

An Address to
Latter Day
Saints



NOBLESSE OBLIGE

UNION PRINTING CO.
ST. JOSEPH, MO.

Dear Saints:—

It is only after deep pro and con thinking that I am impelled to give out the following claims to a peculiar and important moral position and mission.

I have finally been decided in this direction by the fact that I soon shall be practically severed from the world, hence can receive no material benefit from any one who might believe me right, and therefore I can hope to be read with less suspicion of my sincerity.

Latter Day Saints will understand what I claim to have been called and sent to do if they shall recall the work prophesied of Baurak Ale in Doc. & Cov. 98, 7 and 8; 100, 3-6; B. M. (Lam. ed.) p. 60.4; pp. 464-466; letter to W. W. Phelps, Nov. 27, 1832. Baurak or Barak is Hebrew for lightning—thunderbolt. Ale is a phonetic spelling of the Hebrew sounding of the name Eli, shortening of the name Elijah or Elias, which means my God—See Matt. 27, 46 and 47.

The latter day work introduced by Joseph Smith is a visitation of the Elijah spirit as predicted Malachi 4, 5 and 6. Its participants are touched with that spirit and in proportion to the degree are Elijahs. The calling referred to above is then that of an enlightening by possession of God—my God—a presentation of truth for the purpose of preparing the way of the Lord, by one to be sent in that spirit.

Sec. 102.5 seems at first sight to indicate that this calling. Baurak Ale, had already passed, having been fulfilled by the former Joseph, but if the prophecy regarding Baurak Ale is examined it will be evident that such has not been the case.

Sec. 100.4 says: Baurak Ale is the man to whom I likened the servant to whom the Lord of the vineyard spoke in the parable which I have given unto you." That is found in Sec. 98, 7 and 8, where this servant is told to "redeem my vineyard," and of whom it is here stated. "And his servant went straightway and done (did W. D. C. P.) all things whatsoever his lord commanded him."

Now it cannot be claimed that the vineyard is yet fully redeemed, hence Baurak Ale's work is not yet all done.

The explanation of 102.5 is this: The former Joseph was called to do the work in question just as the saints of his day were called to assist him in the redemption of Zion, but that was the day of the called, not the day of those chosen to perfect the work, as the Spirit tells us through Joseph in this same Section, par. 10: "There has been a day of calling, but the time has come for a day of choosing, and let those be chosen that are worthy, and it shall be manifest unto my servant by the voice of the Spirit those that are chosen, and they shall be sanctified, and inasmuch as they follow the counsel which they receive, they shall have power after many days to accomplish all things pertaining to Zion." This shows that the people and leader who should redeem Zion were yet in the future. To my mind there is nothing ever prophesied by Joseph that shows more inherent evidence that he was a true prophet than this prophecy of Baurak Ale, who is also referred to in the letter to W. W. Phelps before mentioned; for it prophesies of a valuable work to be done for Zion by some one not necessarily of his own flesh and blood. In fact the letter referred to carries the inference that it is to be someone not included among the officers of the church, for it voices a terrible warning lest he that is "called and appointed" should put forth his hand to steady the ark.

Now it was David, not a Levite, who directed the bringing home of the original ark to Zion, and it was a priest or one "called and appointed" who put forth his

hand to steady it without having been so directed by David and who was slain. Hence the one to be sent "having the scepter of power in his hand," must be one of David's lineage, to whom those truly of the lineage of Levi or of any of the tribes of Israel will eventually give heed. And no true priest will be found to interfere long with the restored right of the house of David to rule or to organize my kingdom upon the consecrated land." Sec. 100.6, D. and C.

Truly the holder of the mission under consideration shall be "one mighty and strong," for he shall have the support of revelation upon revelation, something needed in those days of weak faith, especially.

Book of M., p. 60, par. 4, speaks of one to come after Joseph, referred to in par. 3, who shall through faith "bring to pass much restoration unto the house of Israel."

B. M., p. 464, bottom of page. Who is this "servant" in the day of the redemption of Zion who is called a man, not a priest, and whom some will not believe and who because of them is marred but not killed, and who is finally healed? That certainly does not refer to the former Joseph nor to the present Joseph, for he gets good treatment, as he ought to get good treatment.

