

VIII

The Disruption of the Newcastle Medical School in 1851 and its Consequences

Stephen Harbottle

THE FOUNDATION of the Newcastle School of Medicine is generally dated to 1834, but in 1851 a fundamental and violent quarrel broke out between the proprietary lecturers at the school, who were all practising medical men of distinction in the town, which resulted in the total disruption of the school as it existed at that date. This radical division continued until 1857. An account of these events has not only the intrinsic interest which is always provided by the behaviour of professional gentlemen in dispute, but also throws a revealing light upon the close-knit relationships of the local establishment of the time. Moreover, the consequences were lasting, and probably had the effect of delaying the creation of a university in Newcastle until this century.

The quarrel arose primarily, I shall suggest, from a violent clash of personalities. It was characterized by personal abuse of an extravagant nature, with pamphlets and newspaper advertisements couched in pompous Victorian prose complete with frequent dashes of hypocrisy, and containing assertions which would nowadays have justified a score of libel actions. A principal participant in the quarrel, and subsequently the historian of the Medical School, was Dr. Dennis Embleton. His *History* does not convey the true vulgar flavour of what happened—no doubt he was concerned not to open old sores—but in fact the whole event makes excellent reading. However, if it is to be properly appreciated, one has to look closely at the leading individuals involved, and I propose to begin with a note on each of them.

1 The Main Protagonists

First, of course, there is Dr. Embleton himself.

In 1851 he was aged 41, and had been in practice in Newcastle as a physician for 12 years. He had trained in Newcastle and London from 1828 to 1834, when he qualified as a member of the Royal College of Surgeons. He then spent two years abroad, spending some time at Pisa University and some in hospitals in Paris. He returned home in 1837 and in the following year became a lecturer at the School of Medicine. He was a keen naturalist, a close friend of the Hancocks and a founder member of the Tyneside Field Club. In April 1849 he was elected to the Board of the Newcastle Poor Law Guardians for St. Andrew's Ward, an apparently harmless appointment which was to have, as we shall see, an unexpected and disagreeable consequence. The experience and sophistication which he derived from his training and travels were to stand him in good stead. As the dispute proceeds one is struck by the intelligent vigour with which he leads his party, responding instantly to each foray by the enemy and shrewdly securing the support of the professional and educational opinion necessary for victory. This is to be the main crisis of his career.¹

The key to his ultimate success was the alliance he formed with the Venerable Charles Thorp, Archdeacon of Durham and Warden of the University. In 1851 the Warden was aged 67. He had been Archdeacon for 19 years, and Warden since 1837 when the University was incorporated. His correspondence shows his own financial support for his institution, and a diligent pressure upon Government and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for its progress. He was in addition a Crewe Trustee and the Rector of Ryton. There were naturally conflicting contemporary views of his qualities.

Mr. Newton, the eloquent lecturer supporting Dr. Embleton's opponent, Sir John Fife, pauses in a stream of insults to Dr. Embleton, to refer to the Archdeacon as "this reverend pluralist".² "Sketches of Public Men of the North" is even more direct. "His face is party-coloured. In his head are located a pair of small, twinkling eyes, full of craft and cunning. In stature he rather exceeds the middle height. His charities cannot be measured. His own left hand has no chance of knowing the bounties practised by his right. As a commercial man, he would have made a rapid fortune on the stock, or rather on the coal, exchange . . . He is the reputed author of the medical squabble in Newcastle. To both parties he displayed his usual facility of character and highly elastic principle . . . His speech is like the purring of a cat, and his eye restless in its feline treachery . . ." There is much more of the same, which I omit. What it all shows for our purposes, however, is that the Archdeacon was an experienced operator, whom it was very desirable to have on one's side.³

Dr. Embleton's formidable opponent was Sir John Fife, the founder of the Medical School in 1834. Fifteen years older than Dr. Embleton, he had been Mayor of Newcastle twice, and in practice as a surgeon for over 30 years, by the time the dispute broke out. He had been a leader of the parliamentary reform movement in Newcastle, and the chief organizer of a great demonstration on the Town Moor in October 1831 after the Reform Bill was rejected, when he addressed the crowd to great effect. He was elected Mayor for the first time in 1838, and found himself a few months later, to loud accusations of having turned his coat, assisting with notable courage in the suppression of Chartist riots in Newcastle. His knighthood from a grateful Government followed in 1840. He was a man therefore of considerable political experience and influence.⁴ He is dealt with more mildly than is Archdeacon Thorp in the pages of "Sketches of Public Men of the North". "Clever—ready without learning—fluent without passion—sensible without wit or humour—correct without being profound—a debater without fire or

effect—a frequent expounder of principles without patient and careful study . . . Sir John Fife has accomplished wonders . . . If he had been more striking in mental power he would not have been a local surgeon . . ."⁵

Then there is Dr. T. E. Headlam, at 74 the oldest of the five men we are considering. His significance was perhaps mostly in his ability to lend to Dr. Embleton's party the respect in which he was evidently held, as one of the oldest practising physicians in the town—he had been a physician at the Infirmary since 1805—coupled with the political abilities evinced by his election as Mayor on two occasions, in 1837 and 1845.⁶ But his qualities were more complicated than I suggest, if "Sketches of Public Men of the North" is to be believed. "He is quick and shrewd. Cold as the icicle on the wall, he is never found disarmed or at a disadvantage by those who approach him. There is no enthusiasm in Dr. Headlam for any man or any cause . . . The Doctor's long, pale, sharp face and a certain sententious, grave, guttural style of addressing you, cause you to believe that the Doctor would have been a better judicial functionary than a physician . . ."⁷ He may well, then, have been a more active opponent of Sir John Fife than I suppose, though they had stood side by side in the affray with the Chartists in Collingwood Street in July 1839.

Finally we have the solicitor John Clayton, now 59 and Town Clerk for the past 29 years. Of course, strictly speaking, he had no direct interest in the dispute, but one cannot but be conscious of his quiet influence brought to bear at many crucial moments in the struggle. Dr. Embleton was his client, but he was also a supporter of the Embleton party as a matter of policy on other occasions. Good humour, tact, a retentive memory, a feeling for the possible and the holding of numerous official positions were his strengths, and it will become clear that at every meeting where he is present, the Embleton cause, for one reason or another, sometimes apparent and sometimes concealed, will succeed. The author of the "Sketches of Public Men" is baffled by him. He calls him "bland and prudent". He suggests that his only

real interest is in the accumulation of wealth. The subtleties of John Clayton were beyond him.

These, then, were the main actors in the dispute, and I turn now to consider why it arose in the first place.

2 The Dispute's Origins as seen by Dr. Embleton

As mentioned above, Dr. Embleton became a member of the Board of the Newcastle Poor Law Guardians in April 1849. He took on this responsibility (which involved a weekly meeting and committee meetings in addition) presumably as a matter of public duty, but also no doubt to get his name known in the town. It has been generally accepted that it was a vote given by him at the Board in 1851 that was the final blow to the already precarious unity of the Medical School. The problem arose in this way.

One of the functions of the Poor Law Guardians was the provision of a medical officer to serve in each district of the Union and also in the workhouse. The stipends paid varied (presumably in relation to the size of the district) from £100 to £50 per annum, one district and the workhouse being held in plurality. While the payments were not large, they obviously represented a very useful regular addition to a medical practitioner's casual fees.⁸

Among the medical officers from 1844 was William Newton who became in 1849 a lecturer in the School of Medicine. A natural controversialist, he held liberal views on political, religious and social matters (which he was to display publicly after his election to the Town Council in November 1851), and I suspect that from their first acquaintance he and Dr. Embleton were at odds.⁹

During September 1849 there was an outbreak of cholera in Newton's district and another lecturer, Mr. W. R. Shiell, was appointed as his assistant at a guinea a day for a month or so. Then, after a series of complaints in 1850 against the medical officer for District No 1, William Turner (largely alleging failures to attend patients promptly or often

enough), the Board decided in October 1850 to suspend Mr. Turner and provisionally appoint Mr. William Winship, an old friend and fellow student of Dr. Embleton.¹⁰ While the suspension seems to have been lifted in December, the Poor Law Board (which had been consulted as the national authority) suggested that Turner's appointment, which expired at Lady Day 1851, should not be renewed.¹¹

On 21 March 1851, therefore, there was an election by the Poor Law Guardians of a medical officer for District No 1. There were two candidates, both lecturers, namely Mr. Shiell who was evidently a friend of Mr. Newton, and Mr. Winship the friend of Dr. Embleton. The result was a win for Mr. Winship by 15 votes to 13. Dr. Embleton voted for Winship. The Board's chairman, Henry Ingledeu, voted for Shiell, who also won a block vote of nine from All Saints Ward which was the district in question. The votes from the remaining wards were divided. It is to be noted that if Dr. Embleton had voted for Shiell, there would have been a tie.¹²

The result was bitterly resented by Shiell, who wrote to the lecturers at the Medical School on 2 April 1851 alleging that "at the late election of Surgeon in the Newcastle Union, Dr. Embleton, by his vote recorded against me, censured my professional character, and thereby made an invidious comparison between the other candidate and myself" and saying that either Dr. Embleton or he must retire from their respective "chairs" as lecturer.¹³

With this remarkably silly letter (the bogus indignation of which gives strong indications of its having been composed by Mr. Newton, whose epistolary style we shall often have the pleasure of considering later) the overt quarrel that destroyed the Medical School began.

