



AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME: TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM

Dr. Hanwant Singh Jaitawat*

Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, B.B.D Govt. College, Chimanpura, Shahpura, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Dilip Kumar Trivedi**

Lecturer, Department of Agriculture Extension Education, S.P.R.S. Govt. College, Sawaimadhopur, Rajasthan, India.

Article Received on 21/11/2015

Article Revised on 11/12/2015

Article Accepted on 01/01/2016

ABSTRACT

Advancements in agricultural efficiency make social and monetary influences. With expanded salaries, farmers can more readily take care of their families, send their children to school, accommodate their wellbeing, and put resources into their homesteads. This makes their networks monetarily more grounded and steadier. The contribution of agribusiness as an instrument for industrialization had been thoroughly conceptualized during the 1960s and 1970s under the old style worldview of improvement financial matters. After numerous execution disappointments under import replacement industrialization approaches and extended disregard of horticulture under the strategies of the Washington Agreement that followed the obligation emergency, agribusiness has progressively returned in the advancement plan, particularly with the food emergency. Throughout recent years, practically all aspects of the created world has seen a horticultural change. As cultivating improved, incomes did as well, wellbeing, and economies. All the more as of late, we've seen astounding improvement in pieces of the creating scene. In the original work regarding the matter, horticulture was viewed as a wellspring of commitments that prompted modern development and a primary change of the economy. We contend that another worldview is required that perceives farming's different capabilities for advancement in that arising setting: setting off financial development, lessening destitution, limiting pay variations, giving food security, and conveying natural administrations, globalization, coordinated esteem chains, fast mechanical and institutional advancements, and ecological limitations have profoundly changed the setting for horticulture's job.

KEYWORDS: Agriculture, development, strategies, policies, Conclusion.

INTRODUCTION

Little and minor farmers assume a fundamental part in driving forward India's economy and development. Regardless of development practically 85% of the feasible land in the country, these farmers is excessively defenseless against the impacts of environmental change, market shifts, and other creation gambles. Again and again these ranchers get lost in the noise unfit to get to the administrations they need to build their earnings and thrive.

The Agricultural Development Programme (PDA)

The Agricultural Development Programme (PDA) upholds the market direction of limited scope agriicultural and food creation in rural worth chains. PDA implies a public or confidential venture program that will advance beneficial and sustainable family farms through help to farmers in creating and executing plans for the development of food, fiber, woods, and worth added items, agritourism exercises, showcasing and deals of horticultural items delivered on the homestead, and other agronomically related business exercises.

Agriculture is an essential part of the economy of any nation and its improvement is basic to the improvement of the country's economy overall. The Grow More Food Campaign (GMFC) was India's initially coordinated work to increment food creation. It was sent off in 1943. After freedom, due consideration has been given for advancement of public augmentation framework in India. The GMFC was assessed in 1952 by an administration designated panel.

Agriculture as a Trigger of Financial Development Farming's focal job in development is the significant commitment of the later writing on primary change examined previously. A key inquiry is whether Agriculture keeps on being a viable motor for development particularly in late emerging nations, generally in Africa, considering the quickly changing setting and the possibility to import food. We contend that the response is yes both as far as the significance of homegrown food creation as well as the near benefit of agribusiness in trade drove development in the beginning phases of advancement. Farming is much of the time the lead send out area and unfamiliar trade worker since it is

