ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Role of Agricultural Technologies in Tropical Deforestation

Dr. Ranganatha Sudhakar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-ranganatha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Tropical deforestation is a serious environmental problem that has ramifications for climate change, biodiversity, and sustainable development. This abstract investigates how agricultural technology may be used to address the causes and effects of tropical deforestation. One of the main causes of tropical deforestation is agricultural growth, which is motivated by the need for food and other agricultural products. However, encouraging sustainable land use practices and minimizing deforestation may be greatly aided by agricultural technology. Stakeholders including governments, farmers, and international organizations may aid in lowering tropical area deforestation rates by encouraging the implementation of certain agricultural technology. These technologies provide prospects for sustainable agriculture production and rural development by presenting viable alternatives to activities that harm the environment.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation.

INTRODUCTION

Imagine living in a society where the need for food and other agricultural goods is either constant or grows on a regular basis as the population and wealth rise. The only two uses for land are agriculture and forestry. The only options left is to boost agricultural output, slow down population expansion, or lower earnings if you want to maintain more land for forests. The entire demand for agricultural goods divided by the average production results in the quantity of land used for agriculture. Less land is used for agriculture due to technological advancements that increase yields, and more land is used for forests. Now picture a different planet. Farmers in this second planet will use whatever measure to boost their earnings. They may buy all the land, labor, and credit they need for a set price and sell all the product they wish to do so. What will these farmers do if an advantageous technology advancement boosts their yields or reduces the cost of their inputs? They will undoubtedly develop additional land now that farming is more lucrative. Forest cover will decrease if agriculture and forests are the only two land uses that are still feasible. In contrast to our first world, technological advancement results in the eradication of forests [1].

Policies based on erroneous suppositions

In order to achieve sustainable development in underdeveloped nations, increased agricultural output and forest preservation are both essential. The majority of people recognize the value of increased agricultural output for enhancing farmers' welfare. Researchers have argued over the part agriculture plays in economic growth for a while, but it is now generally accepted that strong agricultural performance is essential for high economic growth. The notion that agricultural expansion decreases poverty and improves income distribution more than industrial growth is also being supported by mounting research.

International awareness about the negative effects of tropical deforestation is also growing at the same time. Deforestation causes climate change, biodiversity loss, a reduction in the amount of wood available, floods, siltation, and soil degradation. In turn, this has an impact on people's lives and economic activities. According to estimates from the Food and Agriculture Organization, during the first half of the 1990s, 12.7 million acres of tropical forest were lost annually. When the benefits outweigh the costs to society, deforestation may be justified in certain circumstances. But for many, it's not. Due in part to erroneous assumptions about the causal relationships connecting the policies to forest removal, current policies and institutional frameworks often result in unnecessary deforestation. One such problematic premise is that forest protection will nearly always benefit from increased production and improved agriculture methods. Recent policy discussions on agricultural technology and deforestation have been dominated by this "win-win" premise. It is supported by a number of theories, which we will evaluate rigorously below [2].

The Borlaug Supposition

Total output is determined by multiplying average yield by area. Thus, greater average yields diminish agricultural acreage, just as they did in the first scenario outlined above, assuming we maintain a constant global food demand. One may argue that employing new technology to increase agriculture's intensity is the only option to prevent increasing pressure on tropical forests given that food consumption is predicted to rise consistently over the next decades. This line of reasoning has prompted the former vice-president of the World Bank to assert that for Central African agriculture to maintain the region's rain forest, productivity growth must increase by 4% yearly. The argument that the Green Revolution has increased forest cover is also supported by this line of thinking. The importance of new kinds of rice, wheat, and maize, together with increased use of fertilizers, irrigation, and pesticides, is often emphasized by proponents of the green revolution. They contend that Asian nations in particular would have needed to increase their agriculture in order to feed their people in the absence of the Green Revolution. In honor of the crucial role that Norman Borlaug, known as the "father of the Green Revolution," played in advancing it, we refer to this claim as the Borlaug hypothesis.

The Borlaug hypothesis likely holds for total world food production, at least under the assumption that all available land is used for agriculture and forestry. It is less obvious, especially at the local and regional levels, if it applies to technical advancements that have an impact on certain goods. Often, the forest frontier's technological development has little effect on agricultural pricing. As a result, the impact of increasing profitability may be dominant and drive more agricultural growth. More significantly, there are other land uses than forests, farms, and pastures. There are vast expanses of savannah, bush, and various land uses. This implies that changes in crops and pasture may or may not result in an equivalent change in the amount of forest cover. It might simply be the case that more fallow land is converted to agricultural use, or the opposite [3].

The Notion of Persistence

What we call the subsistence hypothesis is the Borlaug hypothesis at the micro level. Technological advancement should lessen deforestation if one assumes that smallholder farmers: live close to the subsistence level of consumption; are primarily concerned with meeting that subsistence target; only use family labor on their farms; and have no alternative uses for that family labor. Farmers can use a less area to generate their daily living thanks to higher yields. In addition, the farmer will have to decrease the quantity of land he or she cultivates if the new technology requires a lot of labor. Many efforts that blend conservation and development are motivated by the subsistence concept. Farmers' need to trespass on protected areas is anticipated to decrease with increased agricultural profitability. A similar presumption is that agroforestry may be used to enhance land usage.

It has been a significant component of the Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn project organized by the International Centre for Research on Agroforestry. It will restrict the conversion of primary forests to slash-and-burn agriculture. The subsistence theory is debatable on a number of fronts. The theory suggests that most farmers do not have the "limited wants" or "full belly" preferences. They want to provide their kids with a good education, purchase a brand-new bike or even a motorbike, put a decent roof over their heads, etc. Therefore, farmers are likely to increase their agricultural area if a new technology offers new economic prospects, unless labor and/or financial restrictions prevent them from doing so. Local labor markets exist; however, they are far from ideal. Typically, farmers may employ labor and sell some labor off-farm. Additionally, innovations that open up new economic prospects may encourage migration to remote forest areas, accelerating the conversion of such forests. As the ASB-Indonesia program recognized in a recent evaluation of the problem. It is naive to assume that rising production would inevitably reduce the conversion of forests or enhance the environment. In fact, the reverse is feasible since rising land use productivity associated with forests simultaneously raises the opportunity costs associated with maintaining natural forests. These higher returns on investment have the potential to entice large-scale land developers or draw an influx of migrants, which would speed up deforestation. According to ASB research conducted in Indonesia, land use reform often necessitates trade-offs between global environmental concerns and the goals of eradicating poverty and fostering national prosperity [4].

