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Introduction

Synaspismos (Coalition of Left and Progress – From 2003 Coalition of Left, Movements and Ecology) is a radical left party that has marked the Greek party system since 1992. The party was the convergence of several parties and organizations, which constituted the so-called “eniaios Synaspismos”, an electoral coalition formed in 1987. It is the point meeting of two political currents, one of eurocommunist origin expressed by “KKE-es” (Communist party of the Interior) and one of communist origin – “KKE” (Communist Party of Greece). What was significant about Synaspismos was that it managed to combine and synthesize these two currents. However, this convergence caused certain developments in terms of intra-party politics. Factionalism is the most persisting element of Synaspismos’ physiognomy, mainly as a mark of its insistence on intra-party democracy and a stimulus for high fragmentation. Throughout the last 17 years Synaspismos is well-known for the emphasis on issues including the European Union, civil rights, minority rights, its persistent anti-clerical stance and its anti-nationalist rhetoric. Until 2000 Synaspismos could be described as a pro-european left party that favored a mixed-economy model and had an electoral and institutional orientation and a flexible coalition strategy that aimed to a final convergence with PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement).

Since 2000 the party has started to change its political orientation and strategy, addressing more radical positions in some matters and formulating SYRIZA (Coalition of Radical Left) an electoral coalition with several parties and organizations from the extra-parliamentary left. This ‘left turn’ was organized inside the party through a domination of the leftist faction over the renewers.

This paper’s aim is to explain Synaspismos’ so-called ‘left turn’ in terms of intra-party politics. Following Panebianco’s theories of party evolution and party change, we shall argue that this turn is a result of both external and internal factors, while its limits are defined by the party’s genetic model. The main cores of our analysis are the party’s power structure and factions and how the above mentioned political re-orientation affects intra-party competition.

We define as Synaspismos’ genetic traits its centralist, with relatively autonomous and weak local branches, structure and formal factionalism. Our hypothesis is that Synaspismos’ coalitional origin influenced the party’s evolution into a centralized but fragmented party. From its beginning there were two main political currents that fought for the party’s control, both at ideological and strategic levels. The first current, the so-called “renewalist”, emphasized in the party’s pro-european orientation and called for a left identity that was free from communist elements. The second current, the leftist, held a critical stance against the soviet model and tried to build a radical left identity with a soft euroscepticist stance. Electoral failure and certain developments in Greek political system favored a ‘radical turn’, imposed by the leftists through a zero-sum game with the renewers. This turn was characterized by the implementation of a new coalitional strategy

---

1 The author wishes to thank his colleagues at the ‘Organized Interests Seminar’ held by the University of Athens “Political Communication Unit” for their insightful comments and especially Professor Michalis Spourdalakis for his help and support.
SYRIZA) and by youth’s enhancement that ensured the leftists’ domination. Nevertheless, Synaspismos’ genetic code seems to jeopardize ‘left turn’ integration, defining its limitations.

In the first part we will describe Synaspismos’ evolution, its power structure and its factions. In the second part we will explain the ‘left turn’ and its effects both in the party’s power structure and factional competition.

1. Synaspismos’ evolution

Our theoretical base stems from Panebianco’s theory of party evolution\(^2\). Panebianco has formulated an explanatory model by discerning two stages of party evolution. The first stage is the so-called ‘genetic model’\(^3\) that refers to a party’s birthmarks. There are three elements that determine a party’s genetic model: a) its birth through territorial penetration or territorial diffusion, b) its internal or external legitimization and c) the presence or not of charismatic leader. Penetration occurs ‘when the center controls, stimulates, or directs the development of the periphery’\(^4\). Diffusion occurs ‘when development results from spontaneous germination: local elites construct party associations which are only later integrated into a national organization’\(^5\). Parties developed through penetration tend to obtain a centralist structure, while parties developed through diffusion assimilate to a de-centralized structure. The second stage is a party’s institutionalization\(^6\); a phase that a party consolidates its genetic traits and formulates an organizational culture. There are two indicators that define the degree of institutionalization, the party’s autonomy from its environment and the party’s degree of systemness. The first indicator refers to the resource exchange process between an organization and its environment, the latter including a party’s ancillary or collateral organizations. The second indicator assesses the degree of interdependence between a party’s sub-groups. A highly institutionalized party dominates its environment and possesses a high degree of systemness. A party of low institutionalization tends to adapt to his environment, while there are loose connections between its sub-groups, or a domination of one subgroup over the others.

\(^3\) Ibid, 50-53
\(^4\) Ibid, 50
\(^5\) Ibid
\(^6\) Ibid, 53-59
Panebianco’s basic assumption is that a party organization is a conservative organization, where change can only be the result of a combination between external and internal factors. A party’s dominant coalition – which is the party’s leadership, as a coalition between factions leading figures that control a party’s zones of uncertainty – is formulated at the time of a party’s birth, under the influence of certain genetic traits. During the first phase it is the party’s leadership that forms the party’s identity and goals, providing a system of collective incentives to its members. Through the phase of institutionalization the party organization starts to develop its own preservation goals, providing at this time a system of selective incentives for its members. At this time a party’s genetic code – its genetic features – determines the conditions under which a party functions and poses some constraints to its change. In the second chapter we will exhibit the conditions under which, according to Panebianco, a party changes. This does not mean of course that there is a single path of party evolution and that Panebianco’s types are ‘close’. In many cases there are combinations of the above mentioned procedures and the party-types are hybrid, as Synaspismos for instance.

1.1 The founding congress

Synaspismos’ genetic model has a significant distinctiveness from Panebianco’s initial formulation. The party which was founded in June 1992 constituted the evolution of a former electoral coalition’s evolution into a party, after a great split into the Greek Communist Party which had taken place some months before. Synaspismos at its first form was a political agreement between the leaders of the two main radical left parties, KKE and EAR, aiming to penetrate PASOK’S electorate and become the new opposite pole against New Democracy. This tactical choice was facilitated by Soviet Union’s
policy change under Gorbachev and the split that took place inside KKE-es at 1986. These incidents enhanced both parties’ right-wingers. KKE-es was re-founded as EAR (Greek Left) and the latter along with KKE signed the so-called “Common Conclusion” at the end of 1987.

The responses to this electoral strategy were mixed. For many members of both parties the collaboration with New Democracy in 1989 was considered as a “disgrace” for the greek left, while for others Synaspismos was the only vehicle for a better performance and they supported its evolution to a single unified party. The latter was the object of a great dispute inside KKE, which was intensified after the Soviet Union’s collapse. During the critical 13th Congress (February 1991) the “orthodox” faction superseded the “renewers” electing Aleca Papariga as the party’s new General Secretary against Yannis Dragassakis. The right-wingers declared their intentions to support Synaspismos by participating to its “Panhellenic Assembly” in June 1991. The counterparts from EAR insisted on Synaspismos evolution to a single party while the KKE-based were relatively cautious about this perspective. KKE’s orthodox majority withdrew the party from the coalition, forcing at the same time the right-wingers’ to exit. It is estimated that about the two fifths of KKE’s membership basis including half the Political Bureau and Central Committee were ousted from the party and entered Synaspismos a few months later. The resolution for the conduct of the Founding Congress in June 1992 was the result of an intra-coalition referendum in January 1992 and was almost unanimous.

The Founding Congress transformed Synaspismos to a single party and formulated its basic ideological and organizational principles. In the Resolution what was declared was its enthusiastic support of European integration, its distance to social democracy and “socialist totalitarianism”, a soft support of market economy and a will to interact with several social movements, including the women’s movement and the ecological movement. Dispute rose over amongst two matters: the coalition strategies and the matter of factionalism. At this point the former EAR delegates stressed the need to enhance Synaspismos as an autonomous party, while the former KKE delegates were more “open” to a possible collaboration with PASOK. The final formulation was in favor of a cautious stance towards PASOK. The second matter was the role of factions – “taseis” in Synaspismos’ vocabulary – in the intra-party procedures. For most of the delegates the legitimate functioning of factions was extremely significant for enhancing intra-party democracy. What was discussed was the factions’ degree of autonomy and organization. In the 1992 statutes it was stated that “it is recognized the potential for the existence and functioning of tendencies and currents […] tendencies do not necessarily permanent.

---

7 KKE-es split took place after the party’s 4th Congress (May 1986). There were two main factions at that moment: the left-wingers around General Secretary Yannis Banias (Anavathmissi – Enhancement) and the right-wingers around Leonidas Kyrkos (Metekseliki – Advancement). The dispute was about the abandonment or not of the party’s communist title and symbols. The left-wingers left the party, founding KKE-es – Ananeotiki Aristera (Communist Party of the Interior – Renewing Left), while those who remained re-founded the party as EAR – Elliniki Aristera (Greek Left). See Alexatos Y. (2008), Historical dictionary of the greek workers’ movement, Athina: Geitonies tou Kosmou, 245—251 [In Greek]
9 “Avgi” 5.07.1992
1.2 The organizational and power structure

Therefore, Synaspismos’ genetic model presents two basic traits: formal and established factionalism and a centralist organizational structure with relatively weak and autonomous local branches. The two main counterparts – KKE “renewers” and EAR – were carrying close organizational traditions, which were centralist with a stress – in EAR case – in intra-party democracy. The development of the party structure took the form of territorial penetration, although there were elements of territorial diffusion. In several cases there was a revival and unification of the former KKE and EAR local branches, while there was a respectable number of non-aligned leftists who entered the party individually. In other words there was diffusion in the upper levels and penetration as the party developed downwards.

During the initial processes of the Panhellenic Assembly, a year before the first Congress, the leaderships of the constituent parties and organizations rapidly created a powerful central body – the so called Executive Committee – that was coordinating the coalition’s actions. The Central Political Committee that was elected after the 1st Congress, consisted mainly of members of the former Executive Committee. Maria Damanaki – former KKE deputy - was the first president elected, almost unanimously.

Synaspismos’ structure in 1992 at central level consisted of the a) Central Political Committee (C.P.C.) as the main collective body, elected by the Congress, b) the Political Secretariat (P.S.), elected by C.P.C. and c) the President, also elected by the C.P.C. At local level the party was organized through local branches – the Members’ Political Movements (P.M.) – and at intermediate level through Prefectural Committees (P.C.) that were coordinating the activity of a prefecture’s local branches. There were also professional branches, social movement branches and youth branches.

The main source of power inside Synaspismos seems to be the Central Political Committee and the Political Secretariat. The former elected the President and directed the Congresses’ resolutions implementation inside the party, while the latter, being consisting of the most distinguished counterparts of each faction, leadded the party’s activity between the CPC’s assemblies and determines their agenda. The President’s position was enhanced after the 1993 extraordinary congress that elected Nikos Konstantopoulos as the party’s new leader. Konstantopoulos was also elected directly by the congress delegates after the 2nd Congress (March 1996), causing the leftists’ reaction and abstention at the election. It can also be argued that apart from the structural redefinition of the President’s position in the party’s power structure, Konstantopoulos was a charismatic leader, more successful than his predecessor Maria Damanaki and extremely

10 Article 2, Paragraph 5
11 Ibid
popular not only inside the party but also in general. Alavanos’ election, eight years after, introduced a more complex leadership nexus. The new statutes (2005)\textsuperscript{12} established apart from the president there was established the position of the CPC’s Secretary, holding a significant role inside party’s procedures and after Tsipras’ election (2008) – who was the first non parliamentarian president –, Alavanos’ position as parliamentary group leader resulted to a dualism that finally broadened the leftists’ domination as it will be shown below.

The relative autonomy of the local branches is concrete in the candidate selection procedures, especially for the municipal elections. Theoretically the local branch determines the party’s stance in local elections, in accordance with every prefecture’s or municipality’s particularity. Coalition strategy – mostly with PASOK candidates – is determined by three factors: \textit{first the capacity of the branch}, in terms of adequate resources to support a candidate of its own. Considering the fact that Synaspismos’ organizational strength lies in certain urban areas – Athens, Piraeus, Salonika, Patras – it is possible for many weak branches to provide their support of other party’s candidates. \textit{Second the state of local politics} can also determine a strategy and \textit{thirdly the party’s overall strategy} during the elections. In municipalities or prefectures that are considered of great political importance, leadership decides about the candidates consulting the branches’ secretaries\textsuperscript{13}. Until 2002 the overall orientation favored coalition-seeking strategies, while after 2004 priority was given to single candidacies.

In the decision – making processes the dependence of local branches on the centre is more obvious. Despite the fact that there are certain channels through which members and local branches can participate in the formation of the program – like the Permanent Congress which is usually held before elections -, approve CPC’s resolutions – every resolution is discussed in every local branch between its members and a CPC delegation – and express their disapproval of leadership’s strategies – through referendum – it seems that Synaspismos’ members accept central party’s lead in central politics matters. As Zielonka-Goei\textsuperscript{14} put it “they marginalize themselves”. On the contrary they tend to assert their right to participate and their autonomy, when it comes to local politics. In the only candidate selection procedure where the selectorate stands for all Synaspismos members, - the european elections ballot rank referendum - participation ranges between 50% and 70%.

\textsuperscript{12} http://www.syn.gr/downloads/SYN_katastatiko.pdf [In Greek]
\textsuperscript{13} There are two eloquent examples for the above mentioned in the municipality of Athens. In 1998 elections the decision for Damanaki’s candidacy with PASOK’s support was taken without the Prefectural Organization’s approval, while in 2006 elections P.O.’s suggestion for Papayannakis’ candidacy was ignored in favor of Alexis Tsipras.
\textsuperscript{14} Zielonka-Goei, Mei Lan (1992) “Members marginalising themselves? Intra-party participation in the Netherlands”, West European Politics, 15:2, 93 -- 106
Synaspismos’ membership basis, according to a P.S. member, is “old and introvert”. This can be assured from Table 2, where the size is almost equal from 1994 to 2009, but more important is the member participatory culture, which should be the object of future research. One of the most crucial effects from the so-called “left turn” was the spread of a movement-based participation culture throughout a significant part of Synaspismos’ member community, as we will see below.

1.3 Factions

Synaspismos’ second genetic trait, as we mentioned above, is its formal and institutionalized factionalism. We use here the term faction to refer to any “intra-party grouping which exists for a certain period of time, possesses a minimum of organization, exhibits a common group-consciousness, actively pursues political goals...within a party and which thus can be discerned as a bloc within the party”\(^{15}\). Studying Synaspismos’ factional continuum, one can easily understand that the party is highly fragmented, its factions have reached to a certain level of organization and intra-party competition tends to be polarized and conflict-based. This Synaspismos specificity, i.e. a centralized structure combined with high factional fragmentation, stems from its coalitional background – its main counterparts represent two relatively different political traditions – and the issue of intra-party democracy, which was a statutory care. Nevertheless, in the statutes there is a clear reference: “Synaspismos is a party politically and organizationally unified. It is not the sum of special political groups”.

The length and the limits of factional action weren’t very evident, while in times in great polarization the divisions were extremely visible and acute. The level of organization is defined by the intra-party power correlations. The leftists, for instance, have embraced a more delicate, though informal, structure during the renewers’ domination. On the other hand the renewers formulated their structure after 2004. In general, a faction intervened during the congresses, CPC sessions and PS meetings. The majority faction was trying to impose its propositions either with a consensual or a conflicting logic. The minority faction was intervening by proposing amendments on the resolutions or by different propositions. In cases of great polarization the factions’ vertical structure is being enhanced, while there is an horizontal communication that controls any tensions. Inside the factions the divisions are expressed through their informal bodies, namely the Secretariat – which is constituted by the P.S. members, MP’s and the most important CPC and PO officials – and when the stakes are high through the factions’ Panhellenic Conferences.\textsuperscript{16}

Panebianco uses the term “dominant coalition” to describe the coalition between factions and persons that controls the “zones of uncertainty” inside a party. Harmel and Janda\textsuperscript{17} contribute a typology that defines the sub-units of the “dominant coalition”. The “dominant faction” is the faction that can determine the strategies and the political orientation of a party, the “participative factions” contribute to the decision-making process and the “outside factions”\textsuperscript{18} or “minority elites”\textsuperscript{19} are factions excluded or marginalized from the dominant coalition.

Until 2000 Synaspismos’ dominant coalition was constituted by three factions. The first faction was “Paremvassi” (Intervention), a group of officials that were directly supporting Konstantopoulos. “Paremvassi” was formed during the 1993 Congress to support Konstantopoulos’ candidacy for President. It included mostly former EAR (Lykoudis, Pitsiorlas, Papadimoulis, Theodorakopoulou) and some ex-KKE officials (Balafas, Karangoules). In 1993 they elected Konstantopoulos in the second round against Alavanos, with the support of Papayannakis’ faction. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Congress they merged with the latter into a single ballot, reelecting Konstantopoulos and marginalizing the leftists at many levels. Papayannakis’ faction or “Syspeirossi” (Clustering) was the oldest faction in the party. Papayannakis at the first Congress decided not to participate in the common ballot, filling a separate one. In 1993 he was a candidate for the presidency and after 1993 the initial faction was formulated into “Forum”, a faction with a strong pro-european and ecological orientation. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Congress the faction was presented as “EROIKA” (European, Radical and Ecological Left) and along with Paremvassi re-elected Konstantopoulos. Syspeirossi was in favor of a possible convergence with PASOK, especially after Costas Simitis addressed at the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Congress his speech about the “Centre-Left Space”. Its members were mostly ex-EAR officials. Close to “Syspeirossi” there was a smaller and not ideologically distant faction around ex-EAR officials.

\textsuperscript{16} The renewers organized their first Conferences after 2001 (as Panelladika Syntonistitika), while for the leftists this was a common practice from 1993. These procedures suppose to be open and public, while there are no formal regulations for their conduct, no minutes are kept etc.


\textsuperscript{18} Ibid

officials, with most important Dimitris Hadjisocrat and Theodoros Margaritis. After 1993 it was formulated as “Ananeotiki Protovoulia” (Renewal Initiative), placing itself at the renewal wing. During the 2nd Congress, along with EAR’s former Secretary Fotis Kouvelis they formed “Enotiki Protovoulia” (Union Initiative) distancing themselves from Paremvassi and Syspeirossi. Hadjisocrat posed an extremely critical stance against Simitis’ address, rejecting any potential for collaboration. After 1996 they gradually merged with “Syspeirossi”. A distinctive feature of the renewers’ factions is their extremely loose structure compared to cadre party’s, consisting mainly by certain party cadres and their supporters.

Figure 4: The “renewers”

On the other side, the minority faction of the dominant coalition was “Aristero Revma” (Left Current). “Aristero Revma” core was constituted by former KKE officials and KKE-es left-wingers. The leftists were always influencing the relative majority of Synaspismos’ membership basis, especially in the grassroots. Their organizational culture was more disciplined and centralist and their structure cohesive and concrete. Since the 1st Congress they had lost ideological hegemony to the “renewers”, providing a more organization-based strategy. They have been formulated as an organized faction shortly before the 1993 Extraordinary Congress, to support to Alavanos’ candidacy. Their marginalization after Konstantopoulos’ election preceded them to develop a strict vertical structure in three hierarchical levels and coordinators per prefecture. Nevertheless, their influence in the grassroots is evident mainly from the euro-ballot intra-party elections results, where Alavanos both in 1994 and 1999 surpassed Papayannakis. Their ideological orientation included a soft euroscepticism – which has grown, especially after 1998, - stress on the role of the state in economic development and a negative stance against a possible convergence with PASOK. In the 2nd Congress it was the members of “Aristero Revma” who aggressively rejected Simitis’ proposition and tried to avoid a further enhancement of Konstantopoulos’ power, by rejecting his direct election from the

20 Including the renewers’ candidate for KKE’s leadership Yannis Dragassakis, members of Political Bureau and Central Committee Panayotis Lafazanis, Alecos Alavanos, Dimitri Stratoulis, Nikos Chountis.
21 Nikos Voutsis, Alecos Flampouraris and former Riga Fereos (KKE-es Youth Organization) secretary Nikos Filis
delegates. Their insistence in this matter and the convergence of the renewers’ factions cost them the majority in the C.P.C., which resulted to their gradual marginalization until 2000. During these 4 years they built their rhetoric around the centre-left axis: “[Our party] cannot direct the society, embracing a blurring centre-left constellation”\textsuperscript{22}. On the other side for its members the functioning of “Aristero Revma” was considered by its members as an upgrading compared to the personalized logic that the other factions were following. “The creation and the functioning of Aristero Revma was characteristic of a tendency or ideological current… it refused of the personalized tendency, the machine-tendency and the occasional rallying before the Congress”\textsuperscript{23}. “Aristero Revma” structure was more of a mass party, with vertical aggregation and loose hierarchy.

![Figure 5: The “leftists”](image)

The logic of intra-party competition could be considered as, at least until 2000, as consensus-based and factional polarization low. The two main renewers’ factions were lacking of a vertical structure, while for leftists vertical structure was a necessary reaction to renewers’ domination. In addition, there was a horizontical deliberation between the factions, at the level of P.S. and C.P.C., and a tendency for synthetic resolutions. The key factor of this consensus-based logic was Nikos Konstantopoulos himself who was functioning as an intermediate between the factions, keeping intra-party balances. Konstantopoulos had the advantage that he was not coming from the traditional left organizations and he wasn’t connected with the great disputes that took place in the 70’s and 80’s. He was one of PASOK’s founding members, leaving the party a year after, the founder of a small group named “Sosialistiki Poreia” (Socialist March), a lawyer with a progressive professional course and one of Andreas Papandreou prosecutors during 1989-90 trials. He was praised for his integrity and his eloquence, but mostly for the fact his popularity exceeded Synaspismos. In that sense Konstantopoulos’ presence was absorbing any tensions accrued and imposed moderate solutions.

\textsuperscript{22} Vitsas D. (1997), “On Centre-left”, Alpha, 20, 3—5
\textsuperscript{23} Chountis N. (1998), “Coalition of the Left: a united, multi-tendency party”, Alpha, 27, 8—9
Nevertheless, the ideological distance between the leftists and the renewers was causing clashes in terms of programmatic discourse and political strategy. For instance the 1998 coalition strategy in the municipality of Athens and its failure, caused a dispute and during the 1999 Permanent Congress for the Amsterdam treaty\textsuperscript{24}. The leftists’ proposal was to reject the Treaty, while Papayannakis was in favor of “yes”. Finally Konstantopoulos intervened proposing a moderate solution.

Concerning their zones of influence inside Synaspismos’ membership basis there are two preliminary observations that must be done. First that there is a respectable number of “non-aligned partisans”\textsuperscript{25} that determine the current intra-party power correlation and secondly that in Synaspismos there is a culture of personalized politics that sometimes transcends ideological factors. That explains for example why Alavanos was first in votes in the 1994 and 1999 referenda for the European election ballots and the renewers the majority in the CPC after the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Congress. Or why Papadimoulis was successful during leftists’ domination. On the other side there are certain regions and branches that endure as solid support bases. For the leftists their strength is based in the urban areas and in almost every local branch. In addition they dominate in the professional branches and after 2000 in the youth organization. The renewers had an important influence in the party’s intellectuals – Hadjisocratis was “Avgi”’s (Dawn) editor for many years – and mainly in urban areas. Their stronger presence is recorded in the P.O of Northern Athens, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Salonica, Achaia, Kilkis and Xanthi. They have presence in all Synaspismos’ branches. Mobilization among the opposite factions was nearly nonexistent\textsuperscript{26}.

As we will see in the second part, the so-called “left turn” caused several changes in many aspects of Synaspismos’ political life, including the factions’ functioning and organization and the intra-party competition logic.

2. The ‘left turn’

Our approach in this part is based in Panebianco’s theory of party change, its re-evaluation by Harmel and Janda and Wilson’s\textsuperscript{27} model of party transformation. As we mentioned above, Panebianco assumes that party change is the result of an external stimulus that mobilizes alterations inside a party’s dominant coalition concerning as well its composition and conformation. The goal of organizational stability is always an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Tsakatika, M. (2009). “From a ‘critical yes’ to a pro-european ‘no’. What has changed in Synaspismos’ european orientation?” International and European Politics, 13-14, pp. 157-158 [In Greek] and http://www.syn.gr/gr/keimeno.php?id=7167 [In Greek]
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Due to the leftists’ high degree of solidarity and cohesion there is almost no movement of members to the renewers. On the contrary the renewers’ factions were highly mobilized between them until 2004 when gradually started to integrate. Nevertheless, there is no movement to “Aristero Revma”. The above mentioned refer to the factions’ candidates for the C.P.C. for the six Congresses.
\end{itemize}
important aim for a dominant coalition, so it seems that Panebianco’s approach does not count the intense of intra party conflict in party change procedures. Harmel and Janda recognize two dynamics that can cause change inside a party, a leadership crisis and factional conflict. Barberà associates the above mentioned internal factors with ‘substantial variations’ in an organization’s exchanges with its environment. If we surpass Panebianco’s deterministic logic we can draw a conclusion from his hypotheses. A party’s genetic traits and level of institutionalization can draw the limits inside which a party’s transformation can take place. This can always mean that the dominant coalition’s composition and conformation can change, but not its internal power structure. A change is always organized within the current institutional framework and every change that aims to transcend this framework results to a totally different organization, a different party. In that sense a party organization that has formulated its own "survival" goals it is possible to pose certain constraints to anything that threatens it. If the dominant coalition is recognized by its monopoly in controlling a party’s zones of uncertainty, which means that there is a neutral apparatus being used for the exercise of this control. In Michels’ words an ‘oligarchy’. Of course an organization’s survival is connected with its capacity on achieving the party goals. But there are certain transformations that transcend its short-term goals influencing not only one party’s evolution, but the whole party system. Wilson argues that party transformation is the result of a series of external factors, which affect different aspects of a party’s change. Socio-economic transformations and changes in a system’s political culture can explain long-term movements, while they have serious impact on more direct factors, such as the political institutions and party competition, which affect closely a party’s transformation.

Figure 5: The ‘left turn’

---

28 Harmel and Janda, op.cit, 266—268
29 Barberà, op.cit, 9
30 Wilson, op.cit.
In Synaspismos case change there has been a combination of certain factors. First of all, during the period 1998-2000 the convergence with PASOK fell through due to bad electoral results. Damanaki’s experiment in Athens failed and during 2000 general elections PASOK’s ‘double expansion’ strategy reduced Synaspismos’ results from the previous elections. At the same time a group of 16 CPC members reacting to the party’s hostility against PASOK, decided to leave forming a small organization named AEKA (Renewalist and Modernizing Movement of Left). There were also some Synaspismos’ officials who participated in governmental positions, raising moral issues in the party’s membership. All these caused a sudden change in the dominant coalition’s composition. Gradually a part of Paremvassi – officials close to the president, like Pitsiorlas – started to approximate the former KKE-es members of “Aristero Reyma” – Voutsis, Flabouraris - in order to impose a different political orientation. During the 3rd Congress “Aristero Reyma” managed to elect 46 members for the C.P.C. and along with “Paremvassi” supported Konstantopoulos’ candidacy for a third term. Support to a convergence with PASOK strategy appeared to be waning, while basic political directions of the party – like the pro-european stance – were doubted. Synaspismos’ ‘strategic goal’ according to the Resolution was ‘the socialist transformation of greek society’ through the formation of ‘a Modern, Democratic and Radical Party of the Left’.

In general ‘left turn’ first phase (2000-2004) included several changes in certain aspects of Synaspismos’ party life, mainly its political orientation and strategies. From 2001 to 2004 Synaspismos strategy centered upon three axes: the first one was the connection with anti-globalization movement. Synaspismos’ officials took part in Prague (September 2000) and Genoa (July 2001) demonstrations and in the World Social Forum proceedings in Porto Alegre (2001, 2002, 2003). On February 2003 Synaspismos co-founded along with radical left organizations and movements “Greek Social Forum”, which was of the 2005 European Social Forum co-organizers, held in Athens. In the context of Greek Social Forum, Synaspismos interacted with radical left organizations and activists, an interaction that influenced a small part of Synaspismos’ membership basis. During the 3rd Congress “Kokkino-Prasino Diktyo” (Red-Left Network) appeared, a small leftist faction consisted of activists participating in early expressions of the anti-globalization movement – like the 1995 euro-marches – that addressed an extremely movement-orientated discourse. At the same time Synaspismos’ local branches started to coordinate their activities with Forum’s branches and embody local environmental movements.

The second axis included joint initiatives with radical left parties and organizations under a coalitional perspective. “Space of Dialogue and Common Action of Left” was a coordination of Synaspismos with parties and organizations at central level that prepared inter-plays for the forthcoming elections. In the 2002 municipal and prefectural elections

---

31 For example, during 3rd Congress members of the OSE (Organization of Greek Railways) local branch demanded Nikos Gratsias’, an ex CPC member, exclusion from the proceedings, due to the latter’s appointment as OSE’s President from Costas Simitis three years ago.
32 “3rd Congress Political Resolution” http://www.syn.gr/downloads/apofasi3ou.pdf [In Greek]
33 See the faction’s declaration during the 3rd Congress http://www.geocities.com/redgreendiktyo/protokeimenokokpras.htm [In Greek]
Synaspismos supported 55 candidates ‘of left and ecological origin’. The last axis was the formation of the European Left Party. Synaspismos was one of the main counterparts of the Party, holding its 1st Congress in Athens on October 8, 2005. They also participated as observers in the European Anticapitalist Left.

Following Panebianco’s terminology it seems that there was ‘a succession of ends’ i.e. an identity change. First of all the Programmatic Congress (May, 30 – June, 1 2003) decided the party’s renaming to ‘Synaspismos tes Aristeras, ton Kinimaton kai tes Ekologias’ (Coalition of Left, of Movements and Ecology). In the ‘Programmatic Directions’ voted, there were certain references in ‘a neoliberal globalization under United States hegemony…that formulates for Europe a framework more different than the one encountered at the first stages of European Integration’ and that Europe’s social character is threatened. PASOK under Simitis ‘has implemented a consensual neoliberal programme…and its politics…have transformed it [PASOK] into an authoritative party’. Synaspismos tried to formulate a radical left identity, with a stress on material issues – state-centered economic policy, employment – and an internationalist character.

In terms of faction politics during these 4 years there was a consolidation of leftists’ domination. The ‘Directions’ were voted by the 80% of the delegates and the change of the name was approved by 60%. For the 2004 General Elections there was formulated on December 2003 an electoral coalition between Synaspismos, KOE (Communist Organization of Greece)– a maoist group -, AKOA (Renewalist, Communist and Ecological Left) – Banias’ party -, DEA (Internationalist Worker’s Left) – a trotskyist sect – and a few others small organizations and well-known personalities, like Manolis Glezos. The coalition’s name was SYRIZA (Coalition of Radical Left). SYRIZA’s role and orientation was the subject of a great debate inside the party, which in a sense determined Synaspismos’ agenda, especially after 2004.

2.2 Second Phase (2004-2009)

Konstantopoulos withdrawal from the presidency a little after the 2004 elections raised a serious leadership crisis inside Synaspismos that undermined the previous consensus-based logic in intra-party competition. The leftists’ candidate was Alecos Alavanos, the renewers’ Michalis Papayannakis and a third candidate was Christophoros Papadopoulos from “Kokkino-Prasino Diktyo” faction. Alavanos was elected in the first round with 58.5%, Papayannakis received 33.18% and Papadopoulos 6.94%. In the CPC the leftists increased their influence – from 46 to 61 members-, and supported the members of “Paremvasi” who supported ‘left turn’ 4 years ago – as Pitsiorlas, Karangoules and Theodorakopoulou. It was notable the CPC’s renewal with youth officials as Alexis Tsipras, Andreas Karitzis and Costas Poulakis, while youth organization’s secretary Tasos Koronakis was ex officio member of CPC. Youth’s enhanced role was established through the new Statutes as well as with the introduction of a new institution, CPC’s

---

34 “Avgi”, 19.07.02
36 http://www.syn.gr/downloads/program2003.pdf [In Greek]
37 http://www.syn.gr/gr/keimeno.php?id=2147 [In Greek]
Secretary. Before the April 2005 Statutory Congress, the leftists proposed that the President should be elected by CPC. After renewers’ reactions they modified their proposal initiating a Secretary position as a counter balance to the President’s power. The first CPC Secretary was Nikos Chountis.

What was new about Synaspismos’ intra-party politics was the higher factional polarization and the introduction of a conflict-based logic in inter-faction relations. The renewers started gradually to integrate in order to face majority’s challenges. There was a split in Paremvassi, where members disagreeing with the previous convergence with the leftists formed ‘Aristeri Ananeossi’ (Left Renewal). The latter managed to extract many Paremvassi’s members, especially in the grassroots, and succeeded a relatively high level of organization – which was not a Paremvassi’s feature. Syspeirossi has multiplied its attacks against the leftists, along with Paremvassi and Ananeossi in many cases. SYRIZA’s orientation and organization was considered as an extremely serious matter, mainly whether Synaspismos will fall back in favor of stronger SYRIZA. A clash has taken place before the 2004 European elections, considering the candidates’ rank in the ballot, resulting to the departure of some of SYRIZA constituents, while in the intra-party referendum Dimitris Papadimoulis – the renewers’ candidate – surprisingly overran Chountis.

Nevertheless, ‘left turn’ was consolidated through further SYRIZA’s enhancement and Synaspismos’ participation in a series of actions as the university students’ movement on June 2006, the teachers’ strike a few months earlier and the European Social Forum proceedings. Synaspismos’ new target group was ‘neolea’ (the youths), being considered as a new political subject, ‘an autonomous social category with inter-class character’. In that sense Synaspismos’ functioned as a ‘parliamentary delegate’ of the students’ movement, while at the same time chose Alexis Tspiras as the party’s candidate for Athens, against P.O.’s recommendation for Papayannakis. In the 2006 municipal elections insisted ‘in the formation of municipal and prefectural movements based on SYRIZA’, a strategy that caused disputes between the leadership and some local branches – for example Nea Smyrni, Zografos.

These developments forced the three factions of the renewers to converge in a single faction ‘Ananeotiki Pteryga’ (Renewal Wing). In the 2007 Permanent Programmatic Congress 11 CPC members from the three factions suggested SYRIZA’s dissolution, pointing out that ‘the confusion between movements and electoral coalitions is harmful for both of them’. Chountis’ response in his speech was that SYRIZA ‘is the answer in the problem of Left’s fragmentation, makes Left’s interference against neoliberalism and two-partyism more effective, gives political perspective to the movements’ struggles and is a choice attuned to the Congress Resolutions’. The ‘Declaration’ approved was a

---

38 They supported the ballot “Gynaikes gia mia alli Evropi” (Women for another Europe).
39 Katsabekis Y. (2008), “Towards a new populism of the Left? Explanations for the present conditions and possible developments”, paper presented at the “Modern Greek Politics” Conference, Centre of Political Studies, Panteion University [In Greek]
40 CPC Resolution ‘Left and youths: a dynamic relationship, a relationship of subversion’, CPC Assembly September 17-18, 2005 http://www.syn.gr/keimeno.php?id=7225 [In Greek]
41 CPC Resolution ‘Political developments, party’s course and action programming’, CPC Assembly January 21-22, 2006 http://www.syn.gr/keimeno.php?id=7226 [In Greek]
42 http://www.syn.gr/downloads/eisigisi02.pdf [In Greek]
43 http://www.syn.gr/keimeno.php?id=5280 [In Greek]
mixture of anti-neoliberal and euroscepticist elements. A few months later (June 2007) Ananeotiki Pteryga was officially unified, holding its 1st Panhellenic Conference. The faction declared its attachment to a pro-european orientation, expressing its disenchantment by the party’s strategies: ‘the notorious ‘transformation’ of the party transforms it to a simple demonstration power that doubts the value of addressing positive proposals for the present, chooses entrenchment and stereotypes, does not care about central politics issues and falls back into neo-communist perceptions and practices’\textsuperscript{45}. Concerning the logic of intra-party competition it was recognized that ‘today’s situation is problematic…all of us are living in an extremely conflicting and polarized climate’\textsuperscript{46}. It is significant that Pteryga has developed a relatively high degree of organization, equivalent to leftists’ in the ‘90s. As Sartori puts it: ‘organization elicits organization’\textsuperscript{47}.

The considerable increase in SYRIZA’s quotas in the 2007 general elections has enhanced the belief that current strategy is a successful one: ‘we managed to give a new dynamic to the unity left project and express the movements, the people of labor and the youth that resist neoliberalism’\textsuperscript{48}. In the 5th Congress (February 7-10, 2008) Alavanos stood down in favor of Tsipras, who was elected as a president achieving the 70.6\% of the votes. The leftists managed to elect 76 CPC members, including 17 that were former youth organization’s officials. This impressive renewal, both in leadership and CPC, furthered leftists’ domination as well as their radical left orientation. Tsipras’ opponent, Fotis Kouvelis, managed to achieve a 28.67\% of the votes. In the Resolution\textsuperscript{49} there are optimistic remarks for the party’s and the coalition’s future and several programmatic positions are repeated in as stricter sense: ‘the party must consolidate and enhance its ideological and political identity’\textsuperscript{50}.

Following Panebianco’s scheme, it seems that the above mentioned changes in the party’s identity and orientation and the simultaneous introduction of new institutions produce a change in the dominant coalition conformation. With regard to Synaspismos’ exchanges with its environment, the party’s autonomy is reducing especially after SYRIZA’s enhancement. It can be stated that there is a system of mutual exchanges, in which the other SYRIZA constituents use Synaspismos’ resources in order to intervene in central stage of greek politics – and promote their own candidates – and the leftists use SYRIZA as a left ‘contagion’ to ensure their domination inside the party. That explains the fact that in SYRIZA’s Secretariat Synaspismos’ delegates are from ‘Aristero Revma’ and ‘Kokkino-Prasino Diktyo’ and that for many of SYRIZA constituents, the renewers are considered as political opponents\textsuperscript{51}. Youth’s\textsuperscript{52} enhancement also modified the party’s

\textsuperscript{44} http://www.syn.gr/downloads/diakirixi_7_3.pdf [In Greek]
\textsuperscript{45} Stefanos Bageorgos’ speech at the 1st Panhellenic Conference of Ananeotiki Pteryga, http://www.ananeotiki.gr/el/readArchives.asp?catID=2&subCatID=0&page=8&textID=1876 [In Greek]
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid
\textsuperscript{47} Sartori, op.cit., p. 68
\textsuperscript{48} SYRIZA Secretariat’s Announcement, 20.09.2007 in http://www.syn.gr/gr/keimeno.php?id=7527 [In Greek]
\textsuperscript{49} http://www.syn.gr/downloads/apofasi5ou.pdf [In Greek]
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid
\textsuperscript{51} At the municipal elections, Synaspismos’ allies struggled against several candidacies that came from the renewers’ factions – a good example is Nea Smyrni where the candidate was a former PASOK official.
power structure in favor of the leftists. To a large extent Synaspismos’ interaction with social movements was carried out by youth organization, members of which participated actively in many actions. This radicalized youth contributed in the highly polarized intra-party competition; especially after 2008 when many of its members were elected in the new CPC. It is characteristic that in the recent referendum for the European elections ballot rank, Nikos Chountis’ victory was owed to youth vote, which voted for Chountis almost en bloc

In terms of internal systemness it seems that the former power structure is being reproduced with some exceptions. The majority of Synaspismos’ membership supported the so-called ‘left-turn’, especially after 2004, evaluating its effectiveness in the context of the current political situation – a gap of legitimacy in the greek political system

They even supported the leadership after the December riots, when the party was attacked by the whole political spectrum as co-responsible for the situation. On February 2009 an extremely ambitious programme was voted by a large majority (81.5%), partially as a reaction to these attacks. Nevertheless, those non-aligned partisans are possible to support different positions, due to the fact that in Synaspismos electoral effectiveness continues to be a significant stake. The deepening of democratic procedures after 2005 does not seem to alter the model of participation in the party. The local branches are still ‘old and introvert’, nevertheless the new movement-based culture that was imposed on the party, strengthened the autonomy of a small part of the membership in the grassroots, that assumed an anti-party stance. The main decision-making body is still CPC, with the addition of SYRIZA’s Secretariat. The conflict-based logic favored the development of a zero-sum game between the factions that preserves a highly polarized climate. SYRIZA’s further development is also an issue of great dispute, jeopardizing Synaspismos’ internal balances and increasing fragmentation. However SYRIZA’s democratic deficit is a major issue that determines its future and its evolution. The solution to this problem is to be found within Synaspismos. And this may be a major change in the dominant coalition conformation.

52 Neolaia Synaspismou (Synaspismos’ Youth) was founded on 1999. Its predecessor was EAN (Union of Leftist Youths), an autonomous youth organization not formally connected with Synaspismos. The main problem for EAN was the so called ‘double membership’. Members of EAN were also Synaspismos’ members, undermining the organization’s functioning. In several cases there were youth local branches not connected with EAN, ‘Neolaia SYN’’s founding and development, was the result of a compromise between Synaspismos’ factions. The leftists, who were close to youth’s majority, accepted that the youth members should be excluded from the party’s internal procedures – to their harm -, while the renewers’ majority agreed that the party should finance and support the youth organization. While Neolaia SYN opposed the party’s choices in many cases, in general followed its political orientation. After 2004, provided a zealous support to the ‘left turn’.

53 Chountis’ variation to Papadimoulis was 754 votes. Youth’s votes for Chountis were 770 – while for Papadimoulis voted 108. “Eleftherotypia”, 11.03.09

54 Vernardakis C., “From two-partyism to multi-partyism? The political and ideological geography of the new party system”, in Konstantinidis, Y., Marantzidis, N., Pappas, T. (eds), Parties and Politics in Greece: the modern developments, Athina: Kritiki, 133—148 [In Greek]
Concluding comments

Synaspismos’ intra-party politics is an extremely significant factor for the understanding of this party’s strategies and ideological orientation. During the 17 years of the party’s political life many factions appeared with different goals and structure. The larger and most powerful factions were policy-seeking groups that were trying to impose their own view into the party’s orientation. They re-produced, and they still reproduce, the party’s organizational logic and structure, building collateral institutions similar to the party’s bodies. For both leftists and renewers the main functioning of the faction is conducted at the higher levels, specifically at P.S. level. Addresses to their grassroots members were conducted only in cases of great intra-faction conflict and leadership legitimacy crisis. The intra-faction fragmentation is another element that needs further research, in order to define the true character of a faction’s functioning. In some instances the interaction of personal goals and ideological-policy aims, determines a faction’s composition and its terminal orientation. Over-theorizing can be extremely harmful, if we don’t take under consideration the size of the party, its political traditions and historicity, the members’ behavior and the various divergences that may occur. In some cases, especially during the congresses, there were groupings, which were constituted around personalities who have disagreed with their previous faction choices. These ill-organized factions gradually were absorbed by the bigger ones. This was affecting a faction’s cohesion in one sense, although a faction’s cohesion was directly determined by factional polarization and competition.

In the present conditions electoral results seem to undermine ‘left turn’s’ aims. Wilson has stated that “there is a tendency, particularly strong in leftist parties, to prefer doctrinal purity to accommodations based on electoral expediency”55. Tsipras after the recent electoral failure in the 2009 European elections declared that “we were tempted to blunt our discourse and our choices in order to include everyone”56. Nevertheless, Synaspismos’ coalition origin has also formed the party as an election-orientated organization. As we mentioned above electoral defeat was the initial stimulus for the ‘left turn’ and its consolidation was legitimized by the favorable electoral and the brief popularity that SYRIZA enjoyed for a few months after the 2007 general elections. The critical mass of the non-aligned partisans are coming to decide about the party’s future under the dilemma ‘ideological purity or electoral success’. At the same time inside the two factions there is a dispute concerning the party’s priorities where it appears to be a cross-sections in both factions on SYRIZA’s future. In ‘Aristeri Enotita’ members of Kokkino-Prasino Diktyo, activists, members of youth organizations and the younger officials support SYRIZA’s deepening or its transformation to a single party, like the Portuguese Left Bloc (Bloco de Esquerda), while other older members of Revma insist in Synaspismos’ preservation considered as the main priority. In the renewers there is a call by the most moderate for the party’s enhancement, while for many hardliners the solution is considered to be maybe outside the party. ‘Left turn’s’ limits are visible in the way that the party’s organization is posing some constraints.

55 Wilson, op.cit., p. 270
56 http://www.syn.gr/gr/keimeno.php?id=14949 [In Greek]
As Panebianco recognizes “no institution can...entirely escape from its past”\textsuperscript{57}. And he continues: “no matter how extensive the renewal of leadership, change in the organization, or ‘succession of ends may be, many traces of the organization’s ‘genetic model’ remain visible”\textsuperscript{58}. The predispositions for a radical turn or for a ‘back to society’\textsuperscript{59} strategy is not only a radical change in the political discourse, but also a renegotiation of the party’s institutional framework and strategic orientation. ‘Left turn’s’ future lies first of all inside the party.

### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{62}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{63}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{64}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{65}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{67}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{68}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>14\textsuperscript{70}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{57} Panebianco, op.cit, 261  
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid  
\textsuperscript{59} Term used by Michalis Spourdalakis  
\textsuperscript{60} As an electoral coalition  
\textsuperscript{61} As a single party  
\textsuperscript{62} Alecos Alavanos, Michalis Papayannakis  
\textsuperscript{63} Nicos Konstantopoulos, Stella Alfieri, Vangelis Apostolou, Maria Damanaki, Spyros Danellis, Yannis Dragassakis, Fotis Kouvelis, Petros Kounalakis, Nitsa Loule, Mustafa Mustafa  
\textsuperscript{64} Alecos Alavanos, Michalis Papayannakis  
\textsuperscript{65} Nicos Konstantopoulos, Maria Damanaki, Fotis Kouvelis, Panayotis Lfazanis, Assimina Ksrotiri, Thanassis Leventis  
\textsuperscript{66} As SYRIZA  
\textsuperscript{67} Nicos Konstantopoulos, Alecos Alavanos, Yannis Dragassakis, Fotis Kouvelis, Thanassis Leventis, Assimina Ksrotiri  
\textsuperscript{68} Dimitris Papadimoulis  
\textsuperscript{69} As SYRIZA  
\textsuperscript{70} Alecos Alavanos, Yannis Banias (SYRIZA), Yannis Dragassakis, Pericles Koroessis (SYRIZA), Anna Filini, Grigoris Psarianos (SYRIZA), Michalis Papayannakis, Fotis Kouvelis, Thodoros Dritas, Thanassis Leventis, Tasos Kourakis, Tsoucalis, Panayotis Lfazanis, Litsa Amanatidou-Paschalidou
Table 1: Election results for Synaspismos as a coalition (1989-1990) and as a single party (1993 – present) (Sources: syn.gr, ypes.gr/el/Elections/NationalElections/Results, parties-and-elections.de/greece2.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Common Ballot</th>
<th>Papayannakis' list</th>
<th>Cheirafetissi Melon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: CPC results and factions (Sources: Avgi, syn.gr)
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