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ABSTRACT

Reputation of states is an important issue in the international arena. Especially today, since individuals and societies also have a say regarding foreign politics, reputation of a country before the international community has become an important variable. In consideration of the Turkish foreign politics under the Justice and Development Party (AKP), it is not hard to see that actually this period has been the period when the most important steps regarding soft power and public diplomacy were taken. However, despite all these efforts, the government’s designation of rather authoritarian methods can be interpreted as concessions regarding foreign policy and the country’s reputation in the international arena for the sake of domestic politics. Primarily the pressure of the AKP government on the traditional media channels and then the pressures on the social media and the internet, which comprise the subject of this study and have recently been intensely witnessed, are among the touchstones of such authoritarianization. In this study, reflections of the Twitter and YouTube ban of the AKP government in late March 2014 on the French press have been analyzed. As is known, access to Twitter was banned on March 21, 2014 and following that, to YouTube on March 27, 2014, then access to both was restored in the following days as a result of the appeals to the courts. However, the said bans were perceived as direct intervention in personal rights and freedoms both domestically and internationally during this period, and the AKP government in particular has left deep marks with respect to Turkey’s reputation.

Keywords: Internet, censor, reputation, reputation management, image, loss of image, foreign press, French press.

INTRODUCTION

The credibility of a state in the international community is an important issue even though there is little academic concern with this topic. Since the individuals and societies have become to have a say about the foreign policy issues, the credibility or
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the reputation of a country in the eyes of the international community has become especially today an important variable. In this study too, the credibility and the reputation of Turkey abroad are closely related to how and according to what the image of Turkey was created in other countries. The bans on the access to the Twitter and YouTube are criticized both at home and abroad and it was seen as a violation of right. Therefore, it is the aim of this study to examine the effects of these bans on the credibility and reputation of Turkey abroad by analyzing the way how the French media portrayed the bans. The study is restricted to the French media; and the widely read newspapers are within the scope of the evaluation; and thus it is aimed to find out how the image of Turkey was represented in the French media.

This study consists of three main sections. The theme of the first section is the discussion of how the credibility and reputation are defined in the field of international relations. The second section is a general introduction to the bans on social media in Turkey. The third section examines the related news in the French media and evaluates the factors affecting the credibility and reputation of Turkey.

ON THE CONCEPT OF CREDIBILITY AND REPUTATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In contrast to traditional diplomacy, which is based on high level negotiations and conferences, the public diplomacy relies on direct interaction. This direct interaction is realized through social media and cultural activities (Potter, 2009). The soft power and the public diplomacy depends on persuasion through communication. Accordingly, different concepts and strategies, borrowed from advertising and brand management, are used in public diplomacy. The most important of these concepts are image, reputation and the perception management. As L'Etang (1996: 27) has pointed out, it is possible to establish parallels between the various features of public relations and diplomacy. The basic argument here is that both public relations and diplomacy are responsible for the relations of the official institutions and organizations with other institutions, organizations and wide public masses, and both place importance on the public opinion and on the way how the events are presented by the media.

Perception management is a type of strategy that can be defined as "controlling and improving the flow of data from the outside world in order to provide beneficial and less ambiguous information." (Ozer, 2012: 148). This method was first used by the US Department of Defense to ensure that the domestic and foreign policy decisions were more easily accepted by the public. In other words, perception management is a long-term strategy, which has been developed and used in addition to the conventional arms for the security of the country. Reputation management, going beyond the manipulation of information, aims at keeping the country's world reputation, legitimacy and credibility on a given level and thus contributing to the country's soft power. Image management, a concept again borrowed from advertising and marketing, originates from the consideration that the image that an organization owns within the market needs to be managed just like the other assets owned by the organization (Turner, 2004: 4). Indeed, as Onay argues (2008: 107) "countries are being assessed as brands like any product and countries make efforts toward branding" and hence each country has a "country image". The rhetoric and actions of a country's government, its official institutions, and its diplomatic representatives have
a direct effect on the image of that country. For this reason, it is important to act appropriate to the specific norms and criteria both in discourse and action. Every country has a specific identity and image in the world public opinion and conducts its foreign policy on the basis of this identity. Discourse and actions incompatible with the actual identity and image can not only cause harm to that identity, with the loss of reputation, but the emergence of a new identity in the eyes of the world public opinion.

