

THE IDEOLOGICAL STANCE OF THE FREEDOM AND ACCORD PARTY

Sami ZARİÇ *

ABSTRACT: The Freedom and Accord Party was a party that left a significant impact on multi-party politics after the Second Constitutional Monarchy and on Ottoman political life during the War of Independence. The HİF came to the forefront, in particular, in filling the opposition vacuum left by the closure of the Ahrar Party following the March 31 Incident and in politically combating the Committee of Union and Progress. Thus, the Freedom and Accord Party succeeded in uniting under its umbrella both the conservative and liberal factions seeking a strong opposition to the Committee of Union and Progress. Therefore, after the Freedom and Accord Party attracted a wide range of opposition groups and Ottoman citizens from other ethnic backgrounds and incorporated them into its ranks, it did not, in fact, adopt an ideological line that differed significantly from that of the parties that joined it. In this sense, the Freedom and Accord Party continued the more liberal and decentralized political tradition that began with the Ahrar Party, along with the multi-party system established after the Second Constitutional Era, and was able to easily accommodate other smaller opposition parties with similar views. This study aims to reveal the ideological position of the FAP in Turkish political life and to determine which intellectual currents influenced the party the most.

Key Words: The Freedom and Accord Party, Second Constitutional Monarchy, Committee of Union and Progress, March 31 Incident, Union of Elements.

Article type: Research article

Jel Classification: Y80, Y70

DOI: 10.29131/uiibd.1949929

Received: 12.05.2026/ **Accepted:** 02.06.2026/ **Published:** 20.06.2026

HÜRRİYET VE İTİLAĞ FİRKASI'NIN İDEOLOJİK DURUŞU

ÖZ: Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası, II. Meşrutiyet sonrası çok partili siyasette ve Kurtuluş Savaşı sırasında Osmanlı siyasi hayatında önemli bir etki bırakan bir partiydi. HİF, özellikle 31 Mart Vakası'nın ardından Ahrar Partisi'nin kapatılmasıyla oluşan muhalefet boşluğunu doldurmada ve İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti'yle siyasi mücadelede ön plana çıktı. Böylece İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti'ne güçlü bir muhalefet arayan muhafazakâr ve liberal kesimleri çatısı altında birleştirmeyi başardı. Dolayısıyla, Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası çok çeşitli muhalif grupları ve diğer etnik kökenlerden Osmanlı vatandaşlarını cezbettikten ve bu grupları saflarına kattıktan sonra, aslında kendisine katılan partilerden önemli ölçüde farklı bir ideolojik çizgi benimsemedi. Bu bağlamda Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası, Ahrar Partisi ile başlayan daha liberal ve merkezîyetçi olmayan siyasi geleneği ve İkinci Meşrutiyet'ten sonra başlayan çok partili sistemi sürdürdü ve benzer görüşlere sahip diğer küçük muhalefet partilerini kolayca bünyesine katabildi. Bu çalışmayla HİF'in Türk siyasal yaşamında ideolojik konumunun ortaya konulması ve partinin hangi fikir akımlarından daha çok etkilendiği tespit edilmeye çalışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası, II. Meşrutiyet, İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti, 31 Mart Vakası, İttihad-ı Anasır.

Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi

Jel Sınıflandırması: Y80, Y70

Geliş tarihi: 12.05.2026/ **Kabul Tarihi:** 02.06.2026/ **Yayın Tarihi:** 20.06.2026

* Assoc. Dr., Mersin University, Mersin, samizaric@mersin.edu.tr, **ORCID:** 0000-0002-3375-8825

For citation:

ZARİÇ, S. (2026). The Ideological Stance of the Freedom and Accord Party. International Journal Of Economics And Administrative Sciences, 12 (1), 87-98. DOI: 10.29131/uiibd.1949929

1. Introduction

The Freedom and Accord Party (FAP) was a party that left a significant impact on multi-party politics after the Second Constitutional Monarchy and on Ottoman political life during the War of Independence. The FAP came to the forefront, in particular, in filling the opposition vacuum left by the closure of the Ahrar Party (AP) following the March 31 Incident and in politically combating the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP).