The Theory of Economic Growth

The Borlaug hypothesis is applicable on a worldwide or intercontinental scale. The home or village level is the center of the subsistence theory. A third

IFERP
ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

justification that connects regional or governmental forest preservation with agricultural technical advancement is also discernible. The following is the argument. Increased agricultural productivity—of which better technologies are a key component contributes to economic expansion and development, which in turn are linked to other developments that restrict the conversion of forests. enhanced demand for environmental services and goods from managed forests, decreased poverty and population growth, more and better-paying occupations off farms, and enhanced government ability to enforce environmental legislation are a few of these. The environmental Kuznets curve, which postulates a bell-shaped relationship between wealth and environmental deterioration, has as its foundation this chain of causality. Growth exacerbates environmental issues in the early phases of economic development when per capita incomes are low, but growth later aids in their reduction. The forest transition theory, which contends that as nations develop, the reduction in forest cover would ultimately level out and gradually rise, is related to this notion as well.

Once again, there is a tenable connection between agricultural technical advancement and forest preservation. But does it hold up to a practical test? The industrialized nations' historical experience lends some credence to the forest transition theory. However, the inflection point is still many decades away for the majority of tropical forest-rich nations. Better infrastructure is made possible by these nations' growing economies, which encourages deforestation. Reduced poverty could loosen the labor and financial restrictions that farmers previously used to successfully prevent deforestation. Increasing agricultural need encourages agricultural invasion. Effective forest preservation, which might potentially offset these consequences, is often hampered by the political agendas and poor administrative capabilities of developing-country governments. Additionally, the little statistical information regarding the EKC is not definitive. For instance, a recent research found no statistically significant link between per capita income and deforestation [5].

The Theory Linking Deforestation and Land Degradation

Many farmers in the tropics use non-sustainable agricultural practices. After a few years of cultivation, they are forced to leave and clear more forest someplace else due to weed issues and a loss of soil fertility. While such shifting-cultivation systems could be completely viable as long as population densities stay low, these systems might destroy the natural resources as population increases. Farmers may be able to sustain production without depleting their resources thanks to new technology. This should lessen their need to give up property and cut down more trees to construct new plots. Although farmers may not desire to utilize land extensively, they are limited by their current technologies. This book gives several instances of farmers clearing land, using it for a while, and then relocating to previously un-cleared forest regions. Farmers act in this way for legitimate reasons. Smallholders often have large discount rates and limited time horizons, which causes them to overlook the production impacts of land degradation over the long run. Sometimes it is expensive or difficult to increase their output in a sustainable way due to the political environment, economic conditions, or regulatory regulations. For instance, when farmers need economical inputs, they could not be accessible. Finally, as long as there remains 'unutilized' prospective farmland, farmers will often find it more cost-effective to increase the area under cultivation rather than to intensify. One of Bose Up's primary theories is this. Farmers will choose to expand into new regions before they intensify if given the option.

Another important question pertaining to the land degradation-deforestation hypothesis is whether or if sustainable intensification slows down, or at least lessens, the expansion and deforestation, or whether it will speed up deforestation by increasing the profitability of farming. In other words, is it a matter of intensification or expansion, or is intensification and expansion the most probable result? This book's chapters focus on particular issue in great detail [6].

Defined Technical Advancement

An increase in total factor productivity, a basic idea in economic theory, may be used to characterize technological progress. It only suggests that farmers may generate the same product with less inputs or higher output with the same inputs. Profits will rise when TFP increases if prices stay the same. Agricultural intensification should be differentiated from technological change. Higher input utilization per hectare may be used to describe the latter. The phrases intensification and technical change with rising yield are connected. However, intensification may happen without any change in the underlying technology, and intensification may or may not be accompanied by changes in technologies. Some new technologies are incorporated into inputs and capital products, such as better fertilizers and seeds. Others lack physical shape and must depend only on new organizational techniques or knowledge. The majority of the technical advancements covered in this book are embodied.

The impact of new technologies on how intensely farmers employ various production parameters is a critical component of these technologies. Do the labor and other input needs per hectare rise or fall? Technologies may be capital-intensive, labor-saving, and so on. We provide more detailed explanations of each category of technological progress. Different types of capital-intensive technological transformation exist. For our purposes, it is essential to differentiate between resources that save land, like fertilizers, and resources that conserve labor, like tools and draught animals. The former by definition lower the labor need per acre. The latter often provide the opposite result. Which of these two capital approaches farmers choose will determine how increased usage of capital inputs influences the demand for labor [7].

DISCUSSION

The main factors influencing how technological development impacts forests

How technological development in agriculture impacts the cover of tropical forests is the main subject this book aims to address. Economic theory enables us to synthesize the key points into a coherent framework and develop empirically testable predictions. We provided a list of hypotheses on the main conditioning elements prior to the Costa Rica workshop indicated in the introduction and requested the case-study authors to respond. The following were the primary factors that we thought may impact how technological progress affects forest cover:

1. Technology type: labor and capital intensity, capital type used, and technology's appropriateness for freshly removed forest lands.
2. Income, asset levels, and resource limitations are characteristics of farmers.
3. Output markets: how accessible they are to farmers, how big and elastic their demand is, and how they operate.
4. Salary rates, the ease of recruiting new employees and firing existing ones, and the viability of in-migration and out-migration.
5. Credit Markets: credit terms and credit availability.
6. Property regime: how farmers get rights to forests and the protection of property rights.
7. Argo-ecological circumstances: land quality and accessibility.

Separating the relationship between technology and deforestation

We made an effort to maintain our attention on the connection between technology and deforestation while we put this book together. We have tried to stay away from a broad discussion of what drives deforestation or agricultural innovation in developing nations. There is an urgent need to focus in order to convey something novel. However, there are a few restrictions. Without knowing the larger context, it is impossible to appreciate how technology and deforestation are related. In fact, certain forest outcomes are produced by the interplay between the kind of technology, farmer traits, and place.