In 1883, near Boston, Mass., in visions I was informed that I am the heir to the house of David for this generation and appointed to the work of restoration referred to in Amos 9:11-15; Hos. 3:4 and 5; Mich. 2:13, 5:3; Zech. 9:13, 10:6, 12:6-14; Is. 11:10 and 11, 55:3 and 4, 65:9; Jer. 17:25, 30:9 and 21, 33:15-26; Ezek. 21:25-27, 34:23 and 25; Dan. 2:44.

The consciousness of the responsibilities of this calling will account for some of the singularities of my experience.

Matt. 24:27, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth to the west even so shall the coming of the Son of man be." Lightning, as you have noticed, is barak or baurak in Hebrew. Now, reading this verse in the

light we get in Doc. and Cov. through what is there taught of Baurak Ale we get this further information. As Baurak Ale cometh out of the east and showeth light to the west thus is indicated that the Son of Man is also coming and that soon. If the spiritual significance of the call to me is that named as Baurak Ale, as I believe, the reference to the localities given above would seem to corroborate my view, for it was in the east that the light of heaven flashed and reflashd like lightning upon my mind, and it is to the west that I have been directed—in harmony with Joseph's experience.

In Isaiah 41:25, to follow up this connection, there is to say the least a singular coincidence so far as localities are concerned—much of the prophecy being yet in the future. It reads thus: "I have raised up one from the north from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name." My birth took place in Pontiac county, Prov. of Quebec, one of the most northern counties on this continent at that time—1851.

Also the second and third verses: "Who raised up the righteous man from the east and called him to his foot. . . . even by the way he had not gone with his feet?" for as you will see, from the east, Boston, Mass., I was impelled to go out without purse or scrip and therefore on foot, for years.

Also see Isa. 46:11. Jer. 49:19 and 20, refers to a chosen man, it does not say a chosen priest, who should "appoint me the time." In 1898, as I relate later, I said and did on the "temple lot" that which appointed the time for "the gathering" which the Reorganized church was impelled to make the official rule of the church in less than three years therefrom. Doc. and Cov 125.10, 126.10. The church was not prepared for this revelation before that time, or it would have received it sooner. No one, however, so far as I know, thought of giving my work any credit for the church enactment.

Jer. 49:20 says: "Surely the least of the flock shall draw them out." Going without purse or scrip, following commands that make me appear to be insane—my testimony draws out the underlying spirit of selfishness and hatred for good that is very often covered up by religious formalities and popular illusions. This drawing out has been in accordance with what Jesus said, "Beware of wolves in sheep's clothing. If they have persecuted me they will persecute you."

Now, if I have not in the above interpretations indicated correctly the fulfillment of the prophecies referred to, I would like some one to show something truer to the text. If I have not in so far as I have stated, fulfilled them, who has? Surely they were meant to be fulfilled and not merely to help to fill up the sacred page.

In 1887 I heard my first Latter Day Saint sermon, recognized the Elijah spirit of the preacher, and was shortly afterwards baptized into the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of L. D. S. by Elder Elias N. Webster at Boston, and thus adopted into the tribe of Ephraim.

I soon found that the redemption of Zion was a subject about which most of the members did not wish to be reminded—especially as to the practical question of equality—and was told that being poor I ought to have little to say about it. Ere long dissension arose between prominent members and myself, in which I cannot claim to have been wholly blameless; for finding them inconsistent in this practical matter I began to hold uncharitable ideas of their sincerity until I began to disbelieve their claim to represent the true church and some of the inspiration of their prophets and books. Friends, I felt "the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." (Is. 28:20). It seemed as though the outlets to action were hedged up by so many "thou shalt nots" that I had no free agency or right of initiative left. I could hardly voice my desire for advance

in the work without being reminded that I was infringing on the prerogative of some officer. I believe now that those confusions are largely due to the fact of our being in a period of transition.