The concept of soft power from the international relations literature appears immensely helpful in understanding how the states approach to the concepts of reputation, image and perception and under which conditions these three concepts suffer damage. The importance of the concept of soft power has been increased especially with the end of the Cold War.

During the Cold War, there were two superpowers that dominated world events and were engaged in a continual struggle threatening one another by their military power. Under these circumstances, the non-state actors and other variables other than military power were rarely able to find a place for themselves in the international relations' studies. But, with the end of the Cold War and as a result of the inevitable rise of globalization new actors and new concerns have emerged in the international arena. Consequently, governments have begun to pay attention to these new actors and concerns while formulating and implementing their foreign policies. One of the new concerns is the "soft power", with its component parts, the credibility and reputation.

Governments are obliged to compete for credibility not only with other governments but with a wide variety of alternative structures including news media, corporations, nongovernmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and networks of scientific communities. (Nye, 2003: 82)

The review of the literature in the field of international relations shows us that the subject matter of credibility or reputation has been dealt by different approaches. For example, according to Hans Morgenthau (1948: 84) the third basic element by which power struggle manifests itself in the international scene is the "prestige" (the first two are the "status quo" and "imperialism"). John Mearsheimer, another academican in the field of realist international relations, has also pointed out that the prestige is important for particularly great powers since the relations between the great powers are governed in more different ways and by more different rules than the relations between states in the rest of the world. Mearsheimer (2001), in his *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, writes that great powers mostly feel the need of enhancing their prestige and proving to the world that they are the most powerful state in the world. States use their military, economic and political power to show that they are irresistible. These methods, however, do not produce the expected results because they create fear, rather than respect and prestige, in the eyes of other states. As has been seen, the concept of prestige is treated in the classic texts of international relations as a status that states can attain through their materialistic power. Yet, as has been mentioned above, in the new world order, the sole factor that enables a
country to gain prestige is no longer its materialistic power, composed of military, economic and political powers. Particularly with the transition to the information society, intergovernmental relations have become a process in which the public opinions of all countries are involved. Therefore, countries can gain or lose reputation in different areas that fall under the category of soft power, such as providing the humanitarian relief to a country that needs help, having an effectively functioning democratic regime, or introducing successful names in art and sport to the world public opinion.

Reputation management is a concept actually developed for institutions and organizations. However, countries, like organizations, also have reputation, and they need to manage their own reputation effectively and accurately. (Bostancı, 2012: 45-46) Reputation depends on credibility. The trust brings power to countries as much as to individuals. Yet, credibility is a fragile value for it is achieved in a long but lost in a very short time and for it involves the risks of misapprehension and deceit. (Karatepe, 2008: 83-84) Consistency between the rhetoric and the actions is essential in gaining credibility. A country is expected to be trustworthy in order to gain credibility and maintain the acquired credibility. The world of the twenty-first century increasingly forces countries "to be different than others" and "step forward. To that end, it is necessary to follow effective and sustainable policies. (Bostancı, 2012: 46)

After reviewing the Turkish foreign policy under the rule of the Justice and Development Party Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (JDP AKP), it is not difficult to see the fact that the most important steps in the fields of soft power and public diplomacy were taken in the period of AKP government. For instance, the creation of The Coordinatorship of Public Diplomacy under the Prime Minister's Office and the public diplomacy pursued by the Coordinatorship in the Middle East, Balkans and Caucasus can be considered as a manifestation of the desire of Turkey to become a center of attraction especially for these zones. Despite all these efforts, however, the fact that the AKP government has adopted, especially in recent years, more authoritarian methods for it is stuck in the domestic politics can be interpreted as a sacrifice of the foreign policy for the sake of domestic politics and a retreat of the government from its country image in the international sphere. The AKP government's pressure first on traditional media channels, and then intensively on social media and internet, which the latter two form the subject matter of this study, constitutes one of the important parts of the trio.

