12-22-2016

Hell Hound Rogers or The Great Town Benefactor: Who Was Henry Huttleston Rogers

David Braga

Follow this and additional works at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj

Part of the [Social History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Braga, David. (2016). Hell Hound Rogers or The Great Town Benefactor: Who Was Henry Huttleston Rogers. In *BSU Honors Program Theses and Projects*. Item 186. Available at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj/186
Copyright © 2016 David Braga

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Hell Hound Rogers Or The Great Town Benefactor: Who Was Henry Huttleston Rogers

David Braga

Submitted in Partial Completion of the
Requirements for Commonwealth Honors in History

Bridgewater State University

December 22, 2016

Dr. Paul Robinson, Thesis Mentor
Dr. Thomas Nester, Committee Member
Dr. Erin O'Connor, Committee Member

Introduction:

A brief study of Henry Huttleston Rogers will leave the reader fascinated. His story of rags to riches and fame and fortune encapsulates the “American dream.” The romanticized stories of his friendships with Mark Twain, Helen Keller, and Booker T. Washington depicted a man who valued friendship and philanthropy. Other stories of his ruthless business tactics portrayed an ingenious capitalist who could make money in any industry he desired. This quest for money was coupled with Rogers’s philanthropy to his hometown, Fairhaven, Massachusetts, which some believe justified his immoral business tactics. This is a problem that historians must grapple with when writing about figures such as Rogers: did their good deeds outweigh their evil doing, and how should history remember them?

When discussing businessmen such as Rogers, historians tend to focus on the question of whether he was a “Robber Baron” or a “Captain of Industry.” A “Robber Baron”, is characterized by historian T. J. Stiles, as “An industrialist who wields his power unscrupulously, to the harm of others.”¹ On the other hand a “Captain of Industry” would be a businessman who would have increased his own profits while bringing progress to the public through fair business practices and philanthropy. While this dichotomy of either/or could fit some businessmen it is difficult to place Rogers in either category due to his complex personality.

While much of the writing on Rogers is not factually incorrect it tends to heavily romanticize most of his good deeds while downplaying any wrongdoing. This is partly due to the sources that are available. Most people who wrote about Rogers limited their sources to those available in the town of Fairhaven. This did not allow for a comprehensive analysis of Rogers. Most people who wrote about Rogers such as Earl J. Dias, Mabel Knipe, and Myra Lopes were

¹ T. J. Stiles, *The First Tycoon: The Epic Life of Cornelius Vanderbilt*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2010) 328.

connected to the town of Fairhaven, which might explain their limited use of sources. Rogers was the main benefactor of the town of Fairhaven, and that fact may have led these writers to have a favorable view of him since they benefited from Rogers's philanthropy. While the author of this thesis is a native of the town of Fairhaven an objective interpretation is provided due to the different number of archives and sources consulted.

Throughout this thesis the reader will discover how Rogers could be a great friend to those he cared about but he could also be ruthless and cold hearted to others. Readers will gain an understanding of Rogers's unorthodox business tactics, which are not praiseworthy. Some of his relationships with both friends and family will be called into question. Rogers's philanthropy will also be examined which does portray Rogers as a benevolent businessman but a deeper look will call some of this praise into question. This will offer a comprehensive view of Rogers as a friend, businessman, and philanthropist. With all of these aspects of Rogers taken into consideration it is clear that there was a dual personality to Rogers; if one was in his good graces he could be very kind and generous but if one was Rogers's enemy they would be faced with a tough and ruthless opponent.

While it is not fair to say Rogers was only a "Robber Baron" or "Captain of Industry", he is best characterized in the business world as a "Robber Baron." Nearly all aspects of his business affairs reflected this characteristic, specifically the Amalgamated Copper Company. Rogers was generous but the sincerity of his generosity can be called into question and certainly did not justify his immoral business tactics but it must be discussed to provide a comprehensive analysis. Rogers could be a kind and generous person but his wrongdoing and greed seem to be far more significant and frequent than his good deeds.

Methodology:

Secondary sources on Rogers are scarce; there is only one full-length biography on him: *Henry Huttleston Rogers: Portrait of a Capitalist* written by Earl J. Dias in 1974, which is no longer in print. In fact most of the books regarding Rogers are out of print thus making them expensive and hard to find. Besides his biography two books have been written about his friendship with Mark Twain: *Mark Twain And Male Friendship: The Twichell, Howells, & Rogers Friendships*, published in 2013 by Peter Messent, and *Mark Twain and Henry Huttleston Rogers: An Odd Couple* written in 1984 by Earl J. Dias. Mabel Knipe and Myra Lopes, who offer a favorable analysis of Rogers's philanthropy, have written a small number of booklets published mainly within the town of Fairhaven. Rogers has been featured in a number of works regarding Standard Oil and John D. Rockefeller but he typically receives less focus than most of his colleagues such as John D. Archbold. It is evident that the lack of attention paid to Rogers was due to the lack of primary sources available and not due to a lack of importance or historical significance.

Primary sources on Rogers are just as scarce as secondary sources. The Millicent Library Archives in Fairhaven, Ma, houses the largest repository on Rogers consisting mostly of old newspapers and paperwork regarding his philanthropy, as well as photographs. The Rockefeller Family Archives in Sleepy Hollow, New York, contains correspondence between Rogers and John D. Rockefeller, Sr. There was also a book published in 1969 containing Rogers's correspondence with Mark Twain titled *Mark Twain's Correspondence With Henry Huttleston Rogers 1893- 1909*. Finding any correspondence written by Rogers is difficult; in the case of correspondence between Rogers and Rockefeller or Rogers and Twain most of the correspondence is not from Rogers. A 1904 *Boston Daily Globe* article solves the mystery of

what happen to Rogers's correspondence. Rogers stated that he usually threw away letters "and they are burned up... at night."² Rogers may have done this to destroy evidence of any wrongdoing. If there is any surviving correspondence from Rogers his descendants have yet to make it available to the public. Primary sources on Rogers can also be found in historical newspapers such as the *Boston Daily Globe*.

Biography:

Henry Huttleston Rogers was born to Rowland Rogers and Mary Eldredge Huttleson Rogers on January 29, 1840, in the town of Fairhaven. Rogers traced his roots back to the pilgrims who sailed to Massachusetts on the *Mayflower* in 1620. His parents came from working class backgrounds: his father worked as a ship captain and a grocer while his mother stayed at home. Rogers's parents always valued education, putting Rogers all the way through high school and keeping a vast collection of books in their home. Rogers displayed a strong work ethic at a young age that would last throughout his lifetime. He worked as a newspaper boy and was known for being able to pull in a large number of clients. He also served as a grocery clerk and a baggage boy at the railway depot in Fairhaven.³ All of this helped to prepare Rogers for a new journey he was about to embark on which would eventually lead him to be one of the wealthiest Americans to ever live.

In September 1861 Rogers and his friend Charles Ellis went to Pennsylvania after hearing about the success of oilmen in that region and they each invested \$600 in starting an oil refinery, the Wamsutta Refinery. Rogers and Ellis became quite successful oil refiners. In their first year

² "Lawson Called in Gas Hearing" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): March 25 1904. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

³ Earl J. Dias, *Henry Huttleston Rogers: Portrait of a Capitalist*, (New Bedford, Mass: Reynolds- Dewalt Printing Inc, 1974).

of business they made \$30,000, which by 1861 standards would have been a significant profit. Through a mutual friend Rogers became acquainted with Charles Pratt, a New York oil refiner, who eventually began to purchase oil from Rogers. Pratt saw potential in Rogers and asked him to join his firm, Astral Oil Works. After Rogers joined Pratt's firm he was eventually promoted to plant supervisor. Rogers then became an outspoken critic of the South Improvement Company, the precursor to Standard Oil. Rogers was opposed to the South Improvement Company because it greatly threatened the future of his company. At this time oil companies were faced with two options: join the South Improvement Company, or compete with it. Rogers and his allies were unable to keep up with the men at Standard Oil and they eventually became a member of the oil conglomerate. Rogers became very successful both inside and outside the Standard Oil Company. He became its vice president and sat on the board of directors of many of its subsidiary companies. Rogers also became more involved with his own personal investments, which included heavy metals and railroads all of which greatly added to his wealth. Starting in the 1890's Rogers donated a number of buildings to his hometown in Fairhaven, which helped to beautify the town and solidify his place in the town's history. He built and donated schools, libraries, churches, and other town facilities that were of the best quality one could buy at the time. He also helped Mark Twain, Helen Keller, and Booker T. Washington with financial struggles.

Rogers died at the age of 69 on May 19, 1909, after he suffered from a stroke at his home in New York City following a long day of work at the Standard Oil office.⁴ This speaks to who Rogers really was: a workhorse who loved to make money. Rogers had just recently finished the Virginian Railway, a project that would financially ruin him if it failed. Rogers could have comfortably entered retirement at a relatively reasonable age but instead he took on this huge

⁴ Ibid.

project in the last years of his life and worked up until his death. In this aspect Rogers seems to have been more dedicated to making money than to his health and family.

Literature Reviews:

Earl J. Dias, a former professor at Southern Massachusetts University (now the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth), was the only person to write a full length biography about Rogers, *Henry Huttleston Rogers: Portrait of a Capitalist* published in 1974. This title suggests that Dias saw Rogers as a great captain of industry although this point is not really argued within the book. Dias primarily discussed Rogers's personal life and briefly delved into some of his business expeditions. In the preface Dias wrote that:

There are perhaps two feasible methods that can be utilized in writing a biography of Henry Huttleston Rogers. The first is to concentrate on his career in business and thus to present what would be a detailed history of American capitalistic enterprise in the nineteenth century. The second is to present Rogers as a typical magnate of his time but to emphasize primarily his complex personality, his family and friends, the various influences on his rise to both international fame and immense fortune, and his place in the society of his time - The Gilded Age.⁵

Dias's take on Rogers seems to dismiss any wrongdoing by Rogers and emphasizes the good he did. Dias could refute this by saying that he did not focus on Rogers as a businessman but as a family man, friend, and benefactor although the title of his book would suggest otherwise.