The pace of deforestation is influenced by several variables. It is challenging to distinguish the marginal impact of technological progress from an empirical standpoint. For instance, a rise in the price of a crop suited for frontier farming may directly encourage its spread and may also indirectly encourage the employment of new technology for that crop. On the other hand, new technology could bring about alterations in population trends, infrastructure, and regulations, all of which have an impact on deforestation. An attempt was made to treat most technology development and adoption as exogenous, and have concluded about the means of deforestation. But it is difficult to distinguish between adoption and the results of technical advancement. Before a technology to affect forests, farmers must accept it. According to the hypothesis of induced technological innovation, scientists create and farmers embrace technologies that are a reflection of the shortage of various components. Forest frontiers often have plentiful acreage and a shortage of both labor and money. Therefore, rather than technologies that save land, farmers would often choose those that save labor and money. Because labor-saving technologies free up workers for expanding agriculture, they are more likely to increase the strain on forests. Sadly, this implies that the technology that frontier farmers are most likely to embrace will also be the one that will cause further forest deforestation. In light of these considerations, we may claim that investigating the possibilities of Boserup being mistaken is one of the book's main topics [8].

Agricultural Intensification That is Sustainable

The topics covered in this book are a part of a larger discussion on tropical agriculture and sustainable development. Finding strategies to achieve a number of goals, including greater food production and farmer incomes, fair distribution of the benefits that follow from these changes, little degradation of current farmland, and limited extension of agricultural land into natural forests, are all part of this agenda. Although it pays close attention to the trade-offs and connections between and the other aims, the book primarily focuses on. Analysts should not overlook the detrimental impacts of forest removal and forest degradation, even if they often associate the negative environmental effects of agriculture with land degradation. The two different kinds of impacts could be traded off. Large-scale tree-based systems may have significant effects on primary forest cover, but have little effects on soil erosivity and fertility.

The straightforward forest-non-forest distinction has a tendency to gloss over many of these crucial concerns. As was already said, varying degrees of environmental services are provided by secondary forest in shifting-cultivation systems, tree crops, agroforestry systems, and other land uses in the actual world. This subject is covered in a number of the book's chapters. Our emphasis on reducing deforestation does not suggest that this should be the only or even the main factor for evaluating agricultural methods. What kind of technological change should be encouraged in tropical agriculture is the real issue, not whether it should be done at all. We are certain that technical advancement in tropical agriculture is essential for raising rural income, enhancing food security, and generally promoting economic growth and development. However, we also think that the pace of tropical deforestation now is unacceptably high.

DISCUSSION

In locations close to forests, trade-offs and win-lose situations between forest protection and agricultural technical advancement seem to be the norm rather than the exception. But there are occasions when everyone benefits. Policymakers and other stakeholders may support them by supporting relevant technology and altering the economic and political climate in which farmers operate. When new technologies include items with elastic demand, deforestation is more likely to occur. Typically, export goods fall under this. Almost invariably, export crops are mentioned in articles concerning commodities booms and deforestation. On the other hand, increased supply often led to a quick decline in the price of goods that are exclusively offered in local or regional markets. That lessens and could even cancel out the technical change's expansionary effects. However, it also slows the increase in farmers' revenue.

Economic possibilities that are often brought about by new technology tend to attract immigrants. If not, local wages would undoubtedly rise as a result of agricultural development, preventing future growth. Commodity booms can only last as long as there is a significant pool of cheap labor available or as long as the technology involved requires a lot of capital. The introduction of new crops thrives in circumstances of elastic labor supply and elastic product demand, which results in extensive deforestation. On the other hand, as shown by the historical experience of the industrialized nations, the former may not drive forest conversion when agricultural productivity advances coincide with expanding job prospects in other sectors. The majority of forest border farmers face labor and capital constraints. Therefore, the new technology's factor intensities have a significant role. Farmers may be able to increase the area they cultivate or release labor to move to the agricultural frontier thanks to technologies that liberate labor. The availability of family labor for land development should be restricted by labor-intensive technology, which should also drive-up local wages and deter deforestation. Farmers often choose labor-saving technology since they are labor-constrained. With a few notable exceptions, it follows that the kind of technical advancement necessary to rescue the woods is unlikely to occur. Even farmers with limited labor resources may utilize labor-intensive technology if there is no other way to grow a certain crop that is lucrative or less hazardous or to accomplish another family goal [9].

Capital is often needed for agricultural land development in order to acquire livestock or planting supplies, employ labor, or buy other items. Therefore, financial limitations may prevent growth. Technological advancements should enable farmers to save more money and spend it in deforestation-related projects. Similar to this, even while they raise the opportunity costs of labor, greater off-farm earnings might provide farmers the money they need to develop their business. Technology advancements in agricultural fields that need more labor or money but are often further from the forest border are typically beneficial for the preservation of the forest. By driving up salaries and/or decreasing agricultural prices, technological advancement in these more labor-intensive sectors diverts resources away from the frontier. There are several exclusions. For instance, the new technology may drive labor into agricultural frontiers or create the money farmers need to finance forest conversion. Smallholders often run many manufacturing methods. The need for agricultural land may decline overall as a result of technological advancement in the more intensive systems diverting limited resources from the vast ones. However, the greater excess may also be utilized to make more investments in the expanded system, raising the demand for land.

Deforestation is typically encouraged by many policies that are beneficial for agricultural growth, including those that provide access to markets, financing, transportation infrastructure, and technology. If policymakers clearly take into account the available trade-offs and alternatives, they will be able to make better decisions. They sometimes may also locate win-win solutions. In any instance, decision-makers must foresee the potential consequences of pushing various technologies in diverse situations and cannot start off by assuming that the result would be beneficial to all parties involved. It is not necessary to stop agricultural intensification in order to preserve forests; rather, it is necessary to find technologies and intensification methods that are as close to win-win as feasible. Intensifying pasture systems may aid in reducing deforestation, according to livestock experts in Latin America for some time. Land costs rise in response to forest shortage, making intense expansion more desirable than widespread growth. According to the authors, research should instead concentrate on figuring out how to make deforestation and excessive land usage less appealing to farmers rather than how intensification promotes deforestation [10].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, agricultural technology has a crucial role in combating tropical deforestation. Stakeholders may encourage sustainable land use practices, improve agricultural production, and lessen the causes of deforestation by adopting precision agriculture, agroforestry systems, sustainable intensification, climate-smart agriculture, and remote sensing and monitoring. To accelerate the implementation of these technologies and support the protection of tropical forests, biodiversity, and the achievement of sustainable development objectives, cooperation between policymakers, researchers, and local populations is crucial.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Angelsen and D. Kaimowitz, “Introduction: the role of agricultural technologies in tropical deforestation.,” in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0001.