3 The Dispute's Origins Reconsidered

Dr. Embleton begins his Medical School History with a judicious summary of the conflicting evidence as to whether Dr. George Fife or his brother Sir John Fife was the true inventor of the School. He seems to favour Dr. George,

though I suspect a natural prejudice against Sir John, who he admits was the founder by popular report. In any case, medical lectures seem to have been given on an irregular basis from about 1832–3, and then regularly from October 1834, when a lease was taken of the Barber-Surgeons' Hall. Some financial contributions were made by Newcastle Corporation, the Duke of Northumberland and Sir Matthew White Ridley towards the formation of a Museum and Sir John Fife himself also gave some financial help. Over the period 1834 to 1850 there seem to have been about seven lecturers for the Winter Session with an average of 22 students and a smaller number of lecturers for the Summer, with an average 15 students or so. A ticket for the lectures cost 40 guineas, and another 5 guineas (rising by 1849 to 17 guineas) was payable for hospital practice at the Infirmary.¹⁴

By the year 1851, therefore, the School was well established. It is true that the Barber-Surgeons' Hall was due for demolition that year in connection with the extension of the railway northwards from Newcastle, but this had been known since 1847, and the foundation stone of the new hall, to be constructed at the cost of the railway company, was laid on 6 January 1851 in Victoria Street off Westmorland Road by no lesser person than the Venerable Charles Thorp. Why then did the whole enterprise fall into disarray no more than six months later, with old associates, if not close friends, in bitter conflict, which was to persist for the next five years? Can it really all have arisen from the giving of a single vote, not in itself decisive, by one lecturer on the Board of Guardians in favour of a friend rather than another lecturer? Dr. Embleton offers no other cause, and this has become the accepted version. It is noticeable, however, that he passes over without mention the events of the 1843–44 session discussed below, save to mention that Sir John Fife then ceased to lecture though retaining an interest in the School. One might think that Dr. Embleton would find it preferable to base the disruption on the foolishness of Messrs. Shiell and Newton, without reference to his own conduct. It seems to me that there must

have been deep pent-up feelings of distrust or dislike between the lecturers generally, if such a comparatively trivial event as a vote in an outside body was to have such violent results. I can offer no firm solution as to the cause, but there are strong indications.

By 1850 there were ten proprietary lecturers at the School who, strictly speaking, I suppose, were in fact in partnership, but as Dr. Embleton finally observes there was little in common between them, and outside the School they were in competition for patients and medical appointments. No accounts of the School's finances appear to have been prepared by the Secretary, Dr. Dawson, until September 1850 when he produced some very summary accounts for the period Winter 1843–44 to Summer 1850. These showed that there were no profits to divide and no great reserve of funds, but one may imagine that the absence of a regular account would make worse any other differences that arose. And there were other differences.¹⁵

In the first place, there was evidently disagreement in the 1843–44 session as to how much time the lecturers should devote to the School. Sir John Fife refers in his inaugural speech given to the College of Practical Science at the beginning of October 1851 to the 70 lectures a year which he had given to the old School for 12 years, and then adds obscurely, "but about 6 years ago circumstances occurred which he would not enter into, and was willing to forget, that led him to resign".¹⁶ Certainly he did not lecture after 1843–44, though he remained the ruling spirit in the School's management. The incident is presumably that made much of in a statement dated 13 September 1851 by the lecturers of the College of Practical Science (whose foundation is described later), where, after asserting that Drs. Embleton and Charlton had only entered the School after Sir John Fife and his colleagues had brought it through its early difficulties, they complain that Embleton, Charlton and two others who had left the town "formed . . . a majority of the Lecturers present on a certain occasion, when they passed a resolution that the Demonstrators of Anatomy (Mr. Fife and

Mr. J. B. Fife) should each spend six hours every day in the Dissecting Room, a condition unprecedented, and which was objected to by Sir John Fife, as forcing him and his sons to resign. To this Dr. Embleton offensively replied that the name of Fife occurred so often in the prospectus, that the School might be accused of nepotism". According to the statement, the Fifes then resigned (which is correct), and shortly afterwards the resolution was rescinded.¹⁷

The account in the statement is no doubt selective, but it has the ring of truth. It is consistent with the clear and immediate division between Dr. Embleton and Sir John Fife which became evident at the time of the actual disruption of the School. It also leads one to wonder whether Sir John did not see Dr. Embleton's plan for the connection of the School with Durham University (to which I refer below) as the final blow to his concept of an institution which he had largely created.

It is not quite clear who was responsible for the original approach by the Medical School to Durham University in 1850. It was certainly an approach which was welcome to the Warden, for he was anxious to expand his University into areas wider than those of classics and divinity. (A proposal for a School of Mines, for example, was under consideration at the same time as the discussions with the Medical School.) Dr. Embleton had been in touch with the Warden on another matter (the Newby Scholarship) in 1849,¹⁸ and therefore it is likely to be he who is referred to in the very carefully composed minute of a Senate meeting on 11 June 1850 which reads "The Warden communicated to the Senate a correspondence which he has had with *some persons* [my italics] in Newcastle who are desirous of establishing there a medical school in connection with this University . . ."¹⁹ One may wonder why no names are mentioned. One can infer that the approach had no general authority from the lecturers and that Dr. Embleton had been sent away to get it.

Dr. Embleton's history is a little less than candid on the point. He says that he told Dr. Dawson, the Secretary, in August 1850 (that is,

two months later) of his idea that a connection with the University might be for the benefit of the School, and added that he knew the Warden, who was then staying at Bamburgh Castle (in his capacity as a Crewe Trustee). He would like to call on the Warden and explain the proposal. Dr. Dawson highly approved, and so Dr. Embleton went, was received by the Warden "in his usual most courteous manner" and, as the days were shortening, stayed the night. The meeting was quite evidently arranged beforehand. Since the Senate had agreed in June to receive any proposals and consider them, and then set up a negotiating committee in November, it is also misleading to suggest, as Dr. Embleton infers, that further communications did not take place for 11 months because of delay by the University.²⁰ Indeed a casual sneer by Mr. Newton, almost deliberately designed to worsen the existing quarrel, made during the meeting of the lecturers on 16 April 1851, at the slowness of the Committee of which Dr. Embleton was a member and which was conducting the negotiations with the University, indicates that the trouble lay elsewhere.²¹ It is certainly true that (as mentioned above) Archdeacon Thorp laid the foundation stone of the new Barber-Surgeons' Hall in January 1851, and that Sir John Fife took the chair at the dinner which followed. On the face of it all was going well, but when one reads the address which Mr. H. G. Potter (a supporter of Sir John) gave in October 1854, when he speaks of the junction with the University as "a most foolish and fatal procedure for any free institution to adopt", one can see where the difficulty really lay.²² For Sir John Fife, and some at least of those with him, the loss of independence which, they had come to realize, would result from a connection with Durham University, was unacceptable. The proposals were the brainchild of Dr. Embleton, with whom Sir John had already quarrelled. If this interpretation of these events be right, the dispute about the trivial matter of the vote for Mr. Shiell's election was merely an expedient provocation, and not a real cause at all.

However the reader can now consider the

course of the struggle, and decide for himself how the behaviour of the parties fits with what I have suggested.

4 Dissolution of the School

The reader will remember that on 2 April 1851 the meeting of the Proprietary Lecturers of the Medical School received a letter from Mr. Shiell declining further relations with Dr. Embleton and threatening his resignation as lecturer if Dr. Embleton did not himself resign. It was agreed to take the letter into consideration at the meeting a month later, on 30 April. That meeting, at which Dr. Embleton was not present, had his reply before it. He had promised his vote to Mr. Winship, he said, before he knew that Mr. Shiell was a candidate. Shiell had called on him on the day before the election and threatened his resignation if Dr. Embleton did not vote for him. He did not see why the Medical School should have been made a theatre of discord because of his vote and he did not intend to resign.²³

Some ragged discussion followed. Mr. Newton proposed that Dr. Embleton should apologize for his vote, and Dr. Glover, who was in the chair, actually left the chair to second the proposal. After a procedural squabble the motion was withdrawn. An alternative anodyne motion regretting any misunderstanding between members of the School was proposed, and carried. Mr. Newton enlivened his speech on the second motion by calling Dr. Embleton a deliberate liar, a traitor to his profession and a Judas.

Not surprisingly it was found necessary to have a Special Meeting on 8 May at which all the lecturers were present. Dr. Embleton said he would be wanting in his duty if he did not protest against the employment of such unbecoming and dangerous language in the School, and left the matter in the hands of the meeting, trusting to its impartial justice. It was moved that Mr. Newton be requested to withdraw and apologize. After some discussion Mr. Newton said he would endorse the motion, but then, after Dr. Charlton had rather unnecessarily observed that Dr. Embleton had not apologized because he had nothing to apologize for,

Mr. Newton declared, as the meeting was rising, "I give you, Mr. Chairman, distinctly to understand that I have made no apology".

After that matters went from bad to worse. Dr. Embleton wrote demanding a "full and ample apology" from Mr. Newton. Mr. Newton wrote to say that he would be prepared in a few days with "a calm and dispassionate history of the whole proceeding" (a likely proposition indeed) and asserted that "no foe, whether insidious or declared, shall, with impunity, tread on my character and independence". There was another meeting on 14 May when, after prolonged discussion, Mr. Newton was taken away into another room by Dr. Dawson and Dr. Glover. On returning Dr. Glover said he was authorized by Mr. Newton to withdraw all offensive language he had used, and to accompany it with an expression of regret. "Let Mr. Newton speak himself," said Dr. Embleton, "Am I to regard this as an apology or not?" to which Mr. Newton replied, "No, I will not apologise, no, not till doomsday." Then there was some further talk, Dr. Glover, Mr. Newton and Mr. Shiell put in a written protest, alleging that Dr. Embleton's appeal to the meeting was "a wilful blowing up of the coals of discord, which might otherwise have slumbered" and Mr. Newton called Dr. Embleton a lickspittle. After that the meeting broke up.

The parties then proceeded steadily to a dissolution. On 28 May a resolution was passed requesting Mr. Newton resign, which he refused to do, and on 25 June a resolution (of which notice had been given a fortnight earlier) was adopted unanimously that the School "... be, and the same hereby is, dissolved" (it is clear from the wording that someone had consulted some solicitors, fairly clearly, I think, Dr. Embleton and John Clayton). Dr. Charlton, Dr. Glover and Mr. Heath were appointed to wind up the School's affairs. The real battle now began. Which party could form a School that would gain professional recognition? There was, moreover, little time to lose, for the new session would begin in October just three months away.