Thus, the FAP succeeded in uniting under its umbrella both the conservative and liberal factions seeking a strong opposition to the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP). In this sense, it can be said that the FAP emerged to represent the periphery in the aforementioned center-periphery tension that defined the general framework of political struggle in Turkish political life.

FAP also came to the fore in the political vacuum that emerged after the ruling CUP was forced to withdraw from the political scene following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I, and although it could not fully come to power, it became one of the influential forces in the politics of the period, along with the Sultan.

Within this framework, this study will attempt to reveal the ideological structure of the FAP. Using qualitative research methods, this study examined secondary sources such as books, journals, articles, and other academic studies on the subject, including theses and other studies produced on the subject. This study aims to reveal the ideological position of the FAP in Turkish political life and to determine which intellectual currents influenced the party the most.

2. Declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy

It can be said that modern politics in the Ottoman Empire began with the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy in 1908. Important elements of democracy, such as general elections, civil society organizations, parliament, members of parliament, government formed by election results, freedom of expression, and freedom of the press, were implemented during this period. It should also be emphasized that many societies, particularly in the civil society sector, were established during this period (Fedayi, 2019: 17-19).

Furthermore, a significant difference between the Second Constitutional Era and previous political developments in the Ottoman Empire was that it provided an environment

for the emergence of political currents. Modern political ideologies such as Westernism, Islamism, and Turkism shaped the mindset of Ottoman intellectuals. These currents competed with each other to contribute intellectually to the state's resurgence (Börklüoğlu, 2020: 22-23).

When analyzing the period, the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era was met with joy by a large portion of society, renewing hopes that all problems would be resolved in this new era. However, the leading intellectuals of the period sought to address these problems in a more systematic manner (Kalaycı, 2011).

Following the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era, numerous societies emerged in Ottoman political life, some of which existed on an ideological level but were not formally organized as parties. This period saw the establishment of societies in the modern sense, driven by security concerns or a desire to express themselves. These societies also emerged out of a desire to achieve specific goals (Kalaycı, 2011).

At this point, the first party to form in Turkish political life was the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP). Following the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era in July 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress came to power as a powerful political party. The Ottoman Ahrar Party, formed by the breakaway of Prince Sebahaddin's supporters from the CUP, became the second party to enter Turkish political life (Seyitdanlioğlu, 1997: 101).

The first half of the Second Constitutional Era (1908-1913) was marked by a multi-party system, while the second half was ruled by a single party. Therefore, from 1908 to the early years of 1920, four legislative periods (terms of parliament) can be distinguished: 1st Period (1908-1912), 2nd Period (1912), 3rd Period (1914-1918), and 4th Period (1920). The period leading up to 1912 was multi-party, while all subsequent periods were single-party, occasionally demonstrating divisions within a large mass party (Tunaya, 1988: 7).

After the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era, the center of power and attraction shifted from the Yıldız Palace to the center of the Committee of Union and Progress. Nearly everyone desired to join this center, seeking office, status, or wealth. Following the first elections, the Chamber of Deputies (Meclis-i Mebusan), which began on December 17, 1908, gathered those who had either directly won the election as Committee of Union and Progress candidates or those affiliated with the party. Only Mahir Said (Pekmen) from the

Ahrar Party managed to enter parliament as a member of another party. None of the parties established during the period leading up to the founding of the Freedom and Accord Party had the power to intimidate the Committee of Union and Progress (Birinci, 1998).

On January 13, 1909, Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha formed a new government in accordance with the demands of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and succeeded in receiving a vote of confidence from Parliament. However, the CUP ministers in the cabinet were a minority. Shortly thereafter, Kamil Pasha fell out with the CUP and removed the CUP ministers from the cabinet. Consequently, the CUP succeeded in overthrowing the government through a motion of no confidence on February 13-14. Subsequently, a new cabinet was formed with Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha as Grand Vizier and succeeded in receiving a vote of confidence. Despite all these developments, the CUP's continued adherence to its clandestine organizational structure (komitacılık) drew criticism. Meanwhile, non-Muslims, Arabs, and Albanians in Parliament began to feel uneasy about the CUP's increasingly pronounced Turkist leanings. Thus, some deputies elected from the CUP list joined the Ahrar Party, and intense criticism against the CUP began in the media (Ataay, 2019: 64-65).