[2] J. K. A. Benhin, “Agriculture and deforestation in the tropics: A critical theoretical and empirical review,” Ambio. 2006. doi: 10.1579/0044-7447-35.1.9.

[3] K. Wallington and X. Cai, “The Food–Energy–Water Nexus: A Framework to Address Sustainable Development in the Tropics,” Trop. Conserv. Sci., 2017, doi: 10.1177/1940082917720665.

[4] M. Bhattarai and M. Hammig, “Governance, economic policy, and the environmental Kuznets curve for natural tropical forests,” Environ. Dev. Econ., 2004, doi: 10.1017/S1355770X03001293.

[5] P. Newton, A. Agrawal, and L. Wollenberg, “Enhancing the sustainability of commodity supply chains in tropical forest and agricultural landscapes,” Glob. Environ. Chang., 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.08.004.

[6] F. da Silva Cardozo, Y. E. Shimabukuro, G. Pereira, and F. B. Silva, “Using remote sensing products for environmental analysis in South America,” Remote Sens., 2011, doi: 10.3390/rs3102110.

[7] W. F. Laurance, J. Sayer, and K. G. Cassman, “Agricultural expansion and its impacts on tropical nature,” Trends in Ecology and Evolution. 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2013.12.001.

[8] P. M. Pijut, R. R. Beasley, S. S. Lawson, K. J. Palla, M. E. Stevens, and Y. Wang, “In vitro propagation of tropical hardwood tree species - A review (2001-2011),” Propagation of Ornamental Plants. 2012.

[9] T. A. Jackson, J. W. Crawford, C. Traeholt, and T. A. B. Sanders, “Learning to love the world’s most hated crop,” Journal of Oil Palm Research. 2019. doi: 10.21894/jopr.2019.0046.

[10] R. Houghton, “Global impact of Land Cover Change,” Bioscience, 1994.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Technological Change and Deforestation: A Theoretical Overview

Mr. Naveen Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email-Id-naveenkumarj@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Technological change has had a profound impact on various aspects of human society, including the environment. This theoretical overview focuses on the relationship between technological advancements and deforestation, a critical environmental issue with global implications. The abstract begins by providing a brief introduction to the concept of technological change and its influence on societal development. It then delves into the drivers and consequences of deforestation, highlighting its detrimental effects on biodiversity, climate change, and human livelihoods. The theoretical framework explores how technological change can both contribute to and mitigate deforestation. It discusses the role of technological advancements in enabling more efficient land-use practices, such as precision agriculture and sustainable logging techniques. Additionally, it examines the influence of technological innovations, such as satellite imagery and remote sensing, in monitoring and managing deforestation activities.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Management, Technological Change, Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

Different perspectives may be used to examine technical development or change in agriculture. Technological advancement is often defined in economic theory as an improvement in total factor productivity. This suggests that farmers either generate the same amount of physical product with less inputs or the same output with more inputs. Some people refer to technical advancement as any modification to the industrial process that boosts net profit. This definition and the one before it overlap to some extent. Profits will rise when TFP increases if prices stay the same. Diverse new technologies exist nowadays. They may be disembodied, which implies that they only depend on new management techniques or knowledge, or they can be embodied in inputs and capital goods, as in the case of enhanced seeds and fertilizers. Analysts often discuss the effects of new technologies, whether they are embodied or not, in terms of how heavily they rely on different inputs. Therefore, technologies may be capital-intensive, labor-saving, and so on. Because the precise meaning of these phrases might sometimes be unclear, we will define them and explain how we use them in this article. Starting with a scenario where farmers are required to utilize a certain percentage of inputs in order to generate their output is the most logical course of action. Labor, money, or any other component cannot be substituted for another, even land [1]. This functional form forbids input substitution. A Leontief scenario may be compared to a recipe. You need a certain quantity of eggs, flour, milk, and equipment to make a cake. Lack of milk cannot be compensated for by two ovens, and eggs cannot be replaced by flour, etc. Without a doubt, the Leontief production function oversimplifies the problem. In the actual world, farmers may partially replace between inputs. For instance, they may manually weed or apply herbicides. Even yet, the concepts and ideas from the straightforward Leontief scenario may be used to broader formulations.

Different types of capital-intensive technological transformation are possible. For our purposes, it is essential to differentiate between two types of capital-intensive technical change: those that save land, like fertilizers, and those that conserve labor, like tools and draught animals. The former by definition lower the labor need per acre. The latter often provide the opposite result. The sort of capital that farmers choose to utilize will thus determine how increased usage of capital inputs influences the demand for labor. We demonstrate below how this has a significant impact on how technological advancement will affect deforestation [2].

Most people interpret the word "technological change" to refer to increased input utilization per hectare in agriculture, which is what is meant by the term "intensification" in this context.6 Intensification is thus related to the terms "yield-increasing" and "land-saving" technical change. Nevertheless, agricultural intensification and technical development are not the same thing. Technology change could or might not indicate escalation. Without any modification to the underlying technology, intensification is possible. External development or extension organizations sometimes create and implement new technologies. In other instances, rural communities themselves develop the technology "spontaneously." These' spontaneous' technical developments often reflect context-related modifications. As first proposed by Boserup, variations in population density can, for instance, spur the quest for land-saving solutions. Similar to this, shifts in relative costs may spur technological development as farmers look for methods to use less costly inputs or introduce higher-value crops. The conversation thus far can give the impression that farmers only create one kind of product. In practice, farmers often use more than one production or land-use system to create several outputs, including annual crops, tree crops, animal products, and processed items. This has effects on how we define technical advancement. The following will be considered when defining technical progress and TFP at the farm level: technological advancement for a specific crop and/or production system. The adoption of a new crop and/or production method that has a higher TFP as well as a change in farm inputs to favor these crops/methods. TFP at the farm level rises in each of the three situations, making them all technical advancements [3].

Effects on a Farm-Level

Farmers take advantage of business prospects. To achieve their goals, they deploy their limited resources. These goals can be to guarantee family survival, increase income, or reduce danger. The options accessible to farmers are limited by current technology, assets, market circumstances, land tenure, and other considerations. Technological advancement may alter these limitations and provide farmers incentives to utilize their resources differently. Therefore, restrictions and financial incentives are two crucial ideas to comprehend in order to comprehend how farmers react to technological development. We begin with the analytically simplest situation, where farmers are integrated into ideal output and input markets, to analyze how farmers may alter the way they utilize their land in response to technological advancements. Even though this is rather impractical at the edge of the forest, it is a good place to start. Following an analysis of this straightforward situation, we incorporate market imperfections, labor and capital restrictions, farms with various products, and dynamic wealth and investment impacts that have an impact on the capital constraint.

