already have formed an opinion about the former question.

D.A. I am beginning to infer that when the London Mathematical Society decided to publish this work, they didn't seek your opinion?

E.W. I do wish you wouldn't ask me about matters which are confidential.

D.A. I go on to infer that they must have preferred some other opinion; perhaps someone better qualified by being closer to the subject or more sympathetic to it?

EXPERT WITNESS. This conjecture follows from the former one.

DEVIL'S, ADVOCATE. Let us try another expert witness; they come two a penny.

## REFERENCES

1. M. F. Atiyah, *Bordism and cobordism*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 57 (1961), 200–208. MR 23 #A4150.

2. M. F. Atiyah and F. Hirzebruch, Vector bundles and homogeneous spaces, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 3, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1961, pp. 7-38. MR 25 #2617.

**3.** N. A. Baas, On bordism theory of manifolds with singularities, Math. Scand. **33** (1973), 279–302 (1974). MR **49** #11547b.

4. E. H. Brown, Jr., Cohomology theories, Ann. of Math. (2) 75 (1962), 467–484. MR 25 #1551.
5. \_\_\_\_\_, Abstract homotopy theory, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 119 (1965), 79–85. MR 32 #452.

6. S. Eilenberg, Singular homology theory, Ann. of Math. (2) 45 (1944), 407-447. MR 6, 96.

7. S. Eilenberg and N. E. Steenrod, Axiomatic approach to homology theory, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 31 (1945), 117–120. MR 6, 279.

8. R. E. Stong, Notes on cobordism theory. Mathematical notes, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J.; Univ. of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1968. MR 40 #2108.

9. R. Thom, Quelques propriétés globales des variétés différentiables, Comment. Math. Helv. 28 (1954), 17-86. MR 15, 890.

10. G. W. Whitehead, Generalized homology theories, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 102 (1962), 227-283. MR 25 # 573.

J. F. Adams

BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY Volume 83, Number 2, March 1977

Foundations of quantum physics, by C. Piron, Mathematical Physics Monograph Series, no. 19, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Massachusetts, 1976, xii + 123 pp., \$17.50 (cloth) and \$8.50 (paper).

Ever since the physicists' discovery that a logically coherent and physically acceptable treatment of atomic and subatomic systems has to be based on principles that are profoundly different from those of classical physics, the problem of understanding and clarifying these principles has engaged the attention of many mathematicians, theoretical physicists, and philosophers. That such discussions continue to go on, and often reveal new aspects fifty years after the original discoveries of the physicists, indicates the remarkable nature of these new ideas as well as the extent of their departure from classical lines of thought.

To trace the origin and development of these ideas is a formidable task; in the framework of the present review it is an impossible one. Suffice it to say that the tremendous difficulties in explaining the mass of spectroscopic data