He was described as “a tall, plain-looking man.” He possessed “a strong voice.” Despite his wealth, his domestic life was “plain and economical, and his manner of living strictly temperate.” He displayed “a very kind and affectionate disposition” toward the children in his extended family, but “knew how to be stern” when they annoyed him too much. His intellect was “rather solid, than brilliant,” characterized instead by “stirling good sense.” In later years he would animatedly recount events of the Revolutionary days of his youth. Today, Henry Rutgers appears to most people as two-dimensional as the formal portrait of him by Henry Inman that hangs in Old Queens Building, the Rutgers University administration building.1

When Rutgers died in 1830, the loss of “the most benevolent man” in New York City was generally mourned. As a mark of “the high estimation … they entertain for his public and private Virtues,” the entire Common Council resolved to attend his funeral.2 Yet aside from a few street names, there is relatively little trace of Rutgers or his family in the present-day metropolis. He is the eponym of one of the largest public teaching and research universities in the country, yet students, faculty, staff, and alumni, as well as the general public,
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know little about his life. Indeed, a T-shirt for sale at his namesake institution in the mid-1980s queried “Who the hell is Col. Henry Rutgers?”

Over the years, Henry Rutgers has been the subject of a few brief biographical treatments. The two most comprehensive histories of Rutgers University devote a scant two pages, and two paragraphs, respectively, to him. Part of the problem is that efforts at biography are hindered by the fact that, aside from scattered letters, there is no extant corpus of his correspondence, which is curious considering that he lived nearly 85 years, was prominent on the local, state, and to some extent national levels, and was a benefactor to numerous religious, humane, and educational organizations.3

The genesis of this biographical project was a search for Henry Rutgers’ burial place—he had been, as it turned out, buried and re-buried three times. Then, two exhibitions on aspects of his life were mounted in 2009 and 2010 by staff at Rutgers University’s Special Collections and University Archives, one in New York City and the other in New Brunswick. The lack of knowledge about Rutgers was to some extent rectified by a biographical essay that accompanied the catalogue for the latter exhibition, which was the most systematic and comprehensive treatment of him to date. Imperatives of time, however, dictated that the research had to be truncated.4 A couple of years later, thanks to the generosity of alumni donors, the biographical project was revived. The project benefited from several microform and electronic research databases that were not available to previous biographers. What follows is the result of that research.

There are amazing continuities in Henry Rutgers’ life. Prior to his birth in 1745, his family had already been in the New World for more than 100 years. He was a lifelong Knickerbocker: with only two exceptions—his service in the American army during the Revolutionary War and his tenure in the New York State Assembly—Rutgers spent his entire life on the Rutgers Farm, which in later years would constitute a substantial part of the Lower East Side neighborhood. The “mark of confiscation” the British placed on his door in 1776 was still visible when he died in 1830. William Bran, a Revolutionary War veteran, worked as his rent collector for more than 40 years. Rutgers’ memberships in various organizations typically spanned decades. He was initially interred in the family vault in the burial ground of the church where he had been baptized nearly 84 years previously.5
Beginning in 1766, Henry Rutgers served his king, and then his country in a military capacity for almost 30 years. When hostilities with Britain broke out, he risked his patrimony by casting his lot with the Whig (or patriot) cause, and then exiled himself from his home for seven years. Rutgers felt that he had “bestowed my mite” for the cause but, like many officers and enlisted men toward the end of the war, became disenchanted with the politics of the army: at one point, he lost his position when his department was consolidated. He returned home to a property that had been despoiled at the “rapacious hands” of the enemy. In the postwar years, Colonel Rutgers (as he was usually known) tenaciously pursued what he felt the government owed him and his fellow officers for their service, a process that took nearly five years. And during the 1780s and 1790s, he not only rebuilt the family fortune, but greatly surpassed what previous generations had accumulated. In ensuing decades, numerous individuals, organizations, and institutions would be the beneficiaries of Henry Rutgers’ risk-taking, enterprise, and investment.

Throughout his life Rutgers displayed sensitivity to populist causes. Born to affluence, he might have leaned toward support of the royalist cause during the American Revolution, as did many of the governors, faculty, and alumni of his alma mater, King’s College (now Columbia University). But instead he went against the tide of his peers and supported the popular cause during the anti-imperial protests against Britain. In response to nativist agitation in an election in 1807, Rutgers joined other Republican candidates in opposing “any distinction between native and adopted citizens, as repugnant to the spirit and genius of our free government.” In later years he used his influence on the state and local levels to “extend the right of suffrage” in his native city.

