

Dear Members of the Academy.

I was asked some time ago by Sonja Brentjes, the President and Efthymios Nicolaidis, the Secretary-general to comment on the draft documents of the Academy.

I apologize for being very brief here due to heavy work I have at the moment. I was shocked by the reluctance of members in participating to the election of new members. I was disappointed that so few members participated to the election. This was a very simple voting process. Nevertheless, no interest was shown. It is possible that few people know each other, but the list of publications was good enough to select new members. Here are my views:

Yes, I support single membership.

A layered fee structure is fine. As a retired professor I earn 1500 Euros per month. Thus, I can easily pay 40 Euros. This structure will also help attracting young people to the Academy.

Level 1: 40 Euro for income <2500 Euro
Level 2: 80 Euro for income > 2500 but less than 4000 Euro
Level 3: 120 Euro for income about 4000 Euro
Level 4: 150 Euro to support the Academy.

I support the creation of a special fond for members with income less 2500 Euros to apply for grants, in particular travel grants to participate in meetings or workshops of the Academy. Throughout my professional life, I met many young people who were unable to attend symposia due the lack of financial support.

Regarding the statutes, if the fees are structured as in the layered structure proposed, the Academy may exclude members who do not pay fees.

The duties of the Secretary-general should be defined in detail. I believe that the Secretary-general should not take administrative decisions, issue announcements, organize meetings and events etc. without consulting and approval of the President, and in some cases the Council. The word and opinion of the President should be taken in consideration.

Electoral rules for new members: Of course, a minimum quality rule is needed for nominations. I cannot decide for the number of peer-reviewed or reviewed articles, monographs, edited books etc. The council should decide this. My experience is that the article may not be original even if the article is published in a peer-reviewed or reviewed journal. Thus, members should be very careful. The number of articles is not always is not always decisive.

I visited the comments given by Catherine Jami on the site of the Academy. There are valuable comments, I believe that a number of them are useful. In short, changes are needed in the statutes and administration of the Academy founded in 1927-28 to guarantee its future. It also needs rejuvenation and regeneration in order to make the academy more active and attractive for younger people. It should be a vivid centre for research in history of science and technology while keeping its academic character. The Academy should not be an institution conferring honorific memberships only. It should financially help its members to do research on the history of science and technology. For this, administrators should collaborate with international donors to raise money. What the Academy needs, is money for its projects.

Best regards,
Feza Günergun