Chapter one primarily dealt with Rogers's upbringing in Fairhaven and ancestry. During this initial chapter Dias began his positive portrayal of Rogers, which he continued throughout the book. Dias was not wrong in this initial portrayal; Rogers's upbringing and beginnings in the oil fields are worthy of praise. Dias mentioned Rogers's parents and their lifestyles and his father's various careers. Dias then outlined Rogers's successful careers in his early adulthood. This all set the stage for the discussion of Rogers's business adventures in the oil fields of

⁵ Ibid., 11.

Titusville, Pennsylvania. Dias portrayed Rogers as a hard working and industrious young man.

Chapter two begins when Rogers ventured out to Titusville with his business partner Charles Ellis in 1861. They set up the Wamsutta Refinery, each investing \$600. Within their first year they saw profits of \$30,000. Dias discussed Rogers's recruitment by Charles Pratt of New York, which ultimately led to Rogers joining Standard Oil. Pratt and Rogers met through a mutual friend from Fairhaven. Rogers was appointed as the supervisor of Pratt's plant. Dias noted the 20-year age difference between the two men but regardless of age Pratt still trusted and respected Rogers, which says a lot about Rogers's character and work ethic. This chapter helps to emphasize the industrious side of Rogers and helps Dias paint a "Portrait of A Capitalist."

Dias then discussed Rogers's vocal opposition to Standard Oil and how he organized a group of New York refiners to combat Standard Oil. Dias described Rogers as the architect of the merger of Pratt's company with Standard Oil. He also praised Rogers because he demanded company stock as payment, which gave him a vote on the board of directors. Then he outlined how Rogers became the head of the pipeline division of Standard Oil and how Rogers envisioned a national system of pipelines. Dias could have been critical of Rogers for selling out to Standard Oil but instead he praised Rogers for the negotiations of the merger. Dias could have been critical of Rogers for not being able to beat Standard Oil but Dias found something praiseworthy to discuss rather than mention Rogers's shortcomings. Dias discussed some of Rogers's and William Rockefeller's speculative investments on Wall Street.

Dias then explored two lawsuits which Rogers was involved in. One lawsuit involved two former employees, J. Scott Wilson and Charles Matthews, of the Vacuum Oil Works. The two men left the company after Rogers and other Standard Oil members bought a majority stake in the company. The two men decided to start their own company with processes patented by

Vacuum but patents they believed to be invalid which meant that the rights of the process were not exclusive to Vacuum which made their use of them legal. The two men hired a third man from Vacuum, Albert Miller, who sabotaged their first attempt to refine oil and nearly caused an explosion. Matthews and Wilson believed that Rogers sent Albert Miller to sabotage the plant. Vacuum, headed by Rogers, then filed suit against Matthews and Wilson for patent rights. Dias noted how Rogers told Matthews that he and his colleagues would continue this until Matthews and his partners gave up. Matthews and his partners then filed suit against Rogers and his partners for conspiracy to blow up his refinery but Rogers and his partners were acquitted. Dias tried to avoid unpleasant events and when he did discuss them he seemed to have downplayed them. In the instance of the Vacuum Oil Works incident he does not make it seem as if Rogers and his partners were ruthless criminals, it was just business as usual for them.

The book is brief in discussing Rogers's business affairs but it is a good resource for many interesting anecdotes and facts. Dias was partial in his views of Rogers. He was personally affected by Rogers's philanthropy; he sat on the board of trustees on the Millicent Library, a Rogers's donation. The little that Dias did discuss of Rogers's business endeavors painted a picture of a capitalist and not a Robber Baron. To supplement this portrait he included stories about Rogers's personal life, which made him seem like a great family man and philanthropist. He seems to have picked the best stories about Rogers while leaving out or downplaying the stories that would make Rogers look bad. For example Dias failed to mention the fact that Rogers demolished the oldest home in Fairhaven for one of his future buildings. It is surprising that this is not mentioned because Fairhaven and its inhabitants claim to care deeply about their history. Sources on Rogers, specifically his business matters, are scarce, which is most likely why Dias focused on his personal life rather than his life as a businessman. This paper relies on

both sources that Dias consulted and sources that he did not consult which will surely paint a different portrait of Rogers. Dias certainly painted a portrait of Rogers with his book but it was not a portrait of a capitalist as the title says. Rather, it is a portrait of a businessman who was a family man and friend first and a great philanthropist.

Thomas Lawson, a former business partner of Rogers, held nothing back in his book *Frenzied Finance: The Crime of Amalgamated*, published in 1906. Lawson had a completely opposite view of Rogers than Dias. In this book Lawson revealed a business plan that he, Henry H. Rogers, William Rockefeller, and other esteemed financiers, hatched. The scheme was Amalgamated Copper, a conglomerate of copper mines which Rogers and Lawson were to consolidate into one stock, which was to be sold to the public. At the time, as Lawson noted, copper was one of the safest investments, writing, “For three years I had been advertising to the world the great merits of ‘Coppers’ and for over a year I had announced that when the public was given an opportunity to participate in the consolidated ‘Coppers’ it would be upon a basis most carefully worked out.”⁶ Investor upon investor came in and the company raised all the capital it expected and even had to deny investors a majority of their requested stock because there was not enough stock to meet demands. Lawson went on to describe the foul play committed by Rogers and Rockefeller, such as falsely inflating the capital of the company in order to make it a more appealing stock to invest in. Lawson claimed that he had been deceived and that he had no knowledge of the wrongdoing until it was too late. Small investors lost thousands while Rogers was able to make millions, which Lawson is critical of.

Lawson’s criticism was probably fueled by multiple motives: Rogers made Lawson look like a bad stock broker because Lawson personally pushed investors to buy Amalgamated.

⁶ Thomas W. Lawson, *Frenzied Finance The Crime of Amalgamated*, (New York: Ridgeway Thayer Company, 1905), 26.

Lawson felt betrayed by Rogers, and he may have lost money as a part of this deal. Readers must be cautious of Lawson's writing, just like Dias', but that is not to discredit it. One must keep in mind that by writing this book Lawson declared his innocence to the public so he needed to downplay his own wrongdoing while inflating Rogers's. Lawson wrote that, "The succeeding chapters of this narrative will yield unimpeachable evidence that all my dealing in 'Coppers' as an associate of 'Standard Oil' were open and as much in the interests of the people as it was possible to have them."⁷ There is truth behind what Lawson said but one must cautiously interpret it, as there is significant bias. He certainly had reason to dislike Rogers and he made that evident throughout his book.

Lawson revealed many illegal or immoral acts committed by Rogers, such as political bribery, stock manipulation, and deception. Of the many negative things Lawson said about Rogers some quotes stand out:

I have seen many forms of human wrath, many men transformed to terrible things by anger, but I have never seen any that were other than jumping-jack imitations of a jungle tiger compared with Henry H. Rogers when he 'lets 'er go' - when the instant comes that he realizes one is balking the accomplishment of his will. Above all things Henry H. Rogers is a great actor.⁸

Lawson also said "Henry H. Rogers and William Rockefeller have two sides, their social side and their business side. Socially, they are good men; in business they work evil."⁹ These descriptions are contrary to what biographer Earl J. Dias had to say about Rogers. Dias described Rogers as a great town benefactor and product of his times, the Gilded Age. Lawson believed that Rogers had a dual personality: in public and to friends he was a great man but in private business matters he was a ruthless businessman who would do anything to make a dollar. It

⁷ Ibid., 236.

⁸ Ibid., 18.

⁹ Ibid., 60.

appeared that Lawson had the more accurate interpretation of Rogers although he did little to present any positive aspects of Rogers's dual personality.

Lawson's book can serve as both a primary and secondary source. Being a business partner of Rogers, Lawson discussed many experiences with Rogers that provide valuable insight. While this is biased there are certain claims which can be cross referenced with other sources to check for legitimacy. If Lawson described Rogers in one particular way but no other source does then it is more than likely false but if there are multiple sources to help support it then it is more than likely true. This text will be referenced throughout this paper when dealing with Rogers's business affairs.

Philanthropy:

Just as the Gilded Age was known for vast amounts of wealth it was also known for great acts of philanthropy. John D. Rockefeller gave generously to colleges, libraries and medical research. Andrew Carnegie gave away over 90% of his wealth when he died and sponsored thousands of libraries across the country. Henry Huttleston Rogers gave the town of Fairhaven two schools, a library funded by the water works he built, a town hall, a public park, and the Unitarian Church. He also built a Masonic lodge in town and set up two business ventures, the Tabitha Inn and the Atlas Tack manufacturing company, which generously employed town inhabitants. There are also a number of smaller accounts of donations made throughout the town to teachers and various organizations. He also donated a building to the Old Dartmouth Historical Society in New Bedford, a home for nurses at Saint Luke's Hospital also in New Bedford, and a grammar school to Mattapoisett, Ma. He also made private donations to multiple organizations outside of New England, primarily the Church of The Messiah in New York. He

erected a memorial to Edwin L. Drake, the first man to successfully drill for oil in Pennsylvania. He also donated an orphanage to the Church of the Messiah in New York. There were many instances of Rogers donating money to various organizations and it would be impossible to list or discover all of them.