Henry Rutgers was first elected to public office in 1783. Subsequently, as an Antifederalist and Jeffersonian Republican, he both won and lost elections. When he was nominated to the New York State Assembly in 1800, it was because he was a person of “the first respectability for wealth, patriotism, integrity, and morals.” His election exposed him, nonetheless, to “the vileness of faction”: he endured personal attacks, slander, and the nasty barbs of Federalist newspaper editors. Political rivals labeled him both a Tory and a Jacobin. In one instance he was accused of being “an aristocrat” and “a miser” guilty of “hoarding for the pleasure of hoarding” whose benevolence was not “at all commensurate to his vast opulence.” It
was alleged that he intimidated his tenants at polling places in his ward. In another case, his Revolutionary War service was impugned ("tell us what ever he did"). His qualifications as a legislator were questioned. Even his wealth was used to attack him. In 1807 a Federalist editor queried: “if you take away his money, what do you leave him?—Nothing.” Though no doubt stung by these accusations, Rutgers apparently did not publicly respond to them.

In the early 19th century contemporaries regarded Henry Rutgers as one of the wealthiest men—some said the wealthiest—in New York City. He amassed wealth through inheritance, entrepreneurship, land development, long-term leases, and investments. His success as an entrepreneur and rentier exemplified a national trend toward the growth of liquid financial assets. He was, in a sense, a prototypical New York City developer who left his imprint on the contemporary cityscape. His fortune benefited directly from the burgeoning population of the metropolis: 33,000 in 1790, 60,000 in 1800, 96,000 in 1810, 123,000 in 1820 and, by the year of his death, 202,000. When in 1816 Rutgers advertised the “Sale of Valuable Real Estate,” he noted that his “principal object in disposing of this property is that of promoting the improvement of this part of the city.” He was, of course, also interested in “making a permanent bargain” for both himself and his heirs. In an era when some of the uglier aspects of overdevelopment and related overcrowding began to emerge, Rutgers strove, via conditions in his leases, to maintain standards regarding construction and density. It was, after all, his neighborhood too. Late in life, Rutgers congratulated himself that the formerly “desolate fields” of his farm were now “entirely filled with the cheerful dwellings of men, free, independent, and happy!” But he did not have complete control over development: during the early 19th century, the East River wards were evolving into “an unusual mix of vice and wealth.” Despite his efforts, the demographic of Henry Rutgers’ neighborhood was definitely changing.

Rutgers was also widely known as a benefactor to the poor. He exhibited paternalism toward his tenants, sometimes remitting or easing rental payments, which “secured the strong affection of the poorer classes of the community … dwelling on his property.” When he made a cession of land to the Dutch Reformed consistory for building a church in 1792, Rutgers stipulated that a certain proportion of pews “remain free of rent forever as an encouragement to the poor to attend divine worship.” He thus
combined several of his lifelong passions—poor relief, support of religious institutions, and promotion of personal piety—as well as attempting to control how his money was spent. It was claimed that “his private charities to the poor, amounted to $10,000 a year.” Upon his death, it was noted, “the poor have lost a friend indeed.”

There are several anecdotes regarding Henry Rutgers’ piety, which was practiced in both the domestic and public spheres. Indeed, on her deathbed Rutgers’ niece Catherine Bedlow Crosby chose Uncle Henry as her young boys’ guardian “in preference to nearer relatives on account of his piety.” According to one who knew him, “Piety was the controlling principle of his public life.” In politics, he “never took part in any important measure, without making it a subject of special prayer.” Rutgers made several donations of land to Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches, usually with the stipulation that the land revert to him if a church was not built in a specified time. On a more personal level, one well-remembered charity was that every New Year’s Day he gave the children in his neighborhood a gift and a religious tract. Overall, Rutgers’ profession of faith was characterized as enlightened, practical, and unostentatious.

As with any person, there are also contradictions and anomalies in Henry Rutgers’ life. The most glaring is that despite his renowned piety, he was a slave owner. In 1786 he did join other prominent petitioners for a bill in the New York legislature to prohibit the exportation of slaves out of the state; more than 30 years later, he joined others who advocated “checking the progress of Slavery in our country.” Still, he remained a slave owner. He did, gradually, reduce the number of slaves he owned. But when Rutgers died he still owned a “superannuated” slave, Hannah, whom his will stipulated should be “supported out of my Estate.” From 1817 until his death, he was annually re-elected a vice-president of the American Colonization Society, which sought to resettle free and freed blacks in Africa. In this endeavor, Rutgers affiliated with other nationally prominent men such as Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Bushrod Washington, John Marshall, and the Marquis de Lafayette. The same year that Rutgers joined the society, he did manumit one slave, Thomas Boston. There is no evidence of how conflicted he may have been about being a devout Christian and a slave owner. Henry Rutgers was the product of a society and a religious denomination that rationalized the “humane” ownership of slaves, and also part of a segment of that society that agitated for the amelioration (albeit by degrees) of their status.
Colonel Rutgers was a bachelor. He was certainly not a “disorderly bachelor” who, it was feared, threatened the stability of the early Republic, nor was he the “sporting male” type of bachelor who reveled in fighting, gaming, drinking, and womanizing. Political rivals did snipe at him because of his bachelorhood: in 1807 it was noted that he had “not a chick nor a child in the world”: “Shew us that he has connected himself with some respectable woman and given valuable members to the state.” He was merely a “wealthy old bachelor … who vegetates in society, insulated and alone, resembling the truffle without root or top.” Why Rutgers never married is open to conjecture.

What is certain is that family was of central importance to him. After his father died in 1779, Rutgers noted, “the care of the family … devolves upon me.” When he adopted his two orphaned grand-nephews in 1789, he was obligated to convert his bachelor household into a multigenerational household. It was his maxim to “above all Study to keep harmony in the family.” But he was not always successful in that regard. One source of discord seems to have been his younger brother Harman. It was also said that his sister Anna Bancker “not only loved him extremely but feared him extremely,” a comment which suggests that her brother used his wealth to exert control. Certain family members were also disgruntled over their share of his estate.

Rutgers determined, it is said, to contribute one-quarter of his wealth to charitable causes. While that may or may not be true, what is more certain is that “with regard to his charities, he was resolved to be his own executor” in the sense that he himself would distribute a substantial part of his wealth. He was successful in that regard. The list of his public and private benefactions is lengthy: a partial list compiled in 1826 of his recent contributions amounted to nearly $33,000—a substantial sum for the time. A contemporary questioned “whether any one individual in our country, has given so much in the whole amount, to various objects of general charity.” Henry Rutgers was a product of a “culture of benevolence” in the 18th century (his first recorded philanthropic involvement was in 1771) that evolved into the full-blown “Age of Benevolence” (1790–1840). His humanitarianism bridged the old form of private charity of the 18th century and the newer form of philanthropy during the early 19th century that was channeled through the proliferation of voluntary associations. Notable among these involvements was as a manager (from 1816 until his death) of...
the American Bible Society, the oldest national benevolent society. The lesson of Henry Rutgers’ long participation in philanthropy is the application of wealth to support causes about which he was passionate, notably religion, education, and poor relief.

Rutgers was especially interested in education. He was both a benefactor who donated land for a school, a long-time trustee, and eventually president of the Free School Society (later renamed the Public School Society). The state legislature appointed him a regent of the state university, a role in which he served for over two decades. He was a trustee of both the College of New Jersey in Princeton and of Queen’s College in New Brunswick. Rutgers’ highest profile legacy was lending his name to the latter institution, to which he contributed an interest-bearing bond and a bell. But that story too is not without its ambiguities: he attended only two annual trustee meetings, at one of which he voted with the majority to “discontinue the exercises of the College”; the school was renamed before he gave his “munificent” gift; and there was disappointment after his death that it did not receive a bequest in his will.

In later years, contemporaries regarded Henry Rutgers as a “venerable and patriotic” elder statesman. He was lionized in the Christian and the Republican press of the day: he was “the Patriarch of the Republican party … and a consistent Democrat,” an “honorable patriot and upright politician,” a “venerable and uniform republican.” He was frequently elevated by acclamation to chair public meetings in his native city as “a patriot in whom the people steadily reposed their confidence and delighted to Honor.” His “virtuous deeds” were “interwoven with the records of New-York, with the history of our numerous benevolent institutions, and with the sensibilities of the pious poor.” Rutgers was “universally respected and beloved for his active philanthropy, his pure patriotism, and his devoted piety.” His death was widely reported in the national press. At his funeral, “an immense concourse, in carriages and on foot, followed the procession.” Yet, ironically, Henry Rutgers is “little known today.”

The following article narrates the story of Henry Rutgers from the New World origins of his ancestors, to his birth in 1745, up to the outbreak of hostilities with Britain in 1776. The sequel to this article (to be published in The Journal of the Rutgers University Libraries, volume 68, number 2) focuses on his Revolutionary War service and his efforts to rebuild his fortune during the 1780s and
1790s, concluding with his election to the New York State Assembly during the Jeffersonian “revolution of 1800.” The articles emphasize the social environment that nurtured Henry, various influences upon him, early themes that recurred throughout his life, significant events and transformations in his native city, his state, and his country that intersected at various points with his life, and his wide network of family, friends, and acquaintances, with some of whom he maintained a lifelong connection. As we celebrate the 250th anniversary of the institution that bears his name, the essays seek to shed light upon the man’s life and serve somewhat as a corrective to previous neglect.
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