In 1890 I was formally charged with insubordination, but the trial resulted in a dropping of that charge, a verdict of guilty of heresy being the finding of the court over which presided Elder, now Apostle, F. M. Sheehy. I hope no offense will be taken by my reference to names, as I do so merely as evidence of good faith and so that my statements may be verified.

It will be seen that the finding of the court was illegal and therefore unjust, because I had not the opportunity, allowed by the law, to defend myself upon the question of heresy or retract, and the action of the court is the more surprising from the fact that it had found the charge of insubordination incapable of holding me. In this whole matter my brethren placed a dangerous stumbling block before me—a “marring” influence which ought to be taken into consideration before condemning me too harshly for past lack of faith in some of the doctrine.

I desire also to call attention to the fact that no charge of immorality was ever preferred.

In this action of the church may be seen the spirit against which I had to contend. I hoped that time would bring a better insight.

Finding now that I could work no longer with my brethren of the Reorganized church, but that I must be active in testimony, I went out as an independent to bear witness, especially as to the practical side of the teachings of Christ. Without purse or scrip, during the next six years I traveled upwards of seven thousand miles, mostly on foot, holding meetings where possible, but oftener following the natural trend of being drawn into conversation with nearly every one I met, they being curious to know whence and why. Of course, most failed to appreciate. Some few,

however, gave me Godspeed and I received the requisite food and shelter, which is all the material hire to which Christ referred.

I also during this time spent six or eight terms in prison and twice was for short terms held in asylums for testifying to my belief in the truth, in testimony meetings of popular churches, chiefly in Boston, Tremont Temple, a large church of the Baptist denomination.

In mentioning these names, as in the mention of the name of the court elder, I do not wish to single out any church or person for blame, but merely to make my statements such that they can be sifted.

Now, I find that up to the present time most of my brethren hold against me the fact that the courts condemned me as a law breaker, whereas I have thought that they ought to have judged me from a different view point as to what the true law upholds or condemns. The apostles in Acts 5:29 valued the true law.

At my different trials it was not charged at any time that I had occupied time unduly or that I had been abusive or personal in my remarks. I had, however, brought home to the churches the fact that they had changed God's order of a ministry, without purse or scrip, which I was practising as an independent, to one of elegant appointments for which they had to cater to wealth to the detriment and disappointment of the poor. This testimony they told me they did not want me to give in their meetings, and the courts held that I must obey their orders given to me to keep silence, even though they immediately afterwards had thrown the meetings open calling for testimony as dictated to each by God's spirit. I claimed that the ruling of the court was unconstitutional, because upholding fraud—the pretense that they left truth untrammelled—and because it prevented the truest divine worship in a place licensed for that purpose.

Sad to say, the fact that I suffered for the truth by those perversions of justice is given out today by my brethren of the Boston branch as a reason for not being reconciled with me.

In 1897-98 I spent eight months at Lamoni, Iowa. As a result of which I saw that something uncommon must be done if ever Zion should be redeemed. Now, think of the school through which I for years had been getting instruction. Disowned by brethren and family, yet happy in the consciousness of duty done; is it any wonder that when I found the excuse, which my brethren almost invariably gave for not putting in force the law of consecration, to be that they were waiting for a Baurak Ale, one who should come with power and that they must not move until his appearance—is it any wonder then, knowing the moral power of my position and calling, that I began to hear a call to that work? It was then that Sec. 98, par. 7, came to me with the force of a divine command and the literal significance of the words prophesied to be given to “one of his servants,” dawned upon my mind: “Go straightway unto the land of my vineyard and redeem my land, for it is mine. I have bought it with money. Therefore get ye straightway unto my land, break down the walls of mine enemies, throw down their tower and scatter their watchmen, and inasmuch as they gather together against you avenge me of mine enemies that bye and bye I may come with the residue of mine house and possess the land.”

May, 1898 I went straightway to the “temple lot,” Independence, Mo., where I found a priesthood meeting going on, to which I was admitted. One of the members, L. H. Ezzell, was telling of preparations he had been making for going out without purse or scrip. They also discussed the idea of practising the law of consecration professing willingness to practice it as soon as the “one to be sent” should appear. Not having been able, though I had tried at Boston and at Lamoni, to effect reconciliation with my

brethren of the Reorganized church, and finding here a church professing faith in the most of the records and a willingness to advance, I offered myself for membership in this church, styled the Church of Christ, otherwise known as the Hedrickite church. After I had been a member some weeks I wanted to help an advance, but soon found that this church also felt unable to practice the law of consecration.

Finally I told the brethren about my visions and how I had been impressed by Sec. 98:7, and had come to act thereupon. Of course my words effected nothing. Action was needed. I accordingly threw down all there was there to represent "the walls" of the land that had been bought "with money" in the literal sense by tearing down the barb wire fence surrounding the "temple lot." For this I was arrested and in jail some two months, though I pleaded the constitutional right to obey, that is worship God, it being accepted by this church that Sec. 98:7 should of right be carried out sooner or later, though they did not expect it to be against them. I also claimed that on account of this church holding this divinely set apart parcel of land as its property according to the laws of man, but not according to the law of consecration or while disobedient to that law while professing loyalty to it and Christ—they had become enemies of God, referred to in that section and paragraph.

After serving out my sentence I again went to the officers and asked for a reconsideration. At first they appointed a meeting but finally decided not to hear me further. I then told them I must "throw down their tower." They told me if I injured any part of the property I should be prosecuted. I told them emphatically that they must do their duty as they saw it, and I would do mine as I saw it, leaving the future to decide between us.

Finding the brethren fixedly set in their view, I threw down all there was there to represent their tower or faith by destroying their church building on the "temple lot" by fire, and was held upon a charge of arson.

As I explained fully my reasons to the court, the judge told the jury that there was no criminal intent shown by the evidence and that he would enter for me a plea of insanity. Although I saw that the judge's motion was merciful, I protested against it, for I claimed full reason for my acts, and asked to be acquitted upon the plea of divine worship or obedience to God. I was, however, declared insane and sent to asylum 2, St. Joseph, Mo., where I spent nearly six years, having been discharged last November. I found immediate employment in this city as a tinner in a packing company, and in less than three months was put in charge of the tin work, and found my superior officers very reasonable indeed.

Some weeks ago I felt again the old desire to meet with the saints. I found a welcome among them and applied for admission to their ranks, for since my confinement the Reorganized church had taken public action, 1901, toward acknowledging the law of consecration and the gathering, and I felt that I had found at least some who put Zion first.

I accompanied my request for membership with a meek letter to the Boston branch asking for reconciliation. This request was refused at Boston, and my name cannot yet appear upon the church books. I, however, do not wish to condemn this refusal. It may be wisdom, owing to the lack of faith, that the church should put those who have faith to severer tests as object lessons for the weak. At least the church can but act according to the light of the majority. This is well known always to be inferior to that of some in the minority, when it comes to advanced questions, and time must be granted it to assimilate.

I have this to say: I believe the Latter Day Saints to be the most conscientious of people and that they have sufficient advanced light among them to prevent them being long decoyed from the straight path.

I say this remembering, too, that nearly two years ago I laid this whole matter formally before the leading quo-

runs of the church through Church Secretary Salyards. I think that without disrespect to those quorums I may now make the matter more fully known. The secretary wrote me that he had presented my communications to the quorum secretaries, but I have not been notified of any action on their part. I have felt that the years that I have given, that I might be able to address them consistently, might at least have brought out some inquiries, but know that I ought also to be patient to be worthy of the calling wherewith I am called.

All that I ask is that the matters I present be taken into such consideration as the importance of the subject demands, and not hastily condemned. I can be satisfied with knowing that they are being considered carefully. Very superficial reasons often hinder the consideration of such claims as I present—reasons that would be thought nonsensical if brought against a man of far off times or abode. It takes moral courage to properly judge what God does as well as to act upon His word. I have strong hope of reconciliation with my brethren without violence to the conscience of any one in such good time as is best for all concerned, through the respect for celestial law.

The church is just now in grave danger of taking the pith and meaning out of the law of consecration by applying it merely to the surplus that a man may have over his expenses and capital invested. If Sec. 42, par. 10, does not mean that saints cannot be in consonance with celestial law and have more "than is necessary for their support," it is misleading. Especially should bishops, no matter how large their worldly business, part with it and consecrate the whole surplus above their necessary support in order that they put no stumbling block before those to whom they should teach the law aright. Beware of the temptation to interpret the law so that it will not call for sacrifice, especially from the rich, for they have the means to give and they are the ones who are in the greatest danger from the

snare of riches—the temptation to indulge self and to become so hardened against their brother that they crush into death their own hearts the—source of life. Hence when any one endeavors to make the law easier for the rich by whitening away its demands, he is the rich man's worst enemy.

As I stated in opening, I look for an almost complete separation from the world that shall put me beyond hope of any material reward in my work. I see before me the probability of having soon to return to the asylum for many years. I find that the church is not yet ready to follow out its covenant in practical matters and that it is in great danger of being lulled into still false sense of security. There is more need than ever that God should be “avenged of his enemies”—selfishness and unbelief. I cannot as yet bring with me “all the strength of his house,” but I can go ahead and do what there is for me to do, and leave the awakening of the others to the Lord of the vineyard.

In doing this there is every probability that some who esteem property or their official positions in the church more than they do the still small voice will feel it their duty to shut off my power to disturb the even tenor of their way by putting me under the ban or insanity. This would not be a difficult thing to do on account of my recent confinement on that head.

It sometimes seems strange that although a thing is true, it at first seems very different to truth to the many. This is because that the aim of so few is really high.

I cannot claim any moral or mental superiority from the fact that I have been entrusted with a great service.

As I look back along the way I have come it seems to me that a special providence has so hedged up my way that my naturally immoral nature has been obliged to feel the truth whether I would or not. I do not see how any one could have gone through my experience without arriving at the same conclusion and desire except that the probability is that 99 out of a 100 would have profited far more than

have I. There is one thing that imprisonment for the truth does for one that nothing, as yet, but telling of the gospel without purse or scrip will do, and that is—it takes him out of the dwarfing influence of the commercial system of life that rules the world through self interest.

As yet he who desires not to war with his fellow man cannot “flee to Zion,” for such a Zion as we have so far at Independence or Lamoni only feels able to provide for those who have some of the spoils of our fellow man to share with them. Worldly wise is Zion just now. Does she not need a little of what she now terms fanaticism to make her see that God, when really trusted, has perfect ways for effecting his purposes?

An encouraging editorial in the Herald of June 28th notes lack of “the divine details.” The children of Israel had no idea of how they should cross the Jordan until the priests’ feet stood where before was no visible solidity. I believe that when the priesthood comes to install “the order” with “Baurak Ale” the details will connect.

Sec. 102.8, “My servant Baurak Ale and Baneemy whom I have appointed.” The latter name is the same as the Hebrew Benammi, there having occurred a mere transposition of vowels which often happens in changes of language. Benammi can be found in the dictionary of scripture names to mean “son of my people.” I take that to refer to Elder F. M. Smith of the presidency of the church and priesthood, unless he should be found in transgression. The prophet Joseph is “the watchman” to be more perfectly set upon the tower.

It is only a short time since the patriarchal order was restored to the church. Why should we not expect the order of the kingship also to be restored that we might have the benefit of all “the helps and governments” useful for the preparation of the people to reign with Christ, not only as priests, but as kings also. Do we expect the King

of Kings, Jesus, to develop that order only after he is personally present? Why then did he not keep back the orders of the priesthood also? Remember these must be kings in nobility of heart. They must become Enochs.

B. of M. pp. 12:1, "These things I have written which are a lesser part of the things to be taught the people. and when they have received this which it is expedient that they should have first, to try their faith and if it so be that they believe these things, then shall the greater things be made manifest unto them." Now this "lesser part" is more particularly directed to the restoration of the holy priesthood. May not the "greater things" refer to the restoration of the holy kingship through new light flashing out from the hitherto veiled, as well as restored records, now that our people are manifesting faith in celestial law?

W. D. C. PATTYSON.

St. Joseph, Mo., July 4, '05.