Rogers also gave educational funding to Hellen Keller and to Booker T. Washington. Rogers was always very secretive about his philanthropy, as he never released dollar figures for the buildings he donated and requested his name not be released with the two donations in New Bedford, Ma. He also requested that his benefactions to Hellen Keller and Booker T. Washington be kept secret along with any other charities he subscribed to. Rogers may have wanted to be secretive for a number of reasons. One reason that is apparent is that Rogers was secretive about everything, he tried very hard to stay out of public view, most of the public and newspapers did not hear of Rogers until Thomas Lawson exposed him. Another reason could be that he did not want large numbers of people asking him for donations after they heard about his other benefactions, although he had no shortage of donation requests as will be discussed later.

In comparison to most other Gilded Age millionaires, Rogers's donations were fewer and add up to much less money but there is something that set his philanthropy apart. Specifically within the town of Fairhaven, all of his buildings were of superior quality and he spared no expense. He also knew many of the people who would be benefiting from his donations. This all made Rogers's philanthropy much more intimate and personal than that of his colleagues. One must also consider the fact that Rogers would also benefit from some of his donations to Fairhaven because he spent his summers and many weekends there. Rogers would drive his electric cars on the roads he paid to have paved, he attended the church he built, he would have an office in the town hall he built, and his friends would stay in the inn he built.

Rogers has been remembered as the Great Town Benefactor due to his many benefactions to Fairhaven. The deeds to these buildings provide insight into his philanthropy and help to portray what his true intent was when donating these buildings. Deeds for Rogers School, Fairhaven High School and the Town Hall help to shed light on Rogers's intent and beliefs when donating buildings and his philosophy on education. Rogers believed that education was important and that all children should have fair access to it and that America needed to do more to support education. While these were his beliefs his actions told a slightly different story. Rogers upheld these beliefs but only within in the town of Fairhaven.

The deed to Rogers School, donated in 1885, had multiple stipulations, which reflect Rogers's philosophy on education. One stipulation was that the "school shall be for the Education of the Children of Fairhaven, without restriction on account of sectarian creed or religious belief: and shall never be maintained as a school separately for Protestant or Catholic children, but both shall enjoy in common its privilege."¹⁰ Rogers was clearly stating that he did not believe that religion should play a role in public education. Traditionally religiously affiliated schools charged tuition, which limited their use to only those who could afford it; Rogers wanted his school buildings to be available to anyone regardless of their wealth. The deed also stated "in the event of a non compliance with or violation of the above condition, the said premises and the buildings and improvements thereon shall revert to the grantor."¹¹ This reinforced his belief that religion did not have a place in public education and ensured his wishes would be followed by threatening to take away the building if the stipulations were broken.

¹⁰ Deed of Sale from Henry H. Rogers to the Town of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, 19 June, 1885 (Filed 7 July, 1885), Bristol County, Massachusetts, Deed Book 113, pages 331-333. Millicent Library Archives, Fairhaven, Ma.

¹¹ Ibid.

Rogers also stipulated that if the town ever wanted to sell the school building it could, but all money resulting from the sale had to stay within the town school system and only be used for educational purposes. Here Rogers was certainly farsighted in his thinking, as he knew the town might need a new or larger school one day therefore he allowed for a sale of the school. This clause has become relevant in recent history; Rogers School was closed in 2013 and as of 2016 was still for sale.

The deed to the high school, donated in 1906, also had similar stipulations, which reflected Rogers's beliefs. One clause was that, "There shall be no attempt to foster belief in the particular creed of any church or religious organization, and to which school admission shall never be denied to any pupil on account of race, color or religious belief."¹² Another condition was, "That a copy of this deed of conveyance with the conditions therein contained printed in large type so as to be easily read shall be kept displayed in a prominent place in each of the two entrance halls of the building."¹³ By placing this deed in a prominent place in both entrance halls in large type Rogers ensured that everyone who entered this building knew what his beliefs and wishes for the building were. Rogers wanted this school to be available to students of all religions and all races and for everyone to be aware of that, which was very progressive for this time in American history, as segregation was still the norm in many parts of the country. Massachusetts would not have been segregated like most southern states but it would not be unusual for there to be racism, and ethnic and racial tension at this time in Massachusetts. During this time period Massachusetts would have been taking in a large number of immigrants to provide labor for the large manufacturing centers of New Bedford and Lowell that would have

¹² Deed of Sale from Henry H. Rogers to the Town of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, 30 December, 1907 (Filed 3 September, 1909), Bristol County Massachusetts, Deed Book 301, pages 521-523. Millicent Library Archives, Fairhaven, Ma.

¹³ Ibid.

made ethnic tensions worse. The threat of breaking these stipulations was made clear, the deed states, “Upon the breach of any of the above named conditions the property herein conveyed shall revert to me or to my heirs.”¹⁴ This would not only ensure the stipulations would be followed but could benefit Rogers and his heirs if the terms were broken. In both deeds to the schools Rogers clearly wanted the schools to truly be public, open to anyone regardless of race or religion and includes threats to ensure these stipulations were not broken.

Rogers was once quoted as saying; “My country must do more for its teachers before you can call us civilized.”¹⁵ Rogers seemed to have lived up to this statement, at least within the town of Fairhaven. In addition to the two schools he donated he also gave generously to teachers in the town. A Fairhaven High School English class produced a booklet in 1954 about the high school that included many interesting anecdotes from the school’s history. One anecdote claimed, “One summer the teachers... spent a most carefree vacation. A certain person who wished his identity to remain unknown paid their salaries continuously during the summer months. Mr. Rogers could not keep all his good deeds secret.”¹⁶ Rogers did not have to do this for the teachers who worked in the school he donated but he wanted to because of the beliefs he had about education in America. This is problematic though because like any of Rogers’s philanthropy he was very selective in whom the recipients were. He did not provide funding to teachers at random from across the country; he selected those within the town of Fairhaven. While this does make his philanthropy more intimate and personal than that of other philanthropists it is much less widespread. For example money provided to the University of Chicago and Spelman College by Rockefeller had a much more significant and widespread impact than that of Rogers.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Henry H. Rogers quoted in *Little Journeys To The Home of Great Business Men*, Elbert Hubbard. (New York: Roycrofters, 1909).

¹⁶ Fairhaven High School, *About Our High School*, (Fairhaven, Mass, 1954).

The deed to the Town Hall, donated in 1894, had one interesting condition. The donation of the building was, “subject to the right of Henry H. Rogers of New York to personally use and occupy the central room on the west side on the main floor of said building.”¹⁷ Rogers’s intent for this office is not clear. Rogers did not request just any office: there was a specific one he requested which suggests that it was planned in advance. One could argue that he was planning on holding public office and this is why he wanted an office specifically built for him in town hall. This was less than two years before Rogers was made the Superintendent of Streets in Fairhaven. Rogers more than likely wanted this office built because he knew he would be holding public office and that if he took public office he could benefit himself.

Rogers was praised for his role as the Superintendent of Streets of Fairhaven, a job that he received no salary for. Rogers also paid for many of the streets to be paved out of his own pocket saving the town thousands of dollars. In 1896 the *Boston Daily Globe* reported that in 1891 Rogers had paid for the extension of Green Street, which is where his house was. Rogers “paid all the land damages, amounting to several thousands and contributed \$2,000.”¹⁸ This is a great example of how Rogers’s philanthropy to the town would benefit him, he paid for the street near his mansion to be paved. In February of 1909 the *Boston Daily Globe* also noted that Rogers contributed up to \$30,000 some years.¹⁹ While Rogers did not have to agree to his appointment of Superintendent of Streets, refuse a salary, and pay for streets out of his own pocket he did but there was clear self-interest involved. Rogers could ensure that all of the streets surrounding his mansion and the buildings that he donated were properly paved. He could also ensure that any

¹⁷ Deed of Sale from Abbie P. Rogers to the Town of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, 22 February, 1894, (Filed 21 December, 1912), Bristol County, Massachusetts, Deed Book 384, pages 260-261. Millicent Library Archives, Fairhaven, Ma.

¹⁸ “Millionaire Street Boss” *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): March 15, 1896. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016 .

¹⁹ “H. H. Rogers In Town Politics”, *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): February 23, 1909. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016 .

streets his visitors would use were well paved which would all reflect nicely on Rogers. Rogers was also known for his collection of electric cars and he would not be able to enjoy them without well paved roads.

As mentioned previously Rogers did not confine his philanthropy to Fairhaven. One of his more interesting donations was to Helen Keller, the famous deaf and blind girl who went on to graduate from Radcliffe College at Harvard. Keller described Rogers and his wife, Emilie, as “The best of the world she lives in.”²⁰ Keller had a good reason for this; Rogers agreed to pay for her expenses while attending Radcliffe College after Mark Twain had reached out to Rogers and mentioned Keller’s need for funding. This provides an extremely interesting case of philanthropy, which epitomized the dual personality of Rogers: he performed a great deed but was not completely compassionate in his act.

