In 1931, Frank Fetter published his *Monetary Inflation in Chile*; in 1980, he published *The Economist in Parliament: 1780-1868*. In between he published five other books, including his *Development of British Monetary Orthodoxy, 1797-1875*, and over thirty articles. Although he has worked in other areas, such as international trade and macroeconomics, his principal efforts have been devoted to the history of economic thought, particularly to British thought in the nineteenth century. He has written, for example, on John Wheatley, Francis Horner, Thomas Attwood, the Bullion report, Robert Torrens, and Ricardian economics. He has uncovered the authorship of economic articles in the *Edinburgh Review*, *Quarterly Review*, *Blackwood 's Edinburgh Magazine*, and *The Westminster Review* and interpreted the economic controversies in those reviews during the first half of the nineteenth century. Since his retirement in 1967 from Northwestern University, his research has continued unabated. Professor Fetter has led a life of productive scholarship of the highest order and has earned the respect and gratitude of the economics profession, especially those of us in the history of economic thought whose work his has enhanced.
Remarks of Frank W. Fetter, on receiving a citation of "Distinguished Fellow" from the History of Economics Society, May 25, 1982.

Under any circumstances I would be pleased and honored to be called a "distinguished fellow" by my colleagues who work the vineyard of the history of economic thought and economic controversy. But my pleasure is even greater that I should get reflected glory by having Joe Dorfman as my fellow "distinguished" fellow. Few doctoral theses have equaled Joe's *Thorstein Veblen and His America* in its contribution to economics and in its continuing recognition as a model of research and interpretation; and his five-volume *Economic Mind in American Civilization* is still a must for anyone who wants to understand American economic thinking against the broad background of American growth.

I am reminded of a story told about Philadelphia society when social distinctions were more carefully observed than in the more egalitarian present. At the top of the Philadelphia social scale was a family - let's call it the A family - and further down the scale was a family - let's call it the B family. It used to be said that when a B was drunk he thought that he was an A. I am not aware that I ever imbibed enough to think that I was a Joe Dorfman. So you can realize how satisfying it is, even if I drink nothing stronger than Coca Cola, to know that my colleagues in the History of Economics have suggested that I may consider myself in the company of Joe Dorfman.

Thank you.

Frank Fetter