The perfect-market model offers a critical perspective. Frontier agriculture is becoming more lucrative as a result of technological advancement, which encourages farmers to extend into forested areas. Despite the stylized and irrational assumptions that underlie this result, one should not simply dismiss it since it also applies, in some capacity, to the more realistic models that are provided later. This book's examples illustrate how, despite the fact that reality is far more complicated, this straightforward prediction often comes true. Deforestation rises as technical advancement raises the profitability of frontier agriculture [4].

The Limited Farming Family

We made the assumption in the preceding part that farmers may freely trade in any market without facing any transaction expenses. In reality, farmers may decide that it is not worthwhile for them to engage in certain marketplaces due to the high transaction costs. De facto, certain marketplaces do not exist for some families, according to this. Peasant families could not have access to a full range of markets for other reasons, such their incapacity to share risks. Certain markets' disappearance has significant repercussions on how families are likely to react to technological advancements. The labor market is one that is often overlooked. Outside of the farm, family labor often has few alternatives, and many families lack the funds to employ workers. They must thus only depend on family labor.

The kind of technical development will determine how it impacts deforestation when farmers' inability to extend their land is restricted by their lack of access to labor and/or money. For instance, when a family only has a little quantity of cash available, the only option for them to embrace a new capital-intensive technology is if they decrease the amount of land they cultivate. Deforestation will increase more widely as a result of technical advancements that enable farmers to utilize less of their precious resource. Deforestation will be decreased by innovations that are intense in the scarcity factor. These outcomes may change if the model had more realistic properties. For instance, we presupposed that farmers couldn't switch between various inputs. In practice, however, farmers may be able to reduce their capital restriction by replacing capital with labor. The new technologies won't definitely stop deforestation even if they succeed. The new capital-intensive technology may also make the farmers more credit-worthy or convince them to ask for additional loan, reducing their capital restriction and enabling them to extend their territory [5].

Equally significant is the fact that farmers' access to money during the present time is significantly influenced by the earnings they generated in earlier years. Any technology advancement that increases farmer earnings is expected to ease the farmers' future cash flow restrictions. Technological advancements might provide farmers the money they need to grow. Therefore, as a result of technological advancement, farmers who originally acted in a credit-constrained manner may eventually acquire money and begin acting more like unconstrained profit maximizers. The subsistence model, which is founded on what we referred to as the subsistence hypothesis is the antithesis of the perfect-market model. Here, it's important to make the assumption that individuals only want to attain a certain set degree of material well-being and have little desire to do otherwise. A household will start engaging in leisure or other non-production activities as soon as it reaches this level. The protection of forests will thus unquestionably benefit from any technical advancement that increases production. Thus, as technology advances, the supply of labor simply declines. The goals of wellbeing and conservation are not at odds in this instance. Although the subsistence model may, under some conditions, properly capture a farmer's reaction to technological development, there is no evidence to support the model's use at the aggregate level.

In essence, technical advancement will promote deforestation if farmers have access to a set of ideal markets. Labor-saving technical advancements will likely result in increased deforestation where farmers are labor-constrained, which is often the situation along the forest fringe. Less deforestation will result from labor- and/or capital-intensive technical advancement, unless the constraints are "soft" and/or there is a significant "investment" impact. Household income is impacted by technological advancement, which may have an impact on how much labor is provided [6].

Systems of intensive and widespread production at the domestic level. We broaden our examination of scenarios when farms maintain two production systems one intense and one extensive in this section. Compared to the latter, the former has a higher yield and greater labor and capital intensities. This gives us the opportunity to understand how changes in intense and extended systems brought on by technological progress affect the total demand for agricultural land. For a number of reasons, farmers choose to use several production systems. The desire for self-sufficiency, the division of labor between men and women, the presence of different soil types, production systems that correspond to different stages in a land-use cycle, and different transport costs, depending on where the crop or pasture is located are some of these. Although we might have used any of the other criteria, the transport-cost argument is utilized here to demonstrate how intense and vast agricultural systems may coexist. The intense and extensive boundaries may now be distinguished from one another. The vast border is especially pertinent to individuals who are concerned with protecting natural forests. The fact that many vast systems in real life are based on tree crops and provide some of the same environmental benefits as wild forests should be emphasized.

Technology advancement in the intense sector won't have an impact on the vast frontier as long as we have excellent marketplaces. The two systems are treated separately by farmers, who decide how to maximize their earnings in one system without taking into consideration the other. Perfect markets imply that there is no input competition between the two systems. Farmers employ each input until marginal revenues and marginal costs are equal. When farmers are forced to distribute a specific quantity of labor and/or money between the two systems due to restrictions, more interesting outcomes are produced. First, think about how technology is changing the complex industrial system [7].

Technological advancements that save money and labor will nonetheless lead to a rise in land demand, which will fuel deforestation. However, since farmers may switch labor and resources from intense to widespread agriculture, the impact will be considerably greater. Farmers' ability to switch resources between intense and extended systems suggests that technical advancement that is not labor- or capital-neutral will also promote deforestation. Unlike in the case of one industrial system, capital- and/or labor-intensive technical improvements have uncertain effects, but they may result in increased deforestation. The difference in capital and/or labor needs, the beginning size of the two sectors, and the rise in these requirements as a result of the technological development all influence the final result. Farmers will continue to experience resource constraints as long as labor-intensive or neutral technical advancements in the intense system continue to shrink the vast frontier. Farmers will move away from the vast system and toward the intense system with their limited labor and resources. The development of labor-saving technologies has two opposing consequences on the vast frontier. Although it releases labor, it will move resources to the intensive sector. According to Angelsen, one analytical model consistently favors the first effect. The development of labor-saving technologies in the intensive sector lowers the need for land overall. But it's unclear how far one may generalize these findings.

