sentation of points in closed bounded convex separable subspaces of spaces with the RNP and Phelp's theorem that X possesses the RNP if and only if each nonempty closed bounded convex set in X is the closed convex hull of its strongly exposed points.

In sum, the book is a valuable source to workers in the area of Banach spaces. It is full of details and proofs which are concisely and clearly presented. It is a welcome addition to the growing number of books on Banach spaces.

H. ELTON LACEY

BULLETIN OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 82, Number 5, September 1976

Statistical prediction analysis, by J. Aitchison and I. R. Dunsmore, Cambridge Univ. Press, London, New York, Melbourne, 1975, xi + 273 pp., $24.50.

No doubt future statisticians will find it remarkable that not before the last quarter of the 20th century, did a textbook on what Statistics is really about, finally appear. Too long has the estimation of parameters dominated statistical theory and consequently warped and cluttered up the methodology–the raison d'être of the field, while the prediction of observables, which should have been preeminent, receded into the background. There are several reasons why this occurred. Chief among them is the tremendous preoccupation that theoreticians have had analysing the logical distinctions inherent in the various so-called modes of Inference, i.e., Bayesian (Jefferies, de Finetti, Savage), Frequentist (Neyman-Pearson), Fiducial (Fisher), Likelihood (Fisher, Barnard), etc., rather than what should be the proper subject for statistical analysis–parameters or potential observables. In the early history of Statistics there was no sharp distinction drawn between statistics (functions of observables) and hypothetical parameters, resulting in the tendency for the issue to be obscured. R. A. Fisher correctly made the sharp distinction necessary for the advance of thinking in this area. But since then and apparently through no fault of Fisher's, mathematical statisticians became so enamoured of those artificial constructs–parameters, that all their work tended to be framed and executed parametrically. Oddly enough even in that branch of Statistics which is often referred to as Non-Parametric Inference, developers and practitioners also attempt, to this day, to orient their work towards the estimation of parameters–so ingrained is the habit. Some, perhaps realizing the paradox, even altered the taxonomy by referring to this branch as Distribution-Free Inference.

One must also realize that the parametric approach has advantages, though illusory. Mathematical statisticians using any mode were often seduced by the niceties of the mathematics of parametric structures. Making precise statements about unobservables, i.e., parameters, also serves applied statisticians very well in that it is virtually impossible to contradict them by observation. Of course a predictivist, who by definition is in the business of making statements about potential observables, lacks such security. His statements, to