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'Taking Leave of an Ungrateful Country':
The Loyalist Exile of Joel Stone

A native of Guilford, Connecticut, Joel Stone was born 7 August 1749, the son of Stephen Stone, a fourth generation American. Stephen Stone and his wife Rebecca Bishop moved their family of three children from Guilford to Litchfield on 25 April 1751 where Stephen became a farmer. Joel, the second eldest of nine children, accepted the added responsibilities of the oldest son when his eighteen-year old brother Stephen died in April 1765. The family was again grief-stricken in November 1767 and February 1768 with the death of Joel's mother and fifteen-year old sister Liza. Widowed with seven children, forty-seven-year old Stephen Stone married Deliverance Chapman, who would bear him another seven children. Cast in the traditional role of second father, Joel was compelled to stay at home with the family until he reached the age of twenty-one.

In 1770, with his father's approval, Joel "entered on a branch of the Mercantile Trade, Travelled to Several places in North America returning in about Three months with a Considerable Accumulated property." Heartened by his success, and again with his "Fathers Consent," he moved to the town of Woodbury in February 1773 and by the beginning of the following year entered a partnership with Jabez Bacon, a "Merchant of great trade" in Woodbury. Bacon and Stone agreed to be "co-partners together, or traders in company, in the business of . . . buying, selling, vending, and retailing of all sorts of goods wares and commodities . . ." with the partnership binding from 1 February 1774, "for and during unto the full end of six years from thence next ensuing." Joel's investment had been substantial, for within two years of the agreement he had "Laid out" fifteen hundred pounds of Connecticut currency for his partner.

Joel settled in Judea, a separate parish eight miles from the center of Woodbury. (In 1779 the societies of Judea and New Preston were established as the town of Washington, the first town to be incorpo-
rated in Connecticut after the Declaration of Independence). His two sisters, seventeen-year old Dothe, and eighteen-year old Rene, came to live with him. In May 1774 Joel bought a half acre of land in Judea from Ephraim Baker and built a house and barn valued at 250 pounds by 1779. In January 1773, Joel's brother Leman left home and moved to South Farms, a separate ecclesiastical society in the southern part of the town of Litchfield. Dothe Stone went to South Farms in November 1774 to stay with Leman where, she noted, for the next nine years she would have "the whole care of not only the house, but all my brothers business ...." The following year Leman purchased his own house and thus by the time the Revolutionary War began five of Stephen Stone's seven children from his first marriage had moved out of his household but they all lived within the immediate vicinity of Litchfield and, more important, maintained their close family ties.

Woodbury, like the majority of west Connecticut towns, experienced the patriotic fervor which swept throughout the colony in late 1775 and early 1776. Woodbury, noted for its vigilance of "tories within its borders," formed a committee of inspection and observation at a town meeting on 19 September 1775. Composed of thirty of the town's most prominent citizens, including lawyers, doctors, deacons, military men, and farmers, the committee was designed to suppress "all action, and every expression of thought which did not run in the popular direction—the independence of the country." Joel Stone was called before the Woodbury committee in the latter part of 1775 as he was "violently suspected of being inimical to the Provincial party" and accused of "supplying the people whom they called Tories with sundry articles of provisions and charged with having supported and assisted the British prisoners confined in Connecticut." Although Joel was not arrested, his "aged father" was "repeatedly imprisoned for his steady perserverance in maintaining with all his ability the true Liberty of his country and just cause of his rightful Sovereign." The persecution inflicted on his father may well have induced Joel to take an even more militant stance against the Patriots because, in spite of the threat of imprisonment, he continued to espouse the British cause and to aid British and Loyalist prisoners in Connecticut.

There was no lack of British prisoners to assist. Beginning in the summer of 1776, numerous Loyalists and British soldiers were incarcerated in Connecticut's eighteen major jails as Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey sent their prisoners to the state for safekeeping. Woodbury and Litchfield were each designated to receive prisoners. Included among the most celebrated Loyalists sent to Connecticut and imprisoned at Litchfield was Mayor David Mathews of New
York. Joel Stone would play a major role in the mayor’s escape from the state. In February 1776 Governor William Tryon appointed Mathews mayor of New York but his worship was only in office five months, for on 22 June he was arrested and accused of being involved in a plot to assassinate General George Washington. On the advice of Washington, Mayor Mathews and twelve other Loyalist prisoners were transported from New York to Connecticut in July 1776 because of an anticipated attack on the city.

Mathews was doubtless confined to house arrest in Litchfield as he was placed under the care of Captain Moses Seymore. It was during his detention in Litchfield that Joel Stone and Mayor Mathews became acquainted. After the war when both Stone and Mathews were in London and their cases were before the British Claims Commissioners, Mathews wrote a certificate testifying to Stone’s loyalty. “Joel Stone,” noted the former Mayor, “was introduced to me as a person of character and family attached to the British Government. I found him to be such. And that from the confidence placed in him he would be a proper person to assist me in making my escape to New York which he readily undertook and carried me through the country at a very great risque of his life and property.” Mathews eluded his captors on 21 November 1776 by bribing them with 150 pounds.