Results might be much different if one considers the dynamic interactions between the two sectors. Farmers may utilize funds generated by technological advancements in the intense sector to finance the expansion of the extensive sector. In other words, higher revenues from intensive agriculture may relieve the capital restriction and free up more funds for farmers to spend on forest clearance projects. When these dynamic interactions are taken into account, the effects of off-farm income prospects are likewise left with equivocal outcomes. Off-farm alternatives raise the potential cost of labor in a society without constraints. This increases the cost of land expansion and reduces the agricultural frontier. However, farmers may also utilize more wage income to spend more on buying more livestock, employing more labor to clear forest, and other comparable operations. From this short talk, at least four significant lessons may be drawn. First off, where agricultural subsector technical advancement happens in has a significant impact on how much deforestation occurs. Second, technical change will have a considerably greater impact on total land use if farmers have the option to move between alternative productions systems. Thirdly, given the chance to move resources to the frontier, even labor- and/or capital-intensive technical advancement in the broad system may promote more deforestation. Fourth, increased strain on forests may occur from dynamic investment impacts brought on by greater agricultural revenue as a consequence of technical progress in any system [8].

DISCUSSION

The reaction of the individual household to changes in technical characteristics and costs was the main topic of the preceding section. The development of technology will probably affect more than one home, however. Additionally, if many families employ the new technology, this will have effects on the economy that go beyond what is predicted in section 3. The microeconomic impact outlined in section 3 may be lessened or increased by these macroeconomic consequences. There are primarily two kinds of macroeconomic consequences. The first works by altering the number of households residing in the forest region, i.e., by allowing people to move into or out of the broad margin. The second operates by altering pricing.

Migration

The amount to which the aggregate labor supply restrains agricultural growth will depend on the proportion of agricultural households at the extended margin that are involved in deforestation. Typically, individuals weigh their options for where to reside based on the amount of wellbeing they may anticipate in various areas. We use the assumption that there are two regions uplands and lowlands and that the projected per capita income in each zone decreases as the population in the region increases in order to analyze this kind of choice. The placement of the curves is influenced by technologies. Think of a technique that only works in what are known as typical lowland agricultural regions, not at the broad edge in the uplands where the woods reside. Because it can only be utilized in certain kinds of soils, needs easy access to markets or other institutions, or for some other similar reason, the technology could only be applicable in the lowlands. By introducing such a technology, the lowland income curve is shifted higher, which lowers upland population and forest destruction. To ensure forest protection, it is crucial to provide lucrative economic alternatives outside of the uplands, whether in agriculture or somewhere else. We may multiply the per-household effect by the total number of marginal households to get the overall impact of technical progress on deforestation. The likelihood that technological development will cause more families to move near the edges of forests often rises significantly if this possibility is taken into consideration [9].

The upland labor supply curve and the lowland income curve are identical because the amount of lowland earnings directly affects the upland labor supply. New upland technologies will have a significant impact if the curve is flat, and many prospective migrants will relocate to the forest in response to the new economic prospects. Similar to how we might see the labor demand curve as the upland income curve. A flat curve suggests that the uplands can accommodate many migrants without running out of economic possibilities, maybe in part due to the abundance of woods. Therefore, the circumstances are optimal for

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

technical development in the uplands to result in significant forest removal when both curves are flat.

Internal Prices

Price fluctuations provide the basis for the operation of the second primary macroeconomic feedback mechanism. Prices for both inputs and outputs are included. A considerable increase in agricultural product supply due to innovations might result in lower output prices and an increase in labor and other input costs. The price impact may be broken down into two parts: the degree to which market prices are affected by changes in supply, and the rate at which supply expands relative to the size of the market. The latter is determined by the proportionate growth in output in the technologically impacted area and the market share of that region. Based on this, we can differentiate between agricultural items sold on foreign markets, such as bananas, rubber, coffee, and cocoa, and those sold primarily on local markets, such as food crops for subsistence, like maize and cassava. Regarding the latter, it's often the case that no matter how much technical advancement raises yields in a nation, the overall impact won't be significant enough to affect global pricing. Despite exceptions, the majority of nations have a horizontal demand curve for export crops. Therefore, the micromodels in section 3's underlying assumption of stable pricing for agricultural products still generally applies to export crops. However, given that the demand curve in these situations may be extremely steep, significant increases in the supply of commodities produced for the domestic market would put severe downward pressure on pricing.

Revenues in the individual households may grow or decrease depending on whether the boost in agricultural production balances the price fall brought on by the rise in aggregate supply. When new technology impacts crops with prices that are less susceptible to supply fluctuations, agricultural activity will grow at the cost of forests since productivity will typically improve rather than decline. On the other hand, if the price of agricultural products is very sensitive to changes in supply, the price drop may be greater than the rise in productivity. This latter circumstance is referred described as a treadmill in the written word. Farmers have less motivation to cut more forest as a result of the fact that the more they produce, the less money they make. Regional differences in technological advancement may favor certain manufacturers over others. Deforestation should decrease if agricultural production increases outside the forest zone, farmers within and outside the forest region grow the same crop, and they all sell it in the same market with downward-sloping demand. Frontier farmers will be worse off since they will get lower prices even if they did not profit from the invention. Households will be compelled to leave the frontier as a result, and as long as they deal with flawless markets, they will produce less than they otherwise would. Depending on the strength of the income and substitution impacts, households under unfavorable market conditions may produce more or less. We haven't considered the impact of factor pricing so far. Wages may be crucial since agriculture in developing countries is often labor-intensive. The demand for labor will rise as long as it is not totally elastic, which will drive up wages. Therefore, if technical advancement leads to more employment, salaries will rise, which may deter forest removal. Alternative specifications may allow for the substitution of labor and land. Farmers may utilize more land in place of labor if labor costs go up, which would result in increased deforestation.

Furthermore, the abstract analyzes the underlying factors that determine the relationship between technological change and deforestation. It considers economic incentives, institutional arrangements, and socio-political dynamics that shape the adoption and impact of new technologies in forested regions. The concept of a technological "double-edged sword" is introduced to capture the simultaneous positive and negative effects that technological change can have on deforestation [10]. The theoretical overview concludes by emphasizing the need for a holistic approach that considers the complexities of technological change and deforestation. It highlights the importance of integrating environmental, social, and economic perspectives to develop effective policies and strategies. By harnessing the potential of technology while addressing its potential negative consequences, it is possible to achieve sustainable forest management and mitigate the adverse impacts of deforestation on ecosystems and communities.

CONCLUSION

We have covered how economic theory predicts that technology advancement will impact deforestation in this chapter. The type of technical change, the presence of market imperfections, the ability of farmers to substitute between factors, the way households balance work and leisure, whether the technology affects intensive or extensive production systems, the amount of migration in response to regional income disparities, and the steepness of the demand and supply curves for outputs and inputs will all have an impact. If innovations enable farmers to amass resources that they subsequently use to fund investments in activities related to forest conversion, dynamic wealth effects may come into play.

