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Abstract

Amongst the party members of the European Left Party (ELP), the Greek Coalition of the Radical Left (Syriza) currently stands as the most electorally successful. In fact, recent opinion polls show Syriza as the most likely winner of future elections. Syriza’s increasing importance inside the ELP is echoed by Tsipras’ candidacy for the Presidency of the European Commission (EC). The present paper aims to raise significant questions vis-à-vis Syriza’s stance towards the European edifice in the aftermath of the financial crisis as well as seeking to examine the relative importance of the two main factors behind the party’s stance. It argues that following the financial crisis Syriza’s left Europeanism remained the constant inspiration in shaping the party’s European policy. Indeed, it appears as if the financial crisis solidified the majority’s firm belief in the dictum “pan-European problems ask for pan-European solutions”. Whilst the majority’s Europeanism was being strengthened by the crisis, the minority’s critique towards the EU membership altogether, and of the Euro in particular was sharpened decisively. Following the congress of July 2013, Syriza became a unitary party at full effect. The subsequent organisational mutations, allowed for the party’s majority to gain significantly more influence as well as representation in the policy shaping organs. The present paper argues that this constitutes one of the two main reasons for the party’s persistent and even growing belief in the European idea. At the same time the ELP’s role in influencing Syriza’s constant Europeanism is argued to have been the second major reason, whilst indications of policy transfer from the ELP to Syriza were also found. In seeking the responses to the questions raised, the present paper applied the Johansson & Raunio (2001) framework focusing on the ideology, party factionalism and transnational affiliations factors. Moreover, it combined the aforementioned framework with the theoretical lens of the Communist dilemma as proposed by Charalambous (2013).
Introduction

The end of the cold war, affected all aspects of political life in Europe as well as the rest of the world. For the political parties on the left of social democracy, the acclaimed neoliberal end of history and capitalism’s victory over the ‘really existing socialism’ was thought to constitute the beginning of the end. Two decades later, in the midst of a severe global financial crisis, a number of radical left parties (RLPs)\(^1\) are gaining momentum in Europe. Amongst those, one finds the Greek Coalition of the Radical Left (Syriza). Indeed, Syriza after years of struggling to reach the threshold of 3% in order to be parliamentary represented, managed to achieve a surprisingly high vote share of 26.89% in the most recent national elections (Interior, 2012). This electoral performance was repeated in the latest elections for the European Parliament (EP) in 2014, when Syriza secured the 26.60% of the vote share (Parliament, 2014), becoming the first political force in Greek politics. The present study argues that the party’s distinct left Europeanism is the leading ideological force behind the party’s stance and aims on testing the relative importance of two factors behind it. The party’s ideological heritage going back to the Eurocommunist era is argued to have been one of the major contributing factors behind the party’s stance. In addition to the party’s ideological heritage, the role of the ELP in Syriza’s stance cannot be underestimated. Indeed, the ELP constitutes the channel, through which the necessary cooperation amongst the European left can be achieved. As a result, the mere existence of the ELP can be seen as a condition sine qua non for the professed Europe of the people with socialism and democracy.

\(^1\) The present paper relates only to party members of the European Left Party (ELP)
Theoretical Framework

The overwhelming majority of the studies aiming on analysing radical left parties’ responses towards the EU have opted for the framework of Euroscepticism (Benedetto 2007, Tsakatika 2009), given the critical stance that RLPs have demonstrated towards the process of European integration. While such studies can be useful in providing an overview of party responses and the subsequent change thereof, they do not manage to discriminate effectively between the reasons for criticism towards the European edifice. As a result, they tend to equate radical left and extreme right positions. Another shortcoming of the employment of such a framework relates to its inherent normativism, given that it operates on the assumption of Europe as de facto positive. Arguably, the mere fact that the term ‘Euroscepticism’ has acquired a per se negative connotation in the quotidian lexicon can be seen as an indication of the aforementioned shortcomings.

An alternative is to avoid the framework of Euroscepticism altogether and apply the tools of comparative party policy analysis as proposed by Johansson and Raunio (2001), and applied by Dunphy (2004) in one of the few up to date comparative analyses of RLPs’ stances towards Europe. This is the path that the present paper will follow in order to substantiate its main claims regarding Syriza’s left Europeanism in the post-financial crisis era, and the relative importance of the factors behind the party’s stance. Given the limitations of space and time, the focus will be placed on some of the factors present in the original framework for analysis, which are drawn out of a complete analysis of Syriza’s stance in past research. Out of the seven original factors, thought to affect a party’s stance towards the EU, the present focuses on party ideology, party factionalism, transnational links, and the integration process. The analysis of the integration process will be carried out through the theoretical lens of the communist dilemma as proposed by Charalambous (2013).

The communist dilemma, indeed, provides a highly interesting addition to the contemporary study of political parties. Commencing from the position that the integration process is to a large extent based on liberal, some would argue neo-liberal, politics and economics, we could argue that this per se constitutes a reason for RLPs to be at least critical about it. What is of particular interest in Charalambous’ framework for the present
study, relates to the emphasis it places on salience levels. Indeed, the framework moves beyond programmatic change and manages to include salience levels as an important parameter. In Syriza’s case this framework could serve not only in regards to the salience placed on the party critique towards the European edifice, but also on downplaying the opinions of certain members of the party elite, whose opinions are decisively more critical towards the EU, and whose critique towards the majority’s Europeanism was strengthened by the devastating effects of the financial crisis. In addition to that, the salience levels that Syriza places on its transnational affiliations could be seen as another indication of the ELP’s role on the persistence of the party’s Europeanism. Charalambous’ (2013) findings led him to conclude that the parties examined in his research tend to downplay their transnational affiliations. The reason behind such a choice is according to the Charalambous “that transnational affiliations are themselves not a very salient aspect of a party’s profile for the electorate at large” (2013, p.177). The fact that Syriza chooses to place more salience to this aspect could lead us to a contrary conclusion.

The analysis of the aforementioned factors would have been incomplete without an additional historical analysis of the formations that led to the creation of contemporary Syriza. Indeed, the present study argues that a significant role in the persistence of the party’s Europeanism is played by the party’s historical connection to the Eurocommunist movement. By examining the historical path leading to the current political formation, one could arguably trace a number of commonalities especially in terms of ideology, as well as choice of international affiliations.

---

2 Charalambous (2013) studied the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), the Italian Rifondazione Comunista (Rifondazione), and the Cypriot Progressive Party of Working People (AKEL).
Syriza: A Brief History of the Coalition of the Radical Left; from KKE Interior to Syriza

The KKE Interior Era; the Birth of Eurocommunism

Syriza is the outcome of a number of processes inside the Greek radical left of both communist and non-communist matrices. The origins of the party lie with the KKE Interior back in the late 1960s, with the Greek Left (EA) during the 1980s and the Coalition of Left and Progress (Synaspismos) during the 1990s. During the mid-2000s Synaspismos was the major member of the Coalition of the Radical Left (Syriza), which very recently became a unitary party. In order to trace the party’s origins we first need to go back to the events of 1968. The effects that those events had on the country’s Communist Party are of major importance. In 1968, the military junta in Greece had already celebrated its first year. Notwithstanding the fact that the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) was illegal at the time, the events of Prague led to a crisis between the two main fractions of KKE. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia served as a catalyst, and resulted in the creation of KKE Essoterikou (KKE-Interior). In the aftermath of the Soviet invasion, a number of Western European Communist Parties (WECPs) such as the French Communist Party (PCF), the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) and the KKE Interior were united in their opposition to Soviet domination. Notwithstanding the differences amongst them, those parties had according to Dunphy (2004) a number of common points of departure. The most important for the present study relate to ideology, and to the movement’s ideation of the EC.

The first common point regarded the path to socialism. Although not entirely homogeneously\(^3\), the Eurocommunist parties accepted that the change will have to embrace liberal democratic values including parliamentary democracy. This led to the so-called ‘third way’ between Stalinism and social democracy. The differentiation of the

---

\(^3\) The main differences involve the PCI’s ‘historic compromise’ and the PCF’s strategies and rhetoric. For a more detailed view see, (Dunphy, 2004, pp.24-26)
Eurocommunist strategy from both Stalinism, and social democracy was based on the acceptance of the liberal democratic rules, as means to change the capitalist system from within. The second common point involved the close cooperation leading to a programmatic convergence amongst the main Eurocommunist parties. The common vision of a European Community autonomous from both the United States and the Soviet Union constituted their long-term goal.

Bearing in mind those important common points, we could proceed with the brief historical analysis. KKE Interior since the transition back to democracy in the late 1970s abandoned the practices of democratic centralism in its internal affairs. The party broke significantly with the communist tradition and sought to seek a new direction for the wider left forces in Greece. A considerably symbolic choice was taken when in 1986 KKE-Interior changed its name to Greek Left (EA). In order to fully comprehend the reasons behind such a symbolic move, one needs to gain a brief insight into the political life in Greece during the early 1980s. Indeed, ever since 1981 Greece had, for the first time in the country’s history, a social democratic government. Led by Andreas Papandreou, the Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) was founded in 1974 as a rather radical socialist formation. The party’s rhetoric vis-à-vis Europe was highly critical. Although not directly referring to the European Community, as it did with NATO, PASOK’s founding declaration of 1974 openly questioned all “international treaties and agreements, which have led Greece to an economic, political and military dependence to Western groups of monopolies and especially American imperialism” (PASOK, 1974). Nevertheless, by 1986 PASOK’s policies seemed to have taken a path towards embracing the trend of what will come to be known as ‘new labour’⁴. The Greek Left with this symbolic move arguably tried to present itself as a post-communist formation, which could represent voters from the non-communist left and the social democracy alike.

⁴ For more on PASOK’s stance towards the process of European integration see, Moschonas (2001)
The Era of Synaspismos; Towards the New Left

The name Synaspismos appears for the first time in 1988. Indeed, it was in late 1988, when KKE and E.A formed a coalition in order to “make it easier for the Left to meet very broad, progressive forces of PASOK’s space” (KKE, 1988). During this unique period of moderation for KKE, the Greek left joined forces\(^5\). Synaspismos, thus, commenced as a coalition between the KKE and its former comrades of E.A\(^6\). The coalition was short lived and by 1992 Synaspismos became an autonomous post-communist political formation. The reasons behind this could be traced mainly in KKE’s internal struggles, provoked by the dissolution of the Soviet Union, as well as the change of party leadership. The party hardliners, led by Aleka Papariga, promoted an orthodox Marxist-Leninist rhetoric, and a firm critique of Synaspismos’ left Europeanism (Rizospastis, 2005). During the Thirteenth Congress of KKE in 1991, Aleka Papariga was elected general secretary of the party (Central Committee of KKE, 1991). The vast majority of the party’s so-called ‘renewers’ left KKE and moved to Synaspismos. In June 1992, Synaspismos officially launched as a separate political formation. Maria Damanaki, former ‘renewer’ of KKE and currently an MEP for PASOK, became the first president of Synaspismos. Following the results of the general elections of October 1993, Synaspismos remained with no representation in parliament for a mere 0.06%. The defeat in the elections led Damanaki to resign. Two months after the defeat, Synaspismos’ extraordinary Congress elected Nikos Constantopoulos as new president. It is worthwhile noticing that amongst the contestants for the presidency were Alekos Alavanos (future president of Synaspismos/Syriza) and Fotis Kouvelis (current president of Democratic Left\(^7\)).

During the nineties Synaspismos managed to maintain a low but stable vote share. The party’s best electoral result came in the European elections of 1994, when Synaspismos managed to achieve a 6.94% electing 2 MEPs. In respect to the party’s European policy, Synaspismos carried on its Eurocommunist legacy. The party critically supported the European integration process and declared its commitment in the struggle for a ‘Europe of

---

\(^5\) Another historical example could be seen in the first elections after the restoration of democracy in Greece in 1974, when KKE joined forces with KKE-Interior and the Greek Democratic Left (EDA). The coalition was named United Left and had an arguably short life.

\(^6\) Since E.A succeeded KKE-Interior, the vast majority of the elite party officials were former members of the KKE before 1968.

\(^7\) Democratic Left (DIMAR) constitutes an active political formation of the broad centre-left.
the peoples’. As a result of such pro-integration views, the party voted in favour of the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty in July 1992. In its official decision the Central Political Committee regarding the Maastricht Treaty one reads, “Synaspismos was founded as a force of the European Left. One of the main elements of its new identity is the stable European orientation” (Synaspismos, 1992). The decision then carried on its criticism on the EC’s alleged democratic deficit and on the role that this alleged deficit played in the formation of the treaty. Nonetheless, the party decided to vote in favour so that it could push further towards the democratisation of the EC from the inside. Furthermore, according to the party’s view, failure of Greece to be part of the Union would lead to the country’s marginalisation in the international scene. The party’s vote in favour of the treaty provoked tension between Synaspismos and KKE. Such criticisms resurfaced during the on-going crisis in Greece, since KKE in analysing the current crisis in the Eurozone places the Maastricht treaty as the root of ‘all evils’ (Imerodromos, 2008). The party’s political declaration after the 2nd Congress in 1996 read clearly, “we are firmly in favour of the path towards a united Europe. Synaspismos finds that the interest of the society as well as the nation under all aspects lies with being actively and equally present in the process of European Integration. Nonetheless, we are firmly against an integration built in the basis of the unregulated powers of the market, of capital and of Atlanticism. We are fighting for a united Europe based on democracy, social solidarity, cohesion and convergence, peace and safety for everyone [...] a democratic and federal European Union, based on common foreign and defence policy” (Synaspismos, 1996, pp.11-12).

The new millennium led Synaspismos to its 3rd Congress, when Constantopoulos was reconfirmed President of the party in 2000. In 2003 during the party’s programmatic congress, Synaspismos changed its name from Coalition of Left and Progress to Coalition of the Left of Movements and Ecology. Shortly after the end of the Congress, the Central Committee released the programmatic orientations of the party. In the introduction of the document one finds indications of the reasons behind the change of name. The first paragraph of the document reads, “Synaspismos was founded from forces and people originating from all historical currents of the left movement in our country: the communist, the socialist, the social democratic, the movement of political ecology, as well as forces
originating from the struggles for democracy as well as the social movements” (Synaspismos, 2003b). It then draws the picture of the new world order following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The new world order’s main feature, according to Synaspismos, was constituted by the USA’s hegemonic role in global affairs. The war waged against Iraq mobilised millions of citizens throughout the world and especially in Europe. In light of these events, Synaspismos believed that it “must continue to keep relations of fertile interaction with the wide and multifaceted social movements which also mark the beginning of a new era, the movements against neoliberal capitalist globalisation, the movements which overwhelm the cities and villages of the whole planet defending peace, the movements which highlight the character of the contemporary left” (Synaspismos, 2003b). The change of the name was more than a symbolic move; it signified the beginning of an opening to movements and political forces of the wider left spectrum.

The era of Syriza; The first step towards the ‘government of the left’

By 2003 a wide initiative for the coiling of the radical left forces had commenced. A number of debates were held among members of Synaspismos and various political formations of the left in Greece (Mpalafas, 2012). In January 2004, the president of Synaspismos presented the electoral coalition, Coalition of the Radical Left (Syriza), and its electoral programme. The first parties to join the coalition were Synaspismos, the Renewing Communist and Ecologic Left (AKOA), the Movement for the unitary Action of the Left (KEDA), the Internationalist Working Left (DEA), and the Active Citizens with the Left (AC). The coalition gained a poor 3.26% and managed to elect only 6 MPs (Hellenic Ministry of Interior, 2004). A particular problem was posed by the fact that only Synaspismos’ candidates were elected. The rest of the coalition forces raised voices of internal domination by Synaspismos. Thus commenced a highly unstable period inside Syriza. The 4th Congress of Synaspismos, held in December 2004, posed an end to the instability period. The Congress elected Alekos Alavanos as the party’s new president, supported by the Left.

---

8 Here Synaspismos makes a reference to the social movements against the military junta, and the struggle for the restoration of democracy in Greece during the 1970s.
Platform (LP), a radical fraction inside Synaspismos (Mpalafas, 2012). Alavanos was amongst the strongest supporters of the Syriza ‘experiment’ and as a result pushed into the strengthening of the coalition. In the party’s congress in March 2007, a wide majority approved a wider electoral coalition and most importantly, a pluralistic representation of all the coalition forces inside the parliamentary group. At the same time Alavanos introduced the idea of the rejuvenation of the party by promoting younger members in key party positions (Mpalafas, 2012). Indeed, during Synaspismos’ 5th Congress in 2008, Alavanos supported the candidacy of Alexis Tsipras for the chairmanship of Synaspismos. While Tsipras was elected president of Synaspismos, Alavanos kept for himself the control over the Syriza coalition and remained president of Syriza’s parliamentary group. The relationship between Tsipras and Alavanos would become tense following the results of the European elections of 2009. Although during 2008 Syriza was polling as high as 18%, in June 2009 it managed to secure a poor 4.7% (Interior, 2009). This led to an escalation in their relationship. As a result before the national elections of October 2009, Alavanos openly withdrew his support to Tsipras as well as to the Syriza coalition (Tsatsis, 2009). Following the general elections of October 2009, Tsipras was elected Member of Parliament, thus becoming also the president of the parliamentary group. In 2010 the 6th extraordinary congress of Synaspismos was held. A month earlier the socialist government of Georgios Papandreou signed a memorandum of understanding with the EU and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This agreement brought about a series of draconian measures, which were thought to tackle the financial instability in the country. The stance against the austerity policies divided once more the central committee of Synaspismos. The clear majority supported Tsipras and his hard line of complete opposition to the memorandum-related policies. This led the moderate group of ‘renewers’ under Fotis Kouvelis to leave Synaspismos/Syriza and create a new political party [Democratic Left (DIMAR)], which follows a clear social democratic rhetoric and presents itself as the ‘responsible left’ (Dimar, 2010). In the following two years the austerity measures continued to suppress the country’s lower classes. By the general elections of May 2012, the socialists of PASOK and the conservatives of Nea Dimokratia (ND) had lost the vast support of the past. Indeed, PASOK and ND combined vote shares went from the 77.39% of 2009 (Interior, 2009) to the 32.03% of May 2012 (Interior, 2012) and the 41.94% of June 2012 (Interior, 2012). That signified the end of the bipolar era in Greek politics. As a result, Syriza managed to
impressively multiply its vote share and became the second political force inside the Greek parliament. Syriza, during the elections of May and June 2012, presented the idea of a government of the Left, which could bring over a series of chain reactions in other countries of the EU under austerity measures and push for a reconstruction of the EU and the Eurozone. In this context, Syriza managed to achieve the most significant vote share of its history. In June 2012 the coalition reached the 26.89 % and elected 71 MPs\(^9\). Since then the need for further homogeneity in terms of party structure, led to the 1\(^{st}\) Congress of Syriza as a unitary party of the radical left. According to the decisions of the congress, all constituent party members should be disbanded (Syriza, 2013d). Indeed, right before the congress, Synaspismos decided to disband and dissolve into unitary Syriza (Synaspismos, 2013a). During the congress Tsipras was elected as the first president of unitary Syriza securing an overwhelmingly 71% amongst the party delegates’ votes. For the time being, he seems to maintain control of the party’s central political committee as well as the political secretariat. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile mentioning that the Left platform led by Lafazanis managed to secure a fair share of representation in the party’s main organs (Syriza, 2013c).

This concludes the brief historical reference to the past of the various formations that led to the creation of the contemporary Coalition of the Radical Left in Greece. All the aforementioned events shaped and continue to shape the future of the Radical left in the country. Since the present study focuses on the European perspective of the party, a first conclusion regarding the current stance of Syriza vis-à-vis the EU could be made. Syriza continues to promote the main ideas of the historic Eurocommunism. Given the recent advances regarding a pan-European cooperation amongst RLPs with the support of a radical left Euro party (ELP), the dream of a Europe of the peoples seems less distant than in the past. Notwithstanding the minoritarian voices inside the party, as well as the critique that it faces from the rest of the radical left, the majority of the party has remained loyal to its distinct left Europeanism. In the proceeding chapter, the analysis of the party’s ideology, party factionalism, international affiliations, and the process of European integration will serve as important elements on substantiating the study’s arguments.

---

\(^9\) In the Greek parliament there are currently 300 MPs.
Syriza’s Left Europeanism Overtime

i. Party Ideology

In order to assess the ideological factor in Syriza’s stance towards the EU a number of official party documents will be analysed. Commencing with the party’s 4th Congress, during which Alekos Alavanos was elected president of Synaspismos/Syriza (Synaspismos, 2004). Given that the congress’ political decision was mainly based on the programmatic congress of the party held in May-June 2003 and the subsequent programmatic ‘directions’ document (Synaspismos, 2003a), this document will be also taken into consideration. Moving onwards in time, we will come across the party’s political decision after the 5th Congress in 2008, after the 6th Congress in 2010 (when Tsipras was elected president) and finally the political decision of Syriza’s first unitary Congress in July 2013. Synaspismo’s ideological heritage goes back to the Eurocommunist era of KKE Interior. In addition to the Eurocommunist current, a number of ideological movements were united especially after the creation of Syriza. The common denominator of the aforementioned currents is constituted by the negation of Stalinism and the critical view of the Soviet system of the so-called ‘existing socialism’. Maoists, Trotskyists, libertarian socialists, the so-called new left, political ecology and feminism created the ideological blend of Synaspismos and nowadays Syriza (Synaspismos, 2003a, p.10). Synaspismos/Syriza from 2004 to the present day continues to treat the European edifice in the same critical manner. Departing from the party’s negation of the Stalinist version of ‘Socialism in one country’, the party’s long-term goal of socialism with freedom and democracy has a necessary pan-European, even international, perspective (Syriza, 2013e).10

The analysis of the aforementioned documents leads to the conclusion that Synaspismos/Syriza did not undergo any important ideological mutation throughout the period under study. The reason behind this choice lies with the demonstration of a trend inside the critical left. Following the financial meltdown in 2008, a vast number of theoretical works has been produced from left-wing thinkers. The crisis signified the end of

---

10 The same pan-European and international perspective is present in all party documents under study from 2003 to the present one.
the liberal and neoliberal ideological domination. The meltdown signified the moment when “our side no longer has to go on apologizing; while the other side had better start soon” (Zizek, 2009, p.8). In this context Synaspismos/Syriza sought to reinstate “an all-covering alternative political proposition for the perspective and the role of Europe in the modern world, in the path to socialism with democracy and freedom” (Synaspismos, 2004, p.2).

The major ideological point is constituted by the acceptance of the Marxist worldview vis-à-vis the international scene as well as the basic Marxist tools of analysis in regards to the social, political and economic phenomena. But what differentiates Synaspismos/Syriza’s view from the orthodox communist one is represented by the negation of dogmas. Marx constitutes the “core, but not the exclusive reference, of the left’s theory. Marx’s work, as of course any other human work, could not solve all the problems that social movements had and still have to face. This is the reason why many ‘Marxisms’ have been developed…” (Synaspismos, 2003a, p.12). Marx remains the core but the theoretical work of left-wing thinkers is equally important. The party views the process of globalisation, as a process heavily influenced by the neoliberal economic and political ideals “presented as the infallible truth by the new unitary thought”11 (Synaspismos, 2003a, p.5). The party’s central committee finds that “against the internationalised despotic capitalists and their armies, a new globalisation of social solidarity and ecological responsibility is being developed” (Synaspismos, 2003a, p.9). The outcome of this alternative globalisation is constituted by the growing number of people realising the necessity of a redistribution of wealth. In addition to that, Synaspismos finds that an increasing number of people are becoming aware of the root of all evils for humanity, which for the party is none other than capitalism. This ‘awakening’ will bring about the demand for the overcoming of the capitalist world order and the rebirth of socialism with freedom and democracy (Synaspismos, 2004, p.9). This all led Syriza to declare that the party’s goal is the socialism of the 21st Century12, as opposed to the dogmatic ideas which led to the bankruptcy of the states of the ‘really existing socialism’ (Syriza, 2013e).

What is of outmost importance regarding the party’s ideology is its version of left Europeanism. Synaspismos/Syriza continues to view a Europe of the peoples as the only

11 The reference is clearly to the neoliberal theory of the ‘end of history’ as introduced by Francis Fukuyama’s most influential work (Fukuyama, 1992).
12 An idea influenced partly by the debate held in London in 2008. For more see, (Badiou, 2010)
path towards socialism. A direct outcome of the party’s negation to the Stalinist dogma of socialism in one country Synaspismos/Syriza’s Europeanism remains intact. Especially after the creation of the ELP in December 2004 the party commenced placing more salience to the European alternative, which it had professed for a long time. It was the ELP, which would serve as the vehicle towards a Socialist Europe. An idea that is present in what Zizek calls global revolution. According to this idea the “only answer to particular problems was the universal solution: global revolution” (Zizek, 2013, p.11). The crisis and the subsequent devastating effects in Greek society and economy led the party to place even more salience to the issue. The party’s critique of the neoliberal character of the European integration process is present but moderate in the party’s earlier documents (Synaspismos, 2003b), (Synaspismos, 2004). In 2008, Synaspismos found that “even if the balance of power inside the EU is not favourable to the parties of the European left, we still need to keep on fighting for the overthrow of the neoliberal forces” (Synaspismos, 2008, p.12). Nevertheless, events such as the student movements in France and Greece as well as the creation of a new left party in Germany and Italy were seen as rather positive developments. Those events served to counterbalance the influence of neoliberalism and created the necessary grass roots societal organisations/movements for the left to prosper in Europe.

By 2010 the financial crisis had already hit Greece. The Greek government signed the first, in a never-ending series, memorandum of understanding with the country’s lenders. The so-called Troika made out of members of the European Commission (EC), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the European Central Bank (ECB) were already in the country pressing the government for immediate austerity measures. In June 2010 the political decision of the 6th Congress of Synaspismos draws a far more negative picture and calls for action against the neoliberal forces, which were found to pose an existential threat to the European edifice. The party’s narrative in regards to the reasons behind the crisis maintains clear Marxist characteristics. As the political decision of June 2010 clearly reads, “we are in the midst of an international capitalist crisis of which root cause is the overaccumulation of capital. In substance a structural systemic crisis, which began in 2008 initially in the bank sector and the financial system, and later in investment banking and the reduction of production, has influenced as a natural consequence the working peoples and their incomes” (Synaspismos, 2010, p.1). The subsequent crisis of the sovereign debt especially
inside the Eurozone was also seen as the direct by-product of the neoliberal economics, which for a long time have been dominating Europe. The crisis unmasked according to Synaspismos Central Committee the undemocratic nature of the European edifice, built upon rules of class exploitation. Synaspismos/Syriza goes a step further by declaring that the party’s critical support of the Maastricht Treaty was a mistake (Synaspismos, 2010, p.2). Nonetheless, the party finds that there is no solution to the issues outside of the EU and the Eurozone. The only possible solution is the cooperation amongst the ‘aggrieved’. “The alternative solution is the struggle of the peoples of Europe for a change in the balance of power in each and every country as well as the common coordinated struggle for another Europe. A democratic and social Europe, free from monetarism and the compulsion of capital.” (Synaspismos, 2010, p.3). This is not a national struggle but a pan-European one. The European left must present an alternative to the neoliberal capitalist production and at the same time outline the strategy towards the transition to Socialism.

In the most recent political decision of Syriza’s 1st unitary Congress, one clearly distinguishes a certain continuity vis-à-vis the party’s Europeanism. The deepening of the crisis leads the party to draw a very negative picture of Europe. Indeed, the decision reads clearly that “the reason of existence of a EU in benefit of the peoples is slowly disappearing from the horizon. The Euro is mainly seen as the vehicle of German policy, widening the inequalities between countries as well as the inequalities amongst social classes, while Asian paradigms are imposed to European societies; paradigms, which clearly benefit European capital. The future of the EU as well as the Eurozone itself is rendered more and more uncertain. The politics of austerity and recession disintegrate the bonds amongst the European states, strengthen Euro scepticism, anti-Europeanism, widens the nationalist juxtapositions and render the revival of fascism easier” (Synaspismos, 2013a, p.1). An idea shared by one of Europe’s most influential political thinkers Jürgen Habermas. Indeed, Habermas in his article in the aftermath of the decision for Greece’s first bailout package wrote, “the realization hit home to me for the first time that the failure of the European project was a real possibility” (Habermas, 2012, p.102). For Syriza the continuation of austerity and recession threatens the European edifice as a whole. Europe’s future thus lies with the left. A view shared by economists Yannis Varoufakis and James K. Gailbraith who
chose to entitle one of their articles in the New York Times ‘Only Syriza Can Save Greece’\textsuperscript{13}. In respect to that the two economists argue that, “the crisis could take down the Greek government and bring the left-wing opposition to power. This wouldn’t be a bad thing for Europe or the United States. The policies currently imposed upon Europe’s periphery are worsening the crisis, threatening Europe’s integrity and jeopardizing growth. A Greek government that rejects these self-defeating policies will do more help than harm” (James K. Gailbraith, 2013, p.1). The article concludes with the argument that a government of the left in Greece would try to save the European project. Syriza’s election is also seen as an event, which would bring about a domino effect in the neighbouring countries of the South. It is precisely this kind of effect, which combined with a close cooperation, especially amongst the countries of Southern Europe\textsuperscript{14}, is a necessary condition for Europe’s future as well as for the transition towards Socialism of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

The party’s distinct left Europeanism is a direct by-product of the party’s ‘reformed’ Marxist analysis as well as the party’s negation of Stalin’s version of ‘socialism in one country’. The idea of a socialist Europe has been a constant ideological position of Synaspismos/Syriza ever since the era of KKE-Interior. The current crisis inside the EU had the effect of rendering the request timelier and more pressing than any other time. Given that Syriza as well as the ELP view the neoliberal policies of austerity as an existential threat to the Union, they are in the process of intensifying their struggle towards their professed alternative.

\textsuperscript{13} In the New York paper version the name appeared as ‘Only the Left Can Save Greece’

\textsuperscript{14} The focus on the countries of Southern Europe is much clearer in A.Tsipra’s article in the Spanish newspaper \textit{El Pais} in May 2013, entitled the alliance of the European south. For the article see, (Tspiras, 2013).
ii. Party Factionalism

Given that Syriza was up to June 2013 a coalition of various minoritarian left-wing parties, this factor is of the outmost importance. Because of the limited space at my disposal, it would be impossible to present a detailed analysis of all constituent parties. As a result, the focus will be placed on the two major factions inside unitary Syriza as of the present day.

Another important fact, which needs to be stated a priori, involves the proclaimed self-dissolution of the constituent parties following the 1st congress held in July 2013 (Papadimitriou, 2013). According to said decision the constituent parties, which were still to self-dissolve, had three months to do so. This decision caused a series of heated debates during the congress (Koroneos, 2013).

Syriza was up to July 2013 made out of multiple constituent parties. The constituent parties could be categorized into the more leftist ones and the ones tending more towards the so-called centre left. In the first category we come across the Internationalist Workers Left (DEA), the Communist Organization of Greece (KOA), Kokkino (RED), the Movement for the United in action Left (KEDA), the Renewing Communist Ecological Left (AKOA), the Greek Eco socialists, the Rosa Organisation, the Radicals, and of course Synaspismos. The second category includes the remaining parties of the Democratic Social Movement (DHKKI), the Active Citizens with the Left, the Union of Democratic Centre and the Citizens’ Union Rigas (Syriza, 2013a). According to the coalition’s former statute, all of the constituent parties were represented ex officio in Syriza’s central committee as well as in the party’s political secretariat. This rule was amended during the party’s 1st congress (Syriza, 2013b). Notwithstanding the high number of constituent parties, the Left Platform (LP) and the Unitary Platform constitute the major competitive fractions inside Syriza. As mentioned in the historical overview, those two currents were present ever since the creation of Synaspismos in 1992. The LP throughout Synaspismos/Syriza’s history has remained a minority pushing for more radical solutions ever since its opposition to the Maastricht treaty. The limited period of Alavanos’ times in Synaspismos/Syriza remains the only period during which the LP managed to place its influence on the party’s agenda more successfully. To these two fractions a third one was added recently. The Communist platform is a minoritarian, anti-capitalist group, which managed to elect only two members in the party’s
central committee during the party’s first unitary congress (Tvxs, 2013). Given the limited space of the current study, the focus will be placed on the two main fractions. The analysis will involve the close study of the LP’s alternative propositions in the recent 1st unitary congress as well as some articles published by some of the fraction’s leading figures. The main contention between the majoritarian fraction led by president Tsipras and the minoritarian led by Lafazanis was primarily focused on the European issue as part of Syriza’s strategy to tackle the effects of the crisis. This will lead to significant observations vis-à-vis the internal pressures towards a more radical stance in the European question.

The Left Platform presented a number of alternative versions in respect to the party’s main programmatic positions. After analysing the two versions comparatively, a number of conclusions are drawn. From an ideological perspective the core ideas, as presented in the preceding part, remain intact. Aims of both fractions remain the creation of the Europe of the peoples on one hand, and Socialism of the 21st century on the other. Nevertheless, a number of issues are raised especially with regard to the party’s strategy for exiting the crisis as well as the role of the EU and the Eurozone in it. The party’s rectified decision appears to be more rounded in respect to the proposed manner of approaching the question of public debt as well as the implementation of the draconian austerity measures. It is worthwhile mentioning that the majority’s version is almost completely harmonised with the ELP’s position on the question of the debt. The majoritarian version reads clearly that, “we need to cancel the memoranda and the implementing laws [...] To renegotiate the loan treaties and cancel their burdensome conditions, the primary fact remains that the question of public debt constitutes a European and not a Greek problem strictu sensu. In addition to that we will never allow for our country to become a debt colony, objective of the renegotiations is mainly the cancellation of the biggest part of the debt whereas the residual should be paid after a certain grace period [...] as our slogan clearly reads out ‘no sacrifice for the euro’, our first priority remains the prevention of the humanitarian disaster and the satisfaction of the social needs in the country” (Syriza, 2013f, p.1). In reading the LP’s version one comes across a more radical and decisive action including the possibility of exiting the Eurozone. The LP finds that the crisis proves beyond any reasonable doubt that both the Eurozone and the EU cannot be reformed nor re-established. The only way towards a socialistic Europe of the peoples is overthrowing the current establishment,
which is currently transforming the EU in a modern version of the ‘holly alliance’ against the working classes of the European continent (Syriza, 2013g, p.1). In regards to the aforementioned slogan ‘no sacrifice for the euro’, the LP believes that it should be integrated by a possibility of exiting the Eurozone in extremis. According to their view, the renegotiations with the troika would bring about a series of dilemmas vis-à-vis the country’s permanence in the Eurozone. If the party were to push for the necessary cancellation of the debt along with the austerity measures, the troika members could pose the dilemma (as was the case in Cyprus15) of either staying in the Eurozone and implementing austerity or having to exit. In that case the LP’s views that, “such a possibility of exiting the Eurozone, which demands for a good preparation, in no case constitutes a ‘disaster’ or a national isolation. Contrary to that, as long as said exit is part of a progressive plan for rupture with the memoranda and the troika, the overthrow of austerity, and towards socialism, it could constitute besides the temporary difficulties, which it will cause, a viable and positive proposal for both the Greek and the European peoples. The possible exit from the Eurozone is not part of a different political plan, it does not lead to a different programme or different alliances, but on the contrary states our decisiveness to implement our programme and our plan of rupture and overthrowing in a socialist direction in an unwavering and decisive manner till the end, fully understanding what a direct rupture with the Eurozone would bring about as well the fact that said rupture demands for a full preparation of an alternative plan” (Syriza, 2013g, p.1).

It is evident from the documents under analysis that the LP is criticizing the majority’s left Europeanism. In fact, prior to the party’s congress Panos Kosmas a member of Syriza’s new central committee16 published an article on the Kokkino magazine (organ of the Syriza’s constituent party ‘Red’). The article bears the title ‘left Europeanism, plan B17 and the third way towards socialism’. In the article Kosmas attacks heavily the major argument in favour of the majority’s Europeanism. The majority’s Europeanism is based on the assumption that since the crisis is European the solution should be European. According to Kosmas, “five and a half years of the international capitalist crisis have undoubtedly demonstrated that the

15 For more information regarding the Cypriot dilemma see, (Makriyannis, 2013)
16 Following the elections held at the congress Kosmas secured 308 votes being part of the LP and was thus elected (Tvxs, 2013)
17 Plan B refers to Alekos Alavanos’ newly founded party bearing the exact name ‘Plan B’
management of the crisis is competitive: each and every European bourgeoisie, commencing from the weaker ones (Greek, Portuguese etc.) to the strongest ones (Italian, German, French etc.), tries to save itself, its profits, and its position in the imperialist chain” (Kosmas, 2013, p.3). Kosmas goes further on arguing that the mere existence of national competitive bourgeoisies inside the Union is the true obstacle to European political integration. Given that there is no peaceful way in order to expropriate the European bourgeoisies, the only way towards the European political integration is constituted by the overthrow of capitalism at a European level. The author concludes that the only solution to the current problem is to overthrow capitalism initially at a national level. This would create a domino effect at a pan-European or even international level. Concurrently to the internationalisation of the anti-capitalist struggle, the reforms towards a socialist perspective at a national level must deepen. This line of argument is compatible with the Leninist idea of the weakest link of the imperialist chain as well as Trotsky’s idea of constant revolution18. The article concludes with yet another heavy critique of the majority’s Europeanism. The text clearly reads that, “the strategy of the left Europeanism, which proposes ruptures at a European level, while at a national one views a utopian plan of Keynesian consent with the bourgeoisie, twists the dialectics of internationalism and constitutes a caricature of internationalism” (Kosmas, 2013, p.9).

In concluding the party factionalism factor, we could argue that Syriza’s Europeanism constitutes one of the main ideological constants overtime. The deepening of the crisis, and especially the events in Cyprus, where another RLP (AKEL) had to come to terms with managing the crisis, led the minority of LP to sharpen its critique towards the majority’s Europeanism. Notwithstanding the fact that the majority managed to secure an overwhelming 67.71% in the central committee’s elections the LP managed to increase their vote share from 25.6% in 2012 to 30.16% in the recent congress (Tvxs, 2013). The role the LP played in maintaining a certain degree of radicalisation in the party’s political programme is of major importance. The LP serves to counterbalance the ‘realist’ perspective of the party’s majoritarian current led by President Tsipras. The existence of such an opposing fraction undoubtedly conditions the party’s stance towards the EU in a radical manner. The fact that the LP managed to increase its influence inside the party is viewed by Stathis

18 For a precise analysis of Lenin’s and Trotsky’s ideas see, (Bloodworth, 2013)
Kouvelakis (Member of the party's central committee and amongst the leaders of the LP) as, "sign [the platform's] success is an encouragement to deploy its intervention in a more visible manner inside both inside the party and beyond" (Kouvelakis, 2013, p.1).
iii. Transnational Links

Synaspismos/Syriza maintain intact the Eurocommunist legacy of KKE-Interior by partaking in every European effort for the deepening of cooperation amongst left forces. As mentioned in the preceding chapter the need for a more homogeneous political formation in a European level was addressed\(^{19}\) when in 2004 a number of left parties, amongst which Synaspismos, gave birth to the ELP (Left, 2013). The following analysis will involve the ELP’s main programmatic positions and the degree of coherence between the ELP’s views and the ones professed by Syriza. In order to be able to assess said coherence, the analysis of the ELP’s political theses as produced by the party’s 2\(^{nd}\) congress held in November 2007 is necessary. In addition to that, the agenda for a social Europe as produced by the party’s 3\(^{rd}\) congress in December 2010 presents us with the necessary post-crisis perspective.

ELP’s political theses present a high degree of convergence both in terms of ideology and programmatic positions with Syriza’s. In fact, the document commences with the following aphorism, “the contradiction between capitalism and the emancipation of the individual, armament and war, climate change and environmental disasters, and the privatisation of all spheres of life lead us to ask once again ‘socialism or barbarism’? (Left, 2007, p.1). Indeed, the party states as its primary objectives, the social democratic transformations as opposed to the increasing neoliberal influence inside the EU (Left, 2007, p.3), which altered the Union’s model into an “undemocratic, neo-liberal, patriarchal and militaristic model of the European construction” (Left, 2007, p.5). The ELP’s vision of Europe is presented as a social Union with labour and rights as opposed to the neo-liberal deregulated model, which promotes exploitation. The case for the de-privatisation of public services is also made. The ecological character of the ELP’s vision is also underlined and is seen to oppose the global capitalism’s intensification of the ecological crisis. Peace as opposed to imperialist wars is also emphasized in the text (Left, 2007, pp.13-17). In order for this vision to be achieved, “a deep democratic reconstruction of the European institutions is an indispensable component of our whole strategy. In this field the European Left Party, and our large social and political alliance, take the historical responsibility to change the political balance and the political orientations in Europe” (Left, 2007, p.18). In general we could argue that the issues raised in

\(^{19}\) A conclusion made rather prophetically by Richard Dunphy (2004) in his book
the ELP’s document echo Synaspismos/Syriza’s values in terms of democracy, ecology, feminism and maintain a certain distant perspective in respect to a socialist transformation.

In the party’s ‘Agenda for a social Europe’ we come across a document heavily influenced by the financial crisis in the Eurozone. The EC, ECB and the IMF are thought to have imposed intolerable sacrifices on European peoples. The crisis is seen to pose a risk “of economic collapse, massive exacerbation of poverty and precariousness, and the destruction of the social model and European civilisation itself” (Left, 2010). The ELP finds that the critical situation of the Union calls for radical policy change, to turn from “the logic of profit into the new logic of human development” (Left, 2010, p.2). In addition to that, the crisis is also seen as a crisis of democracy, which needs to be addressed by radically democratising European politics. In terms of measures to tackle the on-going catastrophe a number of measures are proposed. The regulation of the banking sector under social ownership and democratic control is amongst those (Left, 2010, p.8). In respect to the debt crisis, the ELP proposes “the annulation of part of the sovereign debt, in order to assist the indebted countries to develop policies for the restructure of their economies and avoid the destruction of social development” (Left, 2010, p.8). In terms of short-term objectives, the ELP proposes a serious of measures including a guaranteed minimum income for the unemployed, shorter working hours and a European-wide minimum wage around the national average wage (Left, 2010, p.12). As for its vision of Europe the ELP states that “the European Left stands for a vision of a radically different world, democracy, peace and socialism [...] we aspire to a world of freedom, justice, and equality, without repression, exploitation, wars, hunger or need” (Left, 2010, p.16).

In comparing the analyses that the two parties hold both in terms of measures to tackle the on-going crisis and of the alternative model they propose, we could argue that they are quite compatible. The catastrophic picture of the EU that both parties draw is blamed on the neoliberal character of the European integration process. The immediate measures have a certain democratic socialist character. Nonetheless, the final objective of socialism remains, even if as a distant goal, in the wider picture. The importance of the ELP in Syriza’s stance towards the EU is of major significance. The existence of a Euro party is per se a significant advantage. It renders Syriza’s goals much more politically achievable. The ELP constitutes Syriza’s response when faced with the issue of creating pan-European alliances.
in order to promote the European solutions dictated by the party’s left Europeanism. In light of the above, it could be argued that the creation of the ELP solidified Syriza’s critical and concurrently constructive stance vis-à-vis the EU.
iv. European Integration; the Communist Dilemma

The integration process constitutes the last conditioning factor under study in the present. As already mentioned above the current factor will be integrated by Charalambous’ (2013) theoretical lens of the ‘communist dilemma’. Given Syriza’s Eurocommunist heritage and ideology, its stance towards the integration process was critical but yet constructive. The party heavily criticizes the neoliberal connotation inherent to the process. Nonetheless, it supports Greece’s permanence in the Union and seeks the re-foundation of the European edifice according to its social principle. Socialism is believed to be achievable only through a permanent struggle in both the European and the national level. Thus, Syriza’s left Europeanism renders Syriza’s responsive mechanism much easier to operate in comparison to orthodox communist parties, which a priori oppose any participation in the European organs. In fact, Syriza faced with the choice between moderation and ideological consistency, managed to maintain the former in terms of programmatic positions without altering its core ideological pillars. This was arguably influenced by the crisis inside the EU. Syriza’s constant criticism of the neoliberal character of the integration process and of the undemocratic nature of the European institutions was proven correct in the eyes of a large part of the population. This had a solidifying effect on Syriza’s responses to the crisis, seen as a natural consequence of the policies imposed by both the European conservatives and socialists alike. Thus, Syriza seen as a unit appears to be quite consistent during the period under examination. Nonetheless, the third level of analysis presents a rather differentiated picture. As already mentioned in the preceding part of the current study, the LP has been criticising rather heavily the majority’s Europeanism. The Cypriot incident in April 2013 (Makriyannis, 2013) solidified the LP’s critique and rendered the internal struggle more intense. Given the fact that Syriza is currently in the spotlight, the majority inside the party pressed for the self-disbanding of all constituent parties (Papadimitriou, 2013). According to some of the leading figures of the LP, behind the self-disbanding lies the majority’s goal of a tighter organisation pattern (Kouvelakis, 2013). Indeed, as one of the LP’s leading figures Lafazanis suggested “Syriza is pushed into a ‘violent’ maturing process” (Chatzinikolaou, 2013). The need for a leading team made out of members of the majority is the goal of Tsipras’ majoritarian current. The fact that the constituent parties lost their ex officio
representation in the party’s political secretariat is indicative of the majority’s plans (Chatzinikolaou, 2013). In summarizing the above, we could argue that Syriza as a unit did not undergo any serious moderation in terms of ideology and programmatic positions. Nonetheless, the party’s novel role as the major opposition power in Greek politics led the majoritarian current to press for a more centralised party organisation. The reason behind such a move is constituted by the growing need for more homogeneous positions amongst the party’s officials who represent the party especially in media debates. The party’s democratic character in terms of variety of political proposal and analyses is currently seen as an impeding factor for managing to win the elections (Delastik, 2013).

In light of the above, we could arguably suggest that Syriza as most RLPs faced and continues to face dilemmas. The crisis solidified even more Syriza’s critical stance in respect to the integration process as well as ‘proved’ right the party’s denouncement of neoliberalism. The subsequent electoral success in 2012 brought Syriza face to face with another dilemma regarding the opposing positions vis-à-vis the possibility of exiting the Eurozone, present inside the party. The party needed to choose between limiting the freedom of each individual fraction or insist on the party’s open democratic structure. The limitation would create thus the impression of a disciplined organisation rendering it more appealing to a larger percentage of the electorate, and thus grasping the opportunity presented by the vacuum created by PASOK’s demise. On the other hand, the promotion of the opposing views held by the LP could appeal more to a radical left-wing electorate. The first unitary congress concluded in a rather balanced situation. The LP secured the support of 1/3 of the party’s members, whereas the majoritarian fraction secured the residual 2/3. The final decision regarding the self-disbanding of the constituent parties could be seen as slight moderation given that this leads to the marginalisation of certain minoritarian groups inside the party’s organs. Nonetheless, the majority could risk the party’s unity if it opted for further rounding of its more radical policy propositions.

20 Indeed, the only issue that is still under examination by party elites relates to the strategy of tangling the national debt. Syriza’s official position remains unchanged, but a process of harmonisation to the ELP’s position is under way.
Conclusion

The present study with its own limitations of space tried to shed light on Syriza’s stance towards the EU in the post-financial crisis environment. The data at my disposal will serve as a basis for future and more detailed work both on the ELP and on its Greek, Italian, German, French, and Spanish counterparts. A number of new data will be take into account and will provide us with an even clearer image of the current state of the European left and their alternative vision of Europe. As demonstrated in the preceding parts, Syriza’s left Europeanism has remained intact in the post-2008 era. In fact, amongst the party’s majority faction, the firm belief in a Europe of the peoples has been strengthened by the financial crisis inside the EU. The historical process that led to the creation of unitary Syriza as well as the history of the Greek left played a significant role in Syriza’s current stance. The European ideal is a direct by-product of the party’s ideological underpinnings. Syriza’s ideological openness and negation of Marxist-Leninist dogmas led the party to its current Europeanism and modernised version of socialism of the 21st century. An important factor in shaping the party’s stance is constituted by the total negation of the Stalinist idea of ‘socialism in one country’, which concurrently serves as the common unifying denominator of the various fractions. Syriza’s stance is also seen as a product of the internal struggle between the majoritarian fraction led by Tsipras and the LP led by Lafazanis. The LP’s pressure renders Syriza’s overall stance more radical. The balance of power is currently in favour of the moderates but the unstable situation in Greece and in the EU render the possibility of a change quite possible. These organisational mutations are seen to have been Syriza’s response to the dilemma posed by the European integration. Nonetheless, the effect of the crisis while solidifying Syriza’s criticism to the Union’s current structure, led to a series of internal struggles. The majority’s response to the tension was arguably given during Syriza’s 1st unitary congress, when the opposition saw the intensification of the party’s unifying process as a “‘violent’ maturing process” (Chatzinikolaou, 2013). The final observation regards the ELP’s role in shaping Syriza’s Europeanism. The ELP solidified and concurrently rendered Syriza’s stance more appealing and realistic. An important role was also played by the high degree of homogeneity amongst the parties’ strategic positions. Both in terms of
immediate measures and of long-term objectives, the ELP and Syriza aim for a democratic Union with a clear social face, which would be the vehicle towards a socialist Europe of the 21st century with peace and democracy.
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