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The Power of Squares: Ideology in Landscape Archaeology and the Rectangular Land Survey of the United States of America

Owen O’Reilly

Abstract: The Rectangular Land Survey, which covers 69 percent of the United States continuously, was a system of federal land management that began in 1785 and continued into the early twentieth century. Straight, gridded patterns were stretched across the country in an attempt to make the consolidation and distribution of land by the United States government quick and easy. Using the Dominant Ideology Thesis, developed by Louis Althusser, and applied to landscape archaeology by Mark Leone, the rectangular land survey can be seen as an attempt by the government of the United States to control the lives of their citizens through the use of these straight lines. Whole communities were planned in grids, with each person on their own, isolated piece of land, serving to free up crowded cities but keeping the rural population separated and obedient. The survey was also used to dissolve title of lands held by Native American groups and to carve out reservation allotments that they would soon be expected to live their new, Americanized lives upon. This interpretation provides a unique and interesting take on an often forgotten or overlooked part of American history.

Introduction

A single landscape can be interpreted in a series of ways, depending upon the observer. Some see the beauty of nature, while others observe the tremendous work of mankind, while others see a vast array of wealth to be exploited (Menig 1979). Frederick Jackson Turner (1999 [1893]) saw landscape as ideology; standing hypothetically at the Cumberland Gap, Turner exquisitely conjured up an image of the linear progress of American
expansion across the landscape. As the European left his home in the east and entered the frontier, he was broken down by the primitive wilderness only to be rebuilt into a wholly new creation: an American. This process, Turner exclaimed, could be observed in each new, untamed area of the vast continent until every region had been conquered by man, and every man had been born anew.

To take Turner’s thesis at face value, it would lead one to believe that the majority of the United States was settled in a straight line. And as a matter of fact, this is exactly what happened, although it was more of a series of straight lines. This does not mean that Euro-Americans moved in a direct path from east to west or north to south, but rather their excursions into the interior of the country was determined by imaginary, straight lines. These lines, although invisible upon the physical surface, spread out across mountains and valleys, lakes and swamps, prairies and plains, and molded the ways humans interacted with the land and with each other (Carstensen 1968, 1988; Raban 1996:58). These lines, patterns and grids were laid out across the land by men who had never even ventured to see it and who did not know, or care, what it looked like or who lived there. They were the new elite; the winners of a war against the most power army in the world, and only nine years after they declared their independence from the oppressive, British empire, they went about mapping out an empire of their own.

Rhys Isaac (in Leone 1984:373) explains that in the US in the late eighteenth-century, there was a crisis among the planter-gentry of the wealthy, Chesapeake Bay states. The Revolutionary War, which had been fought for freedom and equality of all people, had put the delicate balance of power in jeopardy by making lower class and slave populations believe they deserved the same rights as those in the upper class. The upper and lower classes shared a common hatred of the British Crown, but once it was overthrown, the upper class, now the new dominant political entity, had to consolidate its own power, which differed from the British only in that it was local. Power was granted to the new elite class, Isaac argues, by creating a dominant ideology that could be fed to the lower classes to make them believe that their position at the bottom of the social order was necessary, inevitable and derived directly from nature.

Mark Leone’s (1984) influential work at the William Paca House in Annapolis, Maryland demonstrated how landscape was used by the new, American elites to express power and control. To expand on Leone’s use of ideology in landscape archaeology, these ideas will be applied to the management of US federal land in the late eighteenth- and mid-nineteenth centuries. It is the intent of this paper to show that the Land Ordinance of
1785, the Homestead Act of 1861 and the Dawes Act of 1887 are all ways in which the US government used ideology to shape the landscape and control the lives of their subjects. The archaeology of farms, residential houses, businesses, public institutions (Carstensen 1988) and Indian lands and reservations were all affected by these federal programs involving the distribution and segmenting of the American landscape. The object was to control and order the lives of the people settling on federal land, and therefore make them unaware of the low position they occupied in society so that they would continue to toil for the benefit of the government of the United States.

Methods and Materials

The subject of American ideology, especially in eighteenth century society, is drawn mainly from Mark Leone (1982, 1984, 2010), Leone and Paul Shackel (1987) and Randall McGuire (2006). Leone’s work is heavily influenced, firstly, by the writings of Karl Marx (1972), and secondly by the French philosophers Louis Althusser (1971) and Michel Foucault (1995). Marx and Marx and Engels (2008 [1848]) are crucial for laying the foundation for understanding class structure in a capitalist society. Althusser’s Dominant Ideology Thesis informs how class structures are maintained and Foucault’s idea of the “technologies of the self” attaches the significance of material culture to ideology. Literature on landscape archaeology comes from Deborah Rotman and Michael Nassaney (1997) and Nichole Branton (2009). Their work explores more generally the use of ideology in the interpretation of landscape management. A counter argument by Ian Hodder (in Beaudry et al. 1991) to Leone’s works has also been included to explore other interpretations of this case study. The examination of federal land management comes mainly from the work of Vernon Carstensen (1966, 1988) and Jonathan Raban (1996). The study of federal land management, as it relates to Native Americans, is informed by David Wishart (1994) and Gary Anders (1980).

A brief explanation of the meaning of ideology is necessary to the understanding of the ideas presented in this paper. Ideology, as explained by Leone (1984:372; 2010:53), commands and shapes those small, everyday things that are taken for granted, or taken as a given, by a society. Ideology controls the inevitabilities of daily human life and the way humans relate to each other. All the little things that people do everyday; like brushing one’s teeth, going to work from 9 to 5, eating meals at prescribed times, everything down to the watches worn on people’s wrists can be seen as part of the ideology of the dominant political entity. Normal, everyday behavior, which
may seem to be the choice of an individual’s free will, is really subject to the whims of the controlling power that guides and shapes and bends “free will.” This is done, most simply, by the segmenting of time. By breaking the day down into hours and minutes and seconds, and then filling those units with routine behaviors, like hourly work, people are controlled without ever even knowing it. A subject’s life becomes so structured, so controlled by the ticking clock, that to do anything besides obey it becomes foreign and dangerous.

Within these pieces of segmented time, actions and behaviors are further controlled by material objects. Forks and plates and knives guide the way one eats, how one eats, and who one eats with, while the clock tells them when to eat. This is just one example of the technologies of self (Foucault 1995)—the way material culture creates discipline among the subjects of a dominant ideology. When time and behavior is so rigidly controlled, breaking free and rebelling against the dominant power becomes less and less likely. Formality, created by these materials of discipline, is created at the top and passed down, and helps to justify the unequal distribution of wealth and the stratification of society (Leone 2010:94).

The reason for such nuanced, minute control is twofold: the control of behavior helps to hide the arbitrariness of the social order in which the subjects live and this helps the dominant ideology reproduce itself in its unchanging position of power. Marx defines each class by the relationship they have to the means of production (1972); those who control it are the dominant, upper class and those who labor under them are the subject, lower class. The middle class is essentially that: the middlemen, the managers and operators who stand between the laborers and the capitalists (McGuire and Walker 1999). They neither own the means of production nor labor for it, but rather, they supervise. The arbitrariness lies in the fact that there is no natural or biological difference between the capitalists and the laborers.

Popular eighteenth-century thought would have one believe that there was an inherent difference in the US between the capitalists (typically white, Anglo-Saxons) and the laborers (typically black slaves, the Irish, Eastern and Southern Europeans) but this is merely ideology at work. Distinctions of race and ethnicity become linked to distinctions in class and once these are made, it is the job of the dominant political power to make sure that they are held in place from one generation to another. This is called reproduction and it is the most essential part of ideology. The vast unfairness and inequality, inherent in the capitalist system, must be proliferated, believed and then replicated, by all parties involved. The upper class has to think they are superior just as the lower class has to believe that they are
inferior so that both may teach the generations after them to think the same way.

The question, then, is: how is it that such a grossly unequal system is maintained in society? Why does one group of people believe they are inferior to another? The genius of ideology is that its creators and maintainers work to make it seem both derived from nature and continuous from the past (Leone 1984). Natural history was all the rage in the late eighteenth century and ideology benefitted from this exploration of nature. Garry Willis (in Leone 2010:91) said about the famous eighteenth century naturalist Charles Wilson Peale that he, “brought the outside inside and sorted it out.” Leone (2010:91) argues that what happened in the eighteenth century was that the inside was instead brought outside and the common ideas of human society, material culture and class were projected onto the spheres and domains of nature. Once there, the inorganic creations of human society suddenly became organic because they were hidden in the mysterious folds of nature where no one could see their origins. Their origins were, of course, manmade, but were so successfully projected onto nature that when the subject class looked, all they saw was the way the natural world worked. Once the tenets of ideology were placed in nature by the ruling class and then discovered by them to be there, it made refuting such ideas that much harder (Leone 2010:91).

Similarly, when the present is made to look as if it is simply a continuum with the past, the order of things cannot be easily questioned. One way to create this continuum is through the use of law (Leone 1984) because the building of legal precedents makes it appear as if the rules that govern society are ancient and unchanging. Rhys Isaac points out (in Leone 1984:377) that early American law was based on an ad hoc mixture of new provincial codes and English law. The use of English law set precedents that were crucial for creating a continuum with the past because the laws drew on past cases and previous decisions to inform current matters of similar nature. If an old law, even one that had no bearing in the new world, can be drawn upon to make a new law seem valid, then it makes it very hard to question. Looking at the present as a continuation of the past also leads to ideas of universal time, in which disenfranchised people are led to believe that they have arrived in their meager position through natural order or divine law. Once these ideas of the inevitability of one’s position in society take form in thought, they are very hard to eradicate (Leone 1995:262). When this logic is believed, society reproduces itself intact (Leone 1984:375).

Since landscape archaeology was originally the domain of cultural geographers (in Rotman and Nassaney 1997:42; Branton 2009:58) it is only
fitting that this case study be viewed through the lens of this particular field. Landscape archaeology is defined as the study of an entire empire or a single dwelling and the interrelationships that occur on the land between place and people (Branton 2009:51). Nichole Branton (2009:52) writes that landscape archaeology studies the “...ability to signal and shape human behavior, the use to which humans actively put [objects on the landscapes] to signal and shape desired behavior... Places shape human activities by their physical construction and have their physical constructions shaped by human activities.” This interplay between environment and inhabitant is important because it suggests that the land itself controls human architecture and in turn, human architecture ends up altering the land on which it is placed.

As stated above, Leone’s (1984) piece on the William Paca House was the groundbreaking work that connected landscape archaeology and dominant ideology. Branton (2009:55) writes that “[p]ower is reflected in the landscape both through differential access to resources and the manipulation of the built environment to produce and naturalize the existing (or desired) ideology of the powerful.” Similarly, Deborah Rotman and Michael Nassaney (1997:42-3) explain how landscape archaeology deals with features that may serve to legitimize authority, influence settlement patterns, social organization and stratification. Since ideology can project ideas into the natural world, then the dominant political entity can surely be the architect of physical manifestations of ideology. The construction of monumental structures or even simple homes are all material ways to convey the message that ideology exists in a sphere that is beyond the reach of mankind and whose origins are unquestionable (Leone 2010:53).

While it is clear that the use of ideology to study landscape archaeology is a well-explored and valid form of analysis, there are those who disagree with this approach, especially that taken by Leone. Ian Hodder (in Beaudry et al. 1991:157) rejects Leone’s use of Althusser’s Dominant Ideology Thesis in regards to the study of landscape archaeology in that it “…denies subordinate groups the ability to formulate their own ideologies...” and essentially denies the existence of a working-class culture altogether (Beaudry et al. 1991:157). Similarly, Hodder suggests that all material culture, including landscape archaeology, can be interpreted differently depending both on who is viewing it and the particular historical context in which it is being viewed. I will address Hodder’s criticism of ideology in the interpretation of landscape archaeology in the Discussion section.
Results

The Land Ordinance of 1785 was signed into law by the United States Congress as an attempt to make money off the sale of land owned by the federal government. Under the Articles of Confederation, the government had no direct authority to tax the inhabitants of their country, so the sale of newly acquired lands was a way to raise revenue for the fledgling nation. The project, spearheaded by Thomas Jefferson, "...reflected both the rationalist, French Enlightenment temper of Jefferson's mind and his personal interest in the craft of surveying" (Raban 1996:58). The immediate goal was to divide land west of the Appalachian Mountains and north of the Ohio River, which had just come under ownership of the US government. The division of this land; now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, was ratified in 1787 under the Norwest Ordinance, but the ultimate and most important consequence of the Land Ordinance of 1785 was the enacting of the Rectangular Land Survey. This became the standard for the creation of towns all across the US: six-square-mile townships, each divided into thirty-six 160-acre plots, which were further divided into 40-acre, quarter sections for individual farms. As of today, 69 percent of land in the continental United States is covered continuously by the rectangular pattern crafted in 1785 and 9 percent is intermittently covered (Carstensen 1988:31). Jonathan Raban writes (1996:58), "On the slopes of mountains yet unseen, in valleys that were still the domain of unknown 'savages,' gridded townships awaited the arrival of explorers like Lewis and Clark...In Jefferson's scheme of things, the townships were out there, in the unknown world, as Platonic entities."

Other than the Northwest Ordinance, exactly what land the government owned after the Revolutionary War was somewhat vague. States like Virginia claimed the right to expansive amounts of land west of the Appalachians, so bringing all land west of the mountain range under the Rectangular Survey was heavily supported by those states, like Maryland, which did not have any claim to land beyond the mountains (Carstensen 1988:33). This attempted consolidation of power by the federal government over individual states reflects the ideas of Rhys Isaac (in Leone 1984:373), who claimed that the planter-gentry desperately tried to maintain power after the Revolutionary War. The Rectangular Survey was an attempt to bring as much land as possible under the control of the US government and to then impose their ideology onto it. Therefore, the vast, untamed American wilderness (Leone 1984:375-6) was thus evenly segmented, controlled and distributed to the population. The Homestead Act of 1861 labeled the newly subdivided sections of land "free," and offered plots to any man (and later
woman) who could prove it up, or make the land a working, profitable farm, in five years. The “free” land was seen as a safety valve (Turner 1999 [1893]): the chance to escape crowded, nineteenth-century cities and become a landowner. However, the freedom provided by this new land was an illusion and just part of the dominant ideology.

The powerful, imaginary patterns placed on the land by the Rectangular Survey influenced the way in which humans were allowed to shape their homes and farms. Vernon Carstensen, a scholar of early American land management, writes that “[t]he patterns imposed on the American land by the rectangular survey influenced enormously the economic, political and social lives of the people who came to make their farms, villages and cities on a land marked out in squares of townships and sections” (1988:31). Much like the dominant political ideology “…the ideas and values that controlled [the distribution and management of federal land] lay partly in the American Colonial past, partly in legal and other institutions imported from England and the [European] Continent” (Carstensen 1968:xiii). The boundaries of town and farm plots molded and manipulated the way the land’s new tenants could build their properties. Access to roads was important to farmers because it meant getting their products to market or to the grain elevators on the railroad tracks. The square plots allowed for road access on two sides of each quarter-section and farms houses and barns had to be placed accordingly. Similarly, the square plot encouraged the straight line tillage system seen in farms all over the country today, thus ensuring the uniformity of all American farm properties (Carstensen 1988:36-7). These imaginary lines became accepted as real because they marked property boundaries and men and women built their farms, and their lives, accordingly.

The idea of “free” land was also part of the overall ideology of the US federal land system. Its direct benefit to the government was threefold: reduce the crowding in the overpopulated cities, expand the wheat belt to help supply much needed food for the growing American population and to finance the construction of the railroads (Raban 1996:182-83). Land surrounding railroad tracks, often the best pieces in terms of proximity to transportation, were granted to the railroad companies to help pay for the cost of laying track. The railroad companies took out ads in newspapers in eastern cities in the US and in parts of Europe, grossly exaggerating the potential of the western American soils (Raban 1996:34-5). Other parcels of land were often bought up by speculators who would then sell them to homesteaders at inflated prices. When land was actually obtained for free, farmers were encouraged by banks to purchase the newest, most expensive farming
technologies, like tractors and combines, to modernize their farms and increase their output (Raban 1996:191). Most homesteaders, having no capital of their own, were forced to borrow from the banks at inflated interest rates, meaning that they would be paying off the investments for their "free" land twenty years after they had received its title. This can all be seen as a systematic process by the government to keep people tied to a segmented, individual piece of land. And if they went broke and had to sell or abandon, the bank or government would foreclose on the property and repeat the process with a new homesteader.

The Rectangular Survey also greatly affected another group of Americans, namely, the Native Americans who lived on the land that was to be surveyed. Although the staking of surveyed lands did not end in some places until the 1920s, the idea of the gridded lines already existed in the mind of the dominant political ideology after the signing of the Land Ordinance in 1785 (Raban 1996:58). Nichole Branton writes that landscape “[b]oundaries may be physical or ideational but must originate in the social context and must have emic utility. They must be spatial, but not necessarily ‘real’” (2009:53). Even though most Native Americans did not even know about the enacting of the Land Ordinance, it had begun to shape their lives in ways they could have never imagined. Although the Land Ordinance called for Indian title of the land to be extinguished before it could be purchased and squared off by the federal government, a legal precedent was set that made this step unnecessary. The Supreme Court case of Johnson v. M'Intosh in 1823 made Indian title irrelevant. Chief Justice John Marshall claimed that title to the newly discovered lands lay with the government whose subjects discovered it, not with the Indians. Although Native Americans were acknowledged as legal occupants, they were ruled to have lost their title due to the rights of conquest (Miller 2008:9, 50). This is also known as the Doctrine of Discovery, which Carstensen writes, “… establishing land…rest[ing] on the English and European assumption that discovery or settlement gave possession. These rights could be established, if not enforced, by ceremonial acts or loud proclamations” (1968:xiv). Through legal precedent, the US government erased any right Native Americans had to the land by using laws that did not exist for, and did not apply to, the original occupants.

Although the majority of Native American lands were surveyed for Euro-American settlers, under the Dawes, or General Allotment, Act of 1887, all Indian reservation land was to be surveyed into the standard, square plots as well. The idea was to transform the Indian through their use of, and access to, the land. The plan for the majority of indigenous Americans was to turn
them into the Jeffersonian ideal: yeoman farmers. Although ideas of Indian inferiority abounded throughout the eighteenth- and nineteenth centuries, it was the belief of many in the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the “civilization” process of teaching Native Americans the Western method of farming was within their grasp (Hoxie 1984:193-4, 196, 201-2; Coleman 1993:46-47; Reyhner and Eder 2004:68). This meant that federal officials would have to “wean [the Indians] from his favorite pursuit [hunting] and thereby prepare his mind to encounter the laborious duties of domestic life” (Wishart 1994:57).

The instruction of Western farming was a major part of Native American “civilization.” The fact that many Native American groups were already farmers did not lessen the intensity of their forced assimilation. Gardens of the Pawnee Indians of Nebraska were grown collectively by villagers along the banks of rivers. Squash, beans and corn were grown in a polyculture, meaning all of the vegetables were grown together in the same mound, essentially intertwined. This contrasted to the Western form of farming, which emphasized one crop per plot, mainly wheat or corn, grown on individual lots. Western knowledge about farming and agriculture was an attempt to establish their ideological dominance over Native Americans through the use of almanacs, new farming technologies and a supposed understanding of crops. Since most Native Americans had no written language, they could not keep systematic observations or record tables and charts regarding weather patterns and past plant growth, all of which are essential to the dominant ideology to create a seemingly continuous flow from past to present (Leone 1984:376). Pawnee Agent Lewellyn E. Woodin wrote about the new farming system:

Believing that a complete disruption of the village system, and the locating of families upon lands suitable for agricultural purposes will do more probably to cultivate self-reliance and individuality among these people, as well as to eventually break up the power of the chiefs...I shall exert all possible influence in this direction. [1882:78]

Not only did this new system establish a dominant ideology to control daily economics, it was also meant to tear apart the fabric of daily, social life.

Reservations were designed to confine Indians; allotments were further designed to make all of their property private. The idea was to break large reservations into individual farms, just like for white settlers, and distribute the standard quarter-section farms to families Once all families were settled on their own farms, whatever land remained was to be sold to white settlers,
businesses or anyone else who had the money to purchase it. This was designed to dismantle the traditional style of community living where most homes in a village were arranged in a circular fashion. Placing individuals on their own, private farms removed them from communal groups and limited the chance of rebellion. Isolation assists ideology in keeping order and preventing any attack on the established power through physical and emotional separation (Leone 1984:374). In this sense, reservations were entirely temporary arrangements; they were never meant to be permanent because this would have meant an enormous “waste” of land that could be distributed to white settlers (Wishart 1994). The current existence of federal Indian reservations across the country means that in these places, ideology failed. Since ideology reproduces instead of transforming society, it is the opposite of praxis, which is defined as the way in which humans transform the society in which they live (in McGuire 2006:129). Today, reservations can therefore be seen as a form of praxis because even though Native Americans were forced onto them, they managed to hold onto the land despite a push from the government to eventually incorporate all reservation land into the federal system.

Discussion

This case study is incredibly expansive and complex and some would most likely argue that the Dominant Ideology Thesis (Althusser 1971) should not be applied so broadly to a host of government programs that spanned over a century. It certainly was the case that the Rectangular Land Survey was the cheapest, simplest option presented at the time (Carstensen 1968:xvi). There is question of how federal land distribution, not to mention what constituted federal land, would have been complex and costly, and the land survey system created a systematic way to square off the available land in a uniform, orderly manner. Carstensen (1988:31) writes, “...once they fixed upon the rectangular survey, [they] were inflexible in their devotion to the idea,” suggesting that all the social, economic and political outcomes of the plan were understood from the beginning. It was probably impossible to tell at the time what kind of impact the straight lines would have had on the development of the American interior, but certainly what was desired was an orderly, methodical placement of people and farms.

Hodder’s argument (in Beaudry et al. 1991:157) raises many excellent points about the relationship between the dominant ideology and the subaltern population. To assume that Leone’s interpretation of material culture is correct, the ideology and culture of the subordinate population has to be completely overlooked. Hodder writes the Leone’s theory “…implies a
degree of social control on the part of the elites that makes it particularly unsuitable as a model for class relationships in developed, industrialized societies—even less so in pre-industrial societies...in an economic system characterized by barter rather than exchange of cash” (Beaudry et al. 1991:157). While his argument is valid, in the case of the archaeology of federal land management, the application of Hodder’s argument does not hold up. The power of the US government to survey and distribute land was expansive and the predrawn property lines meant that settlers had to build their homes, grow their crops and live their lives at the behest of the moneylenders and providers of transportation. The capitalist system they lived in, which promised great wealth with hard work and sacrifice, came with more tangible conditions, like where a house could be placed so it had access to the road and how much needed to be spent on equipment and fertilizer to produce enough bushels to make a profit.

For Native Americans, who largely exploited by the US market system (i.e. the fur trade), the effects of ideology were even stronger. Traditional economic bases were depleted, as American Indians were encouraged to participate in capitalism by procuring finite resources, like furs and pelts, and were often rewarded only in whiskey (Jordan 2009:36). Resources continued to be drained from native lands for use in American cities while Indians were offered little in return to either sustain their old way of life or help them enter into the new market system (in Anders 1980:690). Most of what they were given, including whiskey and guns, helped tear down the traditional social fabric of their lives and creating enhanced competition between tribes.

Foreign codes and laws were applied to native lands (in Anders 1980:688) and legal recourse had to be sought in American courts, which had little understanding or sympathy for traditional ways of life. Chiefs signed treaties and sold land, accepting the terms of the contracts, which they could not read, in exchange for money, a concept still foreign to many groups in the mid- to late nineteenth century. Many Native Americans traveled to Washington D.C. and took to calling the US president their “Great Father,” which seems to suggest that they were subjects of the American government and people. Although Native Americans clearly had, and continued to retain their own culture, the ideology of the US government was an incredibly powerful force, and along with the military strength of the country, it completely changed their way of life.

Conclusion

The use of Louis Althusser’s Dominant Ideology Thesis is just one interpretation of the landscape archaeology of the Rectangular Land Survey.
of the United States. The ideas presented by Leone, McGuire and Foucault fit well with this interpretation. The case study uses popular, academic theory to interpret the settlement of the interior of the United States, although there are many other contexts that this historical event can be viewed from, and it would be interesting to see what other academic interpretations could be made.

The allure of “free” land was the most intoxicating gift the New World had to offer, but this land quickly became so segmented and controlled by the dominant power that it lost all pioneer-like notions that were popularly ascribed to it. The rectangular survey can be seen through this interpretation as a way for the dominant political entity to control the vast interior of the United States; one that was full of native people that were quickly being replaced by foreign people. By subdividing the land, controlling how people could construct houses and farms and isolating them on individual plots of land, the citizens of the United States became part of the dominant ideology. They toiled and labored for their country, all happily believing that they were living the ideal, American dream. The dream, however, was created for them, and through their toil they helped to reproduce society as it was; as the dominant ideology wanted it to be.
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