Shortly thereafter, on March 31, 1909, the uprising known as the March 31 Incident took place. Derviş Vahdeti was at the forefront of this uprising. *The Volkan* newspaper, owned and edited by Vahdeti, and the "Community of Muhammad," which he founded, have been portrayed as the organizers, or at least the instigators of this major uprising. At this point, the March 31 Incident can clearly be considered a consequence of the opposition to the Committee of Union and Progress (Çavdar, 2019: 123).

3. Foundation and Political Life of the Freedom and Accord Party

In the period before the declaration of the Constitutional Monarchy, the CUP stood out with concepts such as justice, freedom, fraternity, and equality. While its rhetoric was quite popular, the CUP adopted a more strident rhetoric shortly after the declaration of the Constitutional Monarchy due to the strengthening of opposition to the Committee of Union and Progress. The most significant basis for the opposition to the CUP was the CUP's aforementioned stance and its harsh policies (Kaan, 2008: 280).

At this point, other groups fighting alongside the Committee of Union and Progress to overthrow Abdulhamid II's "despotic regime" accused the Committee of increasingly authoritarianism and of creating a new despotic order. Consequently, opposition groups

formed within Parliament against the Committee of Union and Progress, and the membership of these groups grew daily (Tekin & Okutan, 2011: 38).

From the early days of the Second Constitutional Era, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) began to split due to its monopolistic and dominant stance, leading to the formation of a new political party. These groups claimed that a small group, allegedly linked to Freemasonry and Zionism, had taken control of the CUP, that partisanship was being used in public service appointments, and that important positions such as governorships and provincial governorships were easily obtained. Another factor that increased opposition to the CUP was the separatist movements of minorities. Furthermore, the murder of some anti-CUP intellectuals and journalists fueled widespread anger against the CUP. Thus, in the face of the Committee of Union and Progress's increasingly authoritarian actions, opposition groups united, and the largest political organization established during this period emerged (Birinci, 1998).

This party, founded by the Moderate Freedom (Mutedil Hürriyetperveran) and Ahali parties in Parliament, along with other opposition groups, took the name 'The Freedom and Accord Party (Hürriyet ve İtilaf)'. The meaning of the word 'Hürriyet' is clear; "İtilaf" means unity and agreement. However, rather than a single faction, the aforementioned formation appeared as a "bloc" movement encompassing a wide range of views and tendencies (Çavdar, 2019: 137-138).

The party's constitution and program, which had been decided upon, were drafted by Ahmet Reşit (Rey) at Rıza Nur's home. İsmail Kemal Mithat (Fenmen), Mahir Sait, and Hüseyin Siret (Özsever) also participated in these publications. Colonel Sadık Bey, who was understood to have provided considerable support to these efforts, was also invited. Finally, the party's founding declaration and program were presented to Istanbul Governor Emin Bey by a delegation consisting of Mahir Sait, Kemal Mithat, Hüseyin Siret, and Rıza Nur, thus completing the initial establishment (November 21, 1911) (Erdem, 2021).

The Party was formed after the rapid realization that the parties emerging within Parliament were insufficient to provide an alternative to the Committee of Union and Progress. Several deputies outside these parties also opposed the CUP's practices, finding them unacceptable. Therefore, the HIF emerged as a result of this dissatisfaction (Güneş, 1997: 392).

The founders of the HIF, which would become the CUP's biggest rival in the 1912 elections and the subsequent period, included prominent bureaucrats and intellectuals such as İsmail Hakkı Pasha (Amasya), Dr. Dagavaryan (Sivas), Mustafa Sabri (Tokat), Dr. Rıza Nur (Sinop), Damat Ferit, and Müşir Fuat Pasha (Aydoğan and Mahmutoğlu, 2018, p. 5274). At the first party meeting held on November 24, 1911, Damat Ferit Pasha was elected party chairman; Sadık Bey was elected vice chairman, and the other vice chairmanship was left vacant to be elected by a non-Muslim member (Güneş, 1997: 392).

