friend in battle. Asım Us made an interview with him and concluded that he was a balance power among parties within the parliament rather than a regular representative of DP who were opposed to İnönü naturally (Gürkan, 1998: 201). Cihat Baban from Tasvir says that:

...the presence of Fevzi Çakmak in the parliamentary is a source of peace and order... he would be neutral in the solutions of the cases with a confidence of his independent stand... (Gürkan, 1998: 203)

It could be noted that the Turkish parliament still carried the character of being a military society which relies on the marshal tradition in ruling system. Ahmet Emin Yalman called the Turkish parliament as an assembly of clerks (Gürkan, 1998: 204).

Therefore, in this section, the political atmosphere of 1945 and 1946 in Turkey was evaluated in terms of historicity and perceptions on democracy. It is crucial that Turkish type of democracy depended on the multiparty regime which is remarked by the journalists who were the representatives, deputies of political parties. There is no impartial, neutral voice within the press. Monophthong attitude of press broke with the establishment of Democrat Party whose first opposition was related to the law of press. Press was one of the major, even the first agent to influence the path in politics; even İnönü classified the organs of press, that is, newspapers as the defeatist (leftist and oppositional to RPP); and the smooth, conformist ones (as supporter of RPP) (Gürkan, 1998: 203). It can be concluded with the remark that Turkish democracy and press had a reciprocal relationship with each other.

Following to the distinctive features of 1946 politics within the press; Turkish Journalists' Association is founded; in fact it changes its skin with a freedom discourse in the press.

Turkish Journalists Association (Türkiye Gazeteciler Cemiyeti)

In this section, the case of Turkish Journalists' Association, that is an important result of democratization efforts, will be analyzed in terms of the historical background and the examples memoirs of the people within the association. This association is in fact the outcome of the reactions against RPP-affiliated Press Union.

In Turkey, the organization of Turkish journalists began in 1908 with "Association of Matbuat-ı Osmaniye" (Matbuat-ı Osmaniye Cemiyeti) and continued with "Association of Osmanlı Matbuat" (Osmanlı Matbuat Cemiyeti) founded in 1917. In 1921, with a change of name, this association was called "Association of Istanbul Matbuat" (Istanbul Matbuat Cemiyeti) and finally, in 1934, Istanbul Press Institution (Istanbul Basın Kurumu) was founded. In 1935, with the Ankara government's order, Turkish Press Union (Türk Basın Birliği) was founded and according to the law numbered 3511 (the law of Turkish Press Union) which became valid, the journalists had to be member of Press Union to perform their profession. According to the second item of this law, it was strictly forbidden to perform journalism outside the union. Turkish press was divided into five zones which were Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Adana, Trabzon (Evsal, 1987).

Coming to 1945, this period may be accepted as the beginning of important events for the whole world. World War II was ended and; "democracy" and "freedom" movements were gained importance. Looking to the reflections of this period to Turkey, in this period in which RPP was in power and İsmet İnönü was the president; there was the efforts for the foundation of Democrat Party (Gürkan, 1998). Since we defined democratization as to pass to multi-party regime, the foundation of this party was an important step in the democratization process of Turkey.

In such a political ambience, university or college graduated journalists who have entered Bâbîâli¹ have begun to react against mono-party regime. Using "democracy" and "freedom" concepts frequently, they have begun to look for the answer of the question: "How is it possible to conduct democratic and free journalism?" Young journalists' wish was Turkish Press Union directed by RPP which is the party in power to have been really an association for the journalists and also, they have wanted to have freedom of thought and expression, and social security at work. For the realization of their demands, they have been thinking that the control of RPP over the Press Union has to be ended because RPP had a big pressure over the press (Özsoy,

¹ Turkish press was called Bâbîâli.

2001). Journalists have taken advantage of the congress of Press Union of these days, and they have pressurized at the issue of doing democratic elections. They became successful about the changes that they wanted at the management of Press Union. At the beginning of 1946, first of all, the head of Istanbul Press Union, Hakkı Tanık Us has been discharged and Sedat Simavi became chairman. Then, the head of Ankara central office who was Falih Rıfka Atay has been dismissed, and at his place, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın has been elected as the chairman. Journalists have reached their aims. After awhile, in 30 May 1946, İsmet İnönü cancelled Press Union (Evsal, 1987).