5 The New "School of Medicine and Surgery"

The first meeting of the founders of the new school is recorded in their minutes as being held at Dr. Charlton's house at 7 Eldon Square on 26 June 1851, the day following the resolution to dissolve the old school.²⁴ This puts it a little too formally perhaps—"For a day or two the majority sat *en permanence* daily . . . for consultation, mutual encouragement, reviewing their position, considering their prospects, beating up for recruits and finally for drawing up a prospectus for the next session" is the admirable description of Dr. Embleton himself.²⁵

The immediate urgent consideration was to rally support from the medical profession. An invitation was sent to Dr. Dawson, but he declined unless Dr. Glover was to join the new school. Dr. Glover was invited, but he declined stating that he had already formed another school, and he showed his visitor a list of lecturers. These answers must have been expected (though their accuracy was later disputed).

It was next agreed to invite Dr. Humble and Messrs. Frost and Robinson, "and these gentlemen having been waited on, determined to unite and do their utmost". Successful approaches were then made to Dr. Headlam ("the oldest practitioner in Newcastle"), Dr. Mackintosh, the Physician to the Newcastle Lunatic Asylum, and Mr. Sang, one of the Accoucheurs to the Lying-in Hospital, who were all practitioners of some seniority, and to the existing lecturers on chemistry and botany who were not medical men or proprietary lecturers. Unsurprisingly no approach seems to have been made to Mr. Newton.

Finally a code of laws for the new school was drawn up and submitted to Mr. John Clayton. It was a successful meeting, which must have been planned some days before it was held.²⁶

Two days later they met again to receive an unsolicited, but suitably sycophantic, address from 12 of the 16 students who had attended the summer session. After expressing satisfaction at the efforts being made to re-establish

the school, and noting the irregular and unsatisfactory methods of certain of the summer lecturers, the students said they were glad to find that those parties were not likely to lecture again, and declared that they had no confidence in the opposing party to which they would give no countenance or support.

All this activity was rushed into the press on 5 July by the direct approach of taking advertising space on the front page of the *Newcastle Journal* (in closely printed columns, of course, not in display advertising which did not exist). Dr. Embleton's party put in a letter signed by its 14 supporters, all but two belonging to the medical profession, and also the letter from the students.

The response from the other party consisted only of a letter (also in the advertising columns) addressed to Dr. Headlam by "A Senior Lecturer on the Other Side", but it made much more exciting reading. He expressed regret to Dr. Headlam at seeing "your respected name" on the new school's prospectus. Its list of names, he said, included "the most motley Crew ever arranged under one Banner" such as men "who have never delivered a lecture in their lives" and "incapable of any Effort beyond ordinary Speech". Dr. Headlam's conduct is contrasted with that of Sir John Fife, "who knows from bitter Experience on which side is the Right . . . we do not intend to admit into our Body a Herd of Incapables". This letter may be said to have set the tone for the exchanges which were to follow, because at this time the pompous insults of the last two meetings of the old school were not circulating in print, though they were no doubt well known within the profession itself.

There is one other event of note in the same issue, a report that Mr. W. R. Shiell was entertained at Mr. Rogerson's Crown and Thistle Inn on 28 June on the occasion of his retirement from Newcastle to reside at Colwell, "when he was presented with a splendid riding-horse by a number of friends". An excellent dinner, we are glad to hear, was provided. So the gentleman for whom Dr. Embleton had refused to vote, and who had provided the overt reason for the disruption, departed from the scene.²⁷

The *Journal's* columns were further cheered in the following two weeks with similar correspondence. On 12 July "Medicus" writes to Dr. Donald Mackintosh (the physician to the Lunatic Asylum) to express surprise at the appearance of his name among "the *Savants* who are to hasten the millenium of medical enlightenment" on the grounds that he has steadily refused to allow his dead to be conveyed to the Dissecting Room, apparently because he was demanding payment. "Have you overcome your mercantile scruples. . . ?" "Donald, tak care o' the' siller".²⁸ On 19 July a letter to the editor from "Anti-Humbug" attacks Dr. Fenwick's Scotch medical degree, denies that he is a physician in the true sense and alleges that he "maintains . . . an unholy alliance with chemists and druggists". I forbear to give the later riposte of Dr. Fenwick, in which he denies that he is a medical Dogberry. We may guess that the letter from the supporters of the new school had taken the Fife party by surprise, and that this resort to vulgar abuse, at which Mr. Newton if no one else was a competent hand, was intended to divert the public until the Fifes could produce their lecture programme for the winter session.

This both sides now did with advertisements appearing on 19 July. The programme of the Embleton party substantially followed the subjects of the old school (though substituting a course of lectures on Mental Diseases for one on Medical Philosophy) and included as lecturers all 14 supporters. The programme of the Fife party as advertised in the *Journal* was preceded by a justificatory statement, written in a very different style from that employed by the author or authors of the abusive correspondence.

It began with studied compliments to Dr. Embleton—"a most diligent and anxious lecturer"—and to Dr. Charlton who "did all that could be expected of him" (a somewhat ambiguous comment, perhaps), and then rehearsed the dispute in 1843 about the terms of engagement as demonstrators of the Fife brothers, explaining how Sir John and they then instantly broke off their connection. Dr. Dawson and Dr. Glover had then supported the Fifes, but others, including Dr. Embleton,

did not. The vote at the Board of Guardians was referred to dismissively—"whatever be the merits or demerits of that affair, they have in reality *nothing whatever to do with the question . . .*" The real complaints were against Dr. Embleton's conduct in forming a separate party and taking legal advice before the dissolution, and against his attitude to Dr. Glover. When Dr. Dawson asked why Dr. Glover was not included in the new school he was distinctly told "that the *sole* reason was to gratify the personal feelings of Dr. Embleton".

The programme which follows is again much on the lines of the old school, with the old secretary Dr. Dawson, Dr. Glover, Mr. Potter, Mr. Shiell and Mr. Newton being formally joined by Sir John Fife and his two sons and some others.²⁹

The next move by Sir John Fife's party was a resolution adopted on 28 July that "in compliance with the expressed wish of several of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons", though not it will be noted of the Council itself, the arrangement described below be proposed as a basis for an amalgamation Council or Senate. The Duke of Northumberland, Sir M. W. Ridley, the Mayor and the Town Clerk of Newcastle, Members of the Durham University, and certain other dignitaries appear in a list above a prospectus of lecture subjects and lecturers, and are presumably intended as the suggested Council. The lecturers are an amalgam of those previously advertised, but not arranged with much tact. Six out of the 14 in the Embleton prospectus are omitted, but three only from those in the Fife prospectus. Moreover, only one of the Embleton omissions, Dr. Headlam, is elevated to the Council, while two from the Fife party, Sir John himself and Mr. Potter, are proposed for this honour. The third Fife lecturer omitted is Mr. Shiell, which was no concession. No doubt this was a negotiating position, but acceptance of it as it stood could be seen only as a capitulation.³⁰

Whether tactful or not, the proposals were an embarrassment to the Embleton party and some signs of disarray are visible. However, after much activity, including an inquiry of the Fife party as to what changes there had been in

its membership, a somewhat mealy-mouthed letter of refusal, of a type familiar in these situations, was adopted and sent after a three weeks' delay on 20 August. In effect what was said was that the regretted breach was not the fault of the Embleton party and that so much had now been arranged, and so much expense incurred, that it was "incumbent upon us to hold on in our present course in a straightforward manner". In effect they did not want a reconciliation.³¹

The Fife party responded on the next day (and published their reply in the *Newcastle Journal*). In view of the refusal to merge they would proceed with a separate school. They did not however "at present propose to apply for the patronage of the University of Durham, for we have too much confidence in the judgement and dignified feeling of the distinguished gentlemen who preside over that noble institution to assume that they will rashly commit themselves, as our opponents imagine, to the support of any party whose influence with the medical profession and the public has yet to be determined". I suppose that Drs. Dawson and Robinson believed what they wrote. Certainly it was not the line to take if they themselves wanted to join with the University, for the reference to "the patronage" of the University in itself struck a grating note. In any case, they were wrong.³²

Dr. Embleton saw Archdeacon Thorp on 25 August. The Warden assured him of the University's friendly feelings and advised that the School should proceed on a straightforward course. On recognition by the Royal College of Surgeons, the University would "enter into negotiations for a junction". The Warden also saw Dr. Dawson with a view to bringing about a merger of the Fife party with the Embleton party, but this proposal was refused by Dr. Dawson.³³

6 The Raids on the Museum

The combination of the refusal of their merger terms by the Embleton party and the attempt by the Warden to interfere in the dispute all within a week, was too much for the martial

spirit of the Fifes. The problem of the Museum and its assets was still unresolved. They determined on a radical solution.

To appreciate the importance of the Museum it is necessary to go back a little. While the Embleton party had done well in securing the support of the medical profession in Newcastle, it was also essential for them to get recognition of the new school from the Royal College of Surgeons and the Society of Apothecaries. Recognition by the Royal College was the more important because, as the Warden had made clear, this was a prerequisite to the adoption of the new school by Durham University, and to the attainment of the ultimate aim of a medical degree for which successful attendance at a course in Newcastle would be the qualification.

Therefore as early as 28 June requisitions for recognition had been despatched to the Royal College, and also to the Society of Apothecaries and London University, reporting the foundation of the new school. On 2 July a copy of the circular letter of that date was also sent, and on the following day it was agreed that Dr. Embleton should at once go to London and join with Mr. Henry Heath as a deputation to explain the letter. By 15 July the Society of Apothecaries had written to recognize the school, but Dr. Embleton had to report that the Royal College required a museum as a condition of recognition. The other party, in the persons of Drs. Dawson and Glover, were quick to follow Dr. Embleton's visit, because recognition was also of great importance to them, and were no doubt given the same answer.³⁴

The collections forming the Museum had been moved from the old Barber-Surgeons' Hall, which (as mentioned below) had by now been demolished, to a temporary resting place in hired rooms in Nun Street. The Committee supervising the dissolution of the old school had signed an obscure document on 3 July, making arrangements for valuation of the specimens of comparative anatomy and the chemical preparations, and for advice to be taken about the pathological preparations, but quite unspecific as to what was then to be done.

