and implies a wrong doing against someone. However, if absolutes such as good and evil, better or worse, do not exist, then there can be no victims. Moreover, by implying that American culture is capable of creating cultural victims, one could conclude Galeota also believes other cultures are better than, or "superior" to, American culture. This rather consistent internal contradiction weakens the overall logical consistency of her essay.

Galeota also makes a value claim about humanity as a whole when she states, "It is a fundamental right of humanity to be allowed to preserve the mental, physical, intellectual, and creative aspects of one's own society" (35). This declaration is left unsupported and therefore remains only opinion, an ostensible opinion, but an unsupported one nonetheless. The claim itself is noble in intention although it has contradictory elements. Galeota's assertion of humanity is stated as a natural right. According to the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, "Natural rights are those rights which we are supposed to have as human beings before ever government comes into being." Her declaration also implies the notion of popular sovereignty. According to Dr. Donald S. Lutz, a political science professor at the University of Houston, Texas, "To speak of popular sovereignty is to place ultimate authority in the people" (38). This is precisely what Galeota must assume when she declares the people have the right to their own society, since only with the notion of popular sovereignty can there be no higher authority, or culture, to revoke that right. These democratic ideals at the core of Galeota's declaration become important, as her entire essay is centered on the rejection of her definition of cultural imperialism. In her essay she writes, "This proliferation of American products across the globe is more than a mere accident. As a byproduct of globalization, it is part of a larger trend in the conscious dissemination of American attitudes and values that is often referred to as cultural imperialism." She continues by saying, "Thus, cultural imperialism involves much more than simple consumer goods; it involves the dissemination of ostensibly American principles such as freedom and democracy" (32). It follows then, that Galeota encourages cultures to dissent and reject American imperialism, which includes freedom and democracy, on the principle that humans have certain natural rights, which is a claim made legitimate only through democracy. In other words, Galeota urges other cultures to use the principles of democracy to dissent from democracy. According to Max Kölbel, an ICREA research professor at the University of Barcelona, "The general idea of self-refutation seems to be that a claim is self-refuting if it can in some way be turned against itself." This obvious fallacious argument of self-refutation only further weakens the logical consistency of Galeota's argument as a whole.

Even while disregarding the logical fallacies embedded in Galeota's argument there is still the problematic issue of reductionism. Galeota writes, "It is also equally important to focus on the education of youth in their native values and traditions" (36). This statement begs the question of what constitutes native tradition. This only becomes problematic due to Galeota's view of culture. Earlier she made reference to maintaining "the cultural purity of a country" (36). The

notion that a culture can be "pure" implies that it exists untainted by external influences beyond itself. It follows then, that a culture in order to maintain its purity, must be preserved and protected from outside influence. However, this view of culture contradicts the way people and cultures have traditionally existed. Historically speaking, most people and cultures have been continually in flux. Language, food, and music all have developed and changed with time. According to *Food in the Arts*, Catherine de Médicis of Italy, a descendant of Lorenzo the Magnificent, married king Henry II in the 16th century and brought with her to France an entourage of chefs and revolutionized French cuisine. In light of this history, did "agriculturally pure southern France" (36) come before or after the arrival and foreign influence of Italy's Catherine de Médicis? The tomato originated in South America, although one does not see the top crust of the Italian culinary elite storming the streets in protest with their wood spoons, demanding a return to a "Pre-tomato Italy." Certainly the tomato, with its origins in the indigenous New World, could not possibly be part of "pure" Italian culture. While we are putting the notion of cultural purity through the historical meat grinder, one should note that both the French and Italian languages amount to nothing but the "vulgarizations" of the "pure" Latin language. This process can be continued all the way back to the primordial cell. The problem of reductionism only comes about from the failure of Galeota to accept culture as a living entity that is subject to change based on influences beyond its people. As a whole, while the idea of American cultural imperialism is still likely, Galeota's attempted argument is not a valid, let alone sound argument, due to the various internal inconsistencies present.

In Philippe Legrain's essay "In Defense of Globalization", while he may give more valid statistical support for his argument as a whole, he also makes a logically vulnerable value claim that is worth discussing. He states, "more generally, Western ideas are reshaping the way people view themselves and the world" (41). He uses slavery as an example to showcase this transformation and claims that slavery is virtually extinct. This is certainly and unfortunately not the case. According to Doctors at war.org, human trafficking is the fasting growing and second largest criminal enterprise in the world. Twenty-seven million people are trapped in slavery at this moment. According to Corydon Ireland of the *Harvard Gazette*, there are more than 1.3 million enslaved prostitutes that provide the labor force for much of the world's sex trade. Globalization is propelling this industry forward as modern transportation and communication make it faster and easier than ever to sell and transport bodies from country to country. According to Sue Loughlin from the *Tribune-Star* online, human trafficking generates 32 billion dollars annually in profits. That profit, according to istockanalyst.com, is more than the McDonald's Corporation, which has nearly 33,000 restaurants in operation worldwide, made in 2010. The financial incentive propelling this criminal industry is just one of the many obstacles that make it very difficult to combat this modern globalized form of slavery. This misinformed claim severely weakens Legrain's credibility, as it becomes clear he either dismissed this form of slav-