

gan? His attempt at leadership ended in shame; it ended in disgrace—in his own violent death and in the disbandment of his followers. I had the privilege of baptizing some of them, upon my first mission, in Iowa. What of James Emmet, who led a small company of people from Nauvoo to the West? He soon discovered he was without power, returned to Nauvoo in humility, confessed his error, and begged that some one be appointed by the Apostles to go and bring back his followers. What of Lyman Wright and his followers, who went to Texas? He, too, failed, and his career ended in oblivion. You hear nothing of the success of those who left the body of the Church, as presided over by the Twelve Apostles. In marked contrast to these failures, behold the success of those who followed the Apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ; who, in the absence of the First Presidency are that quorum upon whom devolves the authority to preside over the Church; and who, moreover, possess the right, by virtue of the power given to them—being equal in authority to the First Presidency—to regulate the affairs of the Church in all the world, and in the exercise of that right to regulate all the affairs of the Church. Is it not evident that they have the power to take the steps necessary to organize the First Presidency of the Church, as they have done, not only once, but repeatedly?

In the year 1860—sixteen years after the death of the Prophet—there was a claim made in behalf of the eldest son of the Prophet Joseph Smith. He claimed the right to succeed to the presidency held by his father. He based his claims upon the right of lineage, claiming that he had the right by reason of his being the eldest son of the Prophet Joseph to succeed to the presidency of the Church. A number of people are said to have been aware that his father called, ordained and anointed him to this position previous to his martyrdom. In evidence of this Lyman Wight is quoted. William Clayton is represented as having told Charles Derry, a traveling companion of his in England, that he knew it was little Joseph's right to lead the Church. Is it not strange that Wm. Clayton, after such a statement as he is reported to have made, gave up to the time of his death a faithful allegiance to the Church of Jesus Christ as led by the Twelve Apostles? If he knew that Joseph was the successor to his father, is it not marvelous that he, being a man of character, did not come out and boldly advocate his claims?

Lucy Smith, mother of the Prophet, is reported to have said—by the advocates of the Josephite faction—that young Joseph would yet lead the Church. So far as Lucy Smith is concerned, I believe that she has been misrepresented—absolutely misrepresented. For only yesterday I was going through one of the journals of the late President John Taylor, in which are recorded several communications from Sister Lucy Smith, in which she urges the right of Wm. B. Smith, the only remaining brother of the Prophet, to the Presidency. Her pleadings and her efforts, after the death of her sons, Joseph and Hyrum, were all made in support of the claims of William. He, too, laid claim to the

right of the Presidency of the Church; and when I visited him but a few years ago, and had a conversation with him upon the subject, I discovered that he thought himself harshly dealt with by the Apostles at Nauvoo, and by President Young in particular. He based his claim to the Presidency by virtue of his being the brother to the Prophet Joseph; and, would you believe it, he, too, had Scripture to quote in support of his claim? He called attention to that passage in the Acts of the Apostles where, upon some question arising through the teaching of Paul at Antioch, the Elders and the Apostles were called together at Jerusalem to consider the matter. After Peter had given his testimony, after Paul and Barnabas had spoken, then James, the brother of the Lord, arose and said: "My sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God," etc. From this William concluded that James gave the decision of the council, and if he gave the decision of the council, then he must have been the president of the council, and if the president of the council, then the President of the Church. If James, the brother of the Lord, succeeded the Lord, then William claims that he should have succeeded his brother. This whole theory of the brother of the Lord succeeding to the presidency is made in the face of the plain declaration of the Son of God to the Apostle Peter—"I give unto you the keys of the Kingdom, and whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

Sidney Rigdon wanted to be appointed guardian of the Church, though nothing of the appointment of young Joseph was ever mooted. It is passing strange that something about the appointment and the anointing from his father had not been learned at that time. It would have been a most excellent opportunity for Sidney Rigdon to claim the right to be appointed guardian of the Church during the minority of young Joseph; but he wanted to build it up to the deceased Prophet, not his son. It appears that the rights of young Joseph to the succession of the Presidency of the Church were not talked of at that time.

There is an order of Priesthood, I might say two orders of Priesthood, in which lineage is recognized. This is in the office of Patriarch to the Church. I read from the Doctrine and Covenants, Sec. 107:

"It is the duty of the Twelve, in all large branches of the Church, to ordain evangelical ministers [Patriarchs] as they shall be designated unto them by revelation. The order of this Priesthood was confirmed to be handed down from father to son, and rightly belongs to the literal descendants of the chosen seed, to whom the promises were made. This order was instituted in the days of Adam, and came down by lineage in the following manner:

The revelation then traces the lineage from Adam to Seth, Enos, etc. (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 107). This is one of the passages quoted by the Josephite faction to demonstrate the idea that young Joseph had a claim by right of lineage to the presidency of the

Church. Yet you see it does not have any allusion whatever to the presidency of the Church, but to the office of Patriarch.

The second case where lineage is recognized in the Priesthood is in the Bishopric. The literal descendants of Aaron—among the first-born of his sons—have a right by virtue of their lineage to that position, if at any time they can prove their lineage, or do ascertain it by revelation from the Lord. But even in that case they must be designated by the presidency of the Melchisedek Priesthood, and found worthy and must be ordained either by them or by their direction. Otherwise they are not legally authorized to officiate in that calling. (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 68.)

There is another passage by the Josephite faction in support of young Joseph's claim, but it is not applied correctly. I first read the passage as quoted from a pamphlet the Josephites published on "The Successor."

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord unto you [Joseph the martyr] with whom the Priesthood hath continued through the lineage of your fathers, for ye are lawful heirs according to the flesh, and have been hid from the world with Christ in God; therefore, your life and the Priesthood hath remained, and must needs remain, through you and your lineage, until the restoration of all things spoken by the mouths of all the holy prophets since the world began."

You will observe that this quotation, the way they give it, is made to apply to the Prophet Joseph only; but the revelation is addressed not only to Joseph Smith, but to several of the servants of God. I read the first verse:

"Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you my servants, concerning the parable of the wheat and the tares."

Then we come to the passage they quote:

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord unto you, with whom the Priesthood hath continued through the lineage of your fathers. For ye are lawful heirs according to the flesh, and have been hid from the world with Christ in God; therefore your life and the Priesthood hath remained through you and your lineage, until the restoration of all things spoken by the mouths of all the holy prophets since the world began."

That applies to the Elders of Israel to whom the revelation is addressed; and there is not so much as a crevice left through which the descendants [of Joseph Smith may crawl] to claim any special right above the other Elders who were addressed on that occasion. It would be all nonsense; that would prove too much for those who so construe it; for if it is to be construed their way—if the right of Presidency over the Church is by lineage, and goes to the eldest son by right of succession—how comes it that the same law did not operate the other side of Joseph Smith as well as this side of him? That is, taking it for granted (for argument's sake) that the Priesthood had continued through the lineage of the Smith family and they were lawful heirs according to the flesh; and further granting—for the sake of the argument—that the right of presiding over