Within two months of Mathews’ escape, Joel Stone would be forced to flee Connecticut. Throughout 1776, and especially after the Declaration of Independence, it had become increasingly difficult to postpone the ultimate question of allegiance. Realizing that discreet action in the Whiggish Connecticut backcountry was preferable to overt hostile acts, Stone did not proclaim his principles opposing Congress until 1776 since he “was not obliged to declare sooner.” Faced with probable arrest, Joel set out for New York. Prior to his departure a warrant was issued “by order of the agents of congress” in late December for his arrest. Aware of the warrant, Joel delivered his accounts to a “careful friend” and, leaving the care of his house to his sister Rene, went into hiding. For the next two weeks he was continually pursued but on 7 January 1777 he managed to slip away from Judea, arriving at Long Island 10 days later.

Joel Stone was only twenty-seven years old in 1776 and a partner in a prosperous merchandising firm, yet he was willing to “risque” his “life and property” to remain loyal to the British Crown. Why had he become a Loyalist and, more to the point, why had he aided British prisoners such as Mathews? To answer these questions, it is necessary to keep in mind at least some aspects of Stone’s character. He was a talented young merchant who had the ability to evaluate a given situation and act decisively. What better way to make his mark and
gain immediate recognition from the British authorities than to rescue the Mayor of New York from Connecticut. Admittedly, Stone asserted in his narrative: "I was fixed in my resolves to forego all I could call my property in the world than flinch from my duty to the best of Sovereigns . . . ." Even though faced with the prospect of a British defeat, Joel, as late as September 1776, had purchased a tract of land valued at five hundred pounds in the town of Winchester, from Samuel Talcott junior of Hartford. Although obtaining a deed from Talcott, Joel never had the transaction registered and consequently the land was not confiscated with his remaining property in Judea because there was no clear title to the land. Commenting on the deed in December 1783 Leman remarked to Joel that "It (the deed) being Given at the eve of the War I Suppose You had it in mind Soon to record it in an office erected by a Constitution more agreeable." Clearly, Stone did not anticipate losing his property in the summer of 1776. Would any man invest five hundred pounds in land only to have it confiscated? Congress and the Connecticut authorities held the upper hand in 1776 but, as Stone must have surmised, the British would rally and ultimately prove the victor.

In Woodbury, Joel Stone and all other active Loyalists were ostracized by the committee of inspection for their political principles. In siding with the British, Joel, however, was not censured by his family. Indeed, Joel's father was continually harassed and imprisoned after 1775 for his loyalty. Admittedly, Joel was the only Stone to leave Connecticut because of his loyalty but it must be remembered that five of the seven children of Stephen Stone's first marriage were girls. Of course, Leman did not declare for the British but there was no deep-seated animosity between Leman and Joel in spite of their ideological differences. Leman would not only help Joel escape in 1778 when he was imprisoned at Fairfield but the brothers would correspond throughout the war and for the rest of their lives. Furthermore, Leman would make every effort, after hostilities had ceased, to provide Joel with proof of his losses to lay before the British Claims Commission. Dothe Stone, who resided with Leman during the revolutionary war, kept a diary which revealed the abiding affection among the Stone family.

Joel not only had the support of his father, but a number of his business associates upheld the royal cause. This was especially true of his partner, Jabez Bacon, and the Tomlinson family, Captain Isaac and his two sons, Isaac junior and Russell, all of whom were dry goods merchants. Isaac junior was imprisoned in 1775 while he and his father were "very cruelly treated for their loyalty." Isaac junior suffered much the same fate as Joel, since he was forced to leave Connecticut in
January 1777 and his property was confiscated. Joining the British on Long Island, he eventually became a lieutenant in the King’s American Dragoons. Joel and Isaac junior were close friends and kept in touch throughout the war, and in 1785 would meet in London. But it was Jabez Bacon, not the Tomlinsons, who doubtless had the most influence on his younger partner’s decision to remain loyal.

Prior to the Declaration of Independence, Bacon let it be known that he was not unsympathetic to the royal cause. In 1775 General Benedict Arnold, before siding with the British, ordered Peter Colt, the Deputy Commissary General, to impound goods belonging to Jabez Bacon and Captain Isaac Tomlinson at Derby, as they were suspected of being “unfriendly to the country” and the provisions were destined for the British. Both Bacon and Tomlinson were tried as “enemies” but were acquitted of the charges. On another occasion, the Woodbury committee of inspection seized a large quantity of salt, which was in short supply, belonging to Bacon. Accused of charging an exorbitant price, the committee established a remunerative rate for Bacon and then proceeded to sell the salt to the people.