No doubt a division of these assets was contemplated, but with two rival schools in place the values to be used would present difficulty. Little progress had been made by the middle of August, principally because Dr. Dawson had declined to surrender the books of account to the Committee (one may fairly doubt if they existed).

Dr. Dawson's unsuccessful meeting with the Warden was on 25 August. On the afternoon of Thursday 28 August Dr. Glover got the key of the Nun Street premises from the janitor of the old School, one Craster, and that night with other unnamed members of the Fife party proceeded to remove a number of the most valuable specimens of the Museum to a stable in Eldon Lane East. When this became known on Friday Dr. Charlton called on Dr. Glover to ask for the key of the Museum store to see what was left. Dr. Glover refused to hand it over. He asserted, without any apparent justification, that Dr. Charlton and Mr. Heath had resigned from the Committee, and had no right to the key. A letter of protest was promptly delivered, and on Saturday, with the support of John Clayton's advice, Dr. Charlton and Mr. Heath entered the store, presumably forcibly, to find that the most valuable specimens were missing, and themselves removed what was left to a building in the Manors being used temporarily for the new School. Unfortunately they left some large skeletons of animals, intending to get them on Monday. They were too late. At midnight on Sunday, that day of rest having ended, Drs. Glover and Dawson, with three policemen, entered the store and removed the larger specimens that remained. This direct attack on the problem was a victory for the Fifes in the short term, though I doubt if it added to their qualifications for recognition by outside parties.³⁵

The episode was the subject of a fine pastiche Border ballad, by Dr. John Cargill, entitled "The Knights of St John and the Cross; or the Raid o' the Auld Musee" which is quoted in full by Dr. Embleton. Glover and Dawson are depicted

"... aff to the Knicht o' the Forth sae slee:
'Now, brither Knicht, will ye help the richt
'An' battle our faes as a Knicht suld dae?"

whereupon the Fife sons pipe up in support and

"'Noo, hie ye awa,' quo' the slee Sir John,
'Had awa aff to the auld Musee:
'Rieve ilka bane and ilka beaste,
'An' dinna forget—to tak aff the key!"

The raid is described, and the stable revealed as that of Dr. Dawson. Much fun is made of lawyers advising Dr. Embleton, and then, ending such parodies being somewhat more difficult than beginning them, the ballad rather tails off into a totally imaginary shoot-out on the Town Moor. It remains, however, the only literary product of the dispute that deserves to be remembered, and its views on the sly Sir John Fife, again apparently sure of "which side is the Right", are revealing.³⁶

7 Recognition Won

After the raids on the Museum, any pretence that this was a private quarrel between the members of a learned profession with which the public generally should not be concerned was abandoned. The Embleton party published an 11 page pamphlet, "A Brief Statement of the Facts connected with the Disruption of the late Medical School in this Town", on 12 September.³⁷ The Fifes countered on the following day with a single page "Statement by the Lecturers of the Newcastle upon Tyne College of Medicine and Practical Science".³⁸ Sometime during this period there was also an anonymous pamphlet from the Embleton party with details of the insults exchanged prior to the dissolution.³⁹ The Embleton party claimed to have provided "a condensed, but accurate, narrative". The Fife party appealed "to every candid mind whether it is reasonable to expect them now to consent to co-operate with men capable of such disingenuous conduct". However, all this gratuitous display of ill feeling left the recognition problem unsolved.

The policy adopted by the Fife party was to

create a college with broader interests than merely medical, harking back it seems to an earlier proposal to set up a university in Newcastle, which had first been put forward in 1831 by Mr. T. M. Greenhow (a respected surgeon who studiously refused to take part in the current controversy).⁴⁰ The title adopted for their College was accordingly the Newcastle College of Medicine and Practical Science. They called a meeting at the Farmers Club Room, Westgate Street on 6 September for gentlemen interested in the success of their College, with Sir M. W. Ridley in the Chair. Six platitudinous resolutions were duly passed, including a vote of thanks to Mr. Robert Stephenson MP for approving of their objects, despite being unable to attend.⁴¹

The inaugural meeting of the College of Medicine and Practical Science followed at the beginning of October. It was held in the new Barber-Surgeons' Hall and was addressed by Sir John Fife. The account in the *Newcastle Journal* is a good public relations job, with an admiring description of the building and of the numerous audience of medical men and gentlemen connected with mining, manufacturing, engineering and agriculture who "by their presence and repeated acclamation indicated their approbation of a collegiate institution in this town". Sir John's address emphasized his long endeavours in the cause of medical education, and praised his proposed committee as being composed of "gentlemen of acknowledged talent, intelligence and high character" with access to the necessary capital. One cannot but admire the concept, and certainly the possibility of its achievement was nearer than it had ever been. But the proposals did not fit with any medical school junction with Durham University, and that, given the personal animosity of the parties, was sufficient to make their success improbable.⁴²

In the meantime the Embleton party were at work on the application to the Royal College of Surgeons. A formal letter of request, asserting that an ample Museum was now available, and asking for an Inspector from the College to come and view the Museum and the School, had been sent on 11 September.⁴³

Before any reply was received the moment arrived for the School's inaugural lecture, given by Dr. Headlam at the Lit and Phil after a curious dispute to be described later. He was more concerned with medical matters than Sir John had been. He praised Dr. Embleton for his application of the microscope to anatomical investigations, referred to the current concern about the sanitary condition of places with a dense population, and complained that the medical man's position in society was not equal to that of other professions. That sort of grumble is a familiar one from any profession but since both he and Sir John Fife had each been Mayor of Newcastle on two occasions it seems less justified than usual.⁴⁴

The inspection of the School was carried out by a Mr. Luke, one of the Vice Presidents of the Royal College, on Monday 6 October. He seems to have declared himself satisfied. However, on Friday 10 October the Royal College wrote to say that they were unwilling to recognize two schools of medicine in Newcastle and therefore would not recognize the School. Sir John had evidently been active in canvassing the Council of the College and I believe he knew what the reply was to be.

This could be a mortal blow. The lecturers met in extraordinary meeting on Sunday 12 October and a vigorous, almost emotional, reply was despatched to the College: "... We have now been labouring hard, almost night and day, for nearly three months, and at great pecuniary sacrifices, to furnish a Museum such as would enable us thoroughly to educate our students and at the same time to obtain the recognition" of the College. They were confident of unity with Durham University on getting recognition. The Museum had been furnished in accordance with a list provided by the Secretary of the College. A refusal now would "throw discredit on our labours". They trusted that the report of "your courteous and kind inspector" (a piece of useful tact, this) would show the Museum was amply provided.

It was obviously decided that the letter by itself was not enough. On Tuesday it was resolved that Drs. Embleton and Charlton should confer with the Board of Examiners,

give an undertaking to pursue amalgamation with the University, and make clear that no merger with the Fife party was possible before recognition. The following day revised merger proposals were received from the Fife party. The timing was very nearly perfect. The proposals were, I suspect, actually intended to arrive on the same day as the refusal from the College. They would have done so indeed if they had not originally been addressed to John Clayton, who was, with his usual adroitness, "from home". But by now the letter to the College had gone and the Embleton party set its teeth, and resolved that the deputation should proceed. The Fife party was told that it would be necessary to consult solicitors, and Drs. Embleton and Charlton departed to London.

It is at this crucial moment that, I suppose naturally enough, a mysterious veil is drawn over events. Who did the Secretaries see? What did they say? The records of the Royal College are silent. Dr. Embleton offers no comment. All that we know is that the Board of Examiners held a special meeting on Monday 20 October, reversed their previous decision and recognized the School. Dr. Embleton telegraphed the news to Newcastle and the students got the bells rung at St. Nicholas in celebration. The battle for recognition which had begun at the end of June had been won. What is more, it had clearly been won by Dr. Embleton.⁴⁵

There were two things now to do, first to deal with the revised merger proposals, and secondly to start negotiations with Durham University. The plan for the merger was simply answered. It had contemplated that the Medical School should form a department of the College of Medicine and Practical Science, and that the future appointment of lecturers would rest with the Council of the College. It was hardly necessary to consult John Clayton, though this was done, to be able to reply that the proposal could not possibly tend to achieve unity, since it premised that the School should be a department of the College, when the School was committed to a connection with Durham University.

A week later a deputation of Drs. Headlam, Embleton and Charlton was waiting on the University authorities, by whom they were "*most favourably received*", as the minutes have it, and the University agreed to pursue arrangements for the union.⁴⁶

Needless to say, the Fife party endeavoured to meddle in the negotiations. They too sent a deputation to the Warden, of which there is little record, and then delivered a Memorial to him on 18 November. After recording their ambitions as providers of instruction in practical science, in a building whose foundation stone, they emphasized, had been laid by the Warden, they claimed to be "anxious to obtain for [their] institution . . . the honour of a connection, more or less intimate, with the learned and influential body whom they have now the privilege of addressing". They wanted to appoint the Warden and the Dean of Durham as *ex officio* members of their Council. They proposed to provide religious superintendence, of such students as might desire it, by a clergyman of the Church of England. They wanted attendance at their medical lectures, and this was the main point, to be a qualification for any degree of MD which the University might award in the future.⁴⁷

Senate considered the matter on 25 November. The Warden was directed to reply that there were considerable difficulties to forming a connection with the Institution as at present constituted, but that the University had paid attention to the questions mentioned, and would be ready to give assistance whenever it could be properly rendered. This reply was substantially a refusal, but one couched in suitably ambiguous terms leaving hope for the future. The Warden was no mean draftsman.⁴⁸