The Freedom and Accord Party, with around 70 deputies, formed the largest opposition group in the Chamber of Deputies. Nearly 100 FAP branches were opened in Istanbul and Anatolia (Erdem, 2021). The party, which generated enthusiasm among Arab, Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, and Albanian deputies, attracted interest from various parties within and outside the parliament following its founding, some of which joined the party. In this way, the FAP brought together most opposition movements within its structure (Güneş, 1997: 393).

Thus, Damat Ferit Pasha was the first to assume the chairmanship of the FAP. Ferit Pasha was the son-in-law of Sultan Abdülmecid and was known as a westernized figure. Although the opposition consisted of diverse ideologies, the CUP opposition formed a unifying force. The FAP, which generally represented a liberal-conservative school, adopted a pro-British stance in foreign policy. Seventy deputies in Parliament decided to join the FAP, and many newspapers and magazines also supported the opposition (Ataay, 2019: 69).

The strength of the opposition base of the FAP was demonstrated in the Istanbul by-elections held on December 11, 1911, just twenty days after its founding. The Unionists' candidate in the election was Memduh Bey, Minister of the Interior, while the FAP candidate was Tahir Hayrettin Bey, son of former Grand Vizier Hayrettin Pasha of Tunis and one of the founders of the FAP. According to the election results, the FAP candidate won the election with 196 votes against his opponent, who received 195. This not only came as a major surprise but also caused serious concern and suspicion among the Unionists (Tunaya, 1988: 271).

Having ended the CUP's dominance in parliament and having won the by-election held in Istanbul on December 11, 1911, by a single vote, the party intimidated the Committee of Union and Progress into taking measures. The Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) government sought to amend Article 35 of the Constitution, which stipulated the dissolution of parliament, but the FAP prevented the amendment from being passed. Consequently, the

government acted in accordance with Article 7 of the Constitution and, relying on this article, dissolved parliament by the sultan's will (January 18, 1912) (Erdem, 2021).

Following the opposition's surprising electoral victory, the CUP further escalated its repression and imposed restrictions on candidacy. For this reason, the 1912 elections were known as "elections with sticks." Under these circumstances, the second general election of the Constitutional Era was held in 1912, and the Unionists, who occasionally resorted to repressive methods, were successful. In the 286-member Parliament, the opposition had no more than fifteen deputies (Tunaya, 1988: 272).

Following the Bab-ı Âli Raid, the assassination of Mahmut Şevket Pasha led to the prosecution of many FAP members, some exiled, and others fleeing the country. Unable to maintain its active operations, the FAP withdrew from political life on January 1, 1913, closing its provincial units (Göl, 2018: 335).

In fact, there was no government decision to close the FAP. Similarly, there is no documentation regarding the party's self-dissolution. Only during the reign of Kamil Pasha did Sadık Bey issued a declaration closing down the FAP's provincial units. Thus, despite the FAP's dissolution, many of its members continued their activities abroad (Al, 2006: 95).

Şerif Pasha, a CUP dissident, was appointed president of the new organization abroad, and Sadık Bey was appointed vice president. However, Şerif Pasha resigned shortly thereafter. Following this development, Gümölcinelî İsmail Bey and Colonel Sadık Bey went to Egypt. Thus effectively disbanded, the members of the FAP continued their opposition throughout World War I and did not hesitate to cooperate with the Allied Powers, especially Britain, whom they viewed as enemies of the CUP, not the Ottoman Empire (Erdem, 2021). The FAP did not participate in the 1914 election, the third general election of the Second Constitutional Era, as it had withdrawn from political life. The 1919 election was boycotted by the FAP (Tunaya, 1988: 272). Consequently, the FAP remained inactive in the political arena for nearly five years.