First, we may anticipate technical advancement to encourage deforestation if both the input and product markets are well-developed and "perfect." The forest frontier's high transaction costs, however, could restrict farmers' access to certain markets. Technology change will have equivocal impacts without healthy labor and capital markets, depending on whether it loosens or tightens tying limitations. The micro-level impacts may be amplified if farmers have many production systems and are able to switch inputs from one to another when their relative profitability changes. Second, general equilibrium impacts occur when technical change influences the output potential of several farms. The pricing impacts often 'dampen' the micro-level effects. For instance, if supply grows as a consequence of new technology, prices may drop, thereby reducing the original incentive to clear land. But for the migration impacts, it matters a lot whether the innovations work better in conventional agricultural regions or on the forest border, since a stronger influence in one of the two might lead to movement to or from the frontier.

Finally, it is important to note that the intricate relationship between technical advancement, land degradation, and deforestation was largely disregarded in the preceding debate. Families living in the vast margin often deplete their soils before leaving and clearing a new area of forest. The burden on natural forests is lessened by technologies that diminish land degradation by reducing the temptation to "cut, crop, and run." However, compared to fallow systems or broad agricultural land usage, sedentary agriculture often preserves fewer aspects of natural ecosystems. Additionally, any technology that enhances profitability has the potential to lead to more land removal for all the reasons outlined in section 3 of this article. This further demonstrates the intricacy of the relationship between agricultural technical advancement and forest conservation and the challenge of drawing clear-cut general generalizations.

REFERENCES

[1] T. J. Braje and J. M. Erlandson, “Human acceleration of animal and plant extinctions: A late pleistocene, holocene, and anthropocene continuum,” Anthropocene, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ancene.2013.08.003.

[2] M. Brady and B. Sohngen, “Agricultural Productivity, Technological Change, and Deforestation: A Global Analysis,” Am. Agric. Econ. Assoc., 2008.

[3] D. P. Van Soest, E. H. Bulte, A. Angelsen, and G. C. Van Kooten, “Technological change and tropical deforestation: A perspective at the household level,” Environ. Dev. Econ., 2002, doi: 10.1017/S1355770X02000177.

[4] S. Holden, “A century of technological change and deforestation in the Miombo woodlands of northern Zambia.,” in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0251.

[5] A. Angelsen, D. van Soest, D. Kaimowitz, and E. Bulte, “Technological change and deforestation: a theoretical overview.,” in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0019.

[6] S. B. Hecht, “Soybeans, development and conservation on the Amazon frontier,” Development and Change. 2005. doi: 10.1111/j.0012-155X.2005.00415.x.

[7] A. Cattaneo, “Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon: Comparing the impacts of macroeconomic shocks, land tenure, and technological change,” Land Econ., 2001, doi: 10.2307/3147091.

[8] A. Grainger, H. A. Francisco, and P. Tiraswat, “The impact of changes in agricultural technology on long-term trends in deforestation,” Land use policy, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0264-8377(03)00009-7.

[9] N. B. Villoria, D. Byerlee, and J. Stevenson, “The effects of agricultural technological progress on deforestation: What do we really know?,” Appl. Econ. Perspect. Policy, 2014, doi: 10.1093/aepp/ppu005.

[10] P. Palos-Sanchez and J. R. Saura, “The Effect of internet searches on Afforestation: The case of a Green Search Engine,” Forests, 2018, doi: 10.3390/f9020051.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

The Transition from Deforestation to Reforestation: A European Case Study

Dr. Dileep Ramakrishna
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-dileep.r@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The transition from deforestation to reforestation has become a critical environmental issue, particularly in Europe where historical deforestation has depleted forest cover. This abstract provides a theoretical overview of the factors driving the transition from deforestation to reforestation in Europe, examining the motivations, strategies, and outcomes of reforestation efforts. The study begins by outlining the historical context of deforestation in Europe and its detrimental effects on biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and ecosystem services. It then highlights the shift in environmental consciousness and the recognition of the importance of forests in mitigating climate change, which has led to a growing emphasis on reforestation. The theoretical framework explores the drivers behind the transition from deforestation to reforestation in Europe. It examines the role of policy interventions, such as afforestation incentives, land-use regulations, and international commitments like the Paris Agreement, in promoting reforestation efforts. Additionally, it considers socio-economic factors, including changing land ownership patterns, rural development initiatives, and public awareness campaigns, which contribute to the shift towards reforestation.

KEYWORDS: Deforestation, Reforestation, Environmental Sustainability, Policy Interventions, Socio-Economic Factors, Innovative Technologies.

INTRODUCTION

A forest transition occurred in several European nations in the 19th and 20th centuries. The net national forest cover ceased to decrease and started to rise. People have begun to hypothesize that emerging nations who are now undergoing deforestation may ultimately go through a similar shift as a result of this. A thorough examination of the significance of agricultural technology in Europe's shift to forests is hindered by data shortages and the fact that agricultural technical advancements occurred concurrently with other significant social, political, economic, technological, and cultural developments. The rural exodus, industrialization, better transportation networks, governmental control over and management of forests, and the switch from fuel wood to coal are some of the most significant complicating factors. However, the data points to an important role for agricultural technology development in the forest transition. This suggests that it may also affect deforestation and efforts to control it in emerging nations today. In order to understand contemporary forest patterns in emerging nations, it may be helpful to look to Europe's experience with changing forest cover over the course of many centuries [1].

Throughout history, farmers have expanded agricultural land or intensified land management to meet the requirement for increased food production to feed an increasing population and rising per capita consumption. Since the natural vegetation in the majority of agriculturally productive places is forest, considerable agricultural growth is likely to result in a decrease in the amount of forest. While intensification doesn't directly impact forests, it often forces farmers to use new farming methods.

Farmers are now able to produce more food from fewer areas because to technological advancements in agriculture, especially those that enhance yields. This may lessen the need to clear more land for farming and raising cattle. Farmers may eventually decide to leave some regions, which would allow for reforestation. Similar to this, better transportation may encourage the concentration of agricultural output in more fruitful locations, allowing people in other regions to buy their food elsewhere and ceasing the use of marginal lands for crop cultivation.