It was at just about this moment that Mr. Newton decided that he could helpfully intervene. He published "A Letter to the Venerable Archdeacon Thorp on the Causes which led to the Disruption of the School of Medicine . . ." with a preface initialled "W.N.", and set out to rehearse the awful story of Mr. Shiel's failure to be elected as a medical officer. Shiel's father had been driven into his grave by the inhuman persecution of a Bank,

and a family of orphan children now depended "for protection from the pelting of the pitiless storm" upon Shiell himself. Dr. Embleton should therefore have voted for him but "with characteristic peevishness and want of feeling" he had not. What is more, Embleton had done his best to lower the salaries of all the Medical Officers (of whom Newton was one). "Instead of being our friend and advocate, he became an Egyptian taskmaster". There is much further complaint of ill treatment, and many sneers at the lecturers in the new School. What effect it would all have on the Warden is a matter of speculation, but I would suppose it more likely to raise Dr. Embleton in his estimation than otherwise.⁴⁹

In any event the School adopted a new constitution to meet the requirements of the University on 13 December and changed its name to "College of Medicine". On 20 January 1852 Dr. Embleton and Mr. Pearse attended Senate with the Articles of Foundation, and it was agreed that these be submitted to Convocation. In May 1852 in confirmation of this connection with the College, the University awarded Dr. Headlam the honorary degree of Doctor of Medicine and appointed Dr. Embleton to a Readership in Medicine. Both recognition and collegiate status had been attained. There remained, however, considerable difficulties about accommodation, where the Fife party's influence had scored a notable success, which I will describe later.⁵⁰

The College of Medicine and Practical Science (which perhaps I may abbreviate to "the College of Practical Science") also obtained recognition from the Royal College of Surgeons, not long after Dr. Embleton's success. Sir John Fife is said (by Dr. William Murray) simply to have asked the House Committee of the Infirmary for permission to use the Infirmary Museum on a temporary basis.⁵¹ With this consent obtained, he then persuaded the Royal College that the deficiency in this regard of the College of Practical Science was made good, and that this was sufficient for recognition. (What had happened to the proceeds of the museum raid is not very clear.) Certainly Sir John seems to have turned up at a

House Committee meeting on 30 October 1851, read them a letter from the President of the Royal College asking whether he (the President) was correct in understanding that both the medical schools had equal access to the preparations of morbid anatomy in the Infirmary to illustrate their lectures, and got the House Committee to pass a resolution saying that that was indeed the case. The operation was perhaps a little high handed, but not unfair. No doubt this is what Dr. Murray was referring to.⁵²

The College of Practical Science also made another approach to Durham University. Their application in November 1851 had been refused as mentioned above, so in March 1852 the request was simply that its certificates might be received towards degrees in medicine at the University. The Warden retired gracefully behind a technicality. Senate requested him to say that it did not appear to the University that under its regulations the certificate of the College could at present be so received. What event, if any, in the future could alter this situation was not revealed.⁵³

By the start of the Session in October 1852, therefore, the parties were fairly evenly balanced. Each had permanent buildings (as discussed in Section 8), each had museums or their equivalent, and each had recognition from the Royal College. The College of Medicine and Surgery had access to the degrees of Durham University, and the other College had none, but this was not a decisive advantage. It was time to press on with the struggle.

The field of battle was again Newcastle Infirmary, where at the beginning of 1852 Sir John had (as we shall later see) already defeated the Embleton party. Mr. C. J. Gibb was the House Surgeon and Apothecary of this institution (where of course he would mend your broken ribs). He was a lecturer at the College of Medicine and Surgery, as he had been at the old school, and an Embleton supporter. In October 1852 a vacancy arose in the office of Secretary and at a Special Meeting of the Governors on 4 November it was proposed to elect Mr. Gibb to this post.

The Mayor as usual was in the chair, and

there was a good turnout. There are 66 Governors named as present in the minutes, and "a great many others". When the resolution was proposed, Sir John Fife moved that, if Mr. Gibb were elected, he should not be allowed to hold any other duties outside the House. Objection was taken that this was in effect an alteration of the Rules and inadmissible at this meeting, so the proposal was changed to a recommendation that Gibb should resign "the Appointment as a lecturer to another Institution", and carried by the (rather shaky) majority of "about 4 votes". Gibb was then elected.⁵⁴

I think there is little doubt that the Embleton party had been taken by surprise by this attack. Sir John had at least three lecturers to support him. Dr. Embleton was alone. Vigorous steps were evidently now taken to restore the position. The next Quarterly Court was on 5 January 1853. There were 121 Governors named "and a great number of other governors" present. Drs. Embleton, Charlton and Headlam were there, as well as the Venerable Charles Thorp, not in his capacity as Warden but in the disguise of a Crewe Trustee. John Clayton was also there, to control the event.

Sir John Fife evidently complained that Mr. Gibb's activity as lecturer offended against the 51st Rule of the Infirmary, namely "That he . . . shall not practise as a Surgeon or Apothecary out of the House, nor attend any other Business than that of the Infirmary". Clayton said that Rule 51 was not sufficient to prevent Mr. Gibb being a lecturer, an activity which gave him useful experience. Explanatory words could be added to the Rule. Sir John objected that notice should be given of any such alteration. Mr. Clayton overrode him. He was not, he said, aware of any rule to that effect, and therefore he was in order. He proposed an addition to the rule, which simply excluded membership of a Medical School, and the giving of lectures there, from the forbidden actions.

This was too much for Sir John, who spoke his mind and once more revealed the true divide between the parties. "No one could serve two masters. The Infirmary [which he

evidently equated with his own college] and the University of Durham were diametrically and violently opposed to each other, and it was the interest of the University to destroy the College of Practical Science (cries of 'No, no' and 'Hear, hear') . . . Unless Durham University succeeded in running down and destroying the College—the University would be driven out of Newcastle (loud laughter). Aye, and that great fortification [evidently the new Medical School building in Orchard Street—see Section 8] erected at such cost would remain a monument of the vanity and folly, and the feelings of certain parties (renewed laughter)". The feeling of the meeting was clear. The Clayton amendment was carried with only 15 votes against it, and Mr. Gibb continued to lecture. The Infirmary was now Embleton territory.⁵⁵

It is necessary now to turn back to the start of the struggle, because running in parallel with the rivalry for recognition, there was also a vigorous attempt by the Fife party to obstruct the provision of new premises for the new Medical School.

8 Premises

While the manoeuvres to secure recognition and defeat the merger proceeded, there was simultaneously another pressing question for the Embleton party, namely the provision of suitable premises, both for lectures and for the museum. The old Barber-Surgeons' Hall had been demolished by the spring of 1851. The new hall in Victoria Street, off Westmorland Terrace, would be ready for October, but Sir John Fife was a member of the Barber-Surgeons Company, and it was clear that difficulties would be raised on seeking a tenancy here. So it proved, and on 2 September the new College lecturers resolved to refuse an offer of a tenancy from the Barber-Surgeons because of the conditions attached to it. (What they were is not specified.)⁵⁶ The Fife party had obtained the tenancy for themselves by the middle of September.⁵⁷

The Embleton party seems already to have applied to the Finance Committee of the Corporation to occupy at a nominal rent the build-

ing in the Manors where the janitor of the old school had lived, and to which was added a temporary brick building, "hastily run up" and fitted as lecture room and dissecting room. It was here that the session of 1851-52 was held, while the search for a permanent building was carried on.⁵⁸

There was an immediate problem however. The temporary premises at the Manors were apparently not suitable, or possibly would not be ready, for the inaugural lecture to be given on 4 October. As a first public trial of strength, much importance was attached to this. The rival school would obviously occupy the new Hall for their inaugural, and obtain the favourable publicity which would go with the possession of this dignified new building. Accordingly it was determined to press the Lit and Phil lecture room into service.

A special committee meeting of the Lit and Phil was duly requisitioned by three members (including Albany Hancock) for 19 September to consider a request from Dr. Headlam (who was then the President) for the use of the room. The committee was well furnished with the leading lights in the dispute. Mr. John Clayton was in the chair. Dr. Embleton with his co-secretary, Dr. Charlton and Albany Hancock were there to see that right was done for their party. Dr. Robinson and Dr. Glover were there for the other party. I cannot identify the likely views of the remaining four members. They had before them a written protest in Dr. Robinson's hand, signed by him, Sir John Fife and Dr. Dawson, which referred quite gratuitously to the new school as the "Manor Chare Medical School" and alleged that to allow the lecture room to be used by Dr. Headlam would be an infringement of the Society's neutrality and "an [blank] attempt to enlist on behalf of an opposition school of Medicine the name and countenance of a body of influential gentlemen, many of whom are totally opposed to that project". The blank space before the word "attempt" is in fact more than a deletion—whatever the offending word was, it was so offensive that it was necessary physically to cut it out of the sheet. Feelings were certainly running high. How-

ever, the committee, in the best traditions of the Lit and Phil, refused to be swayed by rhetoric, and resolved that their President might use the lecture room. This part of the quarrel spilled over into the *Newcastle Journal*, to whom Dr. Robinson leaked the contents of a resolution of protest which he intended for the Society's November monthly meeting. The next committee meeting in October, however, passed a further resolution, assuring all concerned that it did not consider that it was violating any neutrality, Dr. Robinson withdrew his resolution, and peace was restored at the Lit and Phil, but not elsewhere.⁵⁹

The acquisition of a permanent site seems naturally to have taken second place to the obtaining of recognition from the Royal College of Surgeons and the starting of negotiations with Durham University. It was therefore not until 31 October that it was reported that the Finance Committee of the Corporation had offered the School a site next to the Infirmary on its west side at a price of 12 shillings a square yard or a ground rent of £20 per annum. The University preferred a purchase. The Finance Committee on being asked said they would recommend this, conditionally on the building raised on the site being used for medical education only. Dr. Embleton and Dr. Charlton agreed the position of the site with the Infirmary's Building Committee. All seemed set fair.⁶⁰

But the Fife party were not so easily defeated. By 6 December a printed letter from an "Old Governor" addressed to the Governors of the Newcastle Infirmary was in circulation objecting to the erection of an anatomical school immediately beside the new wing. Would not this ground "now passively given up" be urgently required for any extension? Was the Infirmary "so advantageously circumstanced with respect of the salubrity of the air supplied to it" that it could afford to have an unobjectionable supply (it was indeed on the west side of the town) "destroyed by the close apposition of a pile of buildings exhaling the poisonous effluvia of the dissecting room and the laboratory?" One cannot but admire the technique of unsubstantiated scientific

slurs, which would not disgrace the many ecological protests of today. An appeal to the supporters of public health to defeat a medical school has a fine impudence when set against the background of the disastrous filth of the Quayside slums half a mile away.⁶¹

But it was to succeed. There was an open dispute about the land at the annual meeting of the Infirmary on 1 January 1852, when Sir John Fife and Dr. Glover, now flying their true colours, offered to purchase it for £5,000 and to present it to the Infirmary. In this way, they said, the danger to health from dissection carried on at the School would be averted. In the result a resolution was adopted approving a memorial to the Town Council which requested the Council to prevent the erection of any building on their land to the west of the Infirmary.⁶²

The Memorial, accompanied by one petition signed by about 200 respectable inhabitants of Newcastle, and another 11 yards long with 76 signatures on the first page, was delivered to the Council at its meeting on 4 February 1852. The usual actors reappear. Alderman Sir John Fife, Alderman Headlam and Councillor Newton took the stage, and the quarrel reached what Sir John evidently believed to be a decisive moment. John Clayton incidentally was not present, being in London, and this absence may have affected the outcome.

Sir John began by proposing a resolution in the terms of the Memorial (which he had no doubt drafted himself). He repeated the arguments about air and the future extension of the Infirmary and then denied any imputation of factious motives. "He knew that an amalgamation of the two Medical Schools must come. Public opinion, the public interest, common sense, good feeling—everything in short—pointed to an amalgamation". And finally, with a hint of his early career as a demagogue, he added "he knew well the temper of the public mind on this subject, and especially of the poorer classes; and if care had not been taken to prevent any extraordinary excitement, that Council would have been besieged with such a demonstration as they had not witnessed

for half a century in this district. (Loud applause)".

It is not at first sight obvious why a proposal to put a medical school next to an infirmary (which after all was a course recommended even then) should have aroused such public ire as to bring forth the petitions and Sir John's threatened demonstration. Mr. Newton was the next to speak however, and all was then made clear. After a ritual insult to the Embleton party—"... he must add that he shook the dust off his feet with respect to some of the parties; he would not, on any account, publicly associate with Dr. Charlton and Dr. Embleton. ('Order')"—he got down to the real emotive issue—"... why did the petitioners want to get this ground? Why, that they might get plenty of bodies for dissection, and from an avowed connection with the Infirmary. ('No, no.') The medical officers, on going round, would see many empty beds, from which they might learn a moral. ('Order') ... if they wanted to sanction a medical 'Black Hole of Calcutta' in the Newcastle Infirmary, they would sanction the scheme..." The memory of those body snatchers, Burke and Hare, was evidently still green, and Mr. Newton had no scruples about making use of it.

He also conducted a brisk attack on the University. "What would the University of Durham do to benefit this town? It was an institution which might raise up obscure divines, but would not train up philosophic surgeons and physicians." And here, I believe, he again touched on the fundamental feelings of the citizens of Newcastle, the natural, and persisting, distrust of ideas from South of the Tyne, which lurked behind the apparently irreconcilable division between the medical men, and appealed to the laymen on the Council as well.

Alderman Dr. Headlam made a long speech in reply, defending the Durham connection, defending the use of the land, deploring the prejudice against dissection and suggesting that the simple reason for the objection was that the Barber-Surgeons did not think it was to their interest that another school should be built.

There were other speeches but they add little to the debate.

On voting Sir John Fife's resolution was adopted by 25 votes to 21. He promptly, and significantly, observed, "Now we are ready for amalgamation". Nothing could more clearly reveal what he hoped for from this success. The Embleton party might have recognition, it might have the support of the University, but it had nowhere to carry on its schooling.⁶³

If he believed that, he greatly underestimated the resilience and determination of his opponents. They met the following day, and the search for a new site began.

There was land between the Central Station and the Cattle Market, but it was the subject of a quarrel between two railway companies. Mr. Grainger had a house near the Central Station, but he wanted too much for it. The York Newcastle & Berwick Railway Co had Westmorland House, immediately to the west of the Lit and Phil, but the Company wanted £3,500 for it, which was too high a price, and a new building would be required at the back. Much against their will because of the cost, they finally settled for Westmorland House with its learned environment, and by 2 June they had bought it, beating the Company down to £3,100, and let the building contract for £1,800. Money was put up by the lecturers, with Dr. Embleton very much in the lead, but I think that John Clayton's ability to raise mortgage money was probably the decisive element.⁶⁴

In any event the new building was up and complete for an opening by the Warden in October 1852, who found a moment, in the middle of a speech largely devoted to the history of the University up to that date, to congratulate "my friend Mr. Dobson upon the successful effect of his undoubted genius".⁶⁵ It goes without saying that all this considerably annoyed Sir John Fife. The reader will remember that in the midst of the Infirmary meeting in the January following (described in Section 7), he added to his violent attack on the University a sneering reference to the new building as a monument of vanity and folly.

However, the premises question was now

solved, and from the beginning of 1853 we have more of a cold war than an active one. The first months of 1853 saw a feeble attempt at reconciliation (see Section 9), but the most significant event of the year was the most serious outbreak of cholera which Newcastle had yet experienced (Section 10).

9 Reconciliation—a First Attempt

The first attempt at a reconciliation between the two schools was made by an outsider, Dr. Lyon Playfair*, who became one of the secretaries of the Department of Art and Science on its creation by Aberdeen's government in 1853. Playfair was responsible for the scientific aspects of the Department, and his involvement seems to have arisen out of some rather unformed proposals by both parties for the provision of a school of mines in Newcastle.

The College of Practical Science had of course, from the time of its foundation, contemplated a development of this kind. The audience for Sir John Fife's inaugural lecture in October 1851 included representatives of the mining industry, and a course of lectures on mining was delivered at the College in the summer of 1852. A similar expansion of Durham University had, as mentioned above, (p. 245) been contemplated by the Warden and (no doubt with an eye to the manoeuvres of the Fife party) he obtained an address from the College of Medicine at the end of January 1853 in which the College, after pointing out the proximity of its site to other learned bodies including the Literary and Philosophical Society and the Government School of Design, suggested that instruction in other branches of practical science should be commenced. Simultaneously, the Warden had been in corres-

*Lyon Playfair, 1st Baron Playfair (1818–98); professor of chemistry at Royal Institution, Manchester 1842; chemist to the Geological Survey 1845 and professor at the School of Mining; served on the executive committee of the Great Exhibition and appointed to the household of the Prince Consort; professor of chemistry at Edinburgh 1858; MP 1868 (Dictionary of National Biography).

pondence with Mr. Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, asking for funds for this purpose, and on 8 February 1853 Gladstone wrote to say that the Government were now considering the whole question of Provincial Schools of Science, and how Government aid might best be extended, "a question requiring careful handling, especially when as at Newcastle there appear to be local differences of opinion on policy".⁶⁶

The exchanges between the Warden and Mr. Gladstone seem to have been leaked to *The Athenaeum* which paused, in the midst of an account of the Government's plans for Scientific Education on 26 February 1853, to reprove the medical men of Newcastle for entering into a quarrel "unworthy of an active and intelligent town" and to refer to the College of Practical Science as the "seceding" party. This naturally brought forth, a fortnight later, an indignant reply from Dr. Robinson, but one which went on to regret the dispute if it also attacked the "unprovoked hostility" of the University.⁶⁷

Dr. Playfair must therefore have seen the resolution of the dispute as one of his first objectives. He certainly lost no time, because by early April 1853 he had visited Newcastle and called on Dr. Charlton. After discussion he drew up proposals for fusion which he then reported that the Council of the College of Practical Science had agreed. In fact they were not agreed, but owing to the inability of John Clayton and Mr. Philipson (the solicitor for the College of Practical Science) to meet before 6 July, it took a very long time to find this out. The disagreement was quite simple. The College of Medicine wanted a fusion of the two schools into one under the University of Durham. The College of Practical Science wanted to sever the connection with the University. There was nothing new about this. There was also the unresolved question of how to appoint 30 lecturers to 13 chairs, which on this occasion, though it was in practical terms the most difficult to solve, never got considered at all. After some sterile bickering about who was to blame for the delay the negotiations were overtaken by the cholera outbreak de-

scribed in Section 10 and petered out. No more was heard from Dr. Playfair.⁶⁸

10 Cholera in 1853—a Touch of Reality

The niceties of the Medical School dispute were sharply interrupted in the late summer of 1853 by the cholera outbreak in Newcastle. The medical profession emerged with little credit.

Although there was by this date a continuous mains supply of water to the town from the reservoir at Whittle Dene, there was not enough to meet the demand in the summer months, particularly because of increasing industrial use. When the reserves fell too low, the only solution at this particular moment was to pump water out of the Tyne which was a tidal sewer. The suppliers, the Whittle Dene Water Company, began to pump on 5 July 1853. By the beginning of September the epidemic was in full swing. The Company secured an additional supply from the River Pont in early September and on 15th ceased to draw from the Tyne. Five days later the epidemic sharply declined and finally ceased in early November. In that period 1,500 persons died of cholera out of a population of 90,000.⁶⁹

The severity of the attack, or possibly the difficulties experienced by the General Board of Health in dealing with it, were such that a Commission was appointed by the Government "to inquire into the causes which have led to, or have aggravated, the late outbreak of cholera in the towns of Newcastle upon Tyne, Gateshead and Tynemouth". It sat in Newcastle in January and March 1854, and before it appeared many of the medical gentlemen whom we have previously met. Their evidence as to the causes of the outbreak, and, a point which much interested the Commission, on their ability to work together, is worth looking at.

It would perhaps be wrong to criticize the medical profession of the town for their ignorance of the causes of cholera. It was a general, but not a universal, ignorance. There was a common feeling that the disease was connected with defective sanitation and overcrowding,

and numerous complaints had been made in Newcastle itself by the doctors about the failure of the Town Improvement Committee to keep the sewers working and to clear the streets, particularly the chares near the river, of excrement. The Poor Law Guardians too were much concerned with the problem, and the egregious Mr. Newton showed in this matter a very proper zeal, writing to them in February 1851 to describe the accumulation of filth in Sandgate and to point out that the inhabitants had no drainage—"the Poor should be enabled to respect the decencies of life". But the resultant contamination of the water supply was ignored, or thought of no importance, except, curiously enough, by one of the first students of the Medical School in 1832, Dr. John Snow, who was now practising in London. He had in fact published in 1849 an essay "On the Mode of Communication of Cholera" which postulated the existence of a living water-borne organism as the cause of the disease but did not identify the organism. As a result his views were not widely accepted.⁷⁰

Dr. Headlam was early in the witness box at the Commission hearings, as befitted his seniority. He thought the use of Tyne water prejudicial to health, but nothing was so unwholesome as the crowded rooms of poor people, and the foul air generated there. Dr. Embleton said he had objected to the state of the drinking water at the time of the cholera. He had recommended people to take a little brandy with their water. He merely thought that the water was dirty due to there being earth in it, and objectionable in taste. The air generally was dirty through gas, emanations from the churchyards and the overcrowding of public places as well as the dwellings in Sandgate. Sir John Fife, who had been a director of the Company five years earlier, thought there was nothing wrong with the water. He had drunk it throughout.

Dr. Charlton described the atmosphere at the time of the outbreak as extremely dark and heavy. "There was no wind at all, and the swarms of the small flies augmented day by day, so that it was impossible to ride with comfort along the lanes. If you opened your

mouth it was filled with them". The words vividly convey the brooding gloom brought by the outbreak to the riverside slums.

Of the other medical men, one blamed the water, two said the water was very dirty but that this had nothing to do with the cholera, and Mr. Clark, who was a councillor as well as a surgeon, was of the opinion that "bad *looking* water" encouraged people to take stronger drink (a blow there at Dr. Embleton) and the resultant intemperate habits predisposed the human condition to epidemic disease.⁷¹

All in all, the medical profession may be said to have missed the point. Moreover the Company, who were much examined about their responsibility for the water shortage, were able to strike back late in the enquiry at Dr. Embleton's complaint about dirt in the water. The Secretary of the Company had met Dr. Embleton in the street in November when he had complained about the water in his water jugs—"it leaves a sediment, and it also smells". The Secretary had examined Dr. Embleton's supply and found his cisterns, which were evidently wooden, to be decayed, so that the cause of the dirt and smell was the rotten wood, and not the Company's water. (The cisterns evidently went back to the time when the supply was intermittent, so that without a cistern you could not be sure of having water available.)

However the real attack on the profession arose out of the medical dispute. The Board of Health had despatched two superintending inspectors to Newcastle in the second week of September 1853, Mr. R. D. Grainger and Dr. Hector Gavin.* Grainger arrived first, and complained of considerable difficulties which were peculiar to the town. Owing to conflicting opinions in the medical profession he could not get them to act in harmony. He found it

* Hector Gavin (1815-55) was prominent in the Sanitary Movement of the 1840s, acted as Medical Commissioner in the West Indies 1851-3, and was tragically killed in 1855 while a Sanitary Commissioner in the Crimea when accidentally shot by his brother William Gavin, a veterinary surgeon attached to the Scots Greys, whom he was visiting. (E. A. Spriggs: *Hector Gavin* MD FRCSE 1815-55)

difficult to get medical students for visiting (a normal practice in a cholera outbreak) because they had to be obtained from two conflicting medical schools. Gavin, with Dr. Gibb's assistance, called a meeting of the Newcastle Pathological Society (presumably as a neutral body) on 20 September to try to agree on a common formula for medicines. The meeting, he said, was "of so confused and disorderly a nature that no possible conclusion could be arrived at". They ended "in endeavouring to teach me my duties". When asked whether disapprobation was exhibited by the Newcastle medical men towards each other or the General Board of Health, he replied "I am bound to confess that it was impossible for me to understand what they were driving at". They simply would not agree on a formula to deal with the elementary stage of choleraic diarrhoea, unlike medical men elsewhere.⁷¹

The meeting of 20 September was followed on 26 September by a meeting of a rather select band of medical men (some 20 out of about 60 doctors and surgeons then in Newcastle) under the chairmanship of Mr. Potter. Dr. Robinson censured Grainger and complained that he had failed to consult the medical profession, and several spoke in his support. Mr. Newton, a good judge of a point like this, complained of personal discourtesy on the part of Gavin, and asserted that, if the local medical men had been consulted, hundreds of lives would have been saved—the disease was to be managed as easily as "hooping (sic) cough" or scarlatina. A letter to *The Times* was composed and signed by ten of those present, of whom seven were of the Fife party and none of the Embleton party, calling for a public enquiry.⁷²

There was an outbreak of anonymous and scurrilous fly posters, one attacking Mr. Newton for cowardice in taking leave of absence (for, I think, only two days in fact) during the outbreak and a number of other muck-raking allegations, and two others defending him and alleging that the original poster was "an effusion from the dark Genius of the Guild-hall" (an accusation which probably tells us more about Mr. Newton than Mr. John Clayton). It must be added, though, that at the end of the

outbreak Mr. Newton was entertained at a public banquet, and presented with a service of plate in "appreciation of his professional talents", so that on this occasion his erratic zeal was properly commemorated.

All in all, one can see why the General Board of Health was itself anxious for an enquiry. At the Commission's hearing, however, Sir John Fife was naturally inclined to pooh-pooh the problem. Gavin's most successful course would have been to ignore the division in the profession. "Gentlemen of both parties co-operate cordially in public institutions . . ." Mr. Furness, the surgeon to the Dispensary, who was a Fife man, was also eager to say that "I never looked upon cholera as a party thing". The Commission were not impressed.⁷³

Their findings were briefly as follows. The principal causes of the outbreak were sanitary defects and defective sewers. The fact that the rapid decline of the epidemic began five days after the pumping of water from the Tyne ceased was noted as "a coincidence if nothing more". They found that "there existed in Newcastle notoriously a schism between considerable sections of the medical profession" which suggested that cordial co-operation with the General Board of Health or the Board of Guardians was not very readily obtainable—this finding is a model of restraint.⁷⁴

It would be gratifying to report that these criticisms brought an immediate reconciliation between the parties, but this was not to be achieved so easily. There can be seen after a year or two, however, a distinct change of attitude.

11 Reconciliation—Success in Stages

Two years went past before the question of reconciliation was raised again. Then in May 1855 Dr. Robinson (of the Fife party) wrote in emollient terms: "Without adverting to the origin of the dispute . . . on reviewing the events of the last four years it is impossible for us not to be conscious of unkind acts and harsh expressions which we would gladly recall . . .". This refreshing honesty promised well. Each

side set up negotiating teams, Dr. Embleton being naturally a member for the College of Medicine and Sir John Fife an alternative member for the other College.

The parties were quickly at odds. The College of Practical Science grudgingly accepted the constitution approved by the University, but wanted Sir John Fife as Vice-President. That was ruled out straightaway—the constitution made no provision for a Vice-President, and that was that. Then there was the question of who would pick up the rent of the Barber-Surgeons' Hall for the remainder of the lease. The College of Medicine were not going to pay that. Who was to get the fees for students already under instruction for that year at the College of Practical Science? It was evident that that institution had financial problems. Some finely balanced solutions might have been found to that particular issue, but then the problem of how many of the lecturers from the College of Practical Science would become lecturers of the University became acute. The College of Practical Science declared that they were not being offered amalgamation on terms approaching equality, and at the end of July they discontinued the discussions.⁷⁵

In the spring of 1856 the House of Commons was considering a Bill to constitute the General Medical Council. Durham University sought to be represented on it as an awardee of medical degrees. In order to make it clear to all concerned that hostilities had been resumed, Sir John Fife and others as the medical lecturers in the College of Practical Science petitioned the Commons against the proposed representation. The conduct of the Warden and Senate towards the medical practitioners of the district and the petitioners in particular had, they said, "been tyrannical and offensive and has inflicted grave and lasting injury on the inhabitants of Newcastle on Tyne". The petition may be admired for its persistency of spirit, but it was of no effect.⁷⁶

So, of course, the Fife party had to come back, though it took another year for them to recognize that they were not getting enough students to pay their way. Finally, in April 1857, Dr. Robinson wrote again, with a nego-

tiating team that did not include Sir John Fife. The College of Medicine appointed Dr. Greenhow (who lectured in Medical Ethics) and Dr. Humble but omitted Dr. Embleton. By 29 May agreement had been reached and on 16 June five of the Fife party lecturers were elected in Convocation of the University, and the honorary degree of MA was conferred on Sir John Fife. The struggle was at an end, and though Dr. Embleton is careful not to say so in his History, it is apparent that his party had won.⁷⁷

Leaving aside the pleasure of the event to an observer of today simply as a spectacle, one cannot but regret the wrongheaded tenacity displayed by both sides. I confess to considerable sympathy with the basic intentions of Sir John Fife despite his highly objectionable conduct (which was met by Dr. Embleton with commendable restraint). But if in fact Sir John had managed to carry with him the whole of the medical men in Newcastle, there seems to be a strong possibility that the College of Practical Science would indeed have developed into a University. The interest shown by the Government in the period January to April 1853 shows a clear recognition that there was a real need for an organization to teach applied skills and science in the North. The success of the Great Exhibition of 1851 (and the existence of its surplus funds) was still an active influence at that date. Therefore, if in 1853 there had been unanimity on a University as a solution, that course might have been adopted. Its endowment might have presented a problem, but the concept, at a time when Tyneside was approaching the most prosperous period in its history, was surely correct. It is therefore an interesting speculation as to how University education in the North of England would have proceeded if Dr. Embleton and Sir John Fife had not fallen out so disastrously in 1843–44, and persisted in obstinate disagreement for over a dozen years.

12 Later Events

The disruption ended in 1857, but the later history of the College of Medicine, and of

those who valiantly took part in the struggle, deserve a short mention.

So far as the individuals are concerned, William Newton was the first to go, killed in a fall from his horse on the Town Moor in April 1863. The Warden died in his Ryton rectory, in his 80th year, in October of the same year. Dr. Headlam died in 1865, having practised until a few weeks before his death. Sir John Fife founded the 1st Newcastle Rifle Volunteer Corps in 1859 and, abandoning local politics, was its commanding officer until shortly before his death in 1871. John Clayton retired as Town Clerk in 1867, and spent his time at Chesters in antiquarian pursuits until his death, aged 98, in 1890.⁷⁸ Dr. Embleton outlived them all, acting as Registrar of the College until 1869, retiring from all official posts by 1872 (though still watching over his beloved College) and becoming a prolific author as historian of the Medical School and as an antiquarian until he died in 1900.⁷⁹

The College, which had begun in 1852 as "The College of Medicine in connection with the University of Durham", was incorporated into the University in 1870 as "The University of Durham College of Medicine at Newcastle". It moved from Orchard Street to Northumberland Road in 1888, to Queen Victoria Road in 1938, and then in 1984 to the present school next to the Royal Victoria Infirmary. (The problems of "the poisonous effluvia of the dissecting room and the laboratory" do not seem to have been an obstacle on this occasion.) In 1937 the College merged with Armstrong College to become King's College of Durham University, and in 1963 King's College was subsumed into the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. The original objectives of all the parties, therefore, seem now to have been achieved.⁸⁰

Acknowledgements

I was greatly helped by Dr. Embleton's descendant the late Dr. Dennis Embleton of Aldeburgh, who kindly made available various family papers to me.

I am much indebted to the following, both

for their general helpfulness, and their patience in dealing with my enquiries:

the librarians and staff of the Durham University Library, the Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle upon Tyne, the Newcastle upon Tyne University Library, the Local History Section of the Newcastle Central Library, and the Royal College of Surgeons;

the staff of the Tyne and Wear Record Office and the Registrar's Department of Durham University;

Dr. Alec Campbell and Mr. Michael Spriggs who helped me with particular points.

I also owe special thanks to Mr. Charles Parish for drawing my attention to Dr. Embleton, and to Professor Norman McCord and Miss Barbara Harbottle for reading this account in draft and pointing out errors, obscurities and solecisms. Those that remain are my responsibility alone.

Finally, I am most grateful to Mrs. Christine Earle Storey for typing such an accurate copy of an ill-written and much altered draft.

Abbreviations

Chol Comm Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into . . . the late Outbreak of Cholera in the Towns of Newcastle upon Tyne, Gateshead and Tynemouth HMSO 1854
Dendy F. W. Dendy: Obituary Notice of Dennis Embleton: *Archaeologia Aeliana* 2 xxxiii [1900] p. 1

DU Mins Minutes of Durham University Senate

Durham UL Durham University Library Archives and Special Collections

Embleton Papers Various notes and printed matter at Newcastle University Library under reference X610.714281

Lit and Phil The Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle upon Tyne and its premises in Westgate Road.

MS Facts "A Brief Statement of the Facts connected with the Disruption of the Late Medical School in this Town" [12 September 1851] Embleton Papers

MS Hist D. Embleton: *History of the Medical School afterwards The Durham College of Medicine* Newcastle 1890

MS Mins Minutes of the Newcastle College of Medicine and Surgery [Embleton Papers] *Newton—Letter* [W. Newton] “A Letter to the Venerable Archdeacon Thorp etc” by a Lecturer Newcastle 1851 [Embleton Papers] *Newton—Pamphlet* “The Five Physicians”—a letter to the Duke of Northumberland Newcastle c. 1853 [Embleton Papers]

NI Mins Minutes of the Governors of Newcastle Infirmary 1851–54 [Tyne and Wear Record Office]

NJ Newcastle Journal

PLU Min Minutes of the Newcastle Poor Law Union [Tyne and Wear Record Office]

Proceedings Proceedings of the Meetings of the Proprietary Lecturers—from 1 April 1851 to 25 June 1851 [Embleton Papers]

Thorp Papers Papers of the Venerable Charles Thorp held at Durham UL

Welford Richard Welford: *Men of Mark 'twixt Tyne and Tweed* London 1895

Whiting C. E. Whiting: *The University of Durham 1832–1932* London 1932

NOTES

1 *The Main Protagonists*

¹ Dendy; PLU Mins 1849–51.

² Newton—Pamphlet.

³ Anon: *Sketches of Public Men of the North*; Newcastle 1855 Welford Vol III p. 521.

⁴ Welford Vol II p. 226. Fife was also the owner of a cockpit at the back of his Newcastle house. *AA5* xx p. 20.

⁵ *Sketches* as above.

⁶ Welford Vol II p. 484.

⁷ *Sketches* as above.

2 *The Dispute's Origins as seen by Dr. Embleton*

⁸ PLU Mins 16 Jun 1850.

⁹ Welford Vol III p. 220.

¹⁰ PLU Mins 17 Jan and 18 Oct 1850.

¹¹ PLU Mins 6 Dec 1850.

¹² PLU Mins 21 Mar 1851.

¹³ *Proceedings*.

3 *The Dispute's Origins Reconsidered*

¹⁴ MS Hist.

¹⁵ MS Hist.

¹⁶ NJ 4 Oct 1851.

¹⁷ Statement by Newcastle upon Tyne College of Medicine and Practical Science 13 Sep 1851 [Embleton Papers].

¹⁸ DU Mins 6 Mar 1849. The scholarship (in classics) was funded by the Newby Testimonial. Dr. Embleton had been educated at Witton-le-Wear Grammar School of which the Rev. Newby was headmaster, and it seems probable that this is the Newby in question.

¹⁹ DU Mins 11 June 1850.

²⁰ MS Hist p. 50.

²¹ *Proceedings* 16 Apr 1851.

²² Newspaper cutting 7 Oct 1854 [Embleton Papers].

4 *Dissolution of the School*

²³ The whole of this account derives from *Proceedings*.

5 *The New "School of Medicine and Surgery"*

²⁴ MS Mins 26 Jun 1851.

²⁵ MS Hist.

²⁶ MS Mins 26 Jun 1851.

²⁷ MS Mins 28 Jun 1851; NJ 5 Jul 1851.

²⁸ NJ 12 Jul 1851.

²⁹ NJ 19 Jul 1851.

³⁰ MS Facts p. 9.

³¹ MS Facts p. 10; MS Mins 5, 12, 14 and 19 Aug 1851.

³² NJ 23 Aug 1851.

³³ MS Mins 25 Aug 1851.

6 *The Raids on the Museum*

³⁴ MS Mins 2, 3 and 15 Jul 1851; NJ 26 Jul 1851.

³⁵ MS Facts pp. 5–9.

³⁶ MS Hist.

7 *Recognition Won*

³⁷ MS Facts.

³⁸ See Section 3 and reference 17.

³⁹ See Section 4 and *Proceedings*.

⁴⁰ Whiting p. 119.

⁴¹ NJ 13 Sep 1851.

⁴² NJ 4 Oct 1851.

⁴³ MS Mins 11 Sep 1851.

⁴⁴ NJ 4 Oct 1851.

⁴⁵ MS Mins 12, 14, 15 and 21 Oct 1851.

- ⁴⁶MS Mins 27 and 29 Oct 1851.
⁴⁷Thorp Papers 437.
⁴⁸DU Mins 25 Nov 1851.
⁴⁹Newton—Letter.
⁵⁰MS Mins 13 Dec 1851; DU Mins 20 Jan 1852.
⁵¹Newcastle School of Medicine Sesquicentennial Scrapbook p. 18.
⁵²NI Mins 30 Oct 1851.
⁵³DU Mins 16 Mar 1852.
⁵⁴NI Mins 4 Nov 1852.
⁵⁵NI Mins 5 Jan 1853; *Newcastle Courant* 7 Jan 1853.
- 8 *Premises*
⁵⁶MS Mins 2 Sep 1851.
⁵⁷NJ 20 Sep 1851.
⁵⁸MS Hist.
⁵⁹Lit & Phil Minutes 19 Sep and 10 Oct 1851.
⁶⁰MS Mins 31 Oct, 20 and 24 Nov 1851.
⁶¹Print with Embleton Papers.
⁶²NI Mins 1 Jan 1852; newspaper cutting (undated) with Embleton Papers.
⁶³Proceedings of the Newcastle Council 4 Feb 1852.
⁶⁴MS Mins 7–29 Feb, 18 and 23 Mar, and 2 Jun 1852.
⁶⁵Thorp Papers 445.
- 9 *Reconciliation—a First Attempt*
⁶⁶*The Athenaeum* 12 Mar 1853; MS Mins; Thorp Papers, particularly 447 and 448.
⁶⁷*The Athenaeum* 26 Feb 1853 p. 258 and loc. cit.
⁶⁸MS Mins 23 and 29 Jul, 31 Aug and 13 Oct 1853.
- 10 *Cholera in 1853—a Touch of Reality*
⁶⁹Chol Comm; Findings.
⁷⁰Chol Comm; PLU Min; DNB.
⁷¹Chol Comm.
⁷²*The Times* 28 Sep 1853.
⁷³Poster: “Paul Pry . . .” nd: John Bell Collection [Newcastle UL]; Chol Comm.
⁷⁴Chol Comm—Findings.
- 11 *Reconciliation—Success in Stages*
⁷⁵MS Mins 14–22 May, 6–28 Jun, 16 Jul and 1 Aug 1855.
⁷⁶Manuscript copy with the Embleton Papers.
⁷⁷MS Hist.
- 12 *Later Events*
⁷⁸Welford, loc cit.
⁷⁹MS Hist; Dendy.
⁸⁰*Proceedings of Newcastle School of Medicine Sesquicentennial Celebrations*; University of Newcastle upon Tyne Calendar 1992–3 p. 23.