The resurgence of the FAP occurred with the CUP's withdrawal from the political arena following the signing of the Armistice of Mudros on October 30, 1918. With the removal of the CUP's political pressure, the FAP leaders, who had been the CUP's most formidable rival and subjected to the Unionists' harsh approach, gradually began to return to Istanbul. Sultan Vahdeddin had already supported the FAP while he was still crown prince. Therefore, his

accession to the sultanate on July 3, 1918, was the most significant factor in accelerating these transformations (Göl, 2018: 335).

Thus, the FAP, which had been dissolved by the Unionists after the Bab-ı Âli Raid, was revived with the support of Sultan Vahdettin and Damat Ferit Pasha. The party entered politics with a directive dated January 8, 1919. The influential figures in the party were Mustafa Sabri Efendi, Nuri Bey, and Ali Kemal. Damat Ferit Pasha, despite supporting the party, preferred to remain outside its administration. The Freedom and Accord Party operated with the support of Britain and France and believed that the country's salvation depended on complete loyalty to the sultanate and the caliphate. Furthermore, it advocated for the harsh punishment of the Unionists, whom it declared responsible for the war (Akşin, 1976: 185).

During the War of Independence, the FAP, viewing the Anatolian uprising as a continuation of Union and Progress, pursued a palace-focused policy. Thus, the FAP was seen as the ruling party of the period. FAP members, who attempted to hinder the Anatolian movement by instigating numerous uprisings in Anatolia, collaborated with minorities and occupying forces. By the end of 1922, realizing they would not be held accountable for their actions following the success of the liberation movement, FAP members fled the country, bringing the FAP to the brink of dissolution (Göl, 2008: 3).

At this point, the Freedom and Accord Party became the first and last major political party that the CUP feared and saw as a rival during the Second Constitutional Era. The FAP ended the Committee of Union and Progress's dominance in parliament and enabled the functioning of a parliamentary system for the first time (Birinci, 1998). In this sense, the Freedom and Accord Party's positive contribution to the more democratic political landscape after the Second Constitutional Era cannot be ignored.

4. The Ideological Stance of the Freedom and Accord Party

The FAP, which succeeded in uniting dissenting conservative and liberal circles under a single party, was undoubtedly the CUP's strongest political rival (Börklüoğlu, 2020, p. 25). Indeed, until the emergence of the Freedom and Accord Party on the political scene, none of the established parties possessed the political power to unsettle the Committee of Union and Progress (Birinci, 1998: 507).

It is quite difficult to determine the ideological orientation of the FAP, which brought together political figures with quite different tendencies. It can be said that the FAP's primary motivation was opposition to the CUP (Nur, 1996: 24). Indeed, it is striking that the four parties

founded in successive years under the name of Freedom and Accord (Hürriyet ve İtilâf) shared the same program and political views. The greatest weakness of the first party, founded on November 21, 1911, was its acceptance of dissidents of CUP from every thought. This shortcoming also applied to the Freedom and Accord, founded during the Armistice period. Consequently, all the Freedom and Accord parties advocated liberalism. In this respect, as seen in the Ahrar Party, the FAP's advocacy was fundamentally based on the ideas of Prince Sabahaddin Bey (Birinci, 1998).

The idea advocated for political unity in the Ottoman Empire was the Union of Elements (*ittihad-ı anasır*). Some consider the FAP's advocacy of these views after World War I as a sign of its utopianism. Anglophilia, one of the FAP's most important foreign policy strategies, increased rather than diminished despite World War I and the attempts by British colonialism to dismantle the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, the FAP viewed gaining British friendship as the sole path to the state's survival (Birinci, 1998).

Therefore, the Party believed that political unity could be preserved by granting new rights to minorities, and this led to their interest in the FAP. The FAP adopted the 'unity of the peoples' (*ittihad-ı anâsır*) view and believed that this could be achieved through the decentralization (*adem-i merkeziyet*) method proposed by Prince Sabahaddin. In this regard, the Party relied on Prince Sabahaddin's views, and therefore, minorities gravitated towards the Party. Minorities could at least find their short-term goals in the party program. However, the FAP did not promise autonomy for any minority, even indirectly. In this sense, the FAP's top priority was to preserve the political integrity of the Ottoman Empire (Erdem, 2021).