Bacon supported the British throughout 1775 and 1776 but by 1777 he had changed sides in favour of the Patriots. Unlike Joel Stone, Jabez Bacon was not willing to lose all of his accumulated wealth. Shortly after Joel had gone into hiding in December 1776 the mob ransacked his house, confiscating his “goods and chattels” which they attempted to sell. Repeatedly objecting to the sale, Bacon maintained that the complete estate had “become the property of the States.” His remonstrances must have had some effect because on 17 January 1777 Daniel Sherman, Woodbury’s Deputy and Justice of the Peace, issued a warrant to “Seize and hold” all of Stone’s “Goods Chattels & effects”. The restraining order was only temporary for on 2 April 1777 the Court ordered Enos Mitchell, Woodbury’s town constable, to sell Stone’s moveable effects.

The lesson had once again been driven home—no staunch Loyalist could live in Connecticut and retain his property. Bacon, if he had not done so earlier, learned quickly because by the end of April 1777, four months after Joel had left Connecticut, he and Captain Isaac Tomlinson were trading with the Patriots. When the British invaded Danbury on 27 April, destroying the stores for the American army, a large number of troops were dispatched to the town after the attack and thus supplies were desperately required. It was “necessary that all the Provisions in the Neighbouring Towns be collected for their Use And that the welfare of the Army & that part of the Country depended upon it . . . .” Thus, Daniel Sherman, Woodbury’s Deputy, applied to Tomlinson and Bacon for relief and they subsequently provided the
army with "fourteen hundred three Quarters & 23 lbs of Flour." The American war effort was proving profitable for these former Loyalist merchants.

Considering that Tomlinson had been "cruelly treated" in 1775 because of his "loyalty" to the Crown, he was doing quite well. So well, in fact, that by May 1776 the state authorities were "shocked" when it was discovered that he and Azariah Pritchard, another Woodbury Loyalist, were still conducting a lucrative trade with the commissary department. Finally, in January 1777, when his two sons had left Connecticut, the Woodbury committee of inspection sent Captain Tomlinson to the General Assembly "as a person dangerous and inimical" to the United States. On 22 January 1777 Tomlinson posted a bond of one thousand pounds and was "permitted to return to his family at Woodbury and to remain in his own business within the limits of the towns of Woodbury and Derby . . . ."29

Unlike Tomlinson, Bacon did not have to post a bond to ensure his safe conduct. Moreover, once Bacon made the decision to side wholeheartedly with independence, there was to be no turning back. But first it was necessary to placate any suspicions the Woodbury committee and the General Assembly might have concerning his devotion to the American cause. Thus, Bacon eventually permitted his son, Jabez junior, to serve in the American army. Furthermore, it would be to Bacon's advantage to disassociate himself completely from the views of his exiled Loyalist partner. Consequently, Bacon unsuccessfully attempted to obtain some of the land Joel had bought in Winchester, claiming that he rightfully owned one-half the property as he was Stone's partner. After the war, in October 1783, when Joel asked Leman to obtain some vouchers from Bacon concerning his "lost interest" in Connecticut, Leman replied: "I soon found Mr. Bacon too much involved in business to attend." Nevertheless, there appeared to be no animosity on Joel's part towards Bacon, as he indicated to Leman in June 1784 that he intended to write his former partner and he requested Leman to present his compliments to Bacon and his family. Of course, it would have been absurd for Joel to be on bad terms with Bacon as he claimed that his ex-partner owed him fifteen hundred pounds.

Jabez Bacon and Isaac Tomlinson had sympathized with the British in 1775 and 1776 and, if nothing else, had offered moral support to Joel Stone in his determination to uphold the rights of the Crown. Like Bacon and Tomlinson, Joel Stone could have attempted to remain neutral. Even if he had anticipated a British victory, he could have played both sides, taken an oath to the American government and then sought a substitute to serve in the American army. But Joel was
unwilling to do this. Joel’s father must be considered. He was a fifty-five year old farmer in 1776 with four small children. What hope of gain could he possibly have had? Clearly, for the Stones, the motives for loyalty go much deeper than the immediate prospect of gain. Joel, in particular, had a conviction, a nagging conviction which told him he could not accept the dictates of a rebel government.

A fugitive from his native Connecticut, Joel Stone arrived at Long Island in mid-January 1777 determined to take up arms against the Revolutionaries. But, as the former mayor David Mathews noted, “on his coming to New York he attempted to get into the Military Line but was very Disappointed.” What a reception for a man who had just forfeited his estate because of his loyalty. What must he do to become acceptable? British administrative incompetence, both at Whitehall and New York, and the contemptuous attitude by the British regulars towards the Loyalists, not the lack of Loyalist enthusiasm by such men as Joel Stone, accounted in large part for the British failure to incorporate the Loyalists into an effective fighting force in the early stages of the war.

