

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS

It is hard to convey in general statements the detailed procedures and the "atmosphere" of the Committee in its selection of fellows. This year about three hundred of the six hundred candidates were of such quality that digests of their records and recommendations were sent in advance to the members of the Committee (usually in batches of 30 or 40 at a time) and were studied and tentatively rated by the members individually. Three formal meetings of the Committee were held. Following the first two meetings many questions which came up in discussions were followed up by letters and personal interviews. In addition to the earlier interviews by Mr. Paty, individual members of the Committee each took half a dozen or so of the doubtful candidates for interviews and personal investigation.

Of the candidates, about 30 (out of a final list of 54 awards) seemed perfectly clear to all Committee members at the first meeting and were at once approved. About another 30 looked tops but required further evidence to convince one or more of the Committee. A third 30 looked promising enough for further study, including interviews. Quickly a dozen of the third thirty were eliminated and the bulk of the time of the Committee and the officers was spent on the 40 or 50 candidates who were active competitors for the 20 to 25 awards remaining after the first unanimous approvals.