I hope I can put myself across more clearly. To write a full reply would entail authoring a large volume, and whilst I may hope to do that one day, I'm afraid that at the moment I do not have the chance, but I will do my best to briefly explain how I see things, and hope it will help you to better understand how many Fundamentalists feel and think on these subjects.

It seems to me that we are approaching the subject of Priesthood succession and authority from two very different angles -

Yours is that because President Hinkley is a successor of Joseph Smith in the office of Church President then he has all the same authority as Joseph did, and that presumably he takes precedence over every previous prophets in defining what the Gospel is, and how it is to be lived.

Mine is that even the President of the Church is amenable to the principles, laws and ordinances of the Gospel, and the Priesthood does now often have to act independently of the Church, as it has in times past. So one cannot approach the issue of authority without treating what that authority is for, and what qualifies it.

I can understand that references to the authority Joseph Smith had, can be misunderstood as referring solely to the office he held as President of the Church. Ideally the offices and organisations of Priesthood and Church should always be in harmony, and many statements refer to a situation where that is the case, but whenever there was a conflict in Joseph Smith's day the Priesthood took precedence, as is witnessed by his actions (often in secret) - especially relating to Celestial Plural Marriage, and the Holy Order.

To my mind - if we believe that having a continuation of organisation or even of offices takes precedence over a continuation of doctrines, laws and ordinances this makes us no different from the Catholics. It was by failing to live the Gospel that the ancient Church lost its authority, when that happened it didn't matter if they filled every Church office, as the power and authority was gone.

I wonder - Why is it that altering doctrines and ordinances in ancient times was apostasy, but now it is assumed to be the evidence of revelation, despite the fact that the word of the Lord has never been given on the subject?

To believe that President Hinkley was right would require me to accept that the Gospel and its ordinances can change, that the requirements for exaltation can also, and that our Unchangeable God changed his mind on these matters. Accepting what the scriptures and the teachings of Joseph Smith say on this matter forces one to conclude that President Hinkley cannot hold all the keys, and that someone else must hold and exercise them, or we must reject the word of the Lord, the statements of His servants and their prophecies.

I do not believe that Fundamentalists (more specifically the Apostolic United Brethren, for lack of a better name) have everything perfectly in order. We are all in an out of order situation, and it is all that we can do individually to keep ourselves and our families on the right path. As Brother Owen says - we are the "puny and weak" not the "One Mighty and Strong", although the Lord does sometimes have to make use of the weak things of this world to bring about His purposes.

The quote you gave me from Joseph Musser's Journal seems to indicate that he was just recording what he told others. I doubt he would have told them in a letter a year earlier to "Get a definite testimony of the Gospel and where the keys of the Priesthood rest and then follow your file leaders." (18 June 1935), if he did not have such a testimony. The whole situation reminds me of Heber C. Kimball's comments after the death of Joseph that, "There are men here brethren who have got authority, but we don't want to mention their names, for the enemy will try to kill them." (Trial of Sidney Rigdon). I have read letters from Musser to his wives in which he refers to the authority he holds, and from this and the testimony of those who knew him I have little doubt that he understood his position, and many others around him did.

Having said all of this, it is ultimately it is Joseph who still presides over the keys, and I believe that it is he who ultimately is spoken of in D&C 132:18-19, as is reiterated by D&C 50:1-3 & 112:15.

The issue of Plural Marriage was very plain to Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, and John Taylor - the only confusion there seems to be in trying to reconcile the views of modern leaders with theirs. All the credible scholars who have covered the subject have seemed to come to the same conclusions, and the Church is yet to bring forward evidence or a responses to the contrary. Were all the Saints who lived and suffered for the principle of Plural Marriage completely wrong in believing it was essential to their exaltation? What about the First Presidency Anointing statement, were they wrong too?

They and their contemporaries left so many clear statements, that those who try to support modern LDS views are forced to find obscure statements, take quotes out of context; attack the reliability of a multitude of sources - even though they say consistently the same thing, or rely on the argument of the primacy of the living Church President (even if it results in alleging that all previous Prophets were wrong).

Although there are some Fundamentalists who seem to have a narrow focus, most of those I know have lives and outlooks that are remarkably balanced. In their homes and their chapel I have just as often heard talks about faith and repentance as I have about any ‘deeper’ subjects, and most of their lives are made up of the same joys and challenges as any other families. It is also important to note that the majority of Fundamentalists are monogamous, and quite a large number remain members of the Church and may be involved with it. They are often indistinguishable from other Latter-day Saints, except for hopefully being a little better studied.

I don't expect any more perfection from Lorin Woolley than the ancient Prophets had in the
Old Testament. They had many foibles and made mistakes, but the Lord persevered with them. Some Saints seem so willing to point out Brigham Young’s eccentricities, and where they think he might have been wrong, but suggesting anything similar about the modern Church President is a treason often dealt with by excommunication - as I know personally.

Despite all of this I look upon the Church President with sympathy for his role, and wish for him all the inspiration his position requires, and will listen with eagerness to all the hesitations he has to impart. But if I am forced to choose between the authority President Hinkley and Brother Owen, then my study and testimony would leave me only one choice. I do not believe the Fundamentalists should reject the Church though, I believe they remain members of it in God’s eyes, and should try to help it in whatever way they can.

At the end of the day I believe my exaltation is reliant upon - 1) Receiving the ordinances essential to exaltation, 2) Living the laws essential to exaltation, 3) Receiving these from someone who has qualified to preside over the Priesthood by doing those two things, (and been appointed to that position by those in authority).

I will leave this letter with a few scriptures and quotes from Joseph Smith on this matter that may be of interest -

TPIS 336 ...it is necessary to know who holds the keys of power, and who does not or we are likely to be deceived.

Jesus holds some unique keys
Rev 1:18 I am he that liveth, and was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.
Revelation 3:7 ... These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth; (see Isa 22:22)

Adam/Michael holds specific keys / Presides over all keys
D&C 78:16 Who hath appointed Michael your prince, and established his feet, and set him upon high, and given unto him the keys of salvation under the counsel and direction of the Holy One, who is without beginning of days or end of life.
TPIS 157 Adam holds "the keys of the universe" p157 The keys .. are revealed from heaven .. by Adam's authority.
TPIS 158 the keys were first given to [Adam,] and by him to others
TPIS 167 Adam holds the keys of the dispensation of the fullness of times.
TPIS 169 Adam holds the presidency of all dispensations.

John the Revelator holds specific keys until the Second Coming
D&C 7:6 Yea, he has undertaken a greater work; therefore I will make him as flaming fire and a ministering angel; he shall minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation who dwell on the earth.
TPIS 257 ... with Moroni, whom I have sent unto you to reveal the Book of Mormon, containing the fulness of my everlasting gospel, to whom I have committed the keys of the record of the stick of Ephraim;

Tyrant Priesthood keys are based on lineage
D&C 68:17 For the firstborn [among the sons of Aaron] v.16 holds the right of the presidency over this priesthood, and the keys or authority of the same.
D&C 68:18 An man has a legal right to this office, to hold the keys of this priesthood, except he be a literal descendant and the firstborn of Aaron. (see v.16,20-21)
D&C 107:70 Unless he is a literal descendant of Aaron he cannot hold the keys of that priesthood. (see v.69)
D&C 107:76 But a literal descendant of Aaron has a legal right to the presidency of this priesthood, to the keys of this ministry, to act in the office of bishop independently, without counselors.

As may be other offices (Restorer, Presiding Patriarch)
D&C 112:3 For verily I say unto you, the keys of the dispensation, which ye have received, have come down from the fathers, and last of all, being sent down from heaven unto you.
D&C 113:6 Behold, thus saith the Lord, it is a descendant of Jesse, as well as of Joseph, unto whom rightly belongs the priesthood, and the keys of the kingdom, for an ensign, and for the gathering of my people in the last days.

Joseph received some keys before being Church President
D&C 13:1 UPON you my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah I confer the Priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness. (note: originally Oliver also received and held the keys)
D&C 27:12 And also with Peter, and James, and John, whom I have sent unto you, by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be apostles, and especial witnesses of my name, and bear the keys of your ministry and of the same things which I revealed unto them.

Even as Church Pres Joseph didn't receive all keys at once
D&C 110:16 Therefore, the keys of this dispensation are committed into your hands; and by this ye may know that the great and dreadful day of the Lord is near, even at the doors. (see v.11 & D&C 27:6,9)

Joseph presides over the keys of this dispensation
D&C 90:3 Verily I say unto you, the keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you, while thou art in the world; neither in the world to come;
D&C 112:15 Except yourselves, rebel not against my servant Joseph; for verily I say unto you, I am with him, and my hand shall be over him; and the keys which I have given unto him, and also to you, shall not be taken from him till I come.

There are keys by the Church Pres no longer seems to claim
D&C 90:7 As also through your administration the keys of the school of the prophets, which I have commanded to be organized;

Holding or exercising keys can be conditional
D&C 64:5 And the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom shall not be taken from my servant Joseph Smith, Jun., through the means I have appointed, while he liveth, inasmuch as he obeyeth mine ordinances.
UR 83:5 For it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood.
(HT Rev, 13 Oct 1882)

Some contemporaries can also hold keys
D&C 50:6 And again, verily I say unto thy brethren, Sidney Rigdon and Frederick G. Williams, their sins are forgiven them also, and they are accounted as equal with thee in holding the keys of this last kingdom.
D&C 124:28 Verily I say unto you, I now give unto you the officers belonging unto my Priesthood, that ye may hold the keys thereof, even the Priesthood which is after the order of Melchizedek, which is after the order of mine Only Begotten Son. (see v.143)
JT "Noah, Shem (who was Melchizedek) and Abraham, the father of the faithful were three contemporaries, holding the keys of the highest order of the Priesthood." (Times and Seasons 5:746)

Some offices or callings can preside over keys relevant to their position
D&C 107:15 The bishopric is the presidency of this priesthood, and holds the keys or authority of the same. (see v.20)
D&C 107:35 The Twelve being sent out, holding the keys, to open the door by the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and first unto the Gentiles and then unto the Jews. (see 112:16)
D&C 124:19 That from henceforth he shall hold the keys of the patriarchal blessings upon the heads of all my people.
D&C 124:128 Which Twelve hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth, and after that to send my word to every creature.

There is also a Presidency of Priesthood
D&C 81:2 Unto whom I have given the keys of the kingdom, which belong always unto the Presidency of the High Priesthood.

The keys are restored for last time
D&C 27:13 Unto whom I have committed the keys of my kingdom, and a dispensation of the gospel for the last times, and for the fulness of times, in the which I will gather together in one all things, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth;
D&C 65:2 The keys of the kingdom of God are committed unto man on the earth, and from thence shall the gospel roll forth unto the ends of the earth, as the stone which is cut out of the mountain without hands shall roll forth, until it has filled the whole earth.

There are keys we may not know about
TPIS 179 There are many things that belong to the powers of the Priesthood and the keys thereof, that have been kept hidden from before the foundation of the world; they are hid from the wise and prudent to be revealed in the last times. (Oct 1840)
HCK ... let me tell you that there are keys that the written word never spoke of, or never will.
(T&S 5:667)

I'm hoping this goes some way to dispelling the myth that we Fundamentalists don't study deeply enough.

God bless,

Nathan

5-6-03

Brother Brian,

I appreciate the time you have taken to correspond. It seemed from the last letter that you did not wish to enlongate this conversation much further and so - if you like - these will be my last comments on this subject. I do hope to yet find the time to write a more complete response to all of your writings (and those of Brother Anderson) for the sake of allowing those Saints investigating these matters to have a balanced view. When I do I will of course let my readers know of your views and where they can find them, correcting any mistakes you find, as you'll undoubtedly do too with your own texts and with those members whom you ask about such things.

... You wrote ...

... I've talked with many fundamentalists who seem to partake of a "fuzzy authority" approach to the sealing keys. They are convinced they must be polygamists and show less concern for the precise sealing authority they use.

... I believe that talking about Joseph Smith and his keys blurs the issue
Let us see what the Prophets and Apostles of the first century of the restoration have to say on the subject of Celestial Plural Marriage and Priesthood, to see if Fundamentalist views are so unsubstantiated and modern.

What would be necessary to bring about the result nearest the hearts of the opponents of 'Mormonism', more properly termed the Gospel of the Son of God? Simply to renounce, abrogate or apostatize from the new and everlasting covenant of marriage in its fulness. Were the Church to do that as an entirety God would reject the Saints as a body. The authority would be withdrawn, with its gifts and powers, and there would be no more heavenly recognition of the administrations among the people. The heavens would permanently withdraw their presence, and the Lord would raise up another people of greater valor and stability, for his work must, according to His unalterable decrees, go forward, for the time of the second coming is near, even at the doors. (Charles W. Penrose, Deseret Evening News, April 23rd, 1885.)

The entire Church and all of its Priesthood, with the Presidency at the head of it might motion and vote against this principle until doomsday with just one effect, (namely) to vote themselves away from the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, from the possession of their Priesthood, and to find themselves very speedily outside the Church and Kingdom of God, while He would raise up others that would honor and observe his law. (Deseret News, Editorial, 1 April 1885.)

When this commandment was given, it was so far religious, and so far binding upon the Elders of the Church, that it was told them if they were not prepared to enter into it, and to stem the torrent of opposition that would come in consequence of the keeping of this commandment, that they would be taken from them and given to others. (John Taylor, 7 June 1866, Journal of Discourses 11:221-222)

If we do not embrace that principle soon, the keys will be turned against us. * If we do not keep the same law our Heavenly Father has kept we cannot go with him. A man obeying a lesser law is not qualified to preside over those who keep a higher law. (John Taylor, October 10th, 1882. Life of Wilford Woodruff, Matthias F. Cowley, p. 542. See revelation to John Taylor, October 13th, 1882.)

We receive the Priesthood and power and authority. If we make a bad use of that Priesthood, do you not see that the day will come when God will reckon with us, and he will take it from us and give it to those who will make better use of it. (Heber C. Kimball, Journal of Discourses 6:125.)

Heber was told by Joseph that if he did not do this [take another wife] he would lose his Apostleship. (Life of Heber C. Kimball, Onson F. Whitney, p. 336, 1888.)

An angel of God...told him [Joseph Smith] that, unless he moved forward and establish plural marriage, his Priesthood would be taken from him. (Eliza R. Snow, Biography and Family Record of Lorenzo Snow, p. 69-70.)

If God saves this people, as He firmly believe He will, it will be through those men and through those women whom men have placed under a ban, whom men have said shall have no power because of the laws that are enacted against them. I tell you, the salvation that will come to this people, will be through the faithfulness of the men of God and the women of God who, in the face of an opposing world, contrary to their traditions, to their education, to their pre-conceived notions and to the popular prejudices of the day, who have in the midst of all this stepped forward in the vanguard and obeyed the command of God, and had dared to endure all the consequences, and have been willing to endure all the penalties. (George Q. Cannon, 8 October 1882, Journal of Discourses 23:280.)

If God has introduced something for our glory and exaltation, we are not going to have that kicked over by an improper influence, either inside or outside of the Church of the living God.

Some folks think that we polygamists are very much indebted to our brethren who are monogamists to help steady the ark to help save us, and that we need such men...We are not very much dependant very much upon the monogamists about any of these things...I will tell you, if you want to get along smoothly, you had better find among your various neighbours, when you have some matter of difficulty to settle, some of these polygamists and ask a little counsel at their hands. (John Taylor, 7 June 1874, Journal of Discourses 25:310.)

There are men who say: "Yield this practice [plural marriage] for the present; perhaps public opinion may soften and then this principle may be taught and practiced." I look upon such a suggestion as from the devil. It would be quite as proper to propose apostasy for a short season until public opinion would become more favorable to us. If there are any in the church who cannot stand the pressure, instead of talking compromise, let them withdraw quietly from the Church. If they can see nothing in the principle of celestial marriage worth contending for, leave those who do see and
appreciate its value to fight the battle alone." (George Q. Cannon, _Lav., Inst._, 20:156, 1885.)

Perhaps others can easily dismiss such statements as irrelevant, but I cannot, they were made by men who knew Joseph, who saw miracles, and who lived and sacrificed for God's laws. Maybe some will just merely brush aside ancient and modern revelations that insist on an unchanging Gospel, and divine laws that cannot be revoked as unimportant. Others cannot do this, however, and are intent on remaining "true to the truth for which martyrs have perished." They find Mess Anderson's interpretations of the evidence surrounding the 1886 meeting to be unconvincing, and through their own studies have found further evidences for it having happened, that it followed prophecy and persecution, and have a testimony of where the authority then conferred resides today.

Wishing you all of God's blessing.

Nathan

6-2-03

Dear Brother Hales,

I hope I don't sound too harsh, but I do worry greatly that our correspondence is beginning to go around in circles. In your last email I do not feel that you have responded to the arguments I have brought up. As I didn't feel your books really addressed what I (and maybe many other Fundamentalists) considered to be the important issues, I hoped it would be constructive to correspond with you. But it seems the questions and issues I've raised have continued to be seen as unimportant, irrelevant or simply overlooked, which still indicates to me that you still do not understand Fundamentalist views, or believe them unworthy of addressing, or perhaps don't feel capable or interested in doing so.

Take for example your brushing aside of some quotes I listed in my last email, which you referred to as "a bunch of references saying polygamy would never be suspended". However, interestingly most were not saying this at all, and some were only incidentally doing so. They actually centered on relationship of Priesthood Authority and Celestial Plural Marriage, and how living that law was necessary to preserving the Priesthood and maintaining that authority. As you stated (in your latest missive) "there can be no polygamy without proper authority", so I was raising the point that statements from and revelations to the early prophets and apostles which showed they believed (more importantly) that "there can be no proper authority without polygamy" either! The quotes were full of the words 'priesthood', 'authority', and 'keys', so I find myself at a loss as how you can conclude that what they said had nothing to do with priesthood authority.

You also seem brush aside statements from Church Pres' earlier in this dispensation, even when there are in harmony, and even when they consistently and repeatedly teach the same thing, just because you can find a few ambiguous quotes that could be interpreted to say the opposite, as if this undermines the great weight of evidence to the contrary. I am not unaware of the quotes you use, but in comparison to the many unambiguous sermons given publically in General Conference by Brigham Young and others, as well as the united testimonies of those who knew the Prophets, I do not believe they really hold the significance you place upon them.

I hate to try and speak for other Fundamentalists, but... Perhaps it is because we have not been aiming our talks, articles and books towards those who are already antagonistic towards us and already have their minds made up, this means that we haven't addressed the issues of most importance to you. Perhaps it is because we have found that these are not the major issues Church members come to us asking about, or that your youth ask about, or that we feel are most important. Maybe we feel that addressing those who are already determined believe in that way on these matters may not have minds open enough to consider others views. Perhaps we have come across such arguments as yours and have not seen them as much of a challenge, and feel that the evidence is so overwhelmingly on our side that those who truly study it (without agenda or predetermined conclusions) will obviously come to the same conclusions.

To my mind, if Joseph Mauer did not use a particular phraseology that conforms to the terms scholars use today, even if some of his examples in defending true principles were not always perfect, this does not undermine the principles he promotes which were established long before 1933 or 1904. It does not justify us in overlooking the concepts, principles, and patterns he recognised, and the part he played. Nor in rejecting whatever else was taught or done.

I find it ironic that the very heavy burdens of proof (or should I say hurdles or barriers) you would try and put upon Fundamentalism are similar to those anti-Mormons try to put on Church members, and that atheists try to put upon them. I was not there at the resurrection, nor was I present at the first vision, or at the 1886 meeting. I understand the principles though and can apply them in my life, I can see the fulfillment of the prophecies, I can recognise the consistency and beauty of God's plan, and see His hand and influence in it. Yet when I dig a little deeper than the surface of the Church's image and course over the last hundred years the inconsistencies, unfulfilled prophecies, contradictions, and lack of the Lord's direction when compared to before that time are all too evident to me. I look upon the road it has taken with sadness, although I support the agency of my fellow members, and know that for many of them the course they are on is the one they want to take.

Sadly though, there are gaps in gospel history and knowledge. The fact that Heber C. Kimball spoke of a "secret priesthood" organisation does not prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Woolley belonged to such an organisation; the fact that many LDS scholars admit that Brigham succeeded Joseph because of a secret ordination, does not prove conclusively that Woolley did either Pres. J.F. Smith, nor does the fact that other scholars believe the evidence showed that Joseph felt that there was a higher office than Church President, that there were higher quorums than those in the Church, and that they could act independently, does not force someone to believe that this is the case now. Although we may wonder - how did Woolley or Mauer know about such things before the scholars did? If the Church was wrong about these points, and the reasons for and meaning of the Manifesto (when compared to what those involved with it actually thought of it), and on the existence and extent of post-Manifesto and its approval, should we place the same trust in its public view that Celestial Plural Marriage is no longer approved and that the authority to live it does not exist? However, that's an idea that I cannot see fitting into any of the gaps in our knowledge of the Gospel and its history, no matter how others try to force it.

You added a postscript to the end of your letter which suggested (if I have understood you correctly) that perhaps I should have mentioned that Vance Allred has joined the Church since writing the letter to you I quoted. I realise that it is desirable to add biographical information on authors where possible, but as the Church avoids mentioning the regrettable excommunication of George P. Lee when they quote him in some of their publications, I think it only respectful to avoid bringing attention to the mistake Vance made when he left the Priesthood work.

Forgive me if I have been a little blunt. I really am glad that you have taken the time to write. Sadly, too many members would sooner cross over the other side of the street than have to say "hello" to a Fundamentalist (as has sometimes literally been my experience). Fortunately not all of my fellow LDS Church members are so afraid or prejudiced, and is always encouraging to know that some can disagree but still be relatively polite. I do wish too that Fundamentalists and other Latter-day Saints had more of a chance to rejoice and work together in the great many principles we both believe in. Alas that is a dream I fear will not happen without a few miracles and upheavals first taking place. It is a shame as it would be nice to think that greater friendship and understanding could be fostered, but I guess there are still ways to grind and wall to build.

Your brother in the Gospel,

Nathan

P.S. As you put a great deal of weight on the issue of who the 'One Man' who presides over the keys to Celestial Marriage is now, I have included below a summary of possible Fundamentalist views on the subject that I hope will once and for all show clearly our views. I haven't added references or developed it into a complete treatment of the subject yet (although I have drafted some aspects of it), but I don't think you would find it too hard to look up the examples and evidences for the points I refer to.

----------

The 'One Man'
(A summary of proposed arguments)

"... there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of this priesthood are conferred..." D&C 132:7

Agreed -

The 'One Man' spoken of in D&C 132 as holding authority was Joseph Smith

Considerations -

At the time he held the office of Church President

Modern LDS Church view -

Gordon B. Hinckley is Joseph's successor as Church President, therefore
Hinkley is currently the 'One Man'

Fundamentalist (AUB) view -

That John Woolley and not Heber J. Grant succeeded Joseph F. Smith as the 'One Man', that he was Joseph's successor as 'Priesthood President', and that the office is held today by Owen Allred

Possible Fundamentalist Arguments -

1. That Joseph Smith was Church President is incidental and was not a requirement for being the 'One Man', although they may have usually and ideally be the same

Joseph held a higher calling and office of being King & Priest and/or presiding over the Church of the Firstborn and Priesthood, and it was this that made him the 'One Man'

Joseph received the necessary authority, lived, taught and performed the principle of Celestial Plural Marriage because it was necessary to exaltation, his authority, and the authority of the Apostles and those who would succeed him.

Statements by early leaders referring to the President of the Church as presiding over keys are correct because the early Presidents of the Church also Presided over the Priesthood / Church of the Firstborn, and lived the higher laws.

2. That John Woolley was the 'One Man' after the death of Joseph F. Smith because -

He was ordained an Apostle by John Taylor in 1886, given the commission to keep Celestial (Plural) Marriage, and the authority to ordain others and eventually preside if necessary.

By virtue of the fact that he was the most senior Apostle still prepared to keep alive the principle he was the only one qualified to Preside after Joseph F. Smith's death

His Patriarchal Blessing (from Joseph Smith Sr.) prophesied him holding the keys of the Priesthood and being the Lord's anointed

Some believe he was specifically appointed by Joseph F. Smith prior to Smith's death

2b. Other possibilities -

Some say that a Patriarch held a higher office than Church President (Woolley had served as a Patriarch), and that their authority to seal was independent of the Church. Woolley could have been the most senior Patriarch qualified and willing to keep alive Celestial Plural Marriage.

I suppose it is also possible that Woolley was the most senior King & Priest in the Church of the First Born still prepared to keep alive Celestial Plural Marriage, or the most senior specifically commissioned to do so (and to set apart others to also).

That Woolley effectively did preside over the Church, although he (or the Lord) allowed Pres. Grant to function in that office for the sake of the general Church membership - who were not ready, worthy, or well studied enough to understand situation that may have not directly affected most of them (as they didn't want to live or believe in higher principles anyway).

That Joseph may remain the 'One Man', and that ultimately he must direct and approve such sealings (which is why he stepped in by appearing to John Taylor in 1886 and instructed him to set men apart to act on his behalf)

3. Reasons why Fundamentalists do not believe that President Grant/Hinkley is the 'One Man' -

He himself does not live the law that it is claimed he preside over. His predecessors had already disqualified themselves from having that authority to pass on by not living it themselves.

There are many other laws and ordinances which ended that were essential to exaltation, as well as many true doctrines that are now considered false, by sustaining this they have also disqualified themselves from holding such an office.

There are many prophecies that - because of changes in the Church - the Church Presidents are not now able to fulfill.

4. The results if President Grant/Hinkley were the 'One Man' -

No-one could live the laws necessary for their exaltation (it would necessitate a re-restoration to change this)

Many of the prophecies of many of the early prophets and apostles would have proved false.

The promised and revelations of God would have proven wrong.

In such a case we might as well discard the Church and its Prophets, as well as God as He would cease to be God (as He would if He lied as the Book of Mormon points out)

Conclusion -

Pres. Hinkley cannot be the 'One Man' - he is not qualified, neither was his predecessor (from the tenure of Heber J. Grant), his life, teachings and actions (as well as those of this predecessors after Joseph F. Smith) show he is not.

John W. Woolley is the only one in the right place at the right time, with the right qualifications, who fulfilled his role, and whose successors have - that successor today being Owen A. Allred

Background Info -

Scriptures dealing with differing roles of Priesthood & Church in scriptures and those who presided over them - Moses & Aaron, Alma & Mosiah, John the Baptist & Jesus, etc.

Keys given to Joseph in Kirtland Temple, 2nd Anointing to King & Priest, Church of Firstborn / Holy Order / Anointed Quorum

Difference between responsibilities and authority of those Apostles & others in 'Holy Order' and not.

Joseph appointing Hyrum Church president

Succession crisis regarding Sidney Rigdon & Brigham Young, reliance on authority & ordinances privately given.

'Apostolic' Interregnum following Joseph's death (and later that of Brigham, Taylor & Woodruff).

Joseph's revelations & statements on Celestial Plural Marriage - necessity to exaltation, Church, God's plans, wouldn't cease, prophecies of.

Relationship of Celestial Plural Marriage with Priesthood authority in Joseph's day.

Church policies on Plural Marriage in Joseph's day and his actions (and others) regarding it. A Priesthood law.

Warnings, prophecies and teachings regarding necessity of living and keeping alive of Celestial Plural Marriage.

John Taylor's revelation & background of necessity of living Celestial Plural Marriage to Preside.

*The 1886 Meeting, precedence for, prophecies of, historical credibility of, credibility of witnesses, other accounts & recollections. The meaning of the revelation.

Reasons for and interpretations of the Manifesto - esp. how Church leaders privately viewed and responded to it.

Post Manifesto polygamy by Woodruff, Joseph F. Smith and others - even after 1904. Difference between Church & Priesthood actions at that time.

Roles Cowley, J.W. Taylor, Woolley, Musser and others played. Scapegoats, etc.

Biographical background on Heber J. Grant, changes he implemented, prophecies further fulfilled.

Path of succession up to present day.

Fundamentalist position more consistent - no changing gospel, doctrines, ordinances, and laws. No changing requirements for exaltation. Prophecies fulfilled, no excuses, ambiguities on doctrine. No fear of results of study. Vindicated by scholars and historians many times (post-manifesto, 1886, etc.)