Rebuffed by the British forces, Joel’s only alternative was to serve as a volunteer and thus on 20 June 1777 he enlisted in Governor John Wentworth’s Volunteers. Within a year Joel was compelled to give up his volunteer service because he was heavily indebted to a number of his “best friends.” Consequently, on 16 April 1778 he accepted a commission from Gabriel Ludlow, Colonel of the third battalion of Brigadier-General Delancey’s Brigade, to recruit 54 men to serve in Delancey’s battalion for two years. Immediately upon enlistment, the recruits were to be paid a five dollar bounty and were guaranteed the same provisions and pay as soldiers of the British army. Within a month of his commission and while in the process of recruiting, Joel was “surprised whilst asleep by a company of whale boat men” at Huntington, Long Island, on the night of 12 May 1778 and carried over to Norwalk, Connecticut.

Appearing before a Norwalk magistrate, Joel was denied the status of prisoner of war, charged with high treason, and confined to the Fairfield jail. Permitted to write, he informed his father that he was imprisoned at Fairfield. Both Stephen and Leman Stone would go “often to see” Joel during his three and one-half months of confinement.

Charged with high treason, Joel’s detention was the least of his anxieties because he was threatened with execution. Little wonder he was determined to escape. Although Leman had not declared for the British, he decided to help his brother, obviously at great risk to him-
self. Joel thus sent a message by way of Leman and “other friends in that country” to the British commander at King’s Bridge, New York, beseeching relief. Receiving no reply, he petitioned Governor Trumbell to be treated as a prisoner of war and appear before the Governor and Council.

Joel’s application was approved but after he had been transported from the jail, the Governor rejected his petition and thus he was returned to Fairfield. David Fell, a lieutenant of the British navy who had accompanied Joel on “several Expeditions”, was also imprisoned at Fairfield in the spring and summer of 1778. According to Fell, who corroborated Joel’s version of his imprisonment, the Governor, believing that Stone should be hanged for his traitorous conduct, rejected his plea to be treated as a prisoner of war.

In his narrative for the British Claims Commissioners, Joel described the Fairfield prison, observing that the “dungeon was truly dismal, the walls strong and the place perpetually guarded . . . .” Compared to his sister Dothe’s account, Joel’s description of his incarceration appeared somewhat exaggerated. Naturally, in seeking compensation, it would be advantageous to relate, as convincingly as possible, the adversities that he had endured because of his loyalty. Thus, the deleted title of a 6 December draft of Joel’s narrative proclaimed: it “exhibits his almost Unparalleled Sufferings, during the late dreadful Unnatural War in that Country”.

Joel’s remarks notwithstanding, he was granted considerable liberty within the prison and, at least on one occasion, was permitted to leave, presumably under guard. The Fairfield gaol was not one of Connecticut’s major prisons and had only minimum security. Indeed, throughout 1777 there were only 25 soldiers stationed in all of Fairfield, even though an attack on the town had been anticipated. Visiting privileges at the Fairfield prison, moreover, seemed liberal because by July 1778 practically all of Joel’s immediate family had made the one hundred-mile round trip to see him. Dothe described her mid-July meeting with Joel:

... We went up to the house where he was for he had the liberty of the yard. He was asleep when Mr. Woodruf went to the house and did not know we were in town till he looked around and see us and said my dear sisters he could hardly speak—and did not expect to see us, we went with him sat down by him and became exceedingly sociable, he got us wine and raisins and seemed anxious to divert us. Night came on he said he must go upstairs and be locked in prison. Oh, that dear brother. We went back to Demonds cried ourselves asleep. Next day Joel went with us to Doctrs Faughs where we dined and after dinner came back to the Goal with Joel, we told him we wished to see where he lived or rather was obliged to lodge, it was with reluctance he complied with our request and went with us where he slept or kept.
Eight days later 23 July Joel escaped, with the help of his friends and all the money he could raise. Finally, on 29 July he crossed the Sound from Connecticut to Satucket, Long Island, and arrived at Huntington the following day.

Joel had baffled his pursuers but his misfortunes were only beginning because almost immediately after his return to New York he contracted a fever and was sick for the next five months. Upon recovering he contemplated petitioning the Commander-in-Chief for assistance but was informed that individual petitions would not be accepted by the government. The latter half of 1778 may well have been the nadir of Stone's life. Certainly, it seemed so to him. "I had not only expended all my money", he lamented, "but had also run considerable in the debt of my friends so that for the present I was obliged entirely to abandon my company or reassuming my wanted life."45

Events took a decided turn for the better, however, when Joel decided to go into privateering. Enlisting as a "Marine officer," his first expedition ended in near disaster, the ship being wrecked in January 1779 with the loss of three lives. The second voyage was successful, proving highly remunerative, and thus Joel was able to pay back most of his debtors and, with the backing of some friends, rent a store and re-enter the mercantile business. Operating a "broker's shop," he was soon able to purchase some property.46

Joel's new-found success did not prevent him from re-entering the military. On 2 February 1780 Major General James Pattison, Commandant of New York, appointed him Second Lieutenant of City Militia Company No. 22, commanded by Captain Willet Taylor. The next month Joel received his own commission, becoming a captain of a militia company which he commanded until the end of the war.47

On at least two different occasions in 1780 and 1781, when the French fleet was off the American coast, the British commander requested New Yorkers to contribute money as a partial "reward" or inducement for volunteers who would join the navy on an expedition against the French. Assigned to "Collect and Distribute" the funds, Stone, according to one anonymous witness, was particularly attentive to his duty:

notwithstanding the known Disobedient behaviour of many of the Militia (about the time the first news arrived in N York of the late treaty of Peace). He punctually obeyed every Order And upon all Occasions Brought into the field a complete Company of Men who faithfully Discharged every Duty required of them which few of the Captns of Militia were able to do at that time.48

Joel's commercial success doubtless assuaged any fears he might have concerning the responsibilities of marriage because on 23 March 1780
he married Leah Moore, daughter of William Moore, a New York merchant and mariner, and his wife Mary Bogart. Within two years of their marriage Leah had given birth to a son, William, but her mother had died. As William Moore was still at sea he informed Joel and Leah that they could have use of his house and furniture without charge for a year. Furthermore, he advised his agent, Anthony VanDorn, to pay the newlyweds 100 pounds per annum out of the rents of his "houses, etc.", at least until he should hear further from them.49

Destitute when he had first arrived in New York, Joel now appeared to be enjoying a happy marriage and commercial prosperity. But in May 1782 he was again crippled with a "violent fever" leaving him incapable of continuing his business for another eight months. While convalescing, he managed to keep in contact with Leman by means of two friends: Captain Jn. Sheathen and Mr. Vandike. Writing from Stratford, Connecticut, on 25 October 1782, Leman, having heard that Joel's health was improving, remarked: "I rejoice to hear it, pray attend to your health, let everything bend to it for nothing in this life is Valuable without it. Your constitution was ever so Slender." Having noted that Joel was going to England, he added: "I wish sister could come & reside with me, but I believe a permission could not be obtained by reason of a late Act of Congress."50

Unfortunately for Joel, his sickness was not all of his problem. "To render the calamity more dreadful," he suffered losses of his goods at sea. On the advice of the British military authorities in New York, merchants were encouraged to send certain goods to the Colonies in exchange for much-needed provisions. "Wishing at all times to promote any Supplies to Government, and flattering myself with a prospect of gain", Stone explained to the Claims Commissioners, "I engaged in that Business and Lost between £700 & £800 N. York Currency . . . ." Included among his losses was a small sloop which foundered in a storm with all hands lost plus its valuable cargo of oysters. The bankruptcy of his trading operations, together with accumulated medical expenses throughout the summer of 1782, quickly dried up Joel's "new-acquired fortune". Small wonder he lamented to the British Claims Commissioners in August 1784 that not only had he been deprived of his property for a "second time" but that myself & family are living entirely on the Benefience of our private Friends . . . ."51

What had Stone gained for his loyalty? To him, at least, it must have seemed to be only misery and debt. If only he had remained passive and had acknowledged the new American government, he would likely be enjoying a flourishing trading business like his former partner. Although he had committed himself to the British, there was always
the hope that after the war he could return to Connecticut. Any thoughts Joel had of returning to the State were undoubtedly buoyed up in October 1782 when Leman wrote that “The Inhabitants of Judea wish you to return.” 52 Replying three weeks later, Joel noted: “You write to me that the people in Judea wish me to Return am much Obliged to them for there Good Opinion of me—and wish as Sincerely there was an End to all Mallice, & I could happily Spend my Days with Them.” 53 Had his loyalty all been for naught? That question must have appeared inescapable for Joel Stone and for numerous other Loyalists in a losing cause. Seemingly willing to concede defeat, Joel at least admitted the possibility that he might return to Connecticut.

Any notion Joel had of returning to Connecticut in the autumn of 1782 would have to wait because he had decided to go to England in an attempt to secure a legacy for his wife. Commodore John Moore, Leah’s uncle, a mariner and former employee of the East India Company, had died in 1780 leaving a considerable estate. 54 What concerned Joel most, if he did go to England, was the care of his family and, as he indicated to Leman in November 1782, he was sorry that “Mrs Stone & the little boy, could not be with You for that time.” 55 Unable to conclude an arrangement with Leman to provide adequate accommodations for his family, Joel postponed his trip overseas.

With the declaration of peace in April 1783 Leah was able to proceed to Connecticut. In July Leman went to New York and, as Dothe noted, visited her “unfortunate brother Joel surronded I may say with all the misfortunes this life affords except sickness. He has been sick this 8 or 10 months past ... To ease if possible the distress of a fooling heart” Leman “consented to take Joel’s wife home with him to stay” while “Joel went to England.” 56 By Saturday, 26 July, Leman, Leah, and William had reached Stanford, on their journey to Litchfield. 57

The next day Joel wrote to his friend, Isaac Tomlinson junior, who had emigrated to Camp Managanish on the Saint John River, describing Leah’s departure for Connecticut. Three weeks later, Tomlinson, having received Joel’s letter, asked rhetorically in his reply: “Why did you not Attend her and Introduce her yourself. Show her that Country and All those fine Prospects you were Obliged to Abandon.” Answering his own question, he continued: “What less than Your fears of further Persecution and Abuse from the hands of your Cruel and relentless countrymen could have prevented you—Nothing I am Sure.” 58

Little did Tomlinson realize that when he wrote the letter, 18 August, Joel was already in Connecticut, for no sooner had Leah
arrived in Litchfield than Joel, accompanied by his brother-in-law, Lewis Moore, had also returned to his hometown. But as he later contended, he only decided to do so after mature deliberation because he was owed some substantial debts. “I was well aware,” he emphasized to the Claims Commissioners, “that all my property real and personal had been confiscated yet as I had secreted my writings and could produce my books I determined to try what I could do among my original debtors.”

Joel believed that all his land had been confiscated but the 250 acres he had purchased from Samuel Talcott junior in 1776 had not been expropriated because the land was still registered in Talcott’s name. Joel had not had the deed recorded. Assuming that all his land had been confiscated, Joel’s only hope was that he might recover some of the large debts owned him. Had Joel been able to recover his debts, there is no doubt, as he indicated to Leman in the latter part of 1782, that he would have stayed in Connecticut. He could hardly expect any compensation from the British since his debts comprised the bulk of his holdings in Connecticut. Nevertheless, Joel did not believe that the state authorities would immediately permit him to prosecute any loyal subjects in the courts because they were indebted to a Tory.

Upon arriving in Litchfield, Joel joined his wife and son at Leman’s and was greeted respectfully by his “former friends” but was accorded a hostile reception by the townspeople generally. Joel’s visit had been to no avail since he was informed by a Councillor, acting as a Justice of the Peace, that all debts due him were considered as confiscated, to relinquish every attempt to collect the debts because, as Joel intimated, “the populace being still enraged against me the consequences might be dreadful.” Joel’s only recourse was to calculate his debts from his account books and to obtain vouchers to present as proof of his losses to the British Claims Commissioners. With the help of Lewis Moore, Joel completed one-half of the work in approximately eight days when the “mob” issued an ultimatum: he was to leave Connecticut within forty-eight hours or suffer the consequences. Heeding their censure, Joel hid in an abandoned farmhouse in the vicinity of Litchfield where he completed transcribing the debts from his books.

Joel’s return to Connecticut to obtain the debts owned him proved most unfortunate. Although treated fairly by the state authorities, he had been threatened by the townspeople of Litchfield. Woodbury’s residents were even more hostile to returning Loyalists for as late as 12 April 1784 the town meeting voted “that those persons who joined the enemies of the United States in the course of the late civil war of what description soever are denied a residence in this Town from this date until the Genll Assembly shall grant them full liberty for that pur-
pose.” On the other hand, the acting Justice of the Peace, an appointee of the General Assembly, had given Joel “human advice” not to collect any debts owing him so as not to excite the people. The “Honorable Uriah Tracy,” later to become Litchfield’s Deputy in the Assembly, also indicated, as Joel noted, “that the reigns of Government was too weak and the violence of the people too great at that time to afford me protection agreeable to the Treaty.”

The following year, 1784, witnessed a mellowing of anti-Loyalist resolutions in numerous Connecticut towns. In late December 1783 the Norwalk town meeting voted to permit the committee of Loyalist inspection to use their own discretion in all Loyalist cases regardless of any previous enactments. Fairfield, Stamford, and Guilford also gradually permitted Loyalists to return and settle. By mid-1784 Woodbury had granted full citizenship rights to Loyalists and, in some instances, they regained their property but only on the condition that they take the Oath of Fidelity.

Why had the towns changed their policies towards the Loyalists? For many towns, and most notably New Haven and New London, the motive was clearly economic. Hoping to attract wealthy Loyalist merchants to bolster their post-war economies, New Haven and New London readily admitted Loyalists in the spring of 1784. “Times are Very much changed in this Country,” Leman wrote to Joel in June 1784, “Congress have Strongly recommended a punctilious observance of the definitive Treaty. The Spirit of banishment the contradicted Ideas of Commerce the local principles of a rigid democratic Government & many Others the eldest children of folly and of this State appear now to be eradicating from the minds of the Inhabitants thereof.” Noting that the last session of the General Assembly was “very liberal”, Leman stated that the government wished to encourage the development of agriculture and commerce. The towns of New Haven, New London, Middle Town, Hartford, and Norwich were incorporated as cities:

The too first of which are made free ports with very considerable encouragements and privileges to Importers of Goods and Other Immunities in favour of Commerce. a Spirit of magnanimity in general prevails the Legislatator have adopted these Sentiments & what is to be admired & Still more applauded the commonalty are pleased with them. You may now come to or live in any part of this State with as much Safety as in England. all ranks of people are by Law admitted as Citizens except those who have waged War contrary to the Usages and Laws of civilised Nations.

Alas for Joel Stone, the “spirit of magnanimity” had come too late. Having recovered from his illness he returned to Connecticut hoping
to be accepted. Instead, he was repudiated, branded a traitor, and compelled to flee. Joel's return to Woodbury had thus reinforced his Loyalist ideology. Although they had been on the losing side of a civil war, the Loyalist attitude was not based solely on loss, for they sought to stress the beneficial effects of their role in the war, especially the nobleness of their cause. Upon arriving at Chappel Street, New York, Joel received Isaac Tomlinson's reply to his letter of 27 July. His friend's words must have been most comforting:

I have recently heard the Cursed Spirit of Persecution Still Prevailed. Oh Discord! Discord! how long will thou continue to Distract with thy Baneful, and Sooty Influence the Unworthy Descendants of Britain—to the Utter Extinction of All the Noble Virtues of Justice, and Humanity—is it Not Enough that the Din of War Should Summon up the resentments, and blason forth the fury of Man—but Must The Golden Winged Messenger of Peace be Insulted Also with the most Untimely and revengefull Persecutions.

To Joel, Tomlinson's letter was truly prophetic. Were not the Loyalists martyrs in a noble cause? "Surely you will not regret, my friend," Tomlinson continued, "but rather Rejoice at the Prospect of Taking Leave of an Ungrateful Country, Which Experience has Taught Us,—has Long been in a State of Total Anarchy and Void of Every Principle of Justice. Here (New Brunswick) is an Asyllum of Freedom, and Safety. Not only for you, but for all our Loyal American friends—and Well Worthy their Acceptance." The die had been cast. Joel would go to England to see compensation.

After Joel had been forced to leave Connecticut, Leah also left the state on 14 October 1783. Thirteen days later, with his wife three months pregnant, Joel departed for England arriving in London on 23 December after "a long & tedious passage". However, "one good Effect" of the voyage, as he indicated to Leah, was that he enjoyed "better health now than for 2½ years past ...." Unfortunately, the same could not be said for Leah and the children because their new son Lewis died in June. Unaware of his son's death, Joel, by June 1784, was worried about his wife for he had been in London six months and had not heard from her. "I am Surpris'd," he wrote to Leah, "that I have not Receivd a line from you or any person in York—and am Very anxious indeed (to) hear of your health & situation & the Child & let me beg & require that you do not fail my Dear to inform me every Opportunity." As soon as he obtained a settlement for his claims, Joel was determined to return. While Leah's father would attend to the legacy of the Moore estate, he then would "... Come out to Some part of America & hope to Settle with my family probably for life for I have
not Altered my Opinion of England Since I left York though I enjoy the Blessings of health hear."?3 Joel, meanwhile, wrote to Leman in the spring of 1784 asking him to assist Leah with money or in any way possible. Leah’s father, William Moore, remained in London throughout much of 1784 and, as Joel explained to Leman, “Treats one very Cordially—but he being a Very high friend to the American Independence cannot assist in my Government affairs. . . .”?4

William Moore soon returned to America but Joel would be delayed in London for another two years. Not unexpectedly, his extended stay in England strained his marital relations and, as he acknowledged in his narrative, he had left Leah under conditions of severe hardship which she had never before experienced. To say the least, her circumstances were distressing, for she wrote to Joel in September 1785, eleven months after he had left New York, lamenting that “it seems as if you have forgot you even had a family for my part I am in a miser[ble] situation I have not a Shilling nor a home to go to and what will become of me this winter God only knows.” Imploring Joel to return, Leah exclaimed that if he did not come soon, she would proceed to England at the “first opportunity”.?5

In August 1784 Joel had appeared before the Claims Commissioners and was awarded a bounty of £30 a year retroactive to January 1784.?6 The annuity must have seemed disappointingly small. For all his losses and sacrifices, he was to receive a pittance of £30 a year. Far from gratified, Joel sought redress, endeavouring to have his case presented again even though he realized the “Design of the Commissioners may not be so particular for granting present relief.” Joel petitioned that he might be able to settle his family in his Majesty’s territory and be provided with some form of assistance.?7

By the spring of 1786 the estate of John Moore had finally been settled and $250,000 was deposited in the Bank of England in Lewis Moore’s name to be ultimately distributed to the heirs of the estate.?8 Understandably, then, by far the greater portion of Joel’s time in London was not concerned with the Claims Commission but with the legacy due the Moore family which had been put into the Court of Chancery by John Blackburn, one of the executors of the estate.

