

The effects of globalization on tribal peoples often come with many unforeseen negative effects. In *Prices of Progress* by John Bodley, economic development that is perpetuated by outside influence often results in disease that stems from dietary change. Tribal peoples who have long eaten traditional meals, usually deemed unpalatable by outsiders, are accustomed to that particular intake of nutrients. Replacing these foods with imported sugary or salty foods leads to substantial increases in the rates of heart disease, high blood pressure, and diabetes. Disturbing the existing order, even with well-meaning dietary changes has failed in certain cases such as milk distribution programs in areas of Southeast Asia where people through evolutionary changes no longer have the enzymes required to digest milk properly. Economic development in particular hurts tribal peoples because it shifts their focus from subsistence farming to cash cropping, such that they can earn money to participate in newly created economies. This exasperates the problems related to dietary change because these people often shift their palate to nutritionally inferior processed foods, systematically forcing harmful dietary change.

In the United States, dietary habits have largely been influenced by corporations who exist to maximize profit. Outside corporations involved in the supply chain of food have power to change dietary habits by choosing to change formulations or genetically engineering changes. These effects appear to have similar negative consequences on people, typically disease, however typically take longer to manifest themselves.

Modern industrial economies put the power and control of resources into the hands of corporations and government, whereas tribal systems place the control of resources entirely into the hands of the people. Tribal systems use a barter economy to obtain resources, while industrial economies use fiat currency. Traditional groups benefit the most from resisting outside influence

and sticking to what has been successful for them for many years. As we've seen with the move to cash cropping, traditional groups shift their focus onto crops that can earn them fiat money and not sustenance. This results in the elements of their traditional foods disappearing in favor of imported goods that can be bought with their newly acquired fiat. This is an unfortunate outcome of globalization, and without making these sacrifices it is difficult for tribal groups to participate in the global economy.

In *Life at the Roof of the World* by Michael Finkel, the nomadic people native to Afghanistan known as the Kyrgyz live in a valley known as the Wakhan corridor. This area of extreme isolation has led to a remarkable preservation of culture, but also presented many difficulties which are not present in modern, well connected societies. Due to a lack of doctors and medicines, the child mortality rate is incredibly high. Many parents lose several children and women often die while giving birth. The Kyrgyz people and their leader known as the khan hope to have a road built in their area. A road, along with cars, would allow the Kyrgyz people to have greater access to doctors, medicine, and other elements of modern society. However, this comes with caveats such as increased tourism and outside interference.

A critical element to survival on this planet as any entity is the ability to change and adapt to your environment. Governments of developing nations and leaders of semiautonomous groups have to make difficult choices on how to evolve their societies properly. Betterment is extremely subjective; however, decisions should be made for the greater good of all. As the world becomes more globalized, we discover the unintended negative consequences on traditional people. If these groups are not in isolation, they typically have no choice but to adapt or die off in some form. The benefits of groups remaining in isolation and preserving their culture while rejecting the global agenda appear outweigh the benefits of letting capitalism

change their ways. Diversity is inherently good for the survival of humans as a whole. Some groups on this earth do not stand to gain from changing their ways to conform with how the rest of the world works.