When Mark Twain reached out to Rogers on November 26, 1894, he asked Rogers to appeal to “John D. and William Rockefeller and the other Standard Oil chiefs in Helen’s case” and to see if they would “subscribe an annual aggregate of six or seven hundred or a thousand dollars- and to agree to continue this three or four years, until she completed her college course.”²¹ There is no evidence of Rogers appealing to any of his colleagues to help support Keller, and Twain claimed that Rogers financed it completely on his own. In writing to Twain, Rogers had noted that just as Twain had made the appeal to him another one of his colleagues, Mr. Hutton, who was close with Keller had informed Rogers about the death of Keller’s benefactor which left her with no endowment. Rogers claimed that he had told a colleague that

²⁰ Helen Keller, Letter to Henry H. Rogers, in “Henry Huttleston Rogers (1840 – 1909) An evaluation on the 150th Anniversary of his Birth”, Earl J. Dias, The Millicent Library. Last updated November, 1996. <http://millicentlibrary.org/henry-huttleston-rogers-150th-anniversary/>

²¹ Mark Twain, Letter to Emilie Rogers, November 26, 1896, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. Ed. by Lewis Leary, (Berkeley: U. of Calif, 1969), 254.

he “would be willing to contribute a little in that direction.”²² This was the kinder side of Rogers: he could have appealed to his colleagues to help him fund Keller’s education but instead he did it on his own and even offered his help before his friend Twain appealed to him. Rogers’s motivation for not wanting to ask any of his colleagues could have been that it would be in bad taste to ask friends to make donations or because it would not have been a large amount of money so he felt it unnecessary.

One very interesting point is that Twain did not directly appeal to Rogers, instead he appealed to Rogers’s wife, Emilie. In the letter dated November 26, 1894, Twain wrote, “Experience has convinced me that when one wishes to set a hard worked man at something which he mightn’t prefer to be bothered with, it is best to move upon him behind his wife.”²³ This is interesting because Twain may have had some doubt in his mind that Rogers would be willing to do this or else he would have appealed directly to Rogers. This was not an unwarranted assumption, since on multiple occasions Rogers denied and even made fun of appeals for benefactions.

Rogers may have not been all that genuine or enthusiastic about this particular benefaction either. In a letter to Mark Twain on January 6 1898, almost two years after he agreed to help Keller, Rogers said, “Poor Helen Kellar [sic] has gotten into trouble over in Boston ... and there is ‘old Harry to pay.’”²⁴ Rogers seemed almost bitter that his funds were not being used up to his standards which was reasonable except for the fact that he did not seem interested in

²² Henry H. Rogers, Letter to Mark Twain, 24 December, 1896, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*, 257.

²³ Mark Twain, Letter to Emilie Rogers, 26 November, 1896, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*, 253.

²⁴ Henry H. Rogers, Letter to Mark Twain, 6 January, 1898, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 312.

helping fix Keller's problems. The phrasing of this quote also makes it seem like Rogers felt that helping Keller had become a burden by this point in time.

Rogers did not always contribute to requests from Twain, which can lead one to believe that Rogers may not have been all that generous. Rogers was worth millions of dollars and one could not expect him to give money to every person that asked, but it is surprising that he would deny an appeal from a worthy cause or a friend. Twain wrote to Rogers on September 16, 1905 saying, "Read and destroy the enclosed, and don't blame me, I'm not doing anything. It is from Mrs. Tom Bailey Aldrich, and I *had* to give her an answer of course."²⁵ Mrs. Aldrich was the wife of Thomas Bailey Aldrich, a fellow American author. Aldrich wrote to Twain saying, "Do you know the name of Mr. H. H. Rogers confidential advisor in money matters? I am in sore distress to get some money to enlarge a Hospital which now for want of space is much curtailed in the splendid work it is doing for the sick and suffering."²⁶ In September 1905 Rogers wrote to Twain saying, "I return herewith the letter of Mrs. Aldrich. I received her letter in reference to the Hospital, and was obliged to say in reply that I could not undertake the matter because of my obligations in other directions."²⁷ This is a rather nice response compared to how Rogers reacted to other letters from people asking for money. At this time Rogers was already in the process of building Fairhaven High School, estimated to be one of his most expensive donations. He was also in the process of building the Virginian Railway which he financed completely on his own, this is not to say that he lacked money but it could explain his cautiousness in spending money if he did not need to.

²⁵ Mark Twain, Letter to Henry H. Rogers, 16 September, 1905, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 598.

²⁶ Mrs. Thomad Bailey Aldrich, Letter to Mark Twain, 15 September, 1905, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 598.

²⁷ Henry H. Rogers, Letter to Mark Twain, 27 September, 1905, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 601.

Rogers, like any well-known wealthy individual, received a number of what were known as “begging letters” most of which he simply ignored. Twain was well aware that Rogers would receive begging letters. In January 1897 he wrote to Rogers saying, “I’ll keep the Hellen Kellar [sic] subscription private. I don’t want you to be flooded with begging letters.”²⁸ There were a number of begging letters he received that he mostly ignored or took great joy in sharing with Mark Twain by making fun of those who were begging. It is hard to say that Rogers was extremely generous and kind hearted due to his lack of empathy towards the plight of the less fortunate.

In April 1896 Rogers wrote to Twain complaining about an article written about himself in the *Boston Globe* and how he received a number of letters from strangers afterwards. Rogers said he destroyed most of the letters after reading them but there were a number of them that grabbed his attention. Rogers said:

One in particular has so appealed to my sense of the humorous, and I may add to my feelings of sympathy, that I have had a copy of it made and enclose it herewith. I hope it will entertain you as it has me. The sweet simplicity of this poor old woman as shown in the whole letter, and the pathetic story of her husband, who has to take a hot stone to bed with him even in July, and the description of her home. ²⁹

The woman had asked Rogers for only two dollars which Rogers clearly found to be a source of entertainment. Rogers referred to this letter as humorous and as a form of entertainment, which reflects little empathy on his part. It would have been one thing to disregard the letter but to find humor in another person’s plight, whether real or not is just as bad. One cannot be overly critical of Rogers for this since he was merely human, but one must acknowledge this character defect.

²⁸ Mark Twain, Letter to Henry H. Rogers, 15 January, 1897, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 261.

²⁹ Henry H. Rogers, Letter to Mark Twain, 10 April, 1896, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 207.

A gentleman by the name of William H. Baker of New Bedford had written so frequently to Rogers that it resulted in some conflict between the men. In August 1901 Baker wrote to Rogers and asked for him to fund an alms house in Fairhaven, but the letter was written in poor grammar which Rogers, Twain and their friends found great humor in. Rogers sent the letter to Twain, who sarcastically wrote back to Rogers, “The Baker letter hasn’t its match in literature anywhere. It can’t be approached- it stands alone. I’ve sent it to Howells- but only lent it. If he loses it I must have another copy. I think Twichell ought to be allowed a sight of it when he comes.”³⁰ The men Twain referred to were his good friends, Joseph Twichell and William Howells, who found the letter just as amusing and also poked fun at Mr. Baker. A portion of the letter from Baker said, “Perhaps you may feel different about it, so I will tell you what it is. It is an Old Peoples Home. It seams to me that it would be a great blessing. Some would say have we not got a good Alms House for the Old People to go to whare thay will be taken care of. [sic]”³¹ The grammar is clearly lacking but Baker had previously mentioned how grateful he was for all of Rogers’s benefactions and said he was even afraid to appeal to Rogers for another benefaction to Fairhaven because he worried that the people of Fairhaven would harm him for being ungrateful to Rogers.³² This is a strong reflection of what the public perception of Rogers was in Fairhaven, which differs from that of other places across the country. Lewis Leary, the editor of *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*, noted that one of Baker’s letters to Rogers was published in a New Bedford, Ma newspaper, which worked as a source of intimidation to stop Baker from writing Rogers.³³ It says a lot about Rogers that he

³⁰ Mark Twain, Letter to Henry H. Rogers, 21 November, 1901, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 475.

³¹ William H. Baker Letter to Henry H. Rogers, 5 August, 1901, in *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 475.

³² Ibid.

³³ Lewis Leary, *Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909*. 497.

would not only make fun of a beggar in private but he would also publicly humiliate the man when he could have easily destroyed the letters along with all of his other begging letters. Rogers may have felt that the man was unappreciative of his donations to the town or was simply annoyed with the letters but that is no excuse to publicly humiliate the man, even if it would get him to stop writing. In this instance Rogers did not show compassion for this man, even though given the town people's love for Rogers the man could have been physically harmed or outcast after this was made public. Instances such as this one make it difficult to view Rogers's philanthropy in a completely positive light.

Rogers's philanthropy is very interesting, as the buildings he donated to the town of Fairhaven were of superior quality and make a visitor to the town feel like they are in a European village; that is to say they are architectural treasures. Outside of Fairhaven Rogers gave buildings to various town and organizations and gave to various individuals. Rogers also benefited from some of his benefactions such as paved roads, the Unitarian church, and the town hall. It is difficult to say that Rogers was completely kind hearted and empathetic due to his treatment of some individuals who reached out to him for assistance. His philanthropy was not as plentiful or widespread as that of Rockefeller or Carnegie, that is not to disqualify his donations, it is just a matter of fact. While Rogers did engage in philanthropy and gave away a small portion of his wealth he did not give widely outside of Fairhaven which does not make up for any wrongdoing committed. Even if Rogers did give away as much as Carnegie it would still be difficult to claim that this negated his crimes which is further evidence that he was a Robber Barron.

Rogers and Business:

Philanthropy is not the only important factor when discussing Gilded Age businessmen and addressing the Robber Baron or Captain of Industry argument. One must also discuss the business side of these men. In the case of Rogers it is important to discuss his work at Standard Oil and his other business ventures. One must consider whether he was a mastermind behind the Standard Oil trust, as some claim, or was he just a pawn in John D. Rockefeller's game. One must also examine his business ventures to discover whether his business practices were similar to that of Standard Oil or if they were different and what that says about Rogers as a business man.

In order to understand Rogers's place at Standard Oil one must understand the relationship between Rogers and John D. Rockefeller. The relationship between Rogers and John D. Rockefeller is complex: they were business partners within Standard Oil but outside of Standard Oil it seems that the two did not interact with one another. The available correspondence between the two does not indicate any sort of friendship and other correspondence and descriptions also support this and even indicate the two may have been business rivals outside of Standard Oil.

The tension between the two men can be traced back to Rogers's vocal opposition to the South Improvement Company that was run by John D. Rockefeller. As Ida Tarbell noted the South Improvement Company did not initially try to take over the New York oil market, which allowed a group of New York oil men in early 1872 to send "a committee of three, with H. H. Rogers of Charles Pratt and Company at its head, to Oil City, to consult with the Producers' Union."³⁴ This committee would try to figure out how to join small refiners, producers and

³⁴ Ida M. Tarbell and Danny Schechter, *The History Of The Standard Oil Company: 2 Volumes In 1*. (New York, NY: COSIMOCClassics, 2009). 89.

transporters across the country in order to resist a takeover by the South Improvement Company. By March 1872 Rogers and his committee posed a serious threat to Rockefeller and the South Improvement Company. Regarding a meeting between the Producers' Union, headed by Rogers, and the South Improvement Company, Tarbell noted that "Mr. Watson of the South Improvement Company, and John D. Rockefeller presented themselves for admission ... things were now in such critical shape that he (Rockefeller) came forward in a last attempt to save the organization."³⁵ Rogers not only vocally opposed Rockefeller and the South Improvement Company but he led the opposition and came close to taking down Rockefeller and his organization.

Rogers's opinion changed after Charles Pratt and Company was taken over by Rockefeller and his partners. Rogers could have had a change in business philosophy or he could have just accepted the fact that he and Pratt were unable to compete with Standard Oil and had to make the best of the situation. Tarbell quoted Rogers as being one of the best defenders of Rockefeller's new Central Association scheme in 1875 which sought to bring independent refiners into his alliance. Rogers was quoted as saying:

The supply of oil is three or four times greater than the demand. If the oil refineries were run to their full capacity, the market would be overstocked. The business is not regular, but spasmodic... It is therefore to the interest of every man who has put a dollar in it to have the trade protected and established on a permanent footing. Speculators have ruined the market. The brokers heretofore have been speculating upon the market with disastrous effects upon the trade, and this new order of things will force them to pursue their legitimate calling, and realize their profits from their industry and perseverance... An organization to protect the oil capital is imperatively needed.³⁶

Here Rogers was defending the practice of independent oil refiners joining together to regulate markets to protect their own interests. By this point Rogers had already joined with Rockefeller

³⁵ Ibid., 92.

³⁶ Ibid., 149-150.

and surely knew of his true intentions behind the Central Association. The Standard Oil men under the guise of the Central Association preached that this newest alliance would help its members protect their own interests, but as with the South Improvement Company it just allowed Rockefeller and his associates to monopolize and control markets which would force small refiners and producers to either join or to go out of business.

Whether Rogers joined Rockefeller because he was unable to beat him or because he saw the opportunity for immense profits or both is unknown, but what is known is that the two were previously rivals who then became business partners that would have to work closely together. Rogers and Rockefeller had to become close business partners within Standard Oil but they never pursued an independent joint venture together without William Rockefeller, John's brother. This suggests that Rogers and John Rockefeller did not work well together and that William Rockefeller may have served as a mediator between the two.

Rogers and the Rockefellers did not confine their personal business ventures to just oil. Outside of Standard Oil they invested in rail, heavy metals and insurance companies. It seems that John Rockefeller's and Rogers's business interests conflicted at one point. In a letter to Andrew Carnegie in February of 1897 Henry Clay Frick described a phone call one of his associates, Mr. Schoonmaker, had with Rogers. Schoonmaker said:

I gathered that he was just a little sore at the arrangement made between the Carnegie Steel Company and Mr. Rockefeller. I think that he recognizes that it hits his interests in the Minnesota Iron Co. pretty hard. Mr. Rogers further intimated to me that Mr. Rockefeller, through his Mr. Gates was now trying to effect a pool arrangement on ore with the ore people; and I think this is causing the delay in the fixing price of ore.³⁷

Rather than working together to control the iron market, Rogers and John Rockefeller were working against each other. It also seems that Rogers was highly suspicious of John Rockefeller

³⁷ Henry Clay Frick, Letter to Andrew Carnegie, 26 February, 1897, Henry Clay Frick Business Records, 1892-1987, AIS.2002.06, Archives Service Center, University of Pittsburgh.

because he believed Rockefeller was trying to control the price of ore by controlling a large amount of iron companies, which could negatively affect Rogers's investments in Iron. This does not portray the men as being business partners but as business rivals. It is clear that Rockefeller and Rogers were not the best of friends yet Rockefeller and other Standard Oil men elected Rogers to Vice President of Standard Oil which speaks to Rogers's ability as a business person. Rockefeller looked past the personal issues between them because he believed Rogers was an intelligent businessman.

Thomas Lawson described the relationship between the Rockefeller brothers and Rogers by saying:

Sometimes John D. Rockefeller uses the name alone in projects in which Henry H. Rogers and William Rockefeller have no interests. Henry H. Rogers or William Rockefeller seldom, if ever, uses the name in projects which neither of the other two is associated. Sometimes, but not often, John D. and William Rockefeller use the name in connection with projects of their own in which Henry H. Rogers has no interest. Henry H. Rogers and John D. Rockefeller, I believe never are associated in projects in which William Rockefeller has no interest.³⁸

This point is further evidenced by the fact that William, not John, partnered with Rogers in Amalgamated Coppers, which is discussed throughout Lawson's book. John may have declined joining because he did not want to work on a project headed by Rogers or because he did not want to associate himself with such a scheme.

Correspondence between the two men from the Rockefeller Archives does not portray anything more than two men working together: the letters were often short, business oriented and secretive. One common practice between the two men was to reference an enclosed letter from another person but the majority of these enclosed letters were not available at the archive which suggested that they could have been destroyed by either man. For example on July 25, 1888, Rogers wrote to Rockefeller saying, "The enclosed letter from Mr. Scheide is so particularly

³⁸ Thomas W. Lawson, *Frenzied Finance The Crime of Amalgamated*. 6.

interesting in reference to the Chicago Line that I send it to you for perusal. Will you kindly return it at your convenience?"³⁹ Rogers and Rockefeller would also reference "esteemed favors" from one another with little to no explanation of the favor. In September 1888 Rogers wrote to Rockefeller, "Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your esteemed favor of 5th instant. Your views I have laid before our people. Nothing further has developed in the matter, although I understand several interviews have been held."⁴⁰ That is the entire letter, short mysterious and poses more questions than answers for the reader which is characteristic of their entire correspondence. Questions such as what was the favor, who are their people, and what was so interesting about the enclosed letters? The men may have been brief in writing because they would see each other at the Standard Oil office or because they did not want to leave a trail of any wrongdoing.

The lack of closeness between Rogers and John D. Rockefeller is proven by the latter's statement following Rogers's death, which was quoted by a number of newspapers. Rockefeller said, "I have seen Mr. Rogers but twice during the past five years, and on both of these occasions as well as often before I urged him with tears in my eyes not to work so hard."⁴¹ Granted by this time John D. Rockefeller was well into his retirement which would lessen his visits to 26 Broadway, the Standard Oil headquarters, but if the two men were anything more than two men connected by business they presumably would have seen or contacted one another more often. While Rockefeller had kind words to say about Rogers after his death it must be understood that speaking ill of a business partner who just passed away would not have been appropriate for a man of Rockefeller's status.

³⁹ Henry H. Rogers, to John D. Rockefeller, Sr., July 25, 1888, Reel 10, Series C: Correspondence, Sub series B: Business, FA002, John D. Rockefeller papers, Rockefeller Archive Center.

⁴⁰ Henry H. Rogers, to John D. Rockefeller Sr., September 7, 1888, Reel 10, Series C: Correspondence, Sub series B: Business, FA002, John D. Rockefeller papers, Rockefeller Archive Center.

⁴¹ "DEATH COMES TO H. H. ROGERS." *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): 1. May 20 1909. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016 .

It is telling that John Rockefeller entrusted Rogers with control of Standard Oil even though they did not work well together. Rogers was a vocal critic of Rockefeller and the South Improvement Company before he joined Rockefeller and nearly twenty years into their relationship there still seems to be tension and rivalry, which suggests that the two probably never worked in complete harmony. The fact that Rockefeller chose Rogers to help run his company despite the fact that they did not get a long speaks volumes to Rogers's capability as a businessman because Rockefeller could have chosen anyone to help run at Standard Oil but he chose Rogers. Rockefeller more than likely did not like Rogers yet he chose him to help run his company because he saw that Rogers was a valuable asset and was an essential member of Standard Oil. Rockefeller's premier biographer, Ron Chernow, also claimed that Rogers and Rockefeller did not work well together but that Rogers was a necessary ally. In *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller Sr.* Chernow wrote, "Though he later clashed with Rockefeller, Rogers was a versatile executive."⁴²

Chernow noted that Roger was not the nicest or most generous executive, especially in comparison to Rockefeller. Chernow described how once a year employees at Standard Oil would be able to argue in front of the executives for higher wages, and cited one employee who recalled that, "H. H. Rogers would say gruffly that he had had enough and we had no right to ask for an increase in salary, Mr. Rockefeller would say, 'Oh give him a chance.'"⁴³ This is certainly in stark contrast to the Great Town Benefactor of Fairhaven who was rumored to give generously to those in his town but would not give generously to those working under him. This could have been due to the fact that paying employees more would not look as good to the public as donating millions of dollars' worth of buildings and that it would not benefit him personally.

⁴² Ron Chernow, *Titan: The Life Of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* (New York: Random House, 1998), 164.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 230.

Rogers's unwillingness to pay employees a high salary even resulted in the alleged suicide of one of his employees. Investigators believed the man committed suicide due to financial hardship. A May 1906 *Boston Daily Globe* article noted that while investigators originally believed it was a murder they then concluded that "Charles L. Spier right hand man of Henry H Rogers" died from suicide.⁴⁴ The article also noted that "Mr. Spier was not as wealthy as was supposed, his salary from the Standard Oil Company being only 5,000 a year."⁴⁵ While Henry H. Rogers was by no means directly responsible for this man's suicide his actions, driven by greed, may have inadvertently resulted in it. One important fact regarding Rogers and employee compensation is that Rogers's secretary was rumored to be the highest paid in New York but besides her it seems that his employees were given minimum compensation. This again refutes the view that Rogers was a great philanthropist, one of the easiest forms of philanthropy is to provide fair compensation which Rogers did not do.

The tension between Rogers and Rockefeller culminated in a number of head to head battles between the two after Thomas Lawson released his scathing stories about Rogers. Rogers had wanted to sue Lawson on behalf of Standard Oil for the misuse of their name but as the *Boston Daily Globe* reported on Christmas Eve 1904 Rockefeller "vetoed legal action, which Mr. Rogers desired to take, but is contemplating making a statement pointing out the difference between what Mr. Rogers may do and what is done by the Standard Oil company."⁴⁶ Rockefeller wanted to disassociate himself from Rogers due to Rogers's immoral business tactics. Chernow described how in 1907 Rockefeller convinced the Board of Directors of Standard Oil not to invest in Rogers's Virginia Railway project, which had buried him in debt. After the vote took

⁴⁴ "Charles L. Spier Died By His Own hand, Say Police" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): May 9 1906. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ "Scores Lawson" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): December 24 1904. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

place Chernow noted that, “Rogers grew so enraged that he slammed his fist on the table, threatening to sell every share of Standard Oil Stock he owned. To this, Rockefeller placidly replied ‘what is your price?’”⁴⁷ By this point in time it is evident that if there were any amends made between the two men after Rogers joined Standard Oil it had been ruined due to Rogers’s businesses outside of Standard Oil.

It is not clear if the newspaper reports of Rogers being the mastermind of Standard Oil were true. Through an examination of the relationship between Rogers and Rockefeller one can conclude that Rogers was a key player behind the trust, which means that he was not the most honest of business people. This was further evidenced by Rogers’s other business affairs. One story in particular helps to portray the Robber Baron side of Rogers, this story being the Amalgamated Copper Company.

The story of Amalgamated Coppers is a case certainly worth examining; it shows how far Rogers was willing to go to make money, regardless of potential casualties. Thomas Lawson, his business partner in the venture, went into great detail about the scheme. Rogers recruited Lawson to help push the stock in the Boston market where Lawson was based. After meeting Rogers, Lawson said, “The chief impression I recall of my experience that night is gratitude for Henry H. Rogers's unexpected kindness and admiration for his manliness, ability and firmness.”⁴⁸ This is a complete contradiction of descriptions Lawson made about Rogers following the Amalgamated scheme which shows that Rogers could deceive people to buy into his schemes. This also indicated that Lawson would have felt betrayed and angry after Rogers took advantage of him.

Rogers and William Rockefeller bought control of a number of different copper mines across the United States and would consolidate them into one company, Amalgamated, and sell

⁴⁷ Ron Chernow, *Titan*. 380.

⁴⁸ Thomas W. Lawson, *Frenzied Finance The Crime of Amalgamated*. 115.

stock to the public. The whole scheme was thought up to enable Rogers and William Rockefeller to immensely profit. Rogers laid out the plans of his real scheme to Lawson:

You can buy or sell any number of millions of pounds in futures or actual deliveries. Suppose a man controlling the selling of three or four hundred million pounds a year should knock the price to, say, ten cents, sell to himself the year's output of all the mines he controls and then lift the price to, say, twenty cents. He would have a sure profit with absolutely no risk, of thirty to forty millions of dollars. If he should sell the next year's output short at twenty and drop the price back to ten, he would have another thirty or forty millions. Wouldn't he? Then if, before he broke the price, he sold copper mining stocks short, and if, before advancing the price, he covered and loaded up with them, he could easily make an additional thirty or forty millions ... A man in such position could absolutely dictate to all new mines whose selling agency he could secure under long term contracts. When their stocks were up, he could pinch them to the edge of bankruptcy by refusing to sell their metal or advance them the cash they needed for operation.⁴⁹

Here Rogers essentially laid out his plan for how he would control the price of copper by selling copper to himself and manipulating the supply end of the business. He would also be able to profit off of selling copper stocks short because he would know when there would be a drop in price. He would then be able to control smaller independent copper mines by having them sell their output to him and his desired price. He would then force them into bankruptcy by refusing to buy their metal. This would not only make copper products more expensive for the public but it would make investors and small independent mines lose money.

Rogers and Rockefeller also had another plan to deceive their investors. Lawson said:

For the purpose of Mr. Rogers' plan its inclusion (Parrott mining Company) was essential for it was well known and helped cover up the inflation in his consolidation. Possession of 100,00 shares would give control, and the public would imagine when the announcement of its purchase was made that this meant ownership of most of the entire capital stock. Indeed, it afterward developed that this was one of the conditions Mr. Rogers and William Rockefeller relied on to deceive investors, for it was a natural assumption that nearly all the Anaconda and Parrott were included in the consolidation, and in estimating the value of the

⁴⁹ Ibid., 293.

properties the public would multiply the market prices of their shares by the total capital stock and assume the result represented the assets of the amalgamation.⁵⁰

Essentially Rogers and William Rockefeller were making it seem as if the Amalgamated Company held a majority stake in many of the companies that it was consolidating, but this was not true. Rogers, Rockefeller and their associates were to personally hold large stakes in these companies which were not to be included in Amalgamated. This allowed them to advertise Amalgamated as being more valuable than it actually was. It says a lot about Rogers that he would intentionally create a company just to profit while his investors lost money. That is perhaps the best example of how Rogers acted as a Robber Baron.

Financial crimes are often thought of as victimless crimes, as there is usually no physical harm as a result which is why some people are willing to overlook financial crimes. The peculiarity of this is that a petty thief would be looked at as much more of a criminal than Rogers who robbed investors on a large scale. The crime of Amalgamated was not a victimless financial crime, in *Frenzied Finance* Thomas Lawson claimed that multiple investors had committed suicide after losing their money in Amalgamated although he offered no evidence to back this up, not even the names of said investors. Evidence has been found to back up this claim, as an article published by the *New York Times* in May 1905 noted that a coal operator, W. C. Jutte, who had invested and lost money in Amalgamated, was found dead as a result of suicide. The article noted that bad investments in stocks such as amalgamated, and other financial issues caused him to commit suicide.⁵¹ While Rogers never intended for people to commit suicide as a result of investing in Amalgamated Copper his intention was to make money at the expense of others, which would ultimately have a number of negative effects. Rogers's complete disregard

⁵⁰ Ibid., 303.

⁵¹ "Suicide Lost Millions In Amalgamated Copper." *New York Times* (1857-1922): May 26 1905. *ProQuest*. Web. 14 Nov. 2016 .

for others' well-being is telling of his character. When Rogers created the Amalgamated Scheme he was already quite wealthy and did not desperately need a get rich quick scheme; it is difficult to come to a conclusion other than that he was just acting on greed.

Rogers was the defendant in a number of lawsuits beginning in the 1900's, all regarding his business tactics. In some lawsuits he was being sued as an individual entity and in others he was sued as being a part of Standard Oil. The *Boston Daily Globe* provided in depth reports of many of these lawsuits. An article from April 30, 1904 described a lengthy lawsuit against Rogers, which was essentially accusing him of deceit to gain control of the Bay State Gas Company of Delaware in order to gain control of gas markets in Boston. Rogers was described as "the inspiring genius behind the act... responsible for the wrecking of the Bay State Gas Company."⁵² Two years later on July 19, 1906, the *Boston Daily Globe* reported that, "It is estimated Mr. Rogers will have to turn over to Mr. Pepper under order of the court, \$2,250,000."⁵³ It is quite telling that Rogers was found guilty, in a court of law, for deceptive business tactics. In the United States people are innocent until proven guilty and since Rogers was found guilty one cannot deny or overlook this crime.

Another lawsuit was reported by *The Boston Daily Globe* on November 24, 1905, and said that John D. Rockefeller, Rogers, and a number of other men from Standard Oil were all subpoenaed to testify in a lawsuit to prohibit Standard Oil and two alleged subsidiary companies from operating in the state of Missouri.⁵⁴ Rogers was notorious for evading subpoenas and whenever he was finally brought in to testify his responses usually warranted little useful

⁵² "Addicks Warming Up To His Work" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): April 30 1904. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

⁵³ "Court Decides Against Rogers" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): July 19, 1906. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

⁵⁴ "After Oil magnates" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): November 24, 1905. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

information. During this particular lawsuit Rogers and his lawyers claimed that he was too sick to testify in court but this seems to have been a lie. To refute this claim the *Boston Daily Globe* reported on September 22, 1907, that “Ten citizens will tell you, one after the other that they have each seen Henry H. Rogers on the streets of Fairhaven, in his electric runabout each day this week.”⁵⁵ While this was not the worst crime committed it is quite immoral for a man to have his lawyers and doctors lie for him in order to skip testifying in court.

There was one lawsuit that calls Rogers’s ability as an oil refiner into question. Rogers has been praised for patenting a way to distill naphtha and other crude oil byproducts. He was given a patent in 1871 for this process while he was working for Charles Pratt but a 1904 lawsuit calls this into question. On November 8, 1904, the *Boston Daily Globe* reported that a suit was filed against Rogers and executors of Charles Pratt’s will claiming that Rogers and Pratt failed to compensate the inventor Benjamin Greenbrough who “assigned the patent to Rogers and Pratt under an agreement, as the plaintiff claims, for a royalty.”⁵⁶ The articles regarding the lawsuit indicated that the issue was not over who invented the process but whether or not the royalties were paid after the process was given to Standard Oil in 1874. The process that the article was most likely referring to is the one filed by Rogers in 1871 because that is the only patent filed by Rogers. The patent listed Rogers as the sole inventor and is for “Improvement In Distilling Naptha and other Hydrocarbon Liquids.”⁵⁷ This calls Rogers’s ability as a refiner into question, as he has often received praise for having his own patent but it now seems that the process was not purely his invention if his at all.

⁵⁵ “Natives Smile, Mystery of Missing H. H. Rogers”, *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): November 24, 1905. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

⁵⁶ “Is Reentered: Suit for 50,000,000 against H. H. Rogers” *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): November 8 1904. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

⁵⁷ Rogers, Henry H. Improvement in Distilling Naptha and other Hydrocarbon Liquids. U.S. Patent 120,539. Issued October 31, 1871.

Not all of Rogers's business dealing were purely evil. The *Boston Daily Globe* reported that in 1893 Rogers threatened the Union Street Railway to finish their extension to the town of Fairhaven or he would buy up enough stock to make sure the job was done. This was after the rail company was granted a charter to extend the line but had made little progress in doing so. Within a week of this the extension was finished. The *Boston Daily Globe* had noted that this extension "would have been of great convenience to the townspeople."⁵⁸ One must also consider that having this railway extended would also benefit Rogers when he stayed in Fairhaven. It would make travel more convenient for both him and his visitors. While this act was mostly for the benefit of the townspeople it was not completely one sided, Rogers did gain something from it. A common theme with Rogers's philanthropy within Fairhaven is that there was some way that he could benefit from his donations which does not make his philanthropy completely selfless.

Political Cartoons & Political Bribery:

Political cartoons of this time period offer valuable insight because they reveal that the public perception of Rogers was not positive. *Puck* was one of the first political cartoon magazines in the United States and this publication ran multiple cartoons involving Rogers, all of which were negative. Cartoons of Rogers were also featured in a number of other publications. Some portrayals include political bribery and manipulation, piracy, evasion of subpoenas, and revenge on enemies. The acts portrayed in these cartoons were accurate depictions, as there are various newspaper articles to back up the claims of campaign financing, political bribery, and corruption.

⁵⁸ "Millionaire Street Boss" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): March 15 1896. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016.

Five cartoons involve Rogers and other Standard Oil men and President Theodore Roosevelt and the Republican Party. Three of these portrayed the Standard Oil men benefiting from or working with Roosevelt and two portrayed Roosevelt as going after the Standard Oil men. This contrast in the portrayal of Rogers has to do with the fact that President Roosevelt became known as the Trust Buster with the Hepburn Act which was passed in 1906, although two cartoons published after this portrayal show Roosevelt working with the Standard Oil men.

The first cartoon, printed in September 1904 depicted Roosevelt on the campaign trail with a number of Standard Oil men holding signs for Roosevelt. The cartoon is titled “The Poor Man’s Candidate.” and captioned “‘Aggregated Wealth Largely Represented Among Parker’s Supporters’ -*New York Tribune*.”⁵⁹ This title is satirical, as at the time the Republican Party was viewed as the party of big business, although President Roosevelt was one of the more progressive Republicans of the time. The name Parker is referring to the Democratic Party nominee in 1904, Alton B. Parker, who lost to Roosevelt. Parker was known to be pro-labor and more progressive than Roosevelt. Rogers is depicted in the crowd of Standard Oil men but he is not holding a sign and is playing a rather passive role but this is still a reference to the fact that many high financiers of this time, including Rogers, had funded and supported Roosevelt, which is evidenced in later cartoons. (See image 1). The reality of the situation, as described by Ron Chernow, was “the idea of backing Roosevelt’s democratic opponent, Alton B. Parker, was unthinkable to Archbold and his associates they smothered the incumbent with money, especially a \$100,00 contribution from Henry H. Rogers.”⁶⁰ This fact contradicts the passive role that Rogers is given in the cartoon.

⁵⁹ Ehrhart, S. D., Artist. *The Poor Man's Candidate* / Ehrhart. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1904. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645568/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

⁶⁰ Ron Chernow, *Titan*. 519.

The next image, printed in January 1906, is titled, “‘Everyman’ And His Dollar- The Republican Morality Show.” and captioned, “But The Real Work Of Financing The Campaign Will, As Usual, Be Done Behind The Scenes.”⁶¹ The cartoon depicts President Roosevelt watching a play where one man is donating one dollar to the campaign while three men behind the scenes are overflowing a barrel with money, labeled “The Dough Barrel.”⁶² The three men are Rogers, Edward Harriman, and John P. Morgan. Here Rogers was depicted as taking a very active role, which suggested that the public was well aware of his, and others’ role in campaign financing during the election of 1906. (See image 2). The men attempted to bribe Roosevelt with campaign contributions because they may have been aware of his progressive views, which would hurt their businesses, and this was an attempt to gain his support. This attempt was unsuccessful as Roosevelt ordered campaign managers to return Standard Oil’s donation and passed legislation to break up trusts.

The following cartoon that included Roosevelt and the financiers, printed in May of 1907, depicted Roosevelt going after the financiers, which was after the Hepburn Act which helped to regulate railroads, a weapon of Standard Oil. The cartoon is titled “Elisha Roosevelt Sicketh The Bears Upon The Bad Boys Of Wall Street.”⁶³ The image depicted Theodore Roosevelt in the background while two bears labeled the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Federal Courts, went after financiers such as H. H. Rogers, J. P. Morgan, and John Rockefeller. The two bears are not directly facing Rogers and Rogers seems to have been trampled by another financier. This image is what one would expect to come from the Trust Buster and reflects an

⁶¹ Keppler, Udo J., , Artist. *"Everyman" And His Dollar - The Republican Morality Show / Keppler*. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1906. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645934/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Keppler, Udo J., Artist. *Elisha Roosevelt Sicketh The Bears Upon The Bad Boys Of Wall Street / Keppler*. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg., May 8, 1907. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647201/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

improved public opinion on how President Roosevelt changed after he passed legislation to regulate business. (See Image 3).

The following cartoon with Roosevelt and Standard Oil men was printed on Christmas of 1907 and is titled, “God Rest You, Merry Gentlemen, Let Nothing You Dismay.”⁶⁴ This cartoon depicts a group of Standard Oil men singing Christmas carols to Roosevelt as he stands in the window. Rogers is depicted holding a sheet of music and all of the men have a frantic look on their face which could be because they were afraid of Roosevelt. Roosevelt seems to look disgruntled by the men. (See Image 4). This is another portrayal of the Standard Oil men failing to win over Roosevelt.

The final cartoon regarding Roosevelt and the financiers was printed in November of 1908 and is titled, “Bringing In The Teddy- Turk.”⁶⁵ This Thanksgiving themed cartoon features financiers such as Rogers, Rockefeller and John Archbold sitting around a table while a chef labeled “Special Privilege” brings out a turkey with the face of Roosevelt. Rogers is seated at the left of the table and is pointing directly at the Turkey. This is certainly an attack at the fact that the privilege of the wealthy allowed them to essentially share the presidency by influencing legislation with donations. (See Image 5). By this point in time the trust had still not been broken up and this cartoon could be a reflection of the public’s dissatisfaction with Roosevelt’s ineffectiveness.

Rogers engaging in political bribery and corruption was not just portrayed in political cartoons. By 1904 the relationship between the men at Standard Oil and the Republican party had become complicated due to President Roosevelt’s stance on big business. Shortly before the

⁶⁴ Glackens, L. M., Artist. *"God Rest You, Merry Gentleman, Let Nothing You Dismay"* / L.M. Glackens. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1907. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647266/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

⁶⁵ Keppler, Udo J., Artist. *Bringing In The Teddy-Turk* / K. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1908. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647371/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

election of 1908, in September of 1908 the *Boston Daily Globe* ran an article outlining campaign contributions from Standard Oil to the Republic Party but the situation was extremely complicated. The Republican National Committee had requested campaign contribution from Standard Oil and other trusts but as the article noted Henry H. Rogers refused to allow Standard Oil to contribute due to his dissatisfaction of President Roosevelt's policies on trusts and big business. The Republican National Committee then made a second request with the promise of security for Standard Oil. Following this, "Mr. Rogers and Mr. Archbold made a contribution of \$100,000."⁶⁶ When Roosevelt found out about the contribution he ordered the RNC's chair, Mr. Cortelyou, to return the funds but, as the article noted, the funds were never returned. Rogers noted that Roosevelt "must have known all along that the \$100,000 which he repudiated had not only been accepted but used."⁶⁷ This is a reflection of the complicated relationship between Standard Oil, President Roosevelt, and the Republican National Committee.

Rogers's political connections and corruption is further evidenced by the *Boston Daily Globe* in an article from May 1, 1900, which detailed Rogers's failed attempt to broker a deal between the Danish government and the United States to sell the Danish West Indies. One of the men involved in the deal, Captain Christmas said that "Rogers told him that he controlled the votes of 26 senators of the United States, who were at all times willing to obey any order given to them by the Standard Oil Company."⁶⁸ The main reason Rogers had wanted to negotiate the deal between the two nations was that he claimed he would be owed a 10% cut of the deal which officials from both nations refused.

⁶⁶ "Standard Oil Contributed. Republican Fund Got \$100,000" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): September 25 1908. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016 .

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ "Story Denied: Standard Oil Report is 'Sheer Nonsense'" *Boston Daily Globe* (1872-1922): May 1 1900. ProQuest. Web. 21 July 2016 .

Political bribery and corruption was frowned upon in the early 1900's just as it is today but it seems that the United States has done little to combat this issue, and just as Rogers and other millionaires financially contributed to campaigns millionaires and billionaires still financially contribute to political campaigns, tipping the scales of democracy.

Two cartoons illustrate the attack on Rogers from Thomas Lawson. The first was printed in January of 1905 and is titled "Mr. Orpheus Of Boston."⁶⁹ The cartoon depicts Thomas Lawson playing a harp while Rogers sits in the corner of the cartoon depicted as a beast like figure clenching his heart (See image 6). The following cartoon printed in December of 1905 and is titled "Merry Christmas In Boston."⁷⁰ This cartoon depicts Lawson in a room full of Christmas presents from Rogers, Rockefeller and other people who were attacked in his book. All of the presents pose a threat to Lawson's life. Rogers's gift to Lawson is a floral piece that Lawson is standing over. This does not seem life threatening except for there being a bomb from John D. Rockefeller right next to the flowers which would engulf Lawson in flames after the bomb went off. (See image 7). The first cartoon paints Rogers to have been the greatest victim of Lawson's book while the second does not portray Rogers to have been Lawson's biggest enemy due to the fact that many others gave Lawson more dangerous gifts such as dynamite and poison. What both do portray is that Lawson made a number of enemies among financiers after he wrote *Frenzied Finance* and Rogers was one of these enemies.

Another cartoon printed in May of 1905 titled, "Belshazzarfeller's Feast" and captioned "And The King Saw The Part Of The Hand That Wrote. Then The King's Countenance Was

⁶⁹ Keppler, Udo J., Artist. *Mr. Orpheus Of Boston / Kep.* N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645619/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

⁷⁰ Keppler, Udo J., Artist. *Merry Christmas In Boston / Keppler.* N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645764/>. (Accessed July 25, 2016.)

Changed And His Thoughts Troubled Him.”⁷¹ The title is a mix of the names of King Belshazzar of Babylon and Rockefeller. The story of Belshazzar was that as he was holding his feast with friends and concubines the city of Babylon was being sieged. Belshazzar did not worry because Babylon was thought to be impenetrable but then a hand appeared and wrote on the wall that Babylon would fall. This cartoon tells the same story but with John D. Rockefeller playing Belshazzar and the mysterious hand is writing “Rate Legislation.”⁷² Instead of concubines his business associates including Rogers surround Rockefeller. Rogers is depicted as staring at Rockefeller while he has both of his hands on a plate of food that says “Fruit of Monopoly.”⁷³ This depicts Rogers as not only being greedy because his hands are directly on the fruit of monopoly, money, but Rogers and the other financiers are where concubines were which says a lot about their relationship with Rockefeller. This could be interpreted as the financiers being Rockefeller’s pawns and he being the dominating man in Standard Oil (See image 8).

Political cartoons helped to sway public perception of Rogers by depicting him in a negative light. Political cartoons were easily understood by commoners, even if the viewer did not know who Rogers was they would be able to see that he was associated with Standard Oil and that Standard Oil was engaging in corrupt actions. The accusations of these cartoons are confirmed by newspaper reports of the time and offer a contradictory view of Rogers than that of Fairhaven.

⁷¹ Pughe, J. S., Artist. *Belshazzarfeller's Feast / J.S. Pughe*. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645706/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

Conclusion:

Looking back on Rogers it is difficult to remember him solely as The Great Town Benefactor of Fairhaven. While he was that, he was many other things, a Robber Baron included. While the town has reason to be grateful for Rogers's donations they and other readers of history must not forget to take a full and comprehensive view of a person. This applies not only to Rogers but to other figures in history, specifically tycoons from the Gilded Age. Historians must not let their good deeds overshadow their wrongdoing and must not let their evil doings erase their good deeds. Practices of philanthropy inspired by Rogers and Rockefeller continue into the modern day but unfortunately their business tactics also do. Their philanthropy should serve to inspire others and their wrongdoing should discourage others from following a similar course.

Rogers is one of the most interesting men of the Gilded Age: he was best friends with Mark Twain and made some of the most corrupt business deals of his time. Rogers was able to deceive people into thinking he was a great gentleman but would often show a different side to these people at some point in time. He could make people believe he was the most kind and generous man on the earth while making others think he was the greediest and most corrupt. Rogers has been praised for his philanthropy but there were clearly ulterior motives and he may have not been as generous or kind as people thought. His philanthropy was neither as widespread nor as impactful of that of his colleagues.

Rogers was a ruthless businessman who did whatever he had to do to make money regardless of others. Even if his business tactics were ingenious they were still immoral, deceitful, and harmed many people. This is a fact that cannot be overlooked, regardless of philanthropy. The case of Amalgamated Coppers is enough to qualify Rogers as a Robber Baron; he created a company with the sole intent to rob investors of their money. It would not be just to

claim that Rogers was just a child of the Gilded Age. It is also difficult to say that Rogers was just a Robber Baron because he was much more than that and is an extremely interesting character and should be discussed for everything he did, the good and the bad. But in terms of business tactics Rogers was a Robber Baron.

Bibliography

Chernow, Ron. *Titan: The Life Of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* New York: Random House, 1998.

Dias, Earl J. "Henry Huttleston Rogers (1840 – 1909) An evaluation on the 150th Anniversary of his Birth". The Millicent Library. Last updated November, 1996.
”<http://millicentlibrary.org/henry-huttleston-rogers-150th-anniversary/>

Dias, Earl J. Henry Huttleston Rogers Portrait of a “Capitalist”. New Bedford, Massachusetts. Reynolds DeWalt Printing, Inc. 1974

Ehrhart, S. D. , Approximately , Artist. *The Poor Man's Candidate / Ehrhart*. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1904. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645568/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Fairhaven High School. *About Our High School*. Fairhaven, Mass. 1954.

Glackens, L. M., Artist. "God Rest You, Merry Gentleman, Let Nothing You Dismay" / L.M. Glackens. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1907. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647266/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Henry Clay Frick Business Records, 1892-1987, AIS.2002.06, Archives Service Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Hubbard, Elbert. *Little Journeys To The Home Of Great Business Men: H. H. Rogers*. New York: Roycrofters, 1909.

John D. Rockefeller papers, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Keppler, Udo J., Artist. Bringing In The Teddy-Turk / K. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1908. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647371/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Keppler, Udo J., , Artist. Elisha Roosevelt Sicketh The Bears Upon The Bad Boys Of Wall Street/ Keppler. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg., May 8, 1907. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011647201/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Keppler, Udo J., , Artist. "Everyman" And His Dollar - The Republican Morality Show / Keppler. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1906. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645934/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Keppler, Udo J., Artist. Merry Christmas In Boston / Keppler. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645764/>. (Accessed July 25, 2016.)

Keppler, Udo J., Artist. Mr. Orpheus Of Boston / Kep. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645619/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Lawson, Thomas W. *Frenzied Finance The Crime of Amalgamated*. New York: Trow Directory Printing and Bookbinding Company, 1905.

Mark Twain's Correspondence with Henry Huttleston Rogers: 1893-1909. Edited by Lewis Leary. Berkeley: U. of Calif, 1969.

Pughe, J. S., Artist. Belshazzarfeller's Feast / J.S. Pughe. N.Y.: J. Ottmann Lith. Co., Puck Bldg, 1905. Image. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2011645706/>. (Accessed July 24, 2016.)

Rogers, Henry H. Improvement in Distilling Naptha and other Hydrocarbon Liquids. U.S. Patent 120,539. Issued October 31, 1871.

Stiles, T. J. *The First Tycoon: The Epic Life of Cornelius Vanderbilt*. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.

Tarbell, Ida M., and Danny Schechter. *The History Of The Standard Oil Company: 2 Volumes In 1*. New York, NY: COSIMOCClassics, 2009.

The Millicent Library Archives, Fairhaven, MA

Images

Image One: "The Poor Man's Candidate"

Image Two: "Everyman and His Dollar- The Republican Morality Show"

Image Three: "Elisha Roosevelt Sicketh The Bears Upon The Bad Boys of Wall Street"

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
DEC 26 1907
DEC. 30 1907
CLASS 151882
COPY 2

VOL., LXII. No. 1508. PUCK BUILDING, New York, December 25th, 1907. PRICE TEN CENTS.

"What Fools these Mortals be!"

Puck

Copyright, 1907, by Keppler & Schwarzmann. Entered at N. Y. P. O. as Second-class Mail Matter.

"GOD REST YOU, MERRY GENTLEMAN, LET NOTHING YOU DISMAY."

Image Four: "God Rest You, Merry Gentleman, Let Nothing You Dismay."

Image Five: "Bringing In The Teddy-Turk"

Image Six: "Mr. Orpheus of Boston"

Image Seven: "Merry Christmas In Boston"

BELSHAZZARFELLER'S FEAST.

"AND THE KING SAW THE PART OF THE HAND THAT WROTE. THEN THE KING'S COUNTENANCE WAS CHANGED AND HIS THOUGHTS TROUBLED HIM."

Image Eight: "Bellshazzafeller's Feast"