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The Effect of Mobs Upon the Majority: A Case Study of Illinois History

Anne Peterson
When Alexis De Tocqueville, in his essay *The Omnipotence of the Majority in the U.S. and its Effects* writes that “[T]here is no freedom of spirit in America,” (Tocqueville 257) he was in a sense repudiating America’s nationalistic creed. What happened to the Spirit of 1776? America was created with a good measure of pluck and inventiveness. How could a nation that was molded and shaped by the enterprising hands of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and James Madison fail to foster a respect for independent thought within its citizens when their government was rooted in equality and liberty—the two fundamental agents of democracy?

Ironically, both Tocqueville and Thomas Ford, Governor of Illinois from 1842-1846, argue that individualism and free thinking are not guaranteed by the Constitution even to the citizens who are bound to adhere to it, because of the inevitable strength and authority of majority opinion. From his observations of mob activity in Alton and Carthage, Illinois, Ford deduced that when “the general sentiment is in favor of martial law . . . these are fearful evidences of falling away from the true principles of liberty” (Ford 331). Both Tocqueville and Ford wrote that the tyranny of the majority exists when the judicious processes and outcomes that are based upon the Constitution are disregarded by the legislative branch of the government or by the citizens.

Ford and Tocqueville, however, cannot fully explain how minority groups such as the one led by Reverend Elijah Lovejoy persuaded the majority of citizens to advocate mob riots. Nor do they explain why Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the founders of the Mormon religion, were murdered by a mob that stormed their jail cells in the Carthage County Jail as they awaited trial. What their analysis lacks is the understanding that mobocracy, the primary factor which led to the deaths of Lovejoy and the Smiths, is not representative of majority opinion. I will argue that the majority is more latent; it does not export subverts the balances of justice in each constitu­tional law of the land, which will further en­courage. This isn’t to argue that Ford and Tocqueville add to the debate. As the site and substance of conflict changes, Tocqueville and Ford’s theory is more or less applicable. For example, they denounced the South’s exploitation of slave force. Had Lovejoy printed his abolitionist journal, he would not have met with the same rep­roach in Alton. The Smiths had built a Mormon temple to complete consensus on all issues. Their support from people outside of their sphere, namely Carthage.

Ford’s theory on how the tyranny of the majority is based on the lack of law enforcement and the politicians that are willing to stand up to people who support policies which may benefit or support policies which may contravene the interest group. They tug at the politicians’ strings, ren­ate or support policies which may contravene the interest group. County leaders incite the mob when they form cliques to control the city. Moreover, the checks and balances of power of justice to the point where people no longer voluntarily to the laws of the land. For the strength of democratic government is that the mass of the people do not need government to governs himself and, if need be, assists
De Tocqueville, in his essay *The Omnipotence of J.S. and its Effects* writes that “[T]here is no America,” (Tocqueville 257) he was in a sense America’s nationalistic creed. What happened to the 1.8. lind its Effects writes that “[T]here is no America,” (Tocqueville 257) he was in a sense America’s nationalistic creed. What happened to the federalism created with a good measure of pluck How could a nation that was molded and rising hands of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, fail to foster a respect for independent thought when their government was rooted in equality fundamental agents of democracy? Tocqueville and Thomas Ford, Governor -1846, argue that individualism and free thinking by the Constitution even to the citizens who to it, because of the inevitable strength and opinion. From his observations of mob activi­lage, Illinois, Ford deduced that when “the n favor of martial law . . . these are fearful evi­from the true principles of liberty” (Ford Tocqueville and Ford wrote that the tyranny of the the judicious processes and outcomes that are tion are disregarded by the legislative ment or by the citizens. queville, however, cannot fully explain how as the one led by Reverend Elijah Lovejoy y of citizens to advocate mob riots. Nor doph and Hyrum Smith, the founders of the re murdered by a mob that stormed their jail County Jail as they awaited trial. What their understanding that mobocracy, the primary fac­leaths of Lovejoy and the Smiths, is not repre­sentative of majority opinion. I will argue that the tyranny of the majority is more latent; it does not expose itself in violent forms: It subverts the balances of justice in each county through the constitutional law of the land, which will further its ends more than violence. This isn’t to argue that Ford and Toqueville have nothing to add to the debate. As the site and substance of majority/minority conflict changes, Tocqueville and Ford’s arguments can be made more or less applicable. For example, the North publicly denounced the South’s exploitation of slaves as their primary labor force. Had Lovejoy printed his abolitionist paper in the North, he would not have met with the same response as he encountered in Alton. The Smiths had built a Mormon community that shared a complete consensus on all issues. Their greatest obstacles came from people outside of their sphere, namely the people of Carthage.

Ford’s theory on how the tyranny of the majority thrives is based on the lack of law enforcement and intelligent, ethical politicians that are willing to stand up to prevent mobocracy. The politicians that are elected to serve the majority become the puppets to the interest groups and people who aided their election to office. They tug at the politicians’ strings, rendering them useless to initiate or support policies which may contradict the position of the interest group. County leaders incite the tyranny of the majority when they form cliques to control the eminent political offices. Moreover, the checks and balances of government slow the wheels of justice to the point where people no longer want to subscribe voluntarily to the laws of the land. Ford writes that the principal strength of democratic government is that “[I]n free countries . . . the mass of the people do not need government at all. Each man governs himself and, if need be, assists to govern his neighbor.
Religious principles and feelings incline to justice. Industry inclines to peace" (Ford 39). Mobocracy, therefore, would not be the authority of choice for a community which was founded on the peaceful principles of Locke and Jefferson.

Yet communities in Illinois, Ford argues, are centered around a set of governmental, social, and religious systems advocated by the majority. If a minority candidly and openly espouses a different paradigm of government, this is oftentimes perceived as a threat to the majority. Such beliefs can upset the natural balance of the majority and incite them to quell the minority’s message through unconstitutional laws or violence.

Some of Ford’s statements are echoed by Tocqueville. Tyranny of the majority, in Tocqueville’s estimation, coalesced around “the absolute sovereignty of the will of the majority” and is administered to the public via public opinion, the moral authority of the majority. Those who are a part of the majority believe that “there is more enlightenment and wisdom in a numerous assembly than in a single man” (Tocqueville 247) and consequently each individual, even if they are unabashedly dumb or prejudiced, is assessed to have an equal measure of idea and foresight as their neighbor. The advancement of the minority’s opinions, therefore, can easily be quelled by the majority’s control on government and public opinion, thus circumventing the development and natural progression of ideas and thoughts of the time.

Individuals cherish their equality more so than their liberty because it gives the common man a “host of small enjoyments” (Tocqueville 505) and it will endure forever, unlike liberty, which is easily lost and neglected. The omnipotence of the majority plies its craft upon the people in a subtle manner, “No longer does the master say ‘think like me or die.’ He does say: ‘You are free to not to think as I do; you can keep your life and property this day you are a stranger among us . . .’” The full potential of the majority’s authority exists in the weakly developed democratic state has in itself are “independent and weak.” In order to protect themselves, they must band together to pursue their own interests. However, when the love of equality starts to overpower people, they do not see their own destiny.

Perhaps that is why when Reverend Lovejoy, the minister who came to Alton to establish a school, could only perceive that he was exercising his freedom to consider the effects of his message in the town of Alton in Illinois. When the citizens of Alton threatened his love of equality, Lovejoy presumed that the people of Alton could only perceive that he was not an abolitionist and suspend slavery. Lovejoy, it is assumed, promised the inflammatory anti-slavery slant in the local newspaper. Lovejoy went back on his word, the people fully persuaded Lovejoy to return to his original beliefs would not budge, thus setting the stage for either tolerate one another or fight for their rights.

Men could not endure such an oversight of the state of mobs, all of which I would consider full of energy for this free country. But no language sufficient severity for the fanatic allure of mobs to violence, by their utter disregard for the peaceful community to a temporary commission of enormous crimes. Where Lovejoy went wrong, according to
and feelings incline to justice. Industry inclines to commerce, therefore, would not be the basis for a community which was founded on the principles of Locke and Jefferson. 

Mobocracy, therefore, would not be the basis for a community which was founded on the principles of Locke and Jefferson. The societies in Illinois, Ford argues, are centered on mental, social, and religious systems advocating the minority candidly and openly espouses a minority viewpoint. Such beliefs can upset the natural balance of society and can lead to violence. Such beliefs are often perceived as a threat to the majority viewpoint.

Tocqueville's statements are echoed by Ford. Government, in Tocqueville's estimation, coalesces around the will of the majority and is public via public opinion, the moral authority who are a part of the majority believe that their government and wisdom in a numerous assembly (Tocqueville 247) and consequently each member of the minority's opinions, therefore, are unabashedly dumb or prejudiced, is an institutional measure of idea and foresight as their acceptance of the minority's opinions, therefore, gives the majority's control on government and circumventing the development and natural order of the time.

Men could not endure such an outrage. I do not apologize for mobs, all of which I would crush forever in every part of this free country. But no language can be loaded with sufficient severity for the fanatical leaders, who, by their violence, by their utter disregard for honest prejudices drove a peaceful community to a temporary insanity and to the commission of enormous crimes. (Ford 23)

Where Lovejoy went wrong, according to Ford, is that his actions think as I do; you can keep your life and property and all; but from this day you are a stranger among us . . .”(Tocqueville 255). The full potential of the majority’s authority eluded America because the weakly developed democratic state has in turn created citizens who are “independent and weak.” In order to do anything for themselves, they must band together to pursue their self interests. However, when the love of equality starts to spread out among the people, they do not see their own destiny tied to their neighbors. Perhaps that is why when Reverend Lovejoy, a Presbyterian minister who came to Alton to establish a religious newspaper, could only perceive that he was exercising his rights and did not consider the effects of his message in the small town in southern Illinois. When the citizens of Alton threw his printing press in the river, Lovejoy presumed that the people of Alton had misconceived his intention, as he was not an abolitionist, but rather opposed to slavery. Lovejoy, it is assumed, promised that he would not continue the inflammatory anti-slavery slant in his newspaper. Yet when Lovejoy went back on his word, the people of Alton tried to peacefully persuade Lovejoy to return to his original promise. Lovejoy would not budge, thus setting the stage for two conflicting interests to either tolerate one another or fight for the viability of their rights.
threatened the established and accepted public opinion of the majority and in turn impelled the majority to stop Lovejoy’s expression of ethical disagreement with the majority’s established system of conducting their society. “In [this] case, as in every other where large bodies of the people are associated to accomplish with force an unlawful but popular object, [i.e. mobocracy] the government is powerless against such combinations” (Ford 42). It is difficult, however, to understand how a Reverend’s choice to publish an abolitionist paper, which was protected under the Constitution, drove law abiding citizens to “a temporary insanity and commission of enormous crimes” to accomplish their point. Ford appears to imply that it was the majority’s consensus that Lovejoy be killed in the heat of the moment.

Yet he continues to write that a public meeting was called to “peacefully persuade” Lovejoy to recant his abolitionist articles in his newspaper and that when the situation degenerated to the point that a mob was threatening the abolitionists who were stationed to protect their printing press, “armed men everywhere came rushing to the scene of action. Some were urging the mob and others sought to ally the tumult” (Ford 30). How then, can it be assumed that the mob’s actions were indicative of majority opinion? Although there was definitely not a consensus within the majority to implement violence against the Reverend, Ford still insists upon counting everyone at the scene as part of the anti-Lovejoy mob.

Moreover, Ford’s analysis of the event at Alton directly contradicts Tocqueville’s argument that the majority no longer has to murder the minority to uphold their interests and instead utilizes public opinion to civilly persuade the individual, as well as politicians, to pass laws that support the majority’s position. Perhaps then, the conclusion that should be drawn from the events at Alton is that the tyranny of the majority began Lovejoy’s press in the river, calling a public meeting to persuade Lovejoy to stop circulating his newspaper, and the community. Violence was not an option.

There is a very strong and logical case that the tool used to implement the majority’s will on the states, the individuals who comprise the change on a different issue. People believe in the minority and the majority when a myriad of issues only one, like the anti-slavery issue. If a minority precipitates in the slaughter of the minority over anyone ever survive as a member of any their individualism and self interests in absolutely contradict the position of the majority.

Yet people do continue to place in some issues. Because of this dilemma people know that it is better to manipulate the love for their interests to someday represent advocate and participate in violent measures to prevail. Although Ford and Tocqueville know that the majority does not have to control the minority the Lovejoy situation starkly shows how to submit to violent factions (yet another measure) a bullet and a torch deliver their meaning and caprice than the peaceful and persevering.

The death of Joseph and Hyrum demonstrate the need to analyze minority and different perspectives in order to show the flaws and contradictions in both Ford and Tocqueville’s arguments.
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The death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith in Carthage demon­
strate the need to analyze minority and majority conflict from dif­
ferent perspectives in order to show the strengths and deficiencies
of both Ford and Tocqueville’s argument. When the citizens of
Carthage asked Ford to send out the militia to assist with the expulsion of the Mormons, he adduced that the mayor, Joseph Smith, and the municipal court had acted in an illegal manner that was independent of the State government. Smith was accused of circumventing justice by discharging individuals accused of high crimes, condoning larceny and robbery, and denouncing the U.S. government as corrupt and claiming that it was to be replaced by the government of God. Despite all these accusations against the Mormon community,

The great cause of popular fury was that the Mormons at several preceding elections had cast their vote as a unit, thereby making the fact apparent that no one could aspire to the honors or offices of the country within the sphere of their influence without their approbation and votes. (Ford 173)

If Ford is assumed to be correct that this indeed was the bone of contention for the citizens of Carthage, the fact that the Mormons acted as a unit in governmental and religious matters allowed them to act as the majority in the small sphere of Carthage, Illinois. Hence Tocqueville is correct in describing how the majority uses the government to enact their policies. Although their government was unconstitutional and primarily the homespun of Joseph, every Mormon in the community subscribed to the same values. Ford goes on to say that the manner in which the Mormons voted was “unfortunate in practice” and was “a fruitful source of mobocracy” because the Mormons put their sense of peace in jeopardy by not voting to their individual preference.

It is true that the Mormons’ practices did incite the violence of a mob, but they did successfully establish a community that endorsed their politics and values, which is the goal of any majority.
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the Smiths were acquitted, and the Mormons lost their authority in Carthage. In the end the mob had accomplished their task, yet it proved to be a fruitless one since the majority of citizens had already called for a higher level of justice to supervise the proceedings, and with the help of Ford, would have resolved the situation to their liking without violence. There is a good chance, as well, that Smith would not have served as the martyr to the Mormon cause and propelled his newfangled religion to such exalted heights.

Lovejoy and Smith were not killed by majority opinion. It is to be sure that the citizens of Alton and Carthage did not want either of the ideas of these men to take root in their communities, but neither did they want their towns to be a place of violence and fear. Tocqueville and more importantly Ford correctly describe the sentiments of the majority and minority, but fail to articulate that mobs, although an offshoot of majority opinion, are in no way to be described as the preeminent will of the majority. The arbitrary and deadly power of mobs extends not only to minority groups that fall out of line with majority opinion, but also to the citizens of towns everywhere because they do not allow for the majority to successfully and civilly instill its authority upon the minority in question.
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