ON THE TURKISH BAN ON TWITTER AND YOUTUBE

Today, the concept of the internet has been used almost as synonym with the concept of social media and the social media has not only become a sine qua non media for online users but created a new public space as well which is an alternative to "real" life. The Facebook, Twitter and YouTube constitute the most important trio of the social media. If we leave the Facebook off the category due to the scope of this study, various statistics will help us understand the importance of Twitter and YouTube in the world. There are 271 million active users of Twitter as of the second quarter of 2014 (Statista, 2014). Twitter, also known as a "micro-blog" for it supplies its users an advantage up to a limit of 160 characters, has accommodated itself to the speed of the modern world and the changing culture of information on the one hand and has
opened new channels for information on the other. Similarly, YouTube too has become popular all over the world by giving the opportunity to its users of being not only the consumers of the internet but at the same time being its creative producers. YouTube has become the visual center of the world today, with its visitors close to a billion in number and video impressions annually reaching a trillion (youtube.com, 2014). It provides the whole world with visuals and other products produced all around the world with a low cost. Twitter and YouTube are used highly effectively and at the same time they are utilized as platforms for socialization.

To understand the pressure of the AKP government on the internet and social media, we must primarily look at the relations between the mainstream media and the political power in Turkey. Today, the mainstream media, contrary to the expectation of the masses, is in general far away from fulfilling the function of transmitting the information without hiding anything. It can be said that two factors appear to have played a role in the emergence of such a negative result. The first one of the two is the capital structure of the media; the latter is the organic relationship between media organizations and the political power. In other words, the mainstream media organizations tend to manipulate the information to maximize their profits and to be in better terms with the political power.

Turkey, one of the countries that have deeply experienced the disfavorable features of the mainstream media, for a long time has had a negative image in the international community about the freedom of the press. When we look at their capital structures, it can be seen that the media organizations in the country are conglomerated into holding companies, which are active in the country's important sectors such as banking, energy and construction along with the sector of media. This situation further deepens the relationship of media organizations with political power and, accordingly, further increases the pressure of the political power on the media (Akın, 2010: 5). For example, the record tax penalty of 826 million Turkish Liras, which was levied in 2009 on the Doğan Medya group, the largest media organization in the country (Radikal, 2009), is a clear indication of how the political power uses the tools it holds, such as tax control, as control mechanisms on the media organizations.

Apart from the pressures on media organizations, numbers of press members, more than any other country, have been sentenced to prison especially since the entry of the new Penal Code into force in Turkey in 2005 (Jones, 2012). The annual report of the Reporters without Borders in 2013 put Turkey in 154th place out of 166 countries in terms of the freedom of press. In 2012, Mehdi Hasan, in The Guardian, began his article which referred to the issue of freedom of the press in Turkey's as follows:

"Which country in the world currently imprisons more journalists than any other? The People's Republic of China? Nope. Iran? Wrong again. The rather depressing answer is the Republic of Turkey, where nearly 100 journalists are behind bars, according to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Yes, that's right: modern, secular, western-oriented Turkey, with its democratically elected government, has locked away more members of the press than China and Iran combined" (Hasan, 2012).
Just in the midst of an atmosphere where the mainstream media suffered from such a pressure a new period was beginning in the relationship between the individual and the media due to the fact that the internet passed to a new stage called Web 2.0, which transformed the internet users from being mere consumers of the information on the internet into the members of a great population producing also the information itself.

It is rather striking that although Turkey is in a backward position in the world in terms of its socio-economic development, it ranked at the high level in the use of internet and social media, a phenomenon that demands to be examined as a case study. Turkey has 35 million active internet users and the proportion of this number in the total population is 45 percent – the worldwide average is 35 percent. Furthermore, the use of social media and the time spent on internet locate Turkey in the statistics at the higher levels. We can conclude from all this that the social media has created a serious alternative to the mainstream media in Turkey. Social media in Turkey, functioning as a platform of organization and communication for those who cannot find a place in the mainstream media for public opposition, has become a new field of struggle for political power as the Gezi events and the corruption scandal of December 2013 have proved. In this struggle, the political power adopted censorship and blocking as the primary tools.

New internet law, which came into force in February 2014, authorized the Turkey’s Telecommunications Directorate (TİB) to block access to any website without any court decision and soon in the same year, the TİB first blocked the access to Twitter on March 21st and then to YouTube on March 27th after Prime Minister Erdogan had made speeches at the election rallies targeting especially Twitter. Both blockings were lifted as a result of the appeals over the ban were made to the judicial courts. In this process, these blockings have been perceived at home and abroad as direct interventions against personal rights and freedoms and left deep scars on the reputation of AKP government in particular, and on Turkey in general.

The AKP government is known to tend to restrict the use of social media, especially in certain periods – for example during and after the Gezi events – when the internal political climate has become tense. The speech made by then Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, is extremely important: "There is a curse and it is called Twitter. The worst of lies and exaggeration are found here [on this site]. This thing called social media, according to my opinion, is the biggest curse on societies. Who cannot see and read that lies misses that [point]. Societies are terrorized in this way." (http://www.radikal.com.tr/politika/basbakan_er-dogan_twitter_denen_bir_bela_var-1135952, accessed September 30, 2014) As has been seen, social media has become a new sphere of struggle for the political power.

RESEARCH METHOD AND FINDINGS

In this study, we analyzed how the AKP government’s blocking access to Twitter and YouTube towards the end of March 2014 were reflected on the French media. The date range is between March 21 and March 31, 2014. We examined the newspapers that were published and read widely in France within 10-day time period. In this context, Lepers, Le Monde, Le Figaro, Le Parisian and Liberation were accessed
through internet. Besides these newspapers, thanks to the search of various key words, we could find and accessed certain French news sites on the internet. The aforesaid sources were examined in order to find out how the news about Twitter and YouTube blockings were prepared, written and presented. After the review of the contents of news and reports, we saw that they laid emphasis on how the government in Turkey increasingly became authoritarian and additionally, that they gave in detail the developments in Syria. It is possible to sort the findings as "the increasing authoritarianism, the Syrian Crisis, and the use of bans on social media as an element of humor." In this study, we also analyzed the cartoons produced in the French media on the bans, with the consideration that they were important for they had a humorous approach to the subject and were presented in a critical perspective.

**THE EMPHASIS ON THE GROWING AUTHORITARIANISM**

When we look at the related news in the French media, it is clearly observed that an emphasis was placed on an increasing authoritarianism in Turkey under the *AKP* government. It was frequently underlined that the bans on Twitter and YouTube did not rest on court decisions but completely and particularly were the personal decisions of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan. For instance, the news in *Le Figaro* of March 21, 2014 (2014a) announced the blocking on the access to Twitter as follows: "Le premier ministre, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, a décidé de bloquer jeudi soir l'accès à Twitter." It is obvious that the executive power, if not, one man alone at the head of the executive power took such a decision without a court judgment was a severe blow to the identity of Turkey as a democratic constitutional state and caused a loss of prestige. It is remarkable that this point was underlined in the aforementioned news. Indeed, the International Association of Internet Publishers explained its opinion on the subject in its reply to a question of the *Liberation* (2014a) dated March 21, 2014, that the ban on Twitter was a blow on the freedom of expression and that Prime Minister held such a power could be read as Turkey became a dictatorship. The first sentence of the same news was rather striking: "Prime Minister Erdogan breaks the social media!" Similarly, the *Le Monde* (2014b) of 27 March 2014, depicted Erdogan as a prime minister criticized for long for his growing authoritarianism at the end of his 12-year term in office.

It is observed that the cancellation decisions of the courts - in response to the executive power that is becoming authoritarian - against the Twitter and Yahoo bans imposed by the Turkey's Telecommunications Directorate *TİB* also widely found place in the French media. In fact, the cancellation decisions of the courts indicate that the blockings on social made are without legal basis and they are the "arbitrary" decisions of the *AKP* government. The contents of the news display that a comparison was made between the decisions of the government and that of the courts. For example, the news in the *Le Monde* dated March 27, 2014 (2014b) announces that "on Wednesday, a court in Ankara cancelled the government's decision, six days after the *TİB* had blocked access to Twitter by the government's decision."

Comparing the democracy, freedom of expression and human rights discourse of the *AKP* government in its early years with the one it has adopted today we can say that there is a transition to the security discourse from the human rights discourse.
Prime Minister at the end of his 12-year term in office was talking about security now, not human rights. For instance, the headline of the report in the *Le Monde* (2014a) on March 21st, reads as follows: “Turkey has blocked access to Twitter for security reasons.” The same report also included these words of Erdogan: "We will not allow it. We will take the necessary measures regarding the ban. My country’s security is in danger." This point was emphasized by a cartoon the *Liberation* published as a part of a report on March 21st (2014a):


The blue Twitter birds seen caged at the back of the police car, on which is written "Democracy" and which is driven by Tayyip Erdogan, symbolize how democracy, once a top priority in Erdogan's discourse, was suppressed by the discourse of security and how freedom of expression was curbed.

Another cartoon in the *Liberation* (2014a) depicted Erdogan with a hose connected to the gas tube on his back, spraying the pepper spray on the blue Twitter birds on the air. Especially after June 2013, viz., after the *Gezi* movement, the security forces in Turkey have been extensively criticized by the international community for their intensive use of pepper spray. Prime Minister Erdogan, however, turned a deaf ear to this criticism by saying; "I gave myself the orders," gave support to the use of disproportionate force.
The reference to the pepper spray made in the news issued after the blocking access to Twitter indicates that an image of the use of brute force against the public opposition in Turkey under Erdogan's government has become established.

Another indication of the growing authoritarianism of Erdogan was hidden in the following statements of him which the French media often gave place: "I don't care what the international community says. They will see the power of Turkey!" The L'express (2014), Liberation (2014b), Le Figaro (2014a) and Le Monde (2014a) attached these words of Erdogan to their news about the blockings. The word "they" among those words can be read in the form of the Western world, or the European Union. It is also clear that the French media perceived itself too as the part of the aforementioned "they." The dichotomy between "I" used in the first sentence for the personality of Erdogan and "they" in the second sentence can be interpreted that Erdogan treats the West now not as an entity into which he should integrate himself; on the contrary, an entity against which he is to fight and display his might and power.

In other words, Turkey, in contrast to its image in the early years of the AKP government, now has the image of not a potential partner in the eyes of the West, and of course the French media, but an authoritarian country, trying to create an alternative against and despite the West.

THE GRAFT SCANDAL AND THE SYRIAN CRISIS

We observe from the published news that the French media mostly distinguishes the grounds officially purported for the blockings from the real ones, which lie behind the blockings. The official authorities in blocking Twitter, showed as reasons the disclosure of the information about private life by different Twitter accounts and the unwilling attitude of Twitter to block such accounts. In blocking Yahoo, this time, the disclosed sound recording related to Syria was declared as a reason for the blocking
because the sound recording posed a threat to national security. All the news examined within the scope of this study, first presented the reasons put forward by the government, but immediately after it they also mentioned that the Twitter was banned with the purpose of preventing the recordings of the graft scandal of December 2013 from spreading, and YouTube was banned again to prevent the spread of the sound recording which contained elements contrary to international law.

HUMOUR, RIDICULE AND THE INTERNET YOUTH IN TURKEY

When we look at the news, we also observe, beyond the above criticism that the French media directed to Erdogan, that he has become an object of ridicule by the language and cartoons used.

For example, the headline of the news given by Liberation (2014a) "Twitter pooped on Erdogan's head" (Twitter fait caca sur la tête d’Erdogan), suggests, beyond criticism, that Erdogan and Turkey have become in the eyes of its readers an object of mockery. One of the cartoons in the same news clearly becomes an example for our former sentence:

![Cartoon Image](http://www.liberation.fr/monde/2014/03/21/twitter-fait-caca-sur-la-tete-d-erdogan_988936?photo_id=630411)

The writing of "Higher Power" on the cartoon above includes a mocking reference to the above-mentioned sentence "they will see our power." It is a cartoon insulting Turkey and its prime minister though.

In another visual in the L’Express (2014), we see the adaptation of U.S. President Barack Obama’s "Yes We Can" campaign poster to Recep Tayyip Erdogan, with the slogan changed now into "Yes We Ban."
These cartoons were not produced by the French media but anonymously created in Turkey shortly after the Twitter and YouTube bans and shared on the social media. Despite all the negative reputation elements mentioned above, if there’s a positive element with Turkey’s reputation in the French media news about the bans, it is especially the success of young internet users in Turkey who were able to overcome the bans and produced a humorous language in the process. When we look at the submeaning of this success and the praise for the humorous language, we can observe that the French media in its criticism of the bans did not treat Turkey as a whole but set the Turkish people apart from the Turkish Government. Quotations from the news and reports below are examples for this situation:

- "After Twitter, the internet users now moved to reaccess to YouTube. Social networks, within just a few minutes after the news had spread, brought up the issue to the agenda and shared many visuals." (Le Parisien, 2014)
- "Due to the fact that the government failed to manage the results of the Gezi events, thanks to the war between the government and the Gülen community, in short, thanks to Turkish politics, we succeeded in becoming a real opposition without losing our sense of irony." (Courrier international, 2014)
- "The ban has been circumvented by some Turkish internet users in a short time and now the hashtag #TwitterisblockedinTurkey is currently the trend in the world." (L’Express, 2014)
- "Only five hours after the ban, 500,000 tweets were posted and more than 9 million Internet users from Turkey had already connected to the banned website in the morning" (Liberation, 2014a)
- "Criticism against the government in the social media continued on
Thursday. In particular, users of social media had fun with Erdogan's last speech that he had to do with hoarse voice. After all, the hashtag #helyumlobisi has taken its place among the most used keywords in the country." (Le Monde, 2014b)

OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSION

The AKP government's blocking access to YouTube and Twitter is a good example to the situation described above. The AKP's discourse, attitude and actions in the process of managing this crisis inflicted damage on Turkey's identity and reputation in the eyes of the world, which is difficult to repair.

First of all, the AKP government broke off relations with the Western world, by which Turkey made itself accepted as a result of its westernization moves in the last century in the fields of culture, military, politics, and economy; and then it shattered the hopes in the West, which were encouraged by AKP especially in its early years, that Turkey, began to experience a transition in the fields of democratization, the rule of law, and human rights. The attained reputation and identity could not be sustained and the reputation and perception in the world were given up in order to consolidate the political power on behalf of the domestic politics.

The above examples of the French newspapers, with their approaches to the bans, prove this changing perception. Additionally, the European Union, the United States, and the PEN International expressed their reactions to the bans. Neelie Kroes, a member of the European Commission responsible for its digital strategies, tweeted that "the Twitter ban in Turkey is groundless, pointless, [and] cowardly. Turkish people and international community will see this as censorship. It is." The U.S. State Department spokesperson Jen Psaki expressed her government's grave concern as follows: " Democracies are strengthened by the diversity of public voices. An independent and unfettered media is an essential element of democratic, open societies and crucial to ensuring official transparency and accountability" (Zaman, 2014). PEN International reminded that Turkey was a country where Western democratic values, secularism and Islamic culture came together; and demanded that the Turkish government give up its retreat from freedom of speech, the keystone of democracy. (Hür Bakış, 2014).

Consequently, we can say that the Twitter and YouTube bans found wide place in the French media, and strengthened the negative image of Turkey and the AKP government, resulting from authoritarianism, corruption, the Syrian Crisis, and the breaking off the ties with the West. And this negative reputation is an example to the fact that the actions of governments in internal politics pose effects on the country's and the government's reputation in foreign policy.

Every country has a "country image." The discourse and actions of the government, official institutions and diplomatic representatives of a given country have direct effects upon the reputation of that country. For this reason, it is significant to behave in accordance with certain norms and criteria both in discourse and actions. Each country has a certain identity and image in the public opinion and conducts its foreign policy over that identity. Discourse and actions, contrary to the existing identity and image, may harm identity and cause loss of reputation. The Twitter and Yahoo blockings
Turkey, for a long time, has had a negative image in the international community about the freedom of the press. When looked at the capital structures of media organizations, we can see that they are turned into holdings, in other words, apart from the sector of media, they became active in important sectors of the country such as, banking, energy and construction. This situation deepens the relationship of the media organizations with the political power, which results in the growing pressure of the political power on the media. Consequently, a process is being experienced in which the media gains a new structure, favoring the interests of the political power and considering the political power's interests equal to its own interests. However, it must also be remembered that the internet now has become a mechanism that has the potential to reverse the known facts. Innovations, accompanying the technological developments and the prevalence of the use of internet are the most important examples that can be given to this situation. Therefore, the internet is an effective and an important milestone in the process of internationalization of communication.

In addition, the emergence of digital media was evaluated by some as a positive development in blocking manipulation and biased information. Dissenting opinion and counter propaganda have found the ability to spread globally to the masses faster than ever before. Just for this reason it is an important issue to focus on how the Western media perceived blocking access to Twitter and YouTube.

Considering that the effect and power of communication are felt heavily in nearly every area, it is possible to say that these bans on social media had a wide echo both at home and abroad and had a negative impact on Turkey's image, although briefly.
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