

Written for this Paper.  
**MOBBING IN WEST VIRGINIA.**

BEVERLY, Randolph Co.,  
 W. Va., April 23, 1896.

The Pennsylvania conference of the Northern States mission convened at the Lee Belle school house on Becca's creek, Randolph Co., W. Va., at 10 o'clock of the morning of the 18th of April. J. R. Clark, president of the mission, Cornelius Richardson, president of the conference, and all the Elders who are laboring in the conference, also six who had just arrived from Utah, were present.

Meeting was called to order by Elder Richardson. Elders Broderick and Bindrup addressed the congregation on the principles of faith and repentance, and produced some sound reasoning that none but the prejudiced could reject.

The speakers at the afternoon meeting were Elders Wm. Hill, Heber Balis, and a local Elder by the name of J. C. Morgan. Elder Hill occupied most of the time in a plain but powerful argument on the great subject of baptism. The Spirit of the Lord rested in rich abundance upon all the speakers.

A session was also held in the evening. Elder Joseph M. Green delivered a very able discourse on divine authority, and was listened to by a house full of attentive listeners. The speaker's effort was a fine one.

On Sunday, after the usual exercises of the morning, Elder A. J. Allen occupied the time in a very able and convincing discourse, his subject being the apostasy. The speaker's remarks were backed up by many quotations from holy writ. He had the attention of his audience throughout.

At 2 p. m. meeting was called to order again and Elder R. A. Perkes delivered a very able discourse on the divine mission of the Prophet Joseph Smith, or was Joseph Smith sent of God? The speaker produced some fine reasoning and held his audience spell bound to the close of his masterly effort.

Monday morning, conference commenced again at 10 o'clock. The attendance was small but the good spirit was present and rested upon all, and especially upon the speakers. The sermons were short, the speakers being Elders J. C. Allen, J. R. Crawford, E. Tanner, J. Y. Barlow, G. W. Parish, J. N. Morris, H. T. Robertson and A. M. Brown. The testimonies were strong and powerful.

Monday afternoon meeting was addressed by Elder Holbrook, who made a brief but pointed address on the first principles of the Gospel and manifested a zeal that was not without knowledge. He was followed by the brethren who have been members of the Church for a short time; each of them bearing a faithful testimony. Elder J. R. Clark occupied the rest of the time in a plain and pointed discourse on the duties of Saints and how we should live if we expected to gain the salvation promised to the righteous. He read from Matthew 7; 13, 14. The spirit of the Lord rested richly upon the speaker; in his closing remarks he invoked the blessings of the Lord to rest upon all who had so kindly entertained the Elders and that none such should go without their reward, and asked for the

Lord's mercy upon those who had been unkind.

At 7:30 p. m. we again assembled and had the pleasure of listening to a fine discourse by Elder Richardson on the resurrection. He read from the 20th chapter of Revelations, and although he was suffering from hoarseness that is so common in this damp climate, he was enabled to make this beautiful subject very plain notwithstanding the influence of the infernal regions that was plainly felt by all the Elders that long to be remembered night. After singing, Elder Clark pronounced the benediction, and the congregation passed out of the house.

We had not gone very far before missiles began to fly around our heads, and we were treated to a shower of rocks and eggs, accompanied with pistol shots, and shouts and oaths filled the air. Then we could account for the depressed influence that hovered over us during our evening meeting. We afterwards learned that these people had contemplated breaking up our meeting, but the power of the priesthood was too strong for them. They shrank back in the brush and like the crouching hyena awaited their chance to pounce upon their unsuspecting prey. Thanks and praise to Almighty God no one was hurt.

We went to our lodging places and before retiring for the night bowed down and thanked the Lord for the good time that we had during our conference, and that we had been permitted to hold all our meetings in peace and that no one had been injured. We implored the mercy of the Lord upon our persecutors, and thanked Him that we were worthy of a little persecution for His sake.

On Tuesday morning we all met at the residence of Brother Ellaba McClouds, and held our Priesthood meeting. We fasted and had a grand time, breaking our fast by partaking of the Sacrament. After the Elders had been assigned to their fields of labor, Elders Richardson and Clark gave the Elders some excellent advice; President Clark pronounced a blessing upon the Elders and the benediction. Thus closed another conference.

Elders Heber Balis, R. A. Perkes and Charles Morris were honorably released to return home. They have filled honorable missions, and may the choicest blessing of heaven follow them through life.

Following are the names of Elders and the fields which they have been assigned to labor in.

**PENNSYLVANIA CONFERENCE.**

President, Cornelius Richardson, Cumberland, Maryland.

Cyrus Neff and George W. Parrish, Hampshire county, W. Va.

Wm. Holbrook and Thomas Britton, Hardy county, W. Va.

A. J. Allen and Peter Gillespie, Grant county, W. Va.

A. J. Broderick and Joseph Hansen, Pendleton county, W. Va.

J. Y. Barlow and H. T. Robertson, Preston and Tucker counties, W. Va.

J. C. Allen and Joseph Bindrup, Lewis and Upshur counties, W. Va.

Wm. Hill and Austin M. Brown, Wetzel and Marion counties, W. Va.

Joseph M. Green and Ebenezer Tanner, Fulton county, Pa. and Allegheny county, Md.

J. R. Crawford and J. N. Morris, La Belle, Randolph county, W. Va.

A number of the Elders will open up new fields and their postoffice address cannot be given at present. The Elders are in good health and are leaving for their fields of labor in fine spirits. I called on the editor of the Enterprise this morning asking permission to have a few facts published in relation to our conference and the attempted mobbing, but he would not grant it. Yours respectfully,

JOSHUA R. CLARK.

**MORE OF THAT MANIFESTO.**

TUCSON, Arizona, April 22, 1896.

Since the so-called "manifesto" was promulgated at the last Conference, I see with much surprise that some Utah newspapers oppose it, even some nominally Mormon. It would not be strange that non-Mormons should be hostile to it, as they do not understand the spirit of Mormonism; but that any who claim brotherhood in the Church should do so, is strange indeed. From newspaper editorials it appears that to them, the "manifesto" is opposed to individual liberty of action in politics; that the Church does seek to govern in political as in ecclesiastical affairs; and prohibits men who hold leading official positions in the "Church" from "accepting any other position, political or otherwise, which would interfere with the proper and complete discharge of ecclesiastical duties" without first consulting the proper authorities, to ascertain if, in their opinion, one may do so without detriment to the office he already holds.

This principle is eminently just and proper. Would it be wise or profitable to the public good for a man who already holds some leading position in the Church to accept another office, the duties of which would prevent him from fulfilling those of his present office or calling? Manifestly—no. And if there be a doubt as to whether such new office would conflict with the other, would it not be eminently wise and proper to consult with his fellow laborers? It is an old and a true adage that "in counsel there is safety." Humanity is not omniscient, but liable to err—no one sees a subject from every point of view. One sees one side, another sees another, and a third sees still another. By comparing these various views a more just and impartial judgment may be formed, as a general rule than from any one person's opinion. Hence, if there be any doubt, "there is safety in counsel."

In many Church offices or callings, political office would not conflict in any marked degree, and in such cases the principles of the "manifesto" would not affect the incumbent of such Church officer or trouble him at all.

But if a man desires another office which would conflict with the one he already holds, what shall he do? If he is between two stools and can sit on only one of them, which shall be chosen? Evidently the one which suits him best. So with the matter now in consideration; if a man values most his position in the Church, let him keep it; if a secular office is more attractive, let him take it and resign the other. I here refer to positions which plainly conflict. In this there is no compulsion, it is simply a matter of choice for the person concerned.