the area with solid near advantage in the beginning phases of improvement. Most African nations are generally wealthy in normal assets, however poor in talented work, recommending relative benefit for natural essential items. This is re-upheld by a powerless business speculation environment concerning framework (streets, power, correspondences) and establishments (legitimate, monetary, administrative) that compel private interest in the conventional assembling and administration ventures. In certain nations, a mix of normal assets, human resources blessings, and a further developing business climate highlight similar benefit in handled essential items, as a potential passage point for building a cutthroat assembling area. Despite the fact that globalization and new unique makers have expanded rivalry in conventional farming products, ongoing victories, for example, espresso in Vietnam and cocoa in Ghana recommend that horticultural commodities can be a significant wellsprings of development. In Ghana, expanded efficiency in cocoa has been a significant driver of its fruitful horticultural development and neediness decrease starting around 1995. African nations, like Senegal, Kenya, and Ethiopia, are additionally progressively fruitful in quickly developing commodities markets for plant items and blossoms. Regardless of whether there is general settlement on the significance of agribusiness in monetary development in the beginning phases, it is now and again contended that quick agrarian development will be troublesome in Africa in view of an intrinsically negative agro-environmental base, corrupted soils, low populace thickness, inadequately working business sectors, and rivalry from the remainder of the world (Maxwell, Urey, and Ashley, 2001). However farming has been the most powerful area in Africa with development paces of 3.7 percent yearly surpassing the development in the nonagricultural area over the 1993-2005 period. Over the drawn out in many nations agribusiness is probably going to develop more leisurely than nonagricultural areas, given Engel's Regulation as per which, as livelihoods rise, the extent spent on food falls. Nonetheless, globalization can likewise assist with loosening up this requirement by furnishing admittance to more profound business sectors with exceptionally versatile requests for items like new agricultural and natural produce and creature and fish items.

The Need to Improve Agricultural Productivity

Severe hunger and poverty affects nearly 1 billion people around the world. By 2050, it's estimated that the earth's population will reach 9 billion. Global food production will need to jump by 70 percent to 100 percent to feed these people. Rising incomes, increasingly scarce resources, and a changing climate are putting additional strains on agricultural productivity.

Two billion people in the developing world are malnourished. Malnutrition continues to be the world's most serious health problem and the single biggest contributor to child mortality. The power of investing in

agriculture is clear: Agricultural development is two to four times more effective at reducing hunger and poverty than any other sector.

Important programmes related to Agriculture Development are as follows

1. Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP)

The Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) was launched in the country from kharif, 1960. Initially this was started with 7 districts (Thanjavur, West Godavari, Sahabad, Raipur, Aligarh, Ludhiana and Pali.). This programme was also popularly known as "package programme".

2. High Yielding Varieties Programme (HYVP)

The Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) and Intensive Agricultural Area Programme (IAAP) were concerned with the package approach and intensive agriculture and these programmes increase the food production to some extent. But in the later period, when yield was stabilized, it could not meet the demand of food production and this experience directed the need of High Yielding Varieties Programme (HYVP). The HYVP was launched in Kharif 1966-67.

III. Constitution of Multidisciplinary Team of Scientists

The project is implemented by Central Agricultural Research Institutes/State Agricultural Universities through a multidisciplinary core team of scientists numbering 4-5 from the implementing institution led by a Team Leader (Principal Investigator). The TAR-IVLP also envisages an optional team of scientists drawn from other institutes to look into specific issues.

IV. Agro-Ecosystem Analysis (AESA)

The AESA of the village using PRA techniques was the first step towards launching the programme. It provided information on resource availability, production practices, interaction within and amongst various resources and enterprises on spatial and temporal basis.

V. Problem Diagnosis and Technology Intervention

Based on the information elicited from AESA and the legitimization through focused group discussion, problems of various enterprises in terms of bio-physical and socio-economic causes were identified. The identified problems were prioritized and possible technological interventions were assessed in focused group discussion with farmers and scientists.

VI. Action Plan for Technology Assessment and Refinement

The technological interventions contemplated were categorized down into specific action plans in terms of On- Farm Trials/demonstration, treatments, local checks, number of trials, plot size, critical inputs etc. Action plans were prepared keeping in view the AESA and in consultation with farmers. The technologies were evaluated not solely in terms of their technical/economic

performance, but also in terms of their conformity to socio-economic and cultural circumstances, goals and needs with active participation of farmers.

VII. Site Committee Meetings

Action plans were also discussed in the site committee meetings to improve the nature of interventions. Site committee was constituted for proper implementation including site selection and project submission considering the guidelines of ICAR. Site committee meetings were held to advise the TAR-IVLP core team on the selection, modifications and approval of techno-interventions and action plan in the adopted villages and overall review of the project.

VIII. Monitoring and Evaluation

The goals of this component are to measure the scale of success. Review team was constituted comprising of subject experts for this purpose. The peer review team visited the TAR-IVLP villages to monitor the progress of the project and made specific recommendations. The progress of TAR-IVLP was also monitored through organizing workshops and Agro- Ecosystem Director visits.

Renewed Interest in Agriculture for Development

The agriculture-for-development agenda presents two challenges for implementation. One is managing the political economy of agricultural policies to overcome policy biases, underinvestment, and misinvestment. The other is strengthening governance for the implementation of agricultural policies, particularly in the many developing countries where governance gets low scores. There is evidence that the political economy has been changing in favor of agriculture and rural development. Since 2001, government and donor interest in agriculture has increased, with a sharp jump in commitments during the 2008 food crisis. For example, the World Bank has committed to double assistance to agriculture in Africa by 2010. This is happening because of higher and more volatile commodity prices; growing recognition among developing country governments and donors of the multiple roles of agriculture for development; and new approaches to agricultural development based on decentralization, participation, and publicprivate partnerships, with greater likelihood of success.

CONCLUSION

With risk of failure in meeting the Millennium Development Goals as the 2015 deadline approaches, the high social costs of the recent food crisis, and the increasingly ominous symptoms of the impacts of climate change on agriculture and the rural poor, there is growing recognition among governments and donors that, contrary to neglect over the last 25 years, agriculture must be given a more prominent part of the development agenda. But returning to agriculture does not imply business as usual. As greater attention is given to agriculture, there is also recognition that a new paradigm has emerged regarding the functions of

agriculture for development, beyond serving as an instrument for industrialization through successful structural transformations. The functions of agriculture for development include growth, poverty reduction, lesser disparities, food security, and providing environmental services. Priorities vary by country type, with accelerating growth dominant in the agriculture-based countries, reducing disparities in the transforming countries, and enhancing smallholder inclusion in the urbanized countries. Today's greater willingness to invest in agriculture requires careful prioritization of the functions of agriculture and selection of the corresponding instruments to achieve these functions. The current attention given to agriculture and the new paradigm in using agriculture for development offer unique opportunities to address the extensive remaining development issues.

REFERENCES

1. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 1998: National Agricultural Technology Project, pp 193, ICAR, New Delhi.
2. CMIE: Directory of Indian Agriculture, 402 Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, 1997.
3. Berry, R A: "Farm Size Distribution, Income Distribution and the Efficiency of Agricultural Production: Colombia", American Economic Review, 1972; 62(1): 403-08.
4. Chand, Ramesh, P A Lakshmi Prasanna and Aruna Singh, "Farm Size and Productivity: Understanding the Strengths of Smallholders and Improving Their Livelihoods", Economic and Political Weekly, June 25, 2011; XLVI, No. 26 & 27: 5-11.
5. Alston, J., C. Chan-Kang, C. Marra, P. Pardey, and T.J. Wyatt. 2002. A Meta-Analysis of the Rates of Return to Agricultural R&D: ex pede herculem? IFPRI. Washington D.C.
6. Christiaensen, Luc, and Lionel Demery. 2007. Down to Earth: Agriculture and Poverty Reduction in Africa, Directions in Development. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
7. Deere, C.D., and M. León. "The Gender Asset Gap: Land in Latin America." World Development, 2003; 31(6): 925-47.
8. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/0f17a011-155d-5220-9b4c-64e2d14d960d>
9. <https://www.agricultureinindia.net/programmes/list-of-important-agricultural-development-programmes-india/18072>