A look at the FAP's program reveals that it embraced Prince Sabahaddin's 'Decentralization and Personal Enterprise' (*Adem-i Merkeziyet ve Teşebbüs-ü Şahsi*) philosophy to prevent the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the FAP assumed that this disintegration could be prevented by granting greater rights to minorities. The FAP's program appears to support this view along with the idea of "Ottomanism." Indeed, the contradictions that emerge in this way demonstrate that the party is not committed to a specific ideology and that its sole purpose is to suppress the activities of the CUP. Furthermore, when comparing the FAP's program with the programs of other factions within the party, it can be seen that, in addition to similarities in thought, there are also contrasts. Indeed, when comparing the FAP's program with the program of the Committee of Union and Progress, it is clear that it shares many similarities (Al, 2006: 95).

According to Çavdar (2019), the FAP's bylaws and program essentially embodied the principles of liberal economics and principles that would encourage separatist movements. For example, the FAP favored autonomous administration in some provinces in areas such as national education, agriculture, and public works. The provinces in question were envisioned as being subordinate to the central government only in defense and foreign affairs. Furthermore, the party's program contained no articles opposing capitulations. On this point, Çavdar (2019) characterizes the FAP as a veritable nest of chaos due to its structure. Despite this, Çavdar states that, in addition to the masses who demanded freedom and whose economic problems never ceased, several liberal and well-intentioned intellectuals personally participated in the party's struggle with the Committee of Union and Progress (Çavdar, 2019: 138).

Unlike the Sadık Bey group, the party's young intellectuals viewed the use of Islam and other religious ideas in politics as a dangerous stance. In the pre-Balkan War era, Islamist or Turkist policies were considered dangerous ideologies that could lead to the disintegration of the state due to its religious and ethnic makeup. In terms of foreign policy, the party sought to avoid alarming European powers, especially Britain. Friendship with Britain was deemed essential for the state's survival. The Unionists, however, missed this opportunity by aligning themselves with Germany (Birinci, 1998).

In this sense, the FAP, as a natural consequence of the multicultural and multinational structure of the Ottoman Empire and society, encompasses a wide variety of elements. Therefore, it is not possible to speak of a specific political ideology. However, the FAP's fundamental views are Ottomanism, Constitutionalism, decentralization, personal initiative (individual initiative, free enterprise), and liberal economics (Göl, 2008: XII).

When it came to economic policies, the FAP shared similar views on economic issues with the ruling CUP. In this sense, both parties opposed internationalist and socialist movements and advocated a policy based on providing all necessary facilities to foreign capital (Tunaya, 1988: 269).

Therefore, the FAP's economic policy was based on liberalism. It aimed to increase prosperity and wealth by breaking down barriers to private enterprise, encouraging foreign capital to enter the country, and establishing a well-established economic policy that would protect the public from foreign competition. It planned to allocate state-owned land to those in need under favorable conditions, establish credit-granting institutions in the provinces to

accelerate economic activity, support agricultural production through the Ziraat Bank, and implement legal measures to improve the situation of landless farmers. It aimed to collect taxes based on taxpayers' power and the principles of justice and equality (Erdem, 2021).

The Freedom and Accord Party's greatest contribution to Turkish political history was its ability to empower intellectuals to express their views during the final years of the Ottoman Empire (Birinci, 1998). The FAP, dating back to the second period of the Ottoman Empire, demonstrated the courage to stand against a party as powerful and well-organized as the Committee of Union and Progress, which operated throughout the Constitutional Era (Göl, 2008: XVII).

5. Conclusion

Following the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, the Committee of Union and Progress rose to prominence as the most powerful political actor in the new era, and over time, its shift toward a more authoritarian stance created a need for a strong political focus within the opposition. Furthermore, the Committee of Union and Progress's shift toward a more Turkish nationalist stance after the Balkan Wars unsettled other ethnic groups within the country and led them to seek a new party.