After the Press Union became abolished with the excuse of the non-existence of any other same institution in Europe (İnuğur, 1992), Istanbul Department's managers of Press Union have applied to governorship for the establishment of a new association and in 10th June 1946, Turkey Journalists' Association (Türkiye Gazeteciler Cemiyeti) was founded (Özsoy, 2001). One of the news about this association was published in Tanin newspaper dated 9th June 1946 which was announcing the foundation of the Turkish Journalists' Association the next day.

Mustafa Ragıp Esatlı who is one of the journalists of this time wrote an article including what Sedat Simavi said about the association (Sedat Simavi was the first of the founders of the association and he was the owner of Yedigün periodical and Yedigün printing press). Sedat Simavi said:

“The foundation of journalists' association was an important step towards freedom of expression and thoughts and towards the social security of journalists. However, everything is not completed yet. There is still a long way to reach press freedom. This association succeeded to gather the journalists who have different standpoints under the same roof” (Özsoy, 2001).

This association founded at the basis of freedom, democracy and protection of journalism's ethics and rules accepted as society (*demek*) for public interest in 8 April 1952 by the decision of Council of Ministers (Evsal, 1987).

Some of the interviews that İskender Özsoy conducted in 2001, with the journalists who have taken part in the struggle against Press Union and who were members of association are below:

Alâeddin Berk who has worked at Son Telgraf, Gece Postası, Günaydın newspapers and who is 10th member of association said: “Press Union was boss weighted. In 1945, in which the struggles which led to the foundation of the association

had begun, the reactions against RPP were increasing. The efforts for the foundation of Democrat Party were important for democracy and freedom. The number of young journalists, proponent of freedom was increasing. But, the bosses were still proponent of RPP. In 1945-1946, Press Union was the only press association and it was boss weighted.

Orhan Mete who worked at Vatan, Tanin, Son Posta newspapers and who was 40th member of association said: "With the movement of Democrat Party, some changes had begun in journalism. Some newspapers of these days such as Cumhuriyet, Vatan and Son Posta were detached from RPP's line while Tanin, Vakit and Tan were still RPP-affiliated newspapers. At these times, there were not laws to provide security of journalists. There were not trade unions.

Recep Bilginer who worked at Vatan, Söz Milletin newspapers and who was 95th member of the association said: "Young generation was tired because of RPP's pressure on press. If the news about the arrival of Mevhibe İnönü –the wife of the president İsmet İnönü– to Istanbul were not given within the frame, at the first page, journalists were reproached by Selim Sarper who was the Press Publication General Director (Basın Yayın Genel Müdürü). Press Union had political and moral pressure over journalists. The struggle against Press Union was based on the wish of freedom and democratization.

Selâmi Akpınar who worked at Vatan newspaper; who was the director of Anatolian Agency (AA) between the years 1962-1972 and who was 80th member of the association said: "With the foundation of the journalists' association, the basis of the principals of democracy was created. Our movement became the beginning point of the development of democracy in Turkey".

In sum, the foundation of Turkish journalists' association is the result of the abolishment of Press Union due to the journalists' efforts conducted with the aim of transforming RPP-affiliated Press Union to a union which is really working for the journalists within the purpose of creating free and democratic journalism. The soldiers of pluralism in media and democracy were not in their usual, mature phase; however, these were the first and naïve attempts to save the "contemporary", "developed", "Westernized" Turkish state. Proliferation in the columnists and the unionization of journalists against to the monophthong style of press and the new party whatever its reproduction was from the dominant ideology were the significant remarks in the "political media" history in Turkey.

Conclusion

Pluralism in media is the very representative indication of the participation of citizens to the public space. Freedom of expression in terms of politics could easily be noticed in the free press. Transition to the democracy requires the elaborative work of journalists in order to facilitate the provision of public opinion. "Ordinary" people need to get political information from the voices of columnists as the speechmakers of governments. Diversified media organs are considered as agencies of both the structure of legitimization and the modernization process of countries.

When media is considered in Turkey especially in 1946; this domain was dominated by the one-party regime of the Republican People's Party (CHP). What the columnists wrote; was regarded as like any declaration in the party congress. Pluralism in press is the gate of a new world in Turkey, deputy journalists started to make opposition from the columns and tried to constitute a public opinion against RPP and they had in their minds to organize as a new party although they were accepted as only a control mechanism rather than a new governor party. In other words, the opposition to assembly decisions and legal regulations were done externally until the establishment of a new party which had a meaning of an opposition from the very heart of the assembly itself; even it was not accepted as a real, concrete party of opposition. However, these new advancements in politics had a direct effect to the press and Sedat Simavi formed an association in order to state the affiliation of RPP, even; he was the very symbol of the ownership paradigm in media. Turkish Journalists' Association was against to the censorship and the pressure of Republican People's Party in the press. Journalists organized in order to be the chorists of the new participatory democratic structure.

According to Baker (2001: i), "Political theorists assert that a free press is essential for democracy and it is an area of preferences or desires for purposes of making law and policy. "In a republican conception, an ideally functioning democracy is open to everyone's participation in the formulation of collective ideals and public goals; democracy is an open process of defining as well as advancing the public good" (Baker, 2001: 126).

In addition to the pluralist understanding in ideal situation and the achievement of political goals within the free press, media has always been an environment of ownership, financial investment and profitability in the sector; and it is directly dependent on the possession of major financial means (Köylü, 2006: 43). When the year 1946 is considered, it is not a surprise to see the media ownership was

monopolized by partisan identities; in addition, even columnists were the members of RPP and after the establishment of DP, some of them split from RPP and joined DP. So, the rhetoric of journalism changed the political discourse or vice versa. The voice of journalists, who were not independent from political interests, was going hand in hand with the business interests' for their corporations and bureaucrats (Köylü, 2006: 46). As well, "the publication by the monopoly groups of many newspapers does not mean pluralism. The same views are being conveyed merely in different words and, in addition to failing to contribute to democracy, the creation of a single source of information damages 'the public right to have accurate information'" (Köylü, 2006: 46). In that context, the establishment of DP and the Turkish Journalists Association were the two crucial breaks in Turkish politics affiliated press. The etatist, authoritarian ideology of RPP was destroyed and it was attempted to achieve diversification in journalism. "Pluralism is an axiological principle that is 'constitutive at the conceptual level of the very nature of modern democracy and considered as something that we should celebrate and enhance' (Mouffe, 2000: 19 in Kari Karppinen, 2007:30). Pluralism is the diversification within the media that is the representations of different views, opinions and cultural traits (Doyle, 2002: 19).

Regarding the economical aspect of that politics affiliated press, it could be said that media is an economical constitution. "Whatever the period, the owners of newspapers follow these three objectives. Increasing the amount of the text which will be published (the number of pages and circulation), increasing the variety and the content (texts, pictures, graphics...), decreasing the cost of the production (to balance the selling price)" (Charon, 1992 *in* Gezgin 2009). Media-ownership is a threat to pluralism and democracy since "excessive concentration of it can lead to overrepresentation of certain political viewpoints or values or certain forms of cultural output at the expense of others" (Doyle, 2002: 13). Market liberals oppose state's monopoly over the media, that is, they primarily say that the broadcasting of information is limited because of the self-interest of the state and its fears and state is also limiting people's choices about the consumption (Baker, 2001). Governments and the media owners "know" what is good for them" and consumers are exposed to an obligatory supply that they do not have the right to choose. When we look to the whole picture, the process of the production and the consumption of the information is an economical circulation. The media owners have the aim of proposing more opportunities to the consumers and at the same time, they try to reduce production costs. Although media is not seen as a direct commercial means, it is, directly or indirectly, an important actor of the commercial process and media owners think that

media has not to be under the monopoly of the state saying that it will cause arbitrary censorship and arbitrary financing of the state.

Media has; not only a political aspect but also an economical inquiry in terms of media ownership and monopoly of state. Furthermore, freedom of press and democracy could only be possible with pluralism in media and multi party politics in a county like Turkey. In these lands, it is very common to see the abolishment of the newspapers or arrestment of journalists. In 1946, ownership characters of the newspapers and the duties of the journalists had very clear cut definitions in terms of ideology. Democratic tradition had been a utopia in Turkey, since freedom of expression is still controversial issue. Democracy is not a mere understanding of multi party system and sphere of journalism is the very component of it in terms of creation of the skeleton of ideas in the public space. It should be reminded that the alliance of Democrat Party and journalists, in particular columnists, constituted a new a phase in Turkish politics in which state-led aspects of social institutions differentiated slowly. Although elitist understanding in the political tradition prolongs in Turkey, multi party system prevails regardless of the culmination of oppositional parties who could be more powerful than the ruling party.

References

- Baker, C. Edwin (2001) *Media, Markets, and Democracy*, West Nyack, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/Doc?id=10063471&ppg=3> (accessed 12.09.2009)
- Bektaş, Tülay (2000) *Medya Demokrasi İlişkisi ve Türk Medyasında Refah Partisi İmajı*, 2000 M.A Thesis, Konya Selçuk University.
- Bernett, Clive (2004) "Media, Democracy and Representation: Disembodying the Public", In *Spaces of Democracy: Geographical Perspectives on Citizenship, Participation and Representation*, ed Clive Barnett and Murray Low, 185-206, London: Sage Publications.
- Bohman, James (2009) "Democratization Through Transnational Publics: Deliberative Inclusion across Borders" in *Does Truth Matter? Democracy and Public Space* edited by Raf Geenens and Ronald Tinnevelt, 149-167. Netherlands: Springer Science + Business Media B.V.

- Doyle, Gillian (2002) *Media Ownership: The Economics and Politics of Convergence and Concentration in the UK and European Media*, London, GBR: Sage Publications. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/Doc?id=10076779&ppg=19> (accessed 26.10.2009)
- Emrence, Cem (2000) Politics of Discontent in the Midst of the Great Depression: The Free Republican Party of Turkey (1930), *New Perspectives on Turkey* 23:31-52.
- Evsal, Vedii (1987) *Gazeteciler Cemiyeti ve 40 Yil*, İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları.
- Gezgin, Suat (2009) *Medya ve Demokrasi*. İstanbul: Konrad. <http://www.konrad.org.tr/Medya%20Mercek/19gezgin.pdf> (accessed 26.10.2009)
- Gürkan, Nilgün (1998) *Türkiye'de Demokrasiye Geçişte Basın 1945-1950*, Çağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Howard, Douglas A. (2001) *History of Turkey*, Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing Group. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/Doc?id=10005624&ppg=138> (accessed 24.10.2009)
- Kalaycioglu, Ersin (2005) *Turkish Dynamics: Bridge across Troubled Lands*, Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/Doc?id=10135382&ppg=84> (accessed 24.10.2009)
- Karppinen, Kari (2007) "In Making a difference to media pluralism: a critique of the pluralistic consensus in European media policy", *Reclaiming the Media: Communication Rights and Democratic Media Roles*, ed Cammaerts, Bart and Nico Carpentier, 9-31 Bristol, , GBR: Intellect Books. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/Doc?id=10146727&ppg=30> (accessed 14.09.2009)
- Koçak, Cemil (2005) Parliament Membership during the Single-Party System in Turkey (1925-1945), *European Journal of Turkish Studies* No: 3 <http://ejts.revues.org/index497.html> (accessed 12.09.2009)
- Köylü, Hilal (2006) *Press ethics and practice of journalism in Turkey: A Case Study On Turkish Journalists' Self Evaluation of Their Codes of Practice*, M.s thesis, METU. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12607793/index.pdf> (accessed on 26.10.2009)

-
- Habermas, Jürgen (1996) *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*, Cambridge, Massachusetts. MIT Press.
- İnuçur, Nuri (1992) *Türk Basın Tarihi*, İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti.
- Mills, C. Wright (2000) *The Power Elite*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Özsoy, İskender (2001) *55 Yılın Tanıkları. Türkiye Gazeteciler Cemiyeti'nin Kuruluşunu Yaşayanlar Anlatıyor*, İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları.
- Turam, Emir (1984) *Medyanın Siyasi Hayata Etkileri*, İstanbul: İrfan Yayıncılık,
- Yılmaz, İhsan (2002) "Secular Law and the Emergence of Unofficial Turkish Islamic Law", *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 113-131.
- Yılmaz, İhsan (2005) "State, Law, Civil Society and Islam in Contemporary Turkey", *The Muslim World*, vol.55, 2005, pp. 385-411.
- Yılmaz, İhsan (2009a) "Cumhuriyet'in İlk Yıllarında Bir Modernleştirme Aracı olarak Gazetelerin Duruşu", *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 40:183-194.
- Yılmaz, İhsan (2009b) "Muslim Democrats in Turkey and Egypt: Participatory Politics as a Catalyst", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 11, No.2, pp. 93-112.
- Zurcher, Erik J. (2004) *Turkey: A Modern History*, London: I. B. Tauris & Company.