Having been paid for attending to the Moore estate, Joel booked passage on the brig Providence which was destined for Quebec where he intended to settle his family. Joel arrived at Quebec on 6 October 1786 after a voyage of fifty-one days from Plymouth. Joel had decided to enter the distilling business and thus he had purchased three stills in London and all the necessary materials for distilling whiskey and gin from grain.??
Joel's most immediate concern in October was how to get his wife and child to Quebec. Noting that he had brought from England "Tables, Chairs, Looking Glasses knives & forks, one bed with furniture & bedding for Two & a sufficient stock of kitchen furniture," he asked Leah on 30 October to bring only small valuable items when she came from New York so that the cost of shipping would not exceed £20. Until he received a reply from his wife he decided to wait at either Quebec or Montreal. By December, Joel still had not heard from Leah but he expected to see or receive news from her in January. "The more I view this Country," he wrote to his wife on 13 December, "the better I am pleased with my resolutions of Indeavouring to Settle myself & family here while in London . . . ." Although he still had not selected a site to settle by mid-December, he hoped to view different parts of the country throughout the winter.

Finally, in January 1787, Leah and William, accompanied by Lewis Moore, arrived in Montreal. Joel meanwhile had toured the country up the St. Lawrence and returned to Montreal on 24 January. Losing no time in making preparations to settle, he petitioned Brigadier General Hope, Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, on 5 February for aid in moving his family and effects from Montreal to "New Johns Town­ship No. 2," and to be allotted the same amount of land and provisions as were usually granted to captains of the British army.

Although Joel settled at New Johnstown or Cornwall in the spring of 1787, he was unable to obtain any large holding of land within the immediate vicinity of the township. Indeed, after he had returned from his visit up the St. Lawrence in January 1787, he expressed surprise at having "found many more inhabitants than I expected. . . ." Joel subsequently applied to Samuel Holland, the Surveyor General, for the method of obtaining lands which were granted by the government to Loyalists. Since he had arrived late, Holland informed him "that most of the Good Lands were taken up" and thus he had no alternative but to purchase land in New Johnstown in order to establish his distillery. Nevertheless, Holland advised Joel that he could go further up the country past Cornwall, select a site, and have Patrick McNiff, the deputy surveyor, survey the land and it "would be granted to him". After having removed his family to Cornwall, Joel eventually selected a site on the Gananoque River and petitioned Lord Dorchester that he be granted the lands.

Unfortunately for Joel, Sir John Johnson, a prominent New York Loyalist and superintendent of Indian affairs in British North America, also applied for the lands on the Gananoque. A bitter feud ensued between the two Loyalists but by 1789 a compromise was arranged. Stone was granted seven hundred acres on the west bank of the river
while Johnson obtained fifteen hundred acres on the east side, with each man promising to erect grist mills. ⁸７

One year before the compromise was concluded on the Gananoque lands, Leah gave birth, on 18 February 1788, to a daughter, Mary. That same month Stephen Stone, Joel's oldest stepbrother, accompanied by eleven other young men from Litchfield, arrived at Cornwall to seek lands for settlement. ⁸⁸ Stephen Stone, however, returned to Litchfield in June 1788 because his father missed him dearly and required his help on the farm. Leah went with Stephen to Albany and then he paid her passage to New York. ⁸⁹ Joel's marriage, which had endured in spite of some trying circumstances, thus ended in failure and he was left alone with two small children. For the next two years he would attempt to seek a legal separation. Leah died sometime in 1793.

In February 1791 Joel took his two children to Connecticut to stay with his sisters and then he settled at Gananoque in the spring of 1792. After the establishment of his mills in 1795, Joel would never again experience the hardships that he had endured during his five years at Cornwall. Renowned as the "founder of Gananoque," Joel, besides operating his saw and grist mills and a general store, would eventually hold the positions of collector of customs, Justice of the Peace, postmaster, road commissioner, and Colonel of the Second Leeds militia. Although his father died in 1790, Joel continued to correspond with his sisters and his brother Leman, who had entered a business partnership at Derby in October 1784 and was elected Deputy for the town in 1792. ⁹⁰ Until his death in 1833, Joel's devotion and affection for the Crown and British institutions, not unlike Leman in his relation to the American government, would grow all the more stronger. ⁹¹ Joel, in fact, wished to see a reconciliation of Britain and the United States, but only under the Crown. "I am happy in hopes that my only wish respecting politicks," he wrote to Leman in 1797, "is that I may Live to See the Family once more (viz Great Briton & America) Joined heart and hand—pray my Dear friend, Join me in my best Endeavours to encourage so Just a reconciliation to take place...." ⁹² For the Loyalist Joel Stone the relationship between Britain and America had been that of a father and son, not of a master and slave. American nationalism and the War of 1812 would obliterate any hope of reconciliation of the "family." A conservative in both religion and politics, Joel had become a Loyalist in a period of political and economic uncertainty because he had a fundamental trust in Britain. His success in later life would give credence to the conviction that his loyalty and sacrifices had been truly worthwhile.
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