Following all these developments and the emerging need, the establishment of the Freedom and Accord Party came to the fore. The FAP, in a manner that met expectations, stood strongly against the CUP and, for a time, became the opposition's only hope until the CUP consolidated its single-party rule. Indeed, after the suppression of the March 31st Incident by the Action Army, which saw the Unionists once again take control, and Abdülhamid II's removal and exile -especially with the constitutional amendments of 1909- the sultan retreated to a more passive position and thus was no longer in a political position that could offer hope to the opposition.

Therefore, after the FAP attracted a wide range of opposition groups and Ottoman citizens from other ethnic backgrounds and incorporated them into its ranks, it did not, in fact, adopt an ideological line that differed significantly from that of the parties that joined it. In this sense, the FAP continued the more liberal and decentralized political tradition that began with the Ahrar Party, along with the multi-party system that began after the Second Constitutional Era, and was able to easily accommodate other smaller opposition parties with similar views (such as the Modest Freedom Party and the Ahali Party).

At this point, it can be easily said that the FAP actually advocated the opposite of what the CUP advocated. Therefore, it appears that the party adopted and followed a more decentralized, liberal line. In this sense, the FAP served as an umbrella organization for broad opposition elements and served as a haven of refuge in the struggle against the Unionists. However, it should not be forgotten that the FAP advocated similar policies to the CUP and embraced a national economic approach.

REFERENCES

- Al, G. (2006). II. Meşrutiyet Dönemindeki En Büyük Muhalefet Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırkası. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Akşin, S. (1976). İstanbul Hükümetleri ve Milli Mücadele. İzmir: Cem Yayınevi.
- Ataay, F. (2019). Türkiye Demokrası Tarihi-1789'dan Günümüze (1st ed.). Ankara: Nika Yayınevi.
- Aydoğan, E. & Mahmutoğlu, T. B. (2018). Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyete Milli İradenin Oluşum Aşaması: Seçimler (1908-1923). *Social Sciences Studies Journal*. 4 (25), 5269-5285.
- Birinci, A. (1998). Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırkası. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 18, 507-511. Retrieved August 11, 2025. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/hurriyet-ve-italaf-firkasi>.
- Börklüoğlu, L. (2020). Tanzimattan Günümüze Türk Siyasal Hayatı (2nd ed.). Bursa: Dora Basım-Yayın.
- Çavdar, T. (2019). Türkiye'nin Demokrası Tarihi (1839-1950) (6th ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Erdem, Ş. C. (2021). Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası. *Atatürk Ansiklopedisi*. Retrieved August 12, 2025. <https://aturkansiklopedisi.gov.tr/detay/781/h%c3%bcrriyet-ve-%c4%b0tilaf-f%c4%b1rkas%c4%b1>.
- Fedayi, C. (2019). Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Sağ Siyaset. Ankara: Kadim Yayınları.
- Göl, H. (2008). Milli Mücadele Döneminde Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırkası. (Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation). Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Göl, H. (2018). Millî Mücadele Sonunda Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkasının Dağılması ve Liderlerinin Akıbeti. (Conference Presentation). XVIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi.
- Güneş, İ. (1997). Türk Parlamento Tarihi: Meşrutiyete Geçiş Süreci: I. ve II. Meşrutiyet. Ankara: TBMM Vakfı Yayınları, I.
- Kaan, O. (2008). II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Muhalefet: Ahrar Fırkası. (Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Kalaycı, H. (2011). Prens Sabahattin'in Ahrar Fırkasının Sosyolojik Analizi. *Türk Yurdu Dergisi*. 31 (291).
- Nur, R. (1996). Hürriyet ve İtilâf Fırkası: Nasıl doğdu? Nasıl öldü?. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Seyitdanlıoğlu, M. (1997). Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası: Programı, İç Tüzüğü, Beyannameleri. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*. 2 (6), 101-117.
- Tekin, Y., & Okutan, M. Ç. (2011). Türk Siyasal Hayatı. Ankara: Orion Kitabevi.
- Tunaya, T. Z. (1988). Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler cilt 1-İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları.