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Introduction 
This paper is part of a larger project, “University of King’s College and Slavery: a Scholarly Inquiry,” initiated in December, 2017, by President William Lahey. The need for such a paper stems from the investigations of Professor Eric Foner and his students at Columbia University into the question of the ties between King’s College, New York, and slavery. In Professor Foner’s words, “From the outset slavery was intertwined with the life of [King’s College, New York].”\(^1\) This conclusion bears upon the history of the University of King’s College because of the claim, in the words of President Lahey, that King’s “... has made since the 1980s to be a successor institution to King’s College in New York.”\(^2\) 

If King’s College, Nova Scotia, founded in 1789, is in fact connected to its New York namesake, the question arises as to whether it can be regarded as implicated either directly or indirectly in this history of slavery uncovered by Professor Foner. An answer requires an investigation as to whether any historical connection actually existed between the two institutions. If, as I argue in this paper, the supposed relationship between the two King’s is a myth, a further question appears. How did a belief in this myth emerge at the University of King’s College?\(^3\) This I also attempt to explain.

It is important to note at the outset that my paper is limited to dealing with the two questions outlined above. I do not examine either the direct or indirect links between the University of King’s College and slavery, subjects which are at the heart of the Scholarly Inquiry initiated by President Lahey. They will be considered by Dr. Shirley Tillotson, Dr. Karolyn Smardz Frost and Mr. David States.\(^4\) My paper should be considered as a ground-clearing exercise for their research by removing any confusion stemming from the supposed relationship between King’s College New York and King’s College Windsor.
1. King’s College, New York

King’s College, New York, founded in 1754 as the fifth college in the pre-Revolutionary thirteen colonies, was controlled by the Church of England, but that control from the beginning was contested by other denominations. It is estimated that less than one-seventh of the churches in the rapidly expanding colony of New York were Anglican. From 1749 to 1756, New York’s population grew from 73,000 to 100,000; by 1790, it had reached 340,000. The dynamism of the colony was expressed most completely in the city of New York itself, which was on a trajectory to become the dominant commercial centre in North America. By 1760, it had a population of 18,000, nearly double its population in the 1740s. In 1785, despite the ravages of war and the departure of the Loyalists, it stood at 24,000 and was growing fast.

The origin of King’s College, New York, lay in the approval by the New York House of Assembly in 1745 of a lottery to fund a college. In 1751, the Assembly appointed a ten-person lottery commission to administer the funds raised. The trustees of the commission, seven of whom were Anglican, decided to build the college on a six-acre piece of land on the western side of Manhattan offered by Trinity Church the following year. This donation was conditional upon the college’s president being an Anglican and the Anglican liturgy being used for services.

Accordingly, the trustees invited the Reverend Samuel Johnson (1696-1772), Rector of Stamford, Connecticut, to be the first president. Johnson was perhaps the most distinguished Anglican clergyman in America. A graduate of Yale and originally a Congregationalist, Johnson corresponded with such luminaries as Benjamin Franklin and the philosopher George Berkeley. He had been awarded a D.D. by Oxford in 1748 for his book *Elementa Philosophica*, which was published on both sides of the Atlantic.

The creation of an Anglican institution led to the “King’s College controversy,” which David Humphrey explored in *From King’s College to Columbia*. It was fuelled by Presbyterian opposition to an Anglican college in receipt of public funds. Although the merchants of New York City tended to be Anglican, the landed interest in the colony was heavily Presbyterian, a powerful and wealthy denomination that had founded the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1746. The Presbyterian attack on an Anglican college was led by William Livingston, a New York lawyer, forceful polemicist and member of a leading landed family. It formed part of a
broad assault on Anglican pretensions to be the established church in New York, which rested on the shaky foundation of the *Ministry Act* of 1693. This provided public funding for six Anglican clergymen in four of New York’s counties, and was interpreted by the Anglican governor and council as the basis for an Anglican Establishment. Livingston and his allies wanted a non-denominational college free from religious teaching, established not by a charter issued by the Anglican governor and council but through an act of the Assembly, which would control the appointment of trustees and staff, including the president.

The Presbyterians did not get their way, for in 1754, Governor James De Lancey granted a royal charter to King’s in the name of George II. Although Anglicans dominated the college’s large board of forty-one members, it initially included, apart from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the president, only one Anglican clergyman (the rector of Trinity Church), and *ex officio* the senior ministers of the Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, Lutheran and French churches in the city. There were no religious tests for faculty or governors. The charter also contained a clause guaranteeing “Equal liberty and Advantage of Education” to students “of any Religious Denomination.” Furthermore, the new president, Samuel Johnson, gave assurances that not only could students choose their place of worship on Sundays but that he would not “impose on the scholars the peculiar tenets of any particular set of Christians.” From the religious point of view, according to Johnson, the aim of the college would be “to inculcate upon their tender minds, the great principles of Christianity and morality in which true Christians of each denomination are generally agreed.” Protestants of all denominations could serve as governors, but Roman Catholics and Jews were excluded by an oath provision.

None of this detracted from the reality that by the terms of the charter and the conditions of the grant of land from Trinity Church, daily worship was conducted according to the Anglican liturgy. Until 1776, of the fifty-nine individuals who served as board members, all were Anglican except for the *ex officio* clerical representatives and a handful of members of the Dutch Reformed Church. The Presbyterians, for their part, refused to participate. More than half of the governors were merchants or merchant-landowners; twenty per cent were lawyers and sixteen per cent clergymen, whose numbers increased through co-optation as governors retired. Board members associated with Trinity Church *de facto* controlled the college, the most influential
being the Reverend Samuel Auchmuty, rector from 1764-77, who from 1759 to 1776 appears not to have missed a meeting.\textsuperscript{24} After 1770, he could rely on the unwavering support of his assistant at Trinity, the Reverend Charles Inglis, who served as acting president from 1771-72. Auchmuty was instrumental in engineering the replacement of president Johnson by the Reverend Myles Cooper (1735-85) in 1763.\textsuperscript{25}

The upshot of this total Anglican domination was low enrolment. Robert A. McCaughey has succeeded in identifying the religion of 168 of the 226 students who enrolled in King’s between 1754 and its closing in 1776. Of these, ninety-seven per cent were Anglican or Dutch Reformed (163), three were Presbyterian, one Moravian and one Jewish.\textsuperscript{26} One-half (113) of those enrolled stayed to graduation.\textsuperscript{27} More than a third of the students were children of merchants. In the words of Craig Steven Wilder, “King’s was a merchants’ college. In its first two decades it enrolled nearly ninety sons of the commercial class, more children of Atlantic traders than any other college in British North America.”\textsuperscript{28} However, many chose not to follow their fathers’ occupations but rather to use their education to pursue the law.\textsuperscript{29} Fewer than twenty (eleven per cent), or about one per class, entered the priesthood.\textsuperscript{30} Most of the students were drawn from a small group of perhaps thirty Anglican and Dutch Reformed families, many of which were drifting towards Anglicanism.\textsuperscript{31} With Congregationalist Yale as well as the College of New Jersey only fifty miles from New York City, non-Anglicans had alternatives to attending King’s. After 1766, with the founding of Queen’s College (Rutgers) by the Dutch Reformed communion, King’s also faced competition for students from New York’s shrinking Dutch community.\textsuperscript{32}

King’s was fortunate in being the richest college in the thirteen colonies, the beneficiary of lotteries, land grants and, notably, in 1758, a bequest of £8,000 from a Trinity parishioner and college governor Paul Murray, the biggest such gift in colonial America.\textsuperscript{33} King’s also benefited from fund-raising in England, which yielded £6,000; in addition, it received large grants of land in upstate New York. The College nevertheless suffered from chronic financial difficulties and charged fees that were twice those of the College of New Jersey (Princeton) and half again the tuition at Harvard.\textsuperscript{34}

Under its first president, the curriculum was relatively progressive. Samuel Johnson was
interested in science and mathematics. In 1762, after the death of his first appointment in these subjects from consumption, Johnson hired a Scottish Presbyterian and graduate of Glasgow, Robert Harpur, as professor of mathematics and natural philosophy. Generally, apart from the medical school that was created in 1767, the college had no more than three professors at a time and often only two. Greek and Latin were emphasized in the first years of study; Johnson taught metaphysics to juniors and moral philosophy to senior students. However, Johnson’s age (58) when he became president and his prolonged absences meant that King’s lacked effective leadership. A major achievement during his presidency, however, was the construction of the college building (1756-60), an impressive three-storey stone edifice 130 feet long, whose design was later to influence that developed by Charles Inglis for King’s College in Windsor, constructed between 1791-94.

Johnson’s successor, the Reverend Myles Cooper, a graduate of Queen’s College, Oxford, had come to King’s in 1762 as professor of moral philosophy. A convivial bachelor, with a wine cellar reputed to be the best in the colonies, he lacked his predecessor’s intellectual interests and attainments. After his death, the Gentlemen’s Magazine commented: “It may deserve mention that Cooper’s estate included his library, valued at five pounds sterling, [and] his wine cellar, valued at 150.” He had little interest in science, devoting himself to making the King’s curriculum resemble that of Oxford as closely as possible, with a focus upon Latin and Greek grammar, classics, logic, metaphysics and ethics. In the words of David C. Humphrey, “Cooper revered Oxford, and it was the only university he knew. He saw no reason why an infant college in the wilderness should not bow to the traditions of England’s greatest educational institution.” As at Oxford, students were required under Cooper’s leadership to eat and live in the college. Discipline was tightened and the college was surrounded by an eight-foot-tall fence with nails on top.

Cooper, like his predecessor Johnson, campaigned with Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Charles Inglis and other Anglican divines for the establishment of an American episcopate, which was strongly resisted by dissenters, who were successful in thwarting their hopes. New York’s Anglicans generally supported Great Britain before and during the American Revolution. Both Cooper and Inglis wrote Loyalist pamphlets. Cooper also produced a thirty-four-page poem, “The
Patriots of North America: A Sketch” (1775), attacking “... This vagrant Crew / Whose wretched Jargon, crude and new / Whose Impudence and Lies delude / The harmless ign’rant Multitude.” Cooper’s opinions, if not his execrable verse, led to an attack on the college in May, 1775, by a mob intent on capturing him. He was guided to safety by a “divine boy,” who was, according to legend, Alexander Hamilton. Cooper took refuge in a warship in New York harbour before sailing to England two weeks later, never to return to America.45

Unlike Cooper, Inglis did not run away. He became a powerful advocate of the Loyalist cause with a number of printed sermons and pamphlets, notably The Deceiver Unmasked, or Loyalty and Interest United: In Answer to a Pamphlet Entitled Common Sense (1776), reprinted as The True Interest of America Impartially Stated.46 Professor Philip Gould regards this work as “perhaps the most effective Loyalist response to Common Sense.”47 Upon the death in 1777 of the Rev. Samuel Auchmuty, Inglis became Rector of Trinity. On October 22, 1779, the New York Legislature passed an act of attaintder finding him, his wife and 57 others guilty of treason and their property marked for confiscation.48 Under the terms of the act they were also convicted of felony and sentenced to death if located in territory held by the Patriots.49 After the peace agreement signed in December 1782 reached New York the following March, Inglis wrote to a parishioner and influential Patriot, James Duane, indicating that he was open to remaining in the new republic as he no longer owed allegiance to the Crown: “I am henceforth at full Liberty to transfer it to that State where Providence may place me.”50 However, an attempt to overturn the 1779 act of attaintder proved unsuccessful, and it is likely that Duane advised him to leave.51 He remained in New York until the late autumn, sailing to England shortly before the British evacuation on November 25.52

Myles Cooper’s somewhat undignified departure in 1775 essentially spelled the demise of King’s College. The Board appointed an interim successor, the Rev. Benjamin Moore, 27 years old and a King’s graduate (1766), but there were few students; in 1776 the college building was turned into a hospital that was used in turn by the British when they re-occupied the city the following year. Moore attempted to carry on in the house of one of the governors, but seems to have given up in 1777. The governors continued to meet on occasion until 1781. As late as 1779, Cooper planned to return to his position, but the British defeat at Yorktown (1781) made clear that this was a vain
hope. The Treaty of Paris ending the Revolution was signed on September 23, 1783. The following spring, on May 1, 1784, the Legislature of New York passed legislation creating Columbia College, which received the property of King’s College. The 1784 Columbia charter was non-sectarian, eliminating the Anglican provisions of that of 1754. The short history of King’s College, New York, had come to an end.

Before turning to the origins of King’s College, Windsor, Nova Scotia, it is important to recognize that King’s College, New York, was the only college in the thirteen colonies whose board of governors, alumni and students generally remained loyal to the Crown. Robert A. McCaughey has attempted to identify the political affiliation of King’s students: of 148 with known political affiliations, seventy-two per cent were Loyalists and twenty per cent Patriots. Among the governors, twenty-six can be identified as Loyalists, and three as Patriots. In the case of Harvard, it is estimated that only sixteen per cent of living students in 1776 were aligned with the Crown. The figure at Yale was ten per cent, and at Princeton, a minuscule two per cent. King’s College, New York, however, remained firm in its loyalism, despite producing a few leading revolutionaries such as Alexander Hamilton and John Jay. To that extent, at least, its founders may be said to have achieved a small step towards their objective of creating an Anglican Establishment, even though the goal was probably doomed from the start because of the energy and strength of their dissenting opponents.

2. King’s College, Windsor, 1789-1802

As remaining in New York was closed to Inglis, he determined to move to Nova Scotia, sending his library and furniture to Annapolis Royal in the summer of 1783. He was a signatory of the ultimately unsuccessful “petition of fifty-five” asking for a grant of 5,000 acres of land for each of the petitioners, a request that proved highly unpopular among other Loyalists, who, in the words of Maya Jasanoff, “saw it as an arrogant assumption of privilege by the elite.” Inglis’s plans were altered by the illness and death of his wife, as well as the illnesses of his children. By the time he was able to leave, transport was available only to England.

There he remained for nearly four years, pursuing his claim for compensation from the Loyalist claims commission and lobbying for the establishment of an episcopate in British North
America. On March 21, 1783, he had been one of eighteen clergymen in New York who presented a memorandum to Sir Guy Carleton, Commander-in-Chief, proposing a “plan for an episcopate in Nova Scotia.” Under the proposal, the bishop would have no temporal power. However, “[t]he fixing of a bishop in Nova Scotia and the consequent supply of clergymen, will strengthen the attachment and confirm the loyalty of the inhabitants, and promote the settlement of the province.” Five days later, seventeen of the signatories, including Inglis, wrote to Carleton recommending the Reverend Thomas Bradbury Chandler, formerly rector of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, and an exile in London since 1775, as bishop of the proposed see. However, the proposal for a Nova Scotian episcopate was not to be acted upon for more than four years.

The same group of clerics also presented Carleton with “A Plan of Religious and Literary Institution for the Province of Nova Scotia.” This advocated the creation of a grammar school and a college, preferably “to be instituted at the most central part of the province (suppose [sic] at Windsor),” both to be headed by members of the Church of England, and the latter by a clergyman. Professors might be of any Protestant denomination, “securities being always given that no doctrine be inculcated repugnant to the constitution of Great Britain as a monarchy – the neglect or perversion of which in most of the seminaries in America is known to have proved one of the most obvious and immediate causes of the subversion of that happy system by which the country was so eminently blest ...” On October 18, 1783, shortly before his departure for England, Inglis and four other clergy wrote a letter to Carleton arguing for “[t]he founding of a College or seminary of learning on a liberal plan in [Nova Scotia], where youth may receive a virtuous education and can be qualified for the learned professions ...” They pointed out that without such an institution, Nova Scotians would have to go to Great Britain, which few could afford, or to “some of the states of this continent, where they will be sure to imbibe principles that are unfriendly to the British Constitution.” Although the letter called for the appointment of a president, and “able professors in the different branches of science, and for a good grammar school,” it said nothing about the proposed college’s religious affiliation. The authors confined themselves to asserting that “[a college] would diffuse religious literature, loyalty, and good morals among His Majesty’s subjects there.”

Aspects of this “Plan of Religious and Literary Institution,” such as the provision for an
Anglican president and the acceptability of Protestant professors, reflected the practice of King’s College, New York. There was no suggestion, however, either in the “Plan” or the letter of October 18, 1783, of any connection between that institution and what was suggested for Nova Scotia, apart from the proposed foundation being Anglican and loyal to the Crown. Only two board members of King’s College, New York – the Rev. Charles Inglis and the Rev. Benjamin Moore, the acting president – participated in drafting the “Plan” and the letter. Moore was to remain in the United States, becoming in 1801 both bishop of New York and president of Columbia. The others of the group comprised a cross-section of American clergy, most notably the Rev. Samuel Seabury, who was to be consecrated in 1784 as the first American bishop (of Connecticut). Apart from Inglis, eight were to immigrate to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Three of these were college graduates, one from Harvard, one from Yale and the third from King’s College, New York. None of the eight played any role in the founding or governance of King’s College, Windsor.

Inglis’s years in London from 1783-87 were ones of uncertainty, even tumult. While waiting upon the adjudication of his claim for compensation, and searching for a suitable living, he had to meet a bitter pamphlet attack upon his reputation from those who defended Nova Scotia’s lieutenant-governor John Parr’s rejection of the deeply unpopular “petition of the 55.” Inglis was accused of disloyalty, primarily on the basis of his final sermon before he left New York. In this he had exhorted his congregation to obey the new government and stated that if he were to remain, he would transfer his allegiance, for that was the “common duty of all Christians; and on no other principle can any government or society subsist.” A further danger to Inglis was the charge of corruption levelled at him by the Reverend Samuel Peters, an emigré clergyman from Connecticut. If substantiated, these assertions would not only have destroyed his claim for compensation but any possibility of preferment. Inglis privately published an effective refutation which preserved his reputation. Judith Fingard has suggested that at this time a colonial bishopric was not actually Inglis’s first choice for his future; he discovered, however, that he did not have enough influence to obtain a more lucrative position in either England or Ireland.

Meanwhile, the question of the Nova Scotian episcopate remained in limbo during the political turmoil that followed the collapse of Lord North’s ministry in 1782. Inglis had no expectation of getting the appointment. John Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, had decided that, if
and when established, the bishopric should go to Thomas Bradbury Chandler, the candidate recommended by the New York clergy in March, 1783. Inglis’s hopes were directed towards the possibility that he might be chosen if a second episcopate were to be created in the province of Canada. To that end he lobbied the newly-appointed governor-general, Sir Guy Carleton, as well as Archbishop Moore.74

But chance in the form of Chandler’s ill-health was to bring Inglis to Nova Scotia. In July, 1786, Chandler sent him a letter, stating he was too weak from cancer of the nose to take up the appointment. Archbishop Moore had previously informed Inglis that he would be the preferred candidate if Chandler should withdraw. Finally, in August, 1786, an Order-in-Council ordered the Privy Committee for Trade and Plantations to take up the question of the Nova Scotian episcopate. After eight meetings, the decision was made in May, 1787, to go forward.

As recommended in the memorandum of March 21, 1783, the new bishop had no civil authority; his responsibilities were confined to ordaining and supervising the clergy, and confirming the laity. Even the right of presentation to benefices was reserved to the lieutenant-governor.75 Appeals of the bishop’s rulings would be made to the High Court of Chancery and not to an episcopal court. The Church of England had been established by provincial statute as early as 1758, but this elevation had limited significance. It could only levy taxes upon declared members, which meant in practice that individuals could avoid church rates simply by declaring themselves dissenters.76 The Church of England in Nova Scotia comprised one-quarter of the population of the province, which was to have implications for the future success of an Anglican institution of higher education.77

The prospect of Inglis as bishop met some opposition among the clergy in his new diocese, particularly those originally from Connecticut and Massachusetts, who were encouraged by his enemy Samuel Peters to mount a petition against his appointment.78 However, resistance faded away when news that Inglis had been consecrated reached the province. He sailed from England on August 26, 1787, arriving in Halifax on October 17.

Although he was later to reside in a bucolic retreat at Aylesford in the Annapolis Valley, it is conceivable that Inglis’s first sight of Halifax might have echoed William Cobbett’s, who arrived two years before as a soldier: “When I first beheld the barren, not to say hideous rocks at the
entrance to the harbour I began to fear that the master of the vessel had mistaken his way, for I could perceive nothing of the fertility that my good recruiting captain had dwelt upon with such delight.” The new bishop’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction embraced Nova Scotia, the island of St. John (after 1799 Prince Edward Island), Cape Breton Island, New Brunswick, Canada and Newfoundland. This vast territory was economically undeveloped, had minimal overland communications and for the most part an impoverished population. Despite the inroads made by Loyalist migration, much of the territory was still in the possession of Indigenous peoples. In the words of Ann Gorman Condon, “[t]iny clusters of people continued to live in isolated pockets of settlement, separated from each other by vast waterways, dense forests, and a forbidding climate.”

Halifax, the largest centre in the Atlantic region, benefited after 1776 through a vastly increased military presence combined with mercantile growth. With a population of perhaps 4,000, only a thin stratum of government officials, merchants and military officers lived comfortably. According to David Sutherland, in the mid-1780s, “[p]aupers were everywhere, housing became almost impossible to secure, while hundreds resorted to a diet of fish, corn, and molasses, with the most desperate dining on dogs and cats.” Overcrowding was due at least in part to the presence in the town of approximately 1,400 Loyalists, part of the exodus of perhaps 19,000 to peninsular Nova Scotia during and after the Revolution.

As has been pointed out by Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan, “loyalism” defies generalization: “Loyalism was not the exclusive preserve of reactionary Tories who used it to combat Lockean liberalism; rather, it encompassed a wide range of peoples in colonial America, from ethnic and religious minorities to Mohawks and enslaved people of African descent to most of the white colonists in the British Caribbean.” Most Loyalists in Nova Scotia were not well-off and many were impoverished. A substantial number were persons of colour. Apart from opposition to American independence, a belief that their sacrifices should be rewarded by the British government, and a hostility to government officials in Halifax, Neil MacKinnon has asserted that “what the Loyalist feared and distrusted most was another Loyalist. One can take the typical Loyalist attitude so far, for there was no typical Loyalist.” The Loyalist presence in the province led to ongoing political conflict with the so-called “pre-Loyalists,” and was responsible for the creation of the province of New Brunswick in 1784.
It is obvious from this brief outline of the size of his diocese, and the economic and political circumstances of the Atlantic region, that Inglis faced a daunting task, not least in relation to education. He discovered that there was no grammar school in Nova Scotia, a prerequisite if students were to be able to attend the college which he knew to be essential to sustain a priesthood. His initial impression of the clergy was not favourable. Two-thirds of them were over fifty years old; of the eleven serving in Nova Scotia, the bishop believed that only four were fit for their duties. A college, in short, was crucial to both church and state in a province where “the old inhabitants have little sense either of religion, order or loyalty; where the new inhabitants must soon sink into the same state, unless prevented by the instruction to be derived from this seminary and the labour of the clergy.”

Inglis rapidly prepared “A brief Sketch of the plan on which it is proposed to Conduct the Academy of Nova Scotia,” proposing the establishment of a school with two streams: a Latin school to prepare men for a college, and an English school centred on reading, writing and practical mathematics. Within six weeks of Inglis’s arrival in Halifax, lieutenant-governor John Parr tabled in the House of Assembly Royal Instructions “that [Parr] recommend to the Assembly ... to make due Provision for the erecting and maintaining of Schools, where Youth may be educated in competent Learning and in Knowledge or the Principles of the Christian religion.” Two of the seven members of the committee struck by the Assembly to implement these Instructions, Thomas Barclay and the Rev. Isaac Wilkins, were graduates of King’s College, New York, and friends of Inglis. The committee recommended the establishment of an academy, to be headed by an Anglican clergyman to be paid £200 per annum, with another £100 per annum allocated for a “professor of mathematics and natural philosophy.”

When these resolutions were sent to the council, there was some disagreement, particularly over the location of the school, which Inglis insisted should be situated in Windsor rather than in Halifax. In his “brief Sketch,” Inglis had argued that “[t]he greatest attention must be paid to the morals of the Students in both Schools, and every precaution must be used to guard them against the infection of bad principles, and bad examples.” In this instance Inglis and the council were revisiting an argument that had surrounded the founding of King’s College, New York, in 1753, when the trustees decided to locate it in New York City. Inglis continued to prefer the rural option
he and other clergy had advocated in March, 1783. He prevailed over those wanting to locate the academy in Halifax, and the decision was made to allocate £400 to purchase a house for the school in Windsor, one with far-reaching consequences for the future King’s College and for the long-term future of higher education in Nova Scotia. After some delay, a person to head the school was found in the person of Archibald Inglis, the bishop’s nephew, who underwent a hasty ordination on October 19, 1788. The school finally opened on November 1 with seventeen students.

The same committee of the Assembly also recommended “as soon as can be found practicable” the need to establish “a College or University in the Province, to prevent as early as may be, the Youth of this Country (now panting for Knowledge) from rushing into the various Seminaries already established in the United States of America, by which means their Attachment to their native Country may be in Danger of being weakened, and Principles imbibed unfriendly to the British Constitution.” The Act consequently passed by the Assembly establishing King’s College in 1789 contained no suggestion that students or professors need be Anglican. The only mention of religion in the Act was the stipulation that the president must be a Church of England clergyman, a requirement that not only hearkens back to the March 1783, “Plan of Religious and Literary Institution” but also recalls the terms of the 1754 Royal Charter of King’s College, New York. However the structure of the boards of the two colleges was fundamentally different. The 1754 charter had created a forty-one-person board of governors, including representatives of the various New York churches. In the case of the 1789 Act establishing King’s College, Windsor, the institution was to be unambiguously an arm of government, funded by the province, with a board of governors made up of the governor and commander-in-chief (Guy Carleton, Baron Dorchester), the lieutenant-governor (John Parr), the bishop of Nova Scotia, the provincial secretary (Richard Bulkeley), the chief justice (Jeremy Pemberton), the speaker of the House of Assembly (Richard John Uniacke), the attorney general (Sampson Salter Blowers) and the solicitor general (Uniacke). Under the terms of the Act, the new college would receive £444, 80 s and 10½ d in perpetuity from the province, and up to £500 to purchase a “house, lot of ground and premises” in Windsor. Somewhat surprisingly, given the presence of dissenters in the Assembly, the Act passed without opposition. J. Murray Beck suggests that “[p]erhaps they did not think the provisions for King’s College unusual or objectionable in a province in which the Church of
England had been established for three decades. Their attitude might have been different if they had known that the governors of the college would impose religious tests which had the practical effect of barring dissenters from its doors ...”

These restrictions were not imposed, however, until the college statutes were drafted after the receipt of its Royal Charter in 1802. During the intervening thirteen years, the governors succeeded in constructing the building that survived until the fire of February 5, 1920, facilitated by grants from the British government totalling £4,000. Designed by Inglis, it was modelled on King’s College, New York, although constructed for the most part of wood rather than stone and slightly larger than its New York prototype. Inglis laid the cornerstone in 1791 and the structure was finally completed in 1794.

Inglis found a capable president in William Cochran (c. 1757-1833), a graduate (1780) of Trinity College Dublin, who had emigrated to the United States in late 1783 and was appointed professor of Latin and Greek in 1785 at the newly-founded Columbia College, which awarded him an honorary M.A. in 1788. He quickly became known in New York for newspaper articles attacking slavery, contrasting the principles of the Declaration of Independence with “men set up at auction in our streets, and sold exactly like horses or oxen.” Disillusioned with the republic, he moved to Nova Scotia in 1788, becoming head of the newly-founded grammar school in Halifax, and playing an active role in the nascent literary life of the town. Ordained by Inglis in 1790, he then assumed the presidency. Cochran was to remain at King’s until his retirement in 1831, although forced out of the presidency because the statutes (1803 and 1807) approved by the board of governors after the college received its Royal Charter in 1802 stipulated that the president must be a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. During the remainder of his career at King’s, with the exception of a brief period as interim president, Cochran acted as vice-president, first under the Rev. Thomas Cox, who died in 1805, and then the Rev. Charles Porter (c.1779-1864), president from 1805 to 1836. Inglis remained a staunch friend and supporter of Cochran’s, strongly opposing his deposition from the presidency by the board of governors, which was dominated by the arrogant and snobbish Alexander Croke (1758-1842), judge of the vice-admiralty court (1801-15), an Oxonian who was determined to make King’s resemble his alma mater as closely as possible.
The number of students who attended King’s during the years between its founding and 1803 is unknown. Bishop John Inglis, third bishop of Nova Scotia (1825-50), one of the first to enrol in the college, estimated that over 200 entered before it received its charter; “more than a hundred of those persons desired to pursue a Collegiate course.” This is improbable. In the “appendix” to his Memoranda on the college, written in 1836 to defend the institution from being taken away from the Church of England and incorporated into Dalhousie College, Inglis listed 95 persons who supposedly attended during this period. It seems likely that Inglis conflated enrolment at the academy and the college. Without a royal charter, students could not receive degrees, and the £30 per annum it cost to attend was prohibitive. Inglis informed Archbishop Moore that there were fewer than 20 “fathers” in Nova Scotia who could afford to send their sons to King’s. Cochran was the only professor, for the college was unsuccessful in finding a person to teach mathematics. It seems likely that students attended daily prayers according to the Anglican prayer book and Sunday services in the Windsor parish church, observances that were made mandatory by the board of governors in 1798. These requirements could hardly have made King’s attractive to dissenters. Brian Cuthbertson is surely correct in suggesting that divinity students, of whom there were seven in the mid-1790s, comprised most of the student body, and that a very small number of students actually enrolled in the college during these years.

With the granting of the College’s Royal Charter in 1802, the history of King’s entered its second phase, although it remained firmly in the grip of provincial office-holders. The charter created a board of governors comprising the lieutenant-governor (Sir John Wentworth), the bishop, the chief justice (Sampson Salter Blowers), the judge of the court of vice-admiralty (Alexander Croke), the speaker of the house of assembly, the attorney-general (both positions held by Richard John Uniacke), the solicitor-general (James Stewart) and the provincial secretary (Wentworth’s brother-in-law, Benning Wentworth). The board was given the authority to include the president and co-opt three additional members.

Brian Cuthbertson and Judith Fingard have analyzed the bitter conflict between Inglis and Judge Alexander Croke over the “Statutes Rules and Ordinances” the board of governors was empowered to prepare under the terms of the charter. Inglis saw King’s primarily as a seminary; Croke was determined that the institution emphasize secular subjects suitable for the education of a
lay elite in a college modelled as closely as possible upon Oxford. He also insisted on the exclusion of non-Anglicans through the requirement that matriculants sign the Thirty-Nine Articles. Croke wanted a lay president, a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge, while Inglis demanded that the president and professors be clergymen, with Cochran remaining as president. The bishop’s attitude on the question of the Thirty-Nine Articles has been a subject for dispute. In the protest Inglis sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose approval of the statutes was required by the charter, he made no mention of the issue; Croke claimed, however, that Inglis attempted to have the requirement concerning the articles revoked, but this is hearsay in the absence of written evidence. Whatever Inglis’s position may have been, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles Manners-Sutton, found the statutes unacceptable, striking out the requirement concerning matriculation and replacing it with the practice of Cambridge (his own university) that students had to sign the articles to take a degree. By the time his decision reached Nova Scotia, the 1803 statutes had been printed; they were not issued in a corrected form until 1821.

Whatever Inglis’s position may have been, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles Manners-Sutton, found the statutes unacceptable, striking out the requirement concerning matriculation and replacing it with the practice of Cambridge (his own university) that students had to sign the articles to take a degree. By the time his decision reached Nova Scotia, the 1803 statutes had been printed; they were not issued in a corrected form until 1821.

Whether this made any difference is doubtful. How many non-Anglicans would have attended if they were not allowed to graduate? In any event, all students were required under the statutes to attend daily prayers according to the rites of the Church of England and were forbidden to enter any non-Anglican place of worship. The restrictions applying to non-Anglicans were not completely abolished until 1828. The upshot was that enrolment during the quarter-century after the receipt of the charter fluctuated between a low of six in 1808-09, to twenty-nine in 1823-24. By 1835-36, it had fallen back again to six. King’s did succeed in supplying clergy to the diocese of Nova Scotia, but it never really recovered from its exclusion of dissenters, which led directly to the proliferation of post-secondary institutions in the province, beginning with the founding of Pictou Academy (1816). When the lieutenant-governor Lord Dalhousie (1816-1820) visited King’s on September 24, 1817, the college had fourteen students. Dalhousie, a Scottish Presbyterian who had studied at Edinburgh before his distinguished career in the British army as one of Wellington’s generals, was scathing in his diary about all aspects of King’s, concluding that “there are a thousand objections to it, & reasons why it should not prosper in its present situation, laws and conduct.” His low opinion of King’s and its utility to the province contributed to his founding of Dalhousie College in 1818.
For my purposes, the history of King’s, Windsor, under the charter is really a coda, as the statutes drawn up in 1803 and 1807 placed King’s firmly in the mould of the University of Oxford. The college now assumed the title of a university, becoming under the statutes of 1803 the “University of King’s College,” for the charter conveyed upon it the powers of a university, a *studium generale.* Any connection with King’s College, New York, had receded into the past. Accordingly, this is an appropriate point to sum up the relationship between the two King’s Colleges on the basis of the evidence presented thus far in sections 1 and 2 of this paper.

Both institutions were Anglican, but King’s, New York, and King’s, Windsor, differed greatly in their origins, purpose, institutional structure and relationships with government. King’s, New York, was born of a vicious struggle between Anglicans and dissenters. Although dominated by Anglicans, its unwieldy forty-one-person board of governors included representatives of other churches *ex officio.* The college was never an instrument of government policy, serving instead the Anglican community whose role in New York society was contested by other wealthy and powerful interests, notably the Presbyterians. Unlike King’s, Windsor after 1803, there were no religious tests for Protestants or faculty. The emphasis of King’s, New York, was not upon the education of the clergy. This was a fundamental difference from King’s, Windsor, under the influence of Charles Inglis, who referred to his college as a “seminary.” Most students who attended King’s College, New York, came from the mercantile elite, many of whom viewed their college education as preparation for the legal profession. In this respect the institution had affinities with Judge Alexander Croke’s secular vision of King’s, Windsor. But as a wealthy mercantile class barely existed in Nova Scotia from which such a student body could be drawn, Croke’s notions were utterly unrealistic.

It is clear from the foregoing examination of the origins of King’s, New York, and King’s, Windsor, that there was no institutional link between them. King’s, Windsor, was a discrete foundation, in no way a “successor” to its New York namesake. What the two had in common was Anglicanism and loyalty to the Crown. For example, the 1789 legislation required the president of King’s, Windsor, be an Anglican clergyman, following the pattern of King’s, New York, where the same held true under the terms of the gift of the college site by Trinity Church. However, the arrival of the Royal Charter for King’s, Windsor, in 1802 led to the statutes of 1803 and 1807, which were...
far more restrictive than the regulations governing students and faculty at King College, New York.

King’s, Windsor, was a linchpin in the hierarchical, religiously exclusive vision of Nova Scotia held by a small group of government officials comprising its board of governors. This proved impossible to realize, like a similar Anglican vision in the vastly more populous, dynamic and complex society of mid- and late-eighteenth-century New York, where even the position of the Church of England as the Established church was vigorously contested.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the records of King’s College, New York, but there is no indication in any documents I have seen that anyone at the time envisaged or imagined it being “transferred” to Nova Scotia. The proposals of October 18, 1783, for a “College or seminary of learning” in Nova Scotia made no such suggestion. When Inglis departed for England in November, 1783, he had no idea if he would ever go to Nova Scotia, let alone as bishop, because the question of a Nova Scotian episcopate was put on hold by the British government for over three years. Inglis was not even the most favoured candidate for the position.

After his arrival in Nova Scotia in late 1787, neither Inglis nor his contemporaries indicated that the college founded in 1789 had any relationship to King’s College, New York, which had been reconstituted five years earlier under a new name and principles. In June, 1791, Inglis wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury: “... it is our intention to bring the Institution gradually, and as its reputation becomes established, to as near a conformity as possible with the models observed in the English universities.”\(^{129}\) Naming the Nova Scotian college “King’s” had nothing to do with the earlier foundation, expressing instead the importance of loyalty to the Crown; in addition, the legislature probably hoped to find favour and financial support from the British government for the fledgling creation. It should be remembered in parenthesis that the college in Windsor was the first of three colleges in British North America to be given the name of “King’s.”\(^{130}\) Unlike King’s College, New York, King’s, Windsor, under the legislation of 1789 and the Royal Charter of 1802, was completely under the control of provincial office-holders, who succeeded by the statutes of 1803 and 1807 in making it *de jure* an Anglican preserve more completely than King’s College, New York, ever was, however completely the latter institution was dominated by Anglicans *de facto*, a domination which continued in the nineteenth century after the establishment of a non-sectarian Columbia College.
These conclusions are consistent with previous writings on the subject. The first work (1836) on the history of King’s, by Bishop John Inglis, had the cumbersome title *Memoranda Respecting King’s College, at Windsor, Collected and Prepared for the Purpose of Making Evident the Leading Object in Suggesting and Establishing That Institution*. As has been pointed out earlier, Inglis wrote to defend King’s as an Anglican institution. In his account of its founding by his father, he makes no mention of King’s College, New York. The same is true of two later works on the college written during the nineteenth century. T. B. Akins’ *A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment, and Progress of the University of King’s College, Windsor, Nova Scotia* was published in 1865. Like Inglis, Akins makes no reference to King’s College, New York, nor does Henry Youle Hind in *The University of King’s College, 1790-1890*, published to commemorate the centenary of the college. The Venerable F. W. Vroom’s *King’s College: A Chronicle* (1941), however, devotes an informative first chapter to the history of King’s College, New York, which he concludes with the closing of the college in 1776: “The history of King’s College, New York, ends at this point ...” Vroom begins his second chapter with the words, “[i]f King’s College, New York, ceased to exist, the principles for which it stood lived on, and it was upon these principles that the founders of King’s College undertook to build their College” No further history of King’s appeared until the publication of Mark DeWolf’s *All the King’s Men*, published in 1972, the same year as Judith Fingard’s landmark book, *The Anglican Design in Loyalist Nova Scotia*. Neither DeWolf nor Fingard mention King’s College, New York, nor does C. E. Thomas in an article on the early history of King’s published in 1964 in the *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society*. However, Brian Cuthbertson, in his fine biography of Charles Inglis, *The First Bishop*, says of the proposals of March, 1783: “These first proposals for a Nova Scotian college were modelled on the Anglican ideal earlier expressed in King’s College, New York. The Loyalist clergy now sought to transfer this ideal to Nova Scotia and establish in America once again a college they could call their own.”

Cuthbertson thus follows a similar line to that taken by Archdeacon Vroom in 1941 as well as in two recent histories of Columbia, by David Humphrey (1976) and Robert A. McCaughey (2003). According to Humphrey, “[t]he spirit of loyalist education was transplanted to Nova Scotia, where Charles Inglis took the lead in founding another King’s College in the 1780s ...” After
briefly describing the founding of King’s, Windsor, McCaughey states that “seven hundred miles to the northeast, in the city of Halifax [sic], Nova Scotia, British Canada [sic], what New York Anglicans had such high hopes of achieving thirty years earlier in their city [was accomplished]: the union of church, state and college.” It is clear that neither Vroom, Cuthbertson, Humphrey nor McCaughey suggest the existence of any empirical connection between King’s, New York, and King’s, Windsor, referring instead to something more intangible, expressed in the language of “principles,” “spirit,” “hope,” or an “ideal.” The caution of historians, however, has not been reflected in the emergence of a more radical point of view that gradually developed at the University of King’s College throughout the twentieth century.

Its most extravagant expression was the claim made by President John F. Godfrey (1977-87) that King’s was entitled to Columbia’s endowment. According to an article published in the Columbia Summer Spectator in August, 1978, Godfrey informed President William J. McGill that “the property given to Columbia before 1802 was actually given to the school that held the King’s College charter.” Godfrey also asserted that the land King’s received from Trinity Church was given on the “understanding that it would be [an] Anglican [Episcopalian] institution and each president of the University was an Episcopalian – until Dwight Eisenhower, who was a Presbyterian.” Godfrey suggested that if Columbia didn’t want to pay $50,000,000, he would be willing to accept Columbia’s Wall Street properties; “I’m not insisting on Rockefeller Center,” he magnanimously informed a bemused, and no doubt amused, President McGill.

The story made the New York Times the following February. Godfrey by then had met with McGill and upped the ante to claim all of Columbia’s assets, totalling $460,000,000. He informed the Times via telephone that “King’s College was ‘sitting around waiting for students’ when in 1783 the board of governors decided to move it to Nova Scotia.” When asked for more detail, Godfrey referred the reporter to the Right Reverend Stuart Wetmore, a Canadian and King’s alumnus who was then Suffragan Bishop of New York. Wetmore was studiously vague: “The Bishop said he could not provide documentation, but recalled ‘being informed’ that when Mr. [sic] Inglis ‘departed with the other loyalists to Nova Scotia he took by resolution the entity of King’s College, New York, and added it to King’s College, Windsor, Nova Scotia.’” The Times article also included a graceful letter written to Godfrey by President McGill: “I do hope that this first association will
ripen, if not into the conveyance of all of Columbia’s property, at least into a close friendship ...”

The following month an edited version of the story appeared in *Tidings*, the King’s alumni magazine.¹⁴³

Neither Godfrey nor McGill seemed to recollect that a “first association” between the University of King’s College and Columbia had been established as early as 1887, when King’s awarded an honorary doctorate to Frederick A. P. Barnard, tenth president of Columbia (1864-1889), and an eminent figure in American academic life. This was a new direction for the college. Throughout the nineteenth century, King’s had emphasized its ties to England, and in particular to Oxford.¹⁴⁴ I have seen no reference to King’s College, New York, or to Columbia in any King’s documents before Barnard’s nomination for a degree, and there is no suggestion in the minutes of the board of governors as to the reasons for this action. However, it would seem that King’s was beginning to reach out to the Episcopal church and to universities in the United States. In 1890, an article in the *Record* commented in a critical vein on the planning for the King’s upcoming centennial celebrations: “It is true that it is well to have the Church and Educational institutions of the neighbouring republic represented in the persons of her bishops and college presidents. But we need far more to make efforts which will result in material good to the College, both financially and in the number of students. This result we have no right to expect from the United States ... Let us aim not so much at empty show in the eyes of American magnates, but let us strive to influence favourably our own Canadian people.”¹⁴⁵ It is likely that Barnard was the first of these “American magnates” to be so honoured, because Columbia still had close ties to the Episcopal community. Its board of trustees was dominated by a self-perpetuating clique of wealthy “old New York” Episcopalians.¹⁴⁶ Barnard, an Episcopalian like all Columbia presidents until 1948, was an obvious choice for recognition by King’s.

Barnard was unable to attend because of illness; his Encaenia address was read by a friend and printed in the *Record*, prefaced by a brief note: “Dr Barnard is President of Columbia College, New York, and it is in a large measure owing to his industry and abilities that that College ranks so high among American Universities.” The address focused mostly on the technological marvels of the nineteenth century, a boiler-plate message Barnard had probably delivered many times before. He briefly touched upon the two King’s Colleges, although without any suggestion of their having
any organic connection: “By a similarity of origin and by a similarity of name, then, it seems to me that King’s College University, Nova Scotia, and King’s College University, New York, ought to feel themselves closer to each other than is usually the case between sister institutions of learning.” He then referred to “another link slight and, when I mention it, may even seem fanciful.” The “link” was indeed slight, even far-fetched, for it was that the name of George Dunk, earl of Halifax, First Lord Commissioner for Trade and Plantations, was affixed to the King’s, New York, 1754 Royal Charter. This recondite piece of information gave Barnard an opportunity to deplore the expulsion of the Acadians in language that may have led to a few indrawn breaths in his audience: “I am afraid that [the earl of Halifax] cannot escape the imputation of having given his official sanction to that measure of doubtful humanity and still more doubtful statesmanship, whereby a whole population of unoffending peasantry were swept almost in a single day, from the lovely region nearly in the centre of which King’s College university is standing today.”

Barnard was the first of three Columbia presidents to be given an honorary degree by King’s. Nicholas Murray Butler, twelfth president (1902-45), was invited to King’s at the time of its greatest crisis. On February 5, 1920, the original college building in Windsor burned to the ground. The then president of King’s (1916-1924), the Rev. T. Stannage Boyle, thought that the college should delay using the insurance money for the purpose of reconstruction, as he and other maritime university presidents had attended a conference in New York held by the Carnegie Corporation, which was interested in sponsoring a university federation for the region. The board, however, disagreed, a fund-raising campaign was launched, and the foundation stone for a new building was laid during Encaenia by MacCallum Grant, the lieutenant-governor of the province, on May 12, 1921.

At the time of the fire, King’s had only recently completed another fund-raising campaign, the “Advance Movement,” initiated by the Rev. T. W. Powell (president 1910-14), and completed by Boyle. In November, 1917, Boyle visited New York on a fund-raising trip and was impressed by his reception: “In that city anyone with a real cause could collect a lot of money.” This probably figured in his decision to invite Butler “of Columbia, the ancient King’s College of New York,” to give the address at the laying of the cornerstone and of course to receive an honorary degree. Like Barnard, Butler could not attend, but his address was duly read and printed in the
Record. Butler, or more probably one of his secretaries, had done some homework. He linked the two King’s Colleges as beacons “to make sure that the lamps of learning should be neither dimmed nor darkened by reason of their distance from the homeland ... Not only do these two King’s Colleges represent the fruit of a common effort but in a very real sense, the King’s College of Windsor is the foster-child, or at least the close relative, of the King’s College that was in the Province of New York.” Butler then touched on the 1783 “Plan of Religious and Literary Institution,” and Inglis’s role in “putting this plan into practical effect.” He spoke as well of William Cochran’s career in New York: “To have been the esteemed teacher of men so widely different as DeWitt Clinton and John Randolph of Roanoke, is of itself ground for a permanent reputation.” Butler also reminded his audience that Inglis had been a trustee of King’s College, New York, which had given both Inglis and Cochran honorary degrees.

There was nothing in Butler’s speech that was inaccurate, but his comment that King’s, Windsor, was “the foster-child, or at least the close relative” of King’s, New York, pulled the connection between the two colleges together. This convergence received a further impetus eighteen years later when King’s held its one hundred-and-fiftieth (sesquicentennial) anniversary celebration from August 22-24, 1939, on the eve of the Second World War. Two representatives of Columbia were in attendance, one of whom, the university chaplain, the Rev. Raymond Collyer Knox, received an honorary doctorate of divinity. Knox described King’s as “kith and kin” to Columbia. The other representative, Dr. Milton Halsey Thomas, “the Archivist of Columbia University, the mother college of King’s,” brought greetings from Columbia in a brief address at the sesquicentennial luncheon held in the ballroom of the Lord Nelson Hotel.

The myth-making process continued in a newspaper article, “Oldest in the Empire,” which did not mention Oxford, despite the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury as Patron under the 1802 Royal Charter had sent sesquicentennial greetings. Indeed, no representative of Oxford received one of the fifteen honorary degrees awarded at the celebration. The article’s focus was exclusively upon the New York connection: “[King’s College] in New York was the predecessor of King’s in Nova Scotia which inherited its name, one of its professors and a number of its distinguished friends and supporters.” These assertions were uniformly inaccurate, but the legend of a link between the two King’s Colleges had clearly gained traction by 1939, no doubt furthered by Canada’s
increasingly close ties, culturally and otherwise, with the United States. It will be recalled that many years later, John Godfrey had referred a New York Times reporter to Bishop Stuart Wetmore as his authority for the claim that King’s, New York, had been moved to Nova Scotia. Presumably Wetmore garnered the information he in turn recounted to the Times reporter while he was a student at King’s. It was perhaps not a coincidence that Wetmore took his licentiate in theology in the year of the sesquicentennial.

Twenty-nine years after the sesquicentennial celebration, Columbia and Oxford were both honoured by King’s on the occasion of the eighth quinquennial congress of the Association of Universities in the British Commonwealth, which was held in Canada in September, 1958. According to the minutes of Convocation, the body that awards King’s honorary degrees, it was moved, in somewhat confusing language, “... that honorary D.C.L.’s [sic] be offered Dr. Grayson Kirk, President of Columbia University, New York, which is, historically, an offshoot of King’s College, and to Vice-Chancellor [J. C.] Masterman, of Oxford, from which King’s College is descended.” Masterman and Kirk received their degrees at a special convocation held in All Saints’ cathedral on September 9, 1958. Vice-Chancellor Masterman gave the convocation address while Kirk spoke at a special convocation dinner; neither of them mentioned the history of King’s College or its relation to either Oxford or Columbia. It was not until 1978 that the question of King’s antecedents was revived by President John Godfrey when he launched his raid on Columbia’s endowment, which generated publicity for the college but had unforseen long-term consequences.

It is ironic that by claiming to be a “successor institution” to King’s College, New York, the University of King’s College began to suffer from guilt by association when Eric Foner and his students revealed the extent to which the history of its New York namesake was “intertwined” with slavery. The evidence presented in this paper, however, shows that the idea that King’s is a “successor institution” to King’s, New York, is false.

There may indeed have been connections between King’s College, Windsor, and slavery. Slavery was, after all, an integral part of the Atlantic economy until its abolition in 1834, and slave ownership existed in Nova Scotia until the early decades of the nineteenth century. Be that as it may, the University of King’s College was not implicated in the history of slavery through an
in institutional descent from King’s College, New York.

There is no evidence that King’s in Nova Scotia has gained any tangible advantage by claiming reflected glory from King’s College, New York, and Columbia; whether it has derived any symbolic benefit from the supposed association is another matter but is impossible to determine. If there is a moral in this story of the two King’s Colleges, it is that, however attractive a particular narrative may seem to be, historical accuracy is generally the safer course to follow.¹⁶²
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