counterbalance the global influx of American culture and encourages the United States to reevaluate its priorities and acknowledge that not one culture should dominate them all. In contrast, Legrain claims globalization is positive force that increases rather than diminishes the diversity within societies. He offers examples of different ways other countries have influenced American culture, portraying globalization as a two-way street instead of a global American cultural takeover. He rejects the notion that diversity is a fixed quality, which can only be preserved, and argues that diversity should be allowed to change over time. Moreover, he claims that this evolving diversity is giving birth to new cross cultures that are breaking from larger national monocultures.

Galeota lists the use of three different devices by which she argues America acculturates other cultures: marketing, the media and information industries, and the Internet. Galeota describes three marketing strategies corporate America has developed to maximize the global market. First, marketers irrevocably tie American products to modernity. According to Galeota, this generates an international mass desire for the same American products. Secondly, marketers create the illusion that American products encapsulate diversity by making light of the multi-ethnic immigrant roots of America that account for almost every culture in the world. Galeota argues this ploy is meant to convince global consumers that American products rise above national differences and represent a unified world. Thirdly, she suggests marketers incorporate recognizable features of local cultures into American products: "America essentially samples the world's cultures, repackages them with an American trademark of materialism, and resells them to the world" (34).

In addition to the marketing strategies utilized by corporate America to acculturate the world, Galeota asserts the media and information industries present a unipolar view of the news, which largely depicts the United States as an economic and military superpower. She suggests this unbalanced practice only further advances the indoctrination of American exceptionalism. Lastly, Galeota emphasizes the Internet as simply another channel in which people can access everything American, thereby accelerating the assimilation process. Since Galeota views the influence of American culture abroad as an imperialistic force, she offers alternative protectionist methods, such as zoning, that can counterbalance America's disproportionate claim on the global community. She calls for social activism among the non-democratic nations who are unable to elect their own leadership. Finally, Galeota encourages Capitol Hill and corporate America to reevaluate American exceptionalism, arguing the United States must acknowledge that no one culture should rule them all.

Philippe Legrain presents several different claims about globalization. First, he argues that globalization does not equal American domination, claiming instead that globalization is sparking a wealth of positive cultural change. As examples, he illustrates the breadth of ideas that come out of great multi-ethnic cosmopolitan cities like New York, and touts the multi-racial soccer team that was France when

they won the World Cup.

Secondly, he claims globalization is liberating people around the world from their geographical shackles by exposing them to new ideas, food, music, and experiences. He suggests globalization also energizes existing cultures and their local goods by providing larger markets, exposing more customers to the craftsmanship of cultures worldwide. He also provides evidence for why he claims global American acculturation is exaggerated. He writes, "Coke accounts for less than two of the 64 fluid ounces that a typical person drinks a day. France imported a mere $620 million in food from the United States in 2000, while exporting to America three times that. Worldwide pizzas are more popular than burgers and Chinese restaurants pop up everywhere" (39). He also uses MTV as an example that when American products are in fact consumed, they are much more ethnically influenced than meets the eye. Legrain states that in China for instance, mainstream songs are sung in Mandarin by local Asian musicians. Legrain also finds examples to indicate how, in some aspects, America and its culture are outliers in the world arena. He includes the rejection of American football in other countries and America's refusal to adopt the use of the metric system, as main instances of these deviancies.

Legrain then shifts his argument to examine the ways American culture is being shaped by outside global forces. He writes, "Since 1990, the number of foreign-born American residents has risen by 6 million to just over 25 million, the biggest immigration wave since the turn of the 20th century. English may be all-conquering outside of America, but in some parts of the United States, it is now second to Spanish" (41). Overall Legrain argues that globalization and acculturation are two-way streets that are generally non-zero-sum games.

When evaluating the essays written by both Legrain and Galeota, there are certain claims that stand out and merit a closer assessment. Throughout Galeota's essay, she makes various value claims worth exploring. She writes, "Contrary to Rothkopf's (and George W. Bush's) belief that, 'Good and evil, better and worse coexist in this world,' there are no such absolutes in this world" (36). This claim by itself is valid; however, it proves problematic when Galeota herself uses an absolute to support her argument. When discussing alternative measures to combat American imperialism, she states, "Thomas Friedman advocated the use of protective legislation such as zoning laws and protected area laws, as well as the appointment of politicians with cultural integrity, such as those in agricultural, culturally pure Southern France" (36). If Galeota claims that absolutes such as better or worse cannot exist, than how can she claim the existence of *purity*? She proceeds to use the absolute when she writes, "If it is utterly impossible to maintain the cultural purity of a country through legislation…" (36). She also demonstrates this kind of inconsistency with her choice of words when she refers to other cultures exposed to American culture, as *victims*. She writes, "Fortunately, many victims of American cultural imperialism aren't blind to the subversion of their cultures" (36). The use of the word *victim* has a negative connotation to it