"Human Knowledge"). He makes the usual onslaught of advocates of frequency theories on the "principle of indifference", the function of which was to state ignorance and give the applications a possible starting point. He even states that no modification that would meet one of his difficulties has ever been suggested—in fact, I gave one in 1931, and modifications for other cases have been suggested at various times since 1919.

The book is difficult to read; for example, "theorem" and "axiom" appear to be treated as synonymous on p. 58, and there are far too many forward references. However, some of the comments are very apt. To some extent they overlap those in Bertrand Russell's "Human Knowledge", on which I comment in a forthcoming paper in *Mind*.

There is abundant work to be done in probability theory, and philosophers can make and have made important contributions. However, these contributions will be better when more philosophers find time to attend to constructive developments in the rational belief theory within the past thirty years.

HAROLD JEFFREYS

THE PLANNING OF CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge Planning Proposals

A Report to the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Cambridgeshire County Council. By Prof. William Holford and H. Myles Wright. Vol. 1: Pp. xvi+102+9 plates. Vol. 2: Maps and Drawings. Pp. viii+58. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950.) 30s. net.

CAN Cambridge control its own destiny in the face of a multitude of unplanned events which may affect its shape, size and appearance in the coming years? This is the question posed by Prof. W. Holford and Mr. H. Myles Wright in the proposals placed by them before the Cambridgeshire County Council; this body has in its turn to submit next year to the Minister of Town and Country Planning a development plan for Cambridgeshire. The planning of Cambridge, a unique university and market town, is a matter of national interest, and the University, Borough and County are all closely concerned in finding the right solution.

The determining factor in the proposed plan is that the growth of the population of Cambridge should be controlled, the future population not being allowed greatly to exceed the present figure. It is to be hoped that this will meet with no serious opposition. The second feature in the plan is that the centre of the town shall be left essentially unchanged, and that relief from the rapidly growing traffic problem should be found in a scheme of by-pass roads in the outskirts and relief roads in the centre.

One important problem is to induce traffic to keep clear so far as possible of what the authors call the "spine road"—that which starts in the south as Hills Road and ends in the north as Huntingdon Road, changing its name seven times on its way through the town. A relief road from the Histon Road corner at the top of Castle Hill, running nearly parallel to the spine on the east side and rejoining it at the corner of Emmanuel Road, is projected; this road has two unfortunate features which the authors have found it impossible to avoid. It involves calling upon Jesus College to sacrifice private land and amenities,

and it crosses Christ's Pieces. The second relief road is on the west side of the spine, continuing a widened Guildhall Street through to the end of Downing Street opposite Emmanuel College; this scheme includes a large car park, which is badly needed. When these streets are completed, it is proposed that the present bridge over the River Cam by Magdalene College shall be closed to vehicular traffic—a further incentive to traffic to avoid using the spine road, even in part, for through movement. These two new roads, with a somewhat elaborate system of traffic circulation by one-way roads, should take care of the more serious traffic problems in the town centre.

Next comes the scheme for keeping heavy through-traffic out of the central portion of the town. An outer ring has two by-pass roads: that to the east leaves the road to Royston, A10, beyond Trumpington and crosses the Cam by a new bridge at Chesterton, swinging round north of the town to join the St. Neot's Road west of Madingley Wood; the other, shorter by-pass road on the west side, proceeds via Grantchester and Coton to the Madingley Road at the foot of Madingley Hill. Parts of these outer by-pass roads belong to a long-term programme. An inner ring road is also projected, of which the western route runs along Chaucer Road, crossing the Cam by a new bridge on to Barton Road, thence northward to Madingley Road, which it crosses just east of the Observatory and on to Huntingdon Road. This road is designed to free the Backs of through-traffic from the Huntingdon Road to the south. One very serious criticism must be made of this plan, and that is the choice of the point where the road crosses Madingley Road.

The public-spirited action of St. John's College, the late Prof. Newall and Trinity College has kept the Observatory clear of buildings on its eastern and southern sides. This new scheme proposes a trunk route, presumably taking heavy traffic with blazing headlights at night, approaching the Observatory directly from the south and passing close to the Observatory grounds on the east side. If the Observatory is to continue to function properly, this inner ring road must be diverted to another crossing point, preferably on the west side of the University Farm. Very little farther distance would be involved for the traffic, and the need to move the Observatory farther away from Cambridge would be avoided. Care should be taken to dislocate as little as possible the experimental work of the University Farm. The very heavy expense involved in moving the Observatory would be obviated. It can be said that in all innocence the planners have selected the very worst point for crossing the Madingley Road with their inner ring road. It will ultimately involve the University in the maximum expense and dislocation of scientific work. It is not too late yet to alter the lay-out of this road and to modify plans for new University buildings not yet erected.

Other points of interest in the general scheme are to be found in the provision of access to the railway station from the east side (though no change is contemplated in its unique platform arrangements) and in the regulation of extensions of building with a refusal to allow further ribbon development and extension to the west. The two attractive volumes containing the proposals bear throughout the hall-mark of the Cambridge University Press, and the fifty-eight maps that illustrate the proposals are enlightening and convincing.

F. J. M. STRATTON