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Greek Universities in the Framework of the Current Financial Crisis
Immobility and Adaptation

Vaios Vaiopoulos

Universités grecques dans le contexte de la crise financière actuelle: immobilité et adaptation

Ce document offre un bref commentaire sur la situation présente de l’enseignement supérieur grec, sous le prisme de la crise financière actuelle qui sévit en Grèce. Tout d’abord, on va essayer de passer en revue les circonstances ayant entouré l’établissement de l’Université grecque afin de pouvoir mieux saisir la réalité des faits, étant donné que l’historique de l’évolution de l’enseignement supérieur va de pair avec des crises s’inscrivant dans un contexte historique, politique et social, tant au niveau local que dans un contexte européen.

La deuxième phase de l’évolution de l’enseignement supérieur grec (1894-1911) a été marquée par l’adoption de nombreuses lois ayant pour objet de donner à l’Université grecque un caractère plus réaliste, et ce à travers l’expansion des domaines traités afin de répondre aux besoins des classes bourgeoises émergentes au début du 20ème siècle. La réforme de 1929 a suivi la restructuration financière grecque qui s’est opérée selon le modèle capitaliste.

Chaque réforme proposée a été systématiquement soumise à l’influence de deux paramètres contradictoires ayant dominé l’histoire grecque moderne: d’une part la modernisation de l’État exige l’encadrement technologique de l’enseignement supérieur; d’autre part, les institutions traditionnelles insistent sur le modèle ethnocentrique et sur le classicisme.

Un équilibre a pu être instauré après la réforme de 1932. Il est révélateur que cette loi a statué sur l’enseignement supérieur grec jusqu’à 1982 (50 ans). Par la suite, une réforme plus radicale a été engagée, y compris l’introduction de cinq catégories pour le personnel académique (conférencier, professeur adjoint, professeur adjoint titulaire, professeur agrégé, professeur). L’intervention de l’État dans la vie universitaire a été ainsi compromise et l’autonomie des universités renforcée. On assiste à l’émergence
d’une université qu’on pourrait qualifier de «démocratique», avec l’innovation
d’autoriser la participation des étudiants et du personnel administratif dans la gestion
institutionnelle, ce qui a engendré un bilan mitigé avec des résultats négatifs, de graves
conscéquences, mais aussi des résultats positifs.

Une tentative visant à adapter l’université grecque à la Déclaration de Bologne a
été faite en 2007, mais l’annulation complète et totale du système qui a persisté jusqu’à
lors sera accomplie en 2011, avec les nouvelles lois sur les universités, et en 2012, avec
des réformes ayant eu de nombreux aspects positifs et négatifs.

In Greece the history of changes in education, and specifically in Higher Education, keeps
pace, as a rule, with historical, political and social crises either at a local level, in Eastern
Mediterranean, or in the entire Europe. A rhetorical flattery to the University students is
frequently declared in my country: that from the twentieth century and afterwards the last ones
constituted the vanguard in the political and the social struggles, which is no absolutely true,
since the study of contemporary Greek political history does not always confirm that role of a
permanent progressive vanguard. However, this rather general and dominant impression of the
Greek public opinion precisely indicates that there is diachronic connection of what happens
in the frame of Higher Education with the sociopolitical developments in Greece, which were
often dramatic in periods of instability.

This is the reason why a major part of my paper will be an *excursus* on the history of Higher
education\(^1\), certainly brief and not complete: it also gives an idea about traits of Greek Higher
education still existing, although faded out. As a dialectic relation between the formation of
the identity of the Greek University and the dominant social, political, ideological and cultural
factors is unquestionable, the question what kind of University was founded in Greece in the first
years of the modern Greek State; which was its orientation, which knowledge was considered as
most important and why; which dominant views about the role and the purpose of the university
led to the selected regulation/legislation every time, lays in the heart of our problematic.

In the period right after the foundation of Modern Greek State (1828-1831) the first Greek
Governor I. Kapodistrias had accepted the necessity of the foundation of University, but his
major concern was to confront practical needs\(^2\); so education under his administration had a
purely practical character, a technological direction, since the necessity was to construct a new
state out of nothing. In consequence, the foundation of a University had been in his plans but
not his priority. The hurried realization of Kapodistrias’s idea was an initiative of Otto, the first
king of the Modern Greek State. The University was founded on the 14th of April 1837, and was

\(^1\) The historical *excursus* is based on the selected bibliography listed at the end of the paper.
inaugurated on the 3rd of May of same year. It was the first University in the newly established Greek state but also in Eastern Mediterranean (the Ionian Academy, ‘ancestor’ of the Ionian University’, founded in 1824 by the British in Corfu was outside the Greek territory). The Ottonian University, as was its name before it takes its current name National and Kapodistrian Athens University, had four faculties: Theology, Law, Medicine, and Philosophy. This structure reveals what prevailed in the ideology of the Modern Greek State at the time: The School of Law was necessary to form the state’s legislation and provide staff for the judicial system; the school of Philosophy needed to staff the schools (and introduce the new generations into the Greek classical past, I would add), the School of Medicine was indispensable for obvious reasons, and the School of Theology needed to staff the Church, that was a source of legitimization for the state; at the same time Church was one of the two ideological pylons of Modern Greek ideology: Hellenism on one hand and Orthodoxy on the other. So, the foundation of the Ottonian University was a political act of strategic character, as it concerned a national institution in the service of the state-nation which was been constructed out of nothing.

As the new State seeks for its roots in the remote Greek past, especially that of the classical Antiquity, which meant that Medieval Greek History and Greece under Venetian and Ottoman domination were simply neglected, the orientation of this first Greek University was purely ethnocentric. Classicism, scholasticism were among its main features, as it aimed at providing an articulated ideology to the new-born State. During this period, due to the Bavarian origin of the young king Otto, a prince who deeply loved the country and the people he was given to rule (1833-1863), Greek education system was consequently organized according to the Bavarian model, which admired classical antiquity, although Greek social and financial circumstances were far different from those of Bavaria.

Contrary to the first Governor’s realistic view accepting the necessity of technical education, the primacy of Classics is impressive. The adoration of the glorious past, that reaches the point of a disease in some cases, the opposition to a more realistic type of education which would lead to a practical/technical orientation, goes in hand with the irredentism running through the Modern Greek State from the moment of its foundation till 1922. This ideological stance is compatible with the notion of a State that transfers the light of knowledge and liberty to its neighbor countries/nations. As a result of the University’s ethnocentric character, the State tightly embraces the University for its own purposes, mainly in the frame of the ideology of irredentism.

In the following years, many laws aimed at renewing the Ottonian Institution and at giving the Greek University a more developmental character, based on the socio-economic circumstances, without at the same time being deprived of its main ideological, political, ethnocentric, irredentist and illuminating/transfilling spirit. These dimensions were often contradictory and conflicting, as it still happens nowadays; on one hand the Greek university and the Greek society are turned towards a past that deserves to revive. On the other hand, the
emerging orders demand a more developmental/technological direction, always considering that the reforms are insufficient. Despite the compromising efforts, the more conservative parts of the society keep protesting, because in every reform they see the purpose of undermining classicist orientation and they think that all old traditional values are sacrificed for the sake of the new utilitarian spirit. Every attempt for reform rises accusations for the supposed undermining of the University’s national mission as conceived by its founders. The often instable political situation will afflict all attempted reforms and enclase the Greek University in an ethnocentric frame, although numerous scholars, both in humanities and sciences came out of the Greek university during this period. Most of the above characteristics could be met within the framework of current situation in Greece.

We should remember that in the beginning of the 20th century the so-called Great Idea is still at its peak and has not yet been abandoned; it will be abandoned right after the total military defeat of Greeks by the Turks in 1922 and the persecution of all Greek and Christian population from Asia Minor. Before that the extension of Greek territory against the Ottoman Empire is realized. Thessaly, Epirus, part of Macedonia, part of Thrace, the islands of the Aegean Sea are progressively added to the Greek State, while military defeats are not absent either, like that of 1897, after a war started by the Greeks against the Ottomans in an ambient of unreasonable national maximalism.

The each time annulment or interception of efforts to combine developmental needs with devotion to the glorious past is due to ideological and political, not financial reasons, as in Modern Greek political history a confusion of roles and actions is continued in the frame of capitalist milieu: on one hand the country’s capitalist modernization required the Higher Education to obtain a practical/financial/technological direction; on the other hand the most conservative and traditional institutions, although interweaved with the bourgeois, insisted on the ethnocentric model, mixed with the Helleno-Christian ideology. Social-political incidents constitute an explosive social-political context: the revolution in Goudi (1909); the movement in favor of the so-called popular language/demotike against the ancient Greek language (1903-6); Balkan wars, expedition in Asia Minor and defeat of the Greek army, death of the Great Idea (1912-1922); military adventures, political crises and instability during Middle War period, political instability after 1934, 2nd World War, civil war (1944-1949), political instability (1963-1965), dictatorship (1967-1974).

The two main views regarding Higher education used to be conflicting, but often found some kind of balance. Some of them are influenced by ethnocentrism and tradition, some others seek for a new developmental dimension. Historical and political peculiarities continue to require an enlightening role from the University; that is to transfer/transfill the light to the populations of the countries added to the Greek territory. This mentality often transforms Greek university into an arena of political strife. The adoption of the necessary developmental dimension is connected to both the final defeat of the Great Idea and the second, after Trikoupis, attempt by Prime
Minister Venizelos to transform Greece into a Western-type state. These contradictions have left their signs even after all successful (or less successful) bourgeois modernizations realized till the actual financial crisis.

In 1982 we have the most radical reform in Greek Higher Education that marked the fate of Greek Universities for the last decades: we have autonomy of the Departments at a high degree, academic and administrative autonomy of the institutions, diminution of the state’s interventions, ‘democratization’: I would say that the usurpation of the idea of nation by the dictatorship of 1967-1974 resulted at an overall abandonment of the ideological character of Athens University in particular. The surname of the University after 1982 is “democratic”, as it is administrated by collective/democratically elected councils, rectors or presidents, senate, etc, in which participation of all factors of university community is established: academic staff, students, administrative staff used to have a word in the university’s administration from 1982 to 2011, which was the cause of many problems, although good intensions are not doubted. It used to be, it is still, a University of “groups”, I am afraid with both negative and positive meaning of the term. An attempt to adapt Greek University to Bologna Declaration will be made with the 2007 reform, and finally in 2011-12, at the peak of the Greek economic crisis, the total reversal of the until then institutional frame will take place.

A part of the state’s influence will be recovered, the students’ and the administrative staff’s participation in the university’s administration will be totally repealed, foreign models will be adopted, both at positive and negative directions. Crisis was used as a pretext for modifications, but not only those aiming at the indispensable amelioration of the system. Today’s attempted reforms are suggested in the frame of circumstances regarded as constituting force majeure. The financial and social panic because of the crisis is used to justify a persistent attempt to denigrate Greek university in the public opinion; this depreciation is due to lack of authoritative information but also to major faults of the universities3.

In today’s Greek life, economic downturn, memorandum, severe austerity measures, economic recession, taxes, more taxes, diminutions of salaries, dismissals, unemployment, create an explosive mixture, and dominate in everyday reality and the citizens’ emotions. Those symptoms have a clearly technocratic/economic character, which is reasonable for a country facing or trying to recover from a major crisis, but this crisis has, I am afraid, left its serious marks on the function of the social system. More concretely, these circumstances have affected education in particular. As reminded by the recent report of the network Eurydice, EU, school reflects the way society is organized, functions, and develops, as it is the society that created school and formed it from a historical, economical, scientific and cultural point of view. In this frame, since 2010, there has been a reduction of funding education in 9 out of 25 EU countries, especially in Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, and Portugal. As a consequence

of financial crisis salaries of teachers were reduced in 11 countries, mainly Greece, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, and Spain. The diminution of salaries was followed by a diminution of personnel in 10 states – Greece being the first among them. Diminution of students in High school and Higher Education is also a rather expected consequence of the economic crisis. However, the number of those interested in Higher education remains very high in Greece, despite the diminution of this number during the last 5 years. In the OSPD countries except Greece a 33% of 18 years old young people enters the University, in Greece more than 66%. Moreover, as in Greece the number of the students entering universities each year is clausus/limited, 60,000 Greek students leave our country in order to do studies in Universities out of Greece, mainly European, although the number of Greek Universities (a few years ago 24, now 22) is considered as extremely high.

A system of freely entering the university had been widely implemented in Europe after the 2nd world war, the State completely funding Higher Education. But, as the number of the students increased, cost also increased, and, as a result, citizens became more and more unwilling to contribute by paying more taxes. The conflict between those two tensions has reduced funding the Universities and affected quality of Higher Education.

The Greeks’ obsession with Higher education is related to their willingness to ensure a better quality of life, which, according to the previous generation mentality, would come as a result of exercising a profession of white collar. As a result, Greeks of all social ranks, even the lowest, saw their children’s education as a kind of family investment, which the older members of the family were always willing to fund. This phenomenon has not stopped despite the strict restrictions for university entrance. Our exams system is really painful for students; every year exam constitutes a major social event even with political parameters, being the leading item in the tv news. This is how we are led to a high percentage in the Greek population having a degree in Higher education, which gives Greece a distinct position in the Balkans regarding this point. Many Greeks leave our country and find good positions abroad, based on their studies, and at the same time the percentage of people speaking foreign languages is among the highest worldwide. Almost 50% of Greek population speaks a foreign language, mainly English (French, German, and Italian come next). Luxemburg and Netherlands come first 90% of their population speak a second language; Italians, Spanish, and British are among the last 35%.

Does this mean the creation of a nation of scientists worthy of Guinness records Prize? In my opinion, absolutely and unfortunately not. The increase of the population’s cultural level is not analogous to the huge number of those having Higher education. I should remind that the initial motive for Higher Education studies had been the abandonment of agriculture and not its modernization, because the goal was to have a higher standard of living, but in an urban milieu. This mentality in combination with the post-war industrialization of the country led to

---

an intense urbanization: today half of Greek population lives in Athens (about 5 millions); only 1/10 of the population used to live in the capital at the end of the war.

Apart from that, while, at the beginning, Higher Education, either in natural sciences and engineering or in Humanities and theoretical sciences, secured professional reintegration to the graduates, the over-abundance of graduates had caused armies of unemployed graduates in the last decades. This development is made even more intense because of the lack of any orientation to studies leading to professions not yet congested: it seems that Greek Higher Education has provided the Greek society with more graduates in Humanities than needed: this reality has its origins in the orientation the Greek University used to have at its first steps. The candidate students select a scientific field based on fame, reputation, rumor or pure chance. In consequence, social disappointment is very serious, when they realize at last (but helas, too late), that Higher education does not guarantee someone that he/she will work in the field he/she has studied.

I don’t underestimate the fact that, thanks to the dominant mentality described, a large number employed in physical jobs or agriculture may have higher education, often in humanities or social sciences, even classics. The situation would have been theoretically ideal; we would have achieved to create a society of cultured manual or clerical workers; however this wide spread of Higher education has unfortunately involved a visible drop of its quality sometimes. This fall was not inevitable but became incontrovertible, as Higher education in Greece is completely free, there are no Private Universities, has also other distortions and rigidity that may render the system non-viable.

The number of students flooding Greek amphitheaters is huge, which deprives teaching and learning procedure of its necessary depth, identification and specialization. Sometimes teaching in University has been transformed into a general education, and as a result specialization is being certified mainly at a conclusive phase. Culture often becomes an individual “sport”, based on personal persistence and will; at the same time the level of the graduates is not homogenous, showing wide variations and fluctuations.

Moreover, I am afraid that, in this period of crisis, expenditure for education may be more and more presented as a load, as something superfluous and unnecessary. It is a burden which covertly or openly the state budget would like to get rid of. Using the crisis as a pretext, there is an attempt to adapt Higher Education to the Markets’ needs. One of the means to diminish funding is to deprive higher education of its collegial character, that is the interruption or/and the reversal of the course followed in the second half of 20th century, when entering the university of wide social ranks was the corollary to the rise of middle classes.

With this purpose a conversion of public opinion is systematically attempted, although for the moment most people a priori favor students university entrance: public opinion is continuously bombed by articles concluding that completely funding higher Education is a load unsustainable for state budgets, onerous cost does not bring tangible positive results, so it is unnecessary. On the other hand the importance and functionality of practical knowledge of exact sciences
or of skills instead of knowledge is over-emphasized; on the contrary theory, humanities are underestimated and often derided as high level talking shops, as mere abstractions. Worst of all, the entire problematic has gone far away from science; it no longer regards knowledge, research, experimentation, documentation, innovation, inquiring and questioning everything, that is the ideals, the principles of education in general. What is a desideratum now days is to have skills, i.e. what a profession needs, or what the markets need. Entrepreneurial mindset becomes more and more dominant in Higher Education.

Apart from all that, diachronic conflicts about the character of Higher Education have come back to the surface. The supposed emphasis of Greek Higher Education on classical past is accused to be one of the main reasons of the Greek society’s problems. Our education’s sociologic, historical, philosophical aspects are simply silenced, as humanities are identified with classics, in order to create an easier target to shoot against. Crisis has offered the reason and the pretext to reconsider the entire course of Higher Education, renewing the old complaints about the lack developmental dimension since its beginnings. The assassination of the first Greek Governor (I. Kapodistrias) who emphasized on Education’s technological directions is used as a constant pretext for the unilateralism of Greek system.

On the denigration of Humanities the two currently conflicting tendencies seem to agree: both the bourgeois Western-type modernization and leftist radicalism, the latter also dominated by economic analysis favoring utilitarian approaches. Thus, pure utility became a general desideratum, a suggestion coming from different ways of thinking and problematic. The defamation of humanities in general and classical studies in particular was also the result of the usurpation of classical studies from the part of the two dictatorships (1936-1941 and 1967-1974).

But defamation of humanities on a strictly utilitarian basis, with the argument that they are not useful, that they don’t bring any profit in the years of economic crisis, inevitably has lately reached the more “useful” economic studies, even practical/technological fields, Public Higher Education in general, as there are not private universities in Greece. Consequently the depreciation of classics is expanded to more “modern” fields. If the argument that, because humanities do not interest the markets, they are condemned to remain in some kind of “Museums of Education”, now the overall critical judgment concerns also other, more practical fields. The current view is that sciences also are not sufficiently connected with what the markets need and require. The whole discussion always end by pointing out the need for reforms6, whose intentions are apparently noble: to make savings by avoiding financing factors that do not deserve to be financed; as they do not bring any profit, they should not add excessive tax-load to citizens. Yet, the real danger is existing: the markets may obtain priority against all entities

producing knowledge, critical thought, innovation, fruitful discussion, communication.

The sincere declaration of all above pathogenicity symptoms has to encourage us to confront problems and not to “shoot the patient”, since the latter, although sick, continues to “produce”, both in the wide and the narrow sense of the word. The reformations pioneers need not to a priori annul all reformative efforts by connecting them with goals not always moral. If they are sincere in their purposes, they should start reformations from fields that undoubtedly need to be reformed, or at least from problems that all society agrees that they need to be cured. Mistakes, misunderstandings, inefficiency in Greek University, as in other countries also, indeed constitute a major problem, which however can be resolved. Greek society is at the position of handling with this problem and get rid of it, provided that we are all fully activated, provided that fear and idleness are abandoned. On the contrary, the loss of education as a civil good and the education’s reorientation according to the markets needs and priorities, constitute a danger of a different class, and its consequences would be irreversible, something like a cultural genocide, much worse than a financial bankrupt7.

So, instead of the indiscriminate coordination with whatever the markets need, instead of requiring skills, as if universities are business seeking for profit, what about inaugurating a noble “championship”? Instead of orientating our students towards what the markets need today, what about reminding our students and ourselves what our studies motives used to be just at the moment when these motives were born, before they are influenced by the economic-social contexts? What about redefining our role within Higher Education without perquisites, having love for knowledge as our only, or at least our main, motive? What about remembering that Higher education comes as a fruit of our desire for research, for thought, for expression, for critical thought, even though studies do not necessarily lead to a good salary?

With all this I don’t fanatically refute any connection of academic work with social context in the framework of which it is created8. It is the exaggeration, the total reversal of roles that I condemn. I think that the absence of moderation is catastrophic, I criticize the total adoption of the markets’ adoration rhetoric, I am looking for the principle of moderation, the metron, the optimum measure, this principle that University has the mission to preserve, and transfer, a principle fundamental for the Western way of thinking. Markets are incapable of implementing this rule, the way they face crises with losses in human lives, properties, jobs. It is the need not to forget the open mind of critical thought that I am pointing out, because this principle lies at the foundation and the survival of a University. The connection of the University with profit, skills, utility has not to annul its principal character as a field appropriate for critical exercise, innovation, questioning everything.

7 See G. Pefanis, “The principle of ‘return’ and the University”, To Βήμα, 13.0.7.2014.
In Greece this (frequent in the West) problematic has perceived a more dramatic tone because of the compressive financial circumstances, often resulting in non-calm considerations. It is difficult to combine two conflicting tendencies, incompatible in principle:

On one hand, in the frame of a panic for immediate reforms, the entire history of Greek university is incautiously depreciated. A complete deconstruction of Greek university is been undertaken instead of its necessary improvement and adaptation to new conditions through the correction of the existing inevitable failures. Instead of the comparative systematic study of other countries educational models, that have similar characteristics to the Greek system, instead of enriching the Greek system with the experience of other systems with really positive results, the direct implantation of already outdated, needing reform models is attempted. In this way what is supposed to need cure is being perpetuated: slow progress, the delay of Greek education.

By definition the overall self-subordinating, unquestioning adoption of matured or rather overripe models that have already presented signs of fatigue or ailment, practically condemns Greek university to a permanent delay; the innovation gap will be always widening, if Greek university does not search for its own identity and special character, if it does not enshrine a role of its own, which will render it eligible from Greek students not only because it is sited in Greece, but also attractive for foreign students.

On the other hand, the violent attack against both existing pathogenic rigidities and positive aspects of Greek society because of the crisis has born stiffness as a reflex. The reaction to the full-on attack is often fear for the necessary modifications, as reforms have already been slandered and therefore a priori undermined by those who, in respect of the crisis, have found a good pretext to demolish labor rights or to appropriate public property at a derisory price. Thus, behind those fair people, naturally defending against the indiscriminate attack, there are others, half-hiding, unfair. The latter cover their personal indolence, or mediocrity under a demagogic and deeply conservative demand that nothing changes.

In this ambient, as happens in the society in general, in the field of education four groups expectedly conflicted, the ones running through the corpus of Greek society:
1. Those saying that we should change everything, no matter if we demolish everything.
2. Those suggesting that we should demolish everything, because they really want to change nothing.
3. Those saying that we should not change anything so that we don’t demolish our country. And finally.
4. Those proposing to change everything or many things, provided that we don’t demolish our country, provided that we don’t annul any good facet of our society; and there are plenty of
those positive aspects in Greek today’s reality. Because those last propose the most tiring, selective, demanding and responsible course, their voice is not always listened, because it often fades out in the increasing populism of two different kinds: of those obsessed with ill-judged reforms and of the opposite “party”, those fossilized pretending to be heroically resistant rebels.

However, the progress of societies, since the years of Gracchi, if I am allowed to remember one of my favorite periods because of my academic field, often goes on thanks to the headlong rush, thanks to the courageous acts of brave persons, solid and flourishing groups, although frequently being a minority, although those pioneers have to pay a high cost at the beginning and their offer is often only \textit{a posteriori or post mortem} acknowledged. The case of Prime Minister Papanastasiou or the pedagogue Delmouzos are characteristic regarding the field of education; the cases of the first governor I. Kapodistrias, of Prime Minister E. Venizelos, of Prime Minister K. Karamanlis the elder are characteristic in Greek political history. So, today, I believe that we may be optimistic, hope that Greek society will get over the actual crisis – moreover since disorderly bankruptcy has fortunately been avoided. We are permitted to hope that necessary reforms and regulations (not the proposed indiscriminate deregulations) will be implemented, even if some brave pioneers will need to suffer a little more.

These are the 22 Greek Universities actually.
2. Polytechnics Scholl is founded in 1843-4. 1863 Higher Education (founded by king Otto).
3. Agricultural University of Athens 1920 (Prime Minister Venizelos).
4. Economic University of Athens 1920 (Prime Minister Venizelos).
5. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki 1925 (Prime Minister Papanastasiou).
7. School of Arts 1930 (Prime Minister Venizelos).
10. University of Patras 1964 (Prime Minister G. Papandreou, the elder). Medicine, Humanities, Natural sciences.
12. Democritus University of Thrace 1973 (under the dictatorship of Papadopoulos). All Faculties.
14. Polytechnics school of Crete 1977 (Prime Minister Karamanlis, the elder).
22. International University of Greece, 2005 (Prime Minister Karamanlis, the younger). Economics, Business administration, Humanities, Science and Technology.