There has been much discussion over how systemic stress and population pressure impact resource management. It is challenging to explain the forest shift within a Malthusian framework, despite the fact that one may see Malthusian patterns in a number of European nations in the centuries before the change. Contrary to what the Malthusians predicted, population increase and forest expansion have coexisted for hundreds of years in these nations. This shows that, as Boserup expected, farmers strengthened their agricultural systems in response to growing population pressure. The case studies that follow demonstrate how different kinds of stress coincided with the forest transition and favored the establishment of new paradigms for resource management, including paradigms for agricultural technology.

The Danish Forest Transition

By 1800, all but 4% of Denmark's forest cover was vanished. From the middle of the 19th century, the expansion of the forest cover continued, but with some oscillations. In comparison to 1800, Denmark has about three times as much forest. Major changes in land and forest tenure, forest management, and the political environment all occurred at the same time as the changeover. It included more than just technical transformation. In the 1780s, rural reorganization started and advanced quickly. Enlightenment-inspired ideas led a handful of "improvers" to effectively "capture the machinery of State" and begin modernizing the nation [2].

The Forest Preservation Act was enacted by the government in 1805, granting landowners "over wood" with the condition that they keep the area forested. The legislation, which Revent low helped draft, was intended to be a stopgap solution until forest owners completely acknowledged that maintaining their woods "scientifically" was beneficial. The law required all forests to be enclosed by 1810 and required landowners to replace any areas that had been stripped of vegetation. Thus, forests maintained primarily or exclusively for wood production gradually replaced the preindustrial practice of managing forests for varied uses, including cow grazing. Germany's "scientific" forest management practices were early adopted by Denmark, which aided in the passage of the 1805 statute. In certain of its royal woods, the government began using a sustained-yield management strategy that had been advocated by German forester von Langen as early as 1763. The woodlands were separated into portions for yearly felling and fenced to keep animals out. Revent low and other powerful landowners backed the new 'scientific' viewpoint, which was spread through a developing system of forestry education. The first university program started in 1800, and the first forestry training institutes opened their doors in 1786.

The 1805 legislation was brought about by a number of events. In the 18th century, according to Kjaergaard, Denmark experienced a protracted, multifaceted ecological catastrophe. As a result of the growing population and scarce agricultural resources, one component of this was a loss of forest cover. In addition, the shipments of firewood from Holstein to Copenhagen were hampered by the Napoleonic Wars. Due to its extreme scarcity, firewood prices increased by 100% between 1780 and 1800. The severe scarcity prompted their implementation, while the ongoing shortfall helped create an environment where new forest management regimes could be adopted. The 1805 ordinance assisted in halting more deforestation. However, meaningful reforestation did not start until 1860. Norway's lack of reliable wood suppliers. Even when the post-World War II agricultural slump liberated land that might have been utilized for that purpose, the failure to reforest following the country's independence in 1814 did not convince citizens to do so. In addition, the state ran out of money in 1813 and had no means to encourage reforestation.

Reforestation was ultimately sparked by the loss of a portion of the nation's land in Schleswig-Holstein. A strong national emotion and a determination to use the nation's land resources as completely as possible were reportedly sparked by this blow to national pride. The establishment of the Danish Heath Society, which strove to transform the 'wasteland' of the Jutland heaths into forest and arable land, was one example of this. The moors' earlier efforts to reforest had been unsuccessful. But by the 1860s, a combination of technological development, the political-economic environment, and the general attitude of the country had created the circumstances for a more persistent extension of the forest.

Agriculture and forests both grew throughout this whole time. Agriculture was not affected by the growth of the forest. Both geographically and practically, planting trees and cultivating went hand in hand. The farmers in Jutland increased their agricultural holdings by using the payment they got for planting trees. In general, farmers kept bringing newly uncultivated land into production and mixing vast and intense growth. Crop yields grew by 25% and agricultural productivity doubled in the two decades after 1788. The nation's cattle herd grew significantly throughout the last part of the 19th century as well. Even though some efforts to turn heathland into agriculture were unsuccessful and the land was abandoned, it took decades for this process to fully take off in the 1890s, when large-scale afforestation had started [3].

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

The instance of Denmark demonstrates that there is a complicated relationship between agricultural technical progress and forest patterns. It would be oversimplified to say that the latter 'caused' the reforestation to begin or the cessation of deforestation to occur. Both were products of modernisation and had their origins in philosophical and political shifts. Although technical advancements in agriculture as a whole undoubtedly lessened the temptation to encroach on the sections of forest that were still there towards the end of the 18th century, other factors, such as the Enlightenment spirit and the national mood of the 1860s, turned out to be more significant. There is little question that technical advancements in agriculture contributed to the stabilization of the forest area in this context, but in a broader sense than some recent research on tropical deforestation and technological change may suggest.

DISCUSSION

Denmark and Switzerland have quite distinct histories and geographical regions. However, both nations' forested areas have significantly increased since the 19th century, and they have similar characteristics when it comes to how they perceive crises, their legal systems, and agricultural transformation. To offer a long-term forest curve, the data are just insufficient and inaccurate, although researchers generally agree that Switzerland's forest acreage has increased by approximately twofold since the mid-19th century. Prior to it, the forest had been diminished for many centuries due to population growth and the need for wood, and the issue probably became worse throughout the 18th century. Like in Denmark, woods once served as both a source of wood and fodder as well as farming. Crop yields were low, not the least of which was the insufficient amount of animal excrement that could be used as fertilizer.

One factor increasing population expansion was the invention and widespread use of the potato. Comparing it to cereal crops, its greater yield per unit area successfully enhanced the land's carrying capacity for food production. Emigration served as a safety valve to some degree. However, the population in the area kept increasing. This caused environmental stress in the absence of a corresponding shift in land management. Farmers partially replaced cows with goats as pasture productivity and haymaking capacity increased more slowly. The actions of the goats, together with the rising fuel needs of the burgeoning people, severely damaged the mountain woods. Early in the 19th century, environmental deterioration and pauperism were results of highland population increase. Thus, the arrival of potatoes in Switzerland raises the possibility that the forest may have suffered as a result of the technological advancement.

Current land management practices were unable to keep up with the population increase and increased demand for wood. Most of the woodland was owned by the community. Historically, the cutting of wood for building and fuel had been severely constrained by a number of intricate community systems. Many localities had elected councils in charge of these checks. The need of preventing resource usage from outpacing forest growth, preserving the protective properties of forests, and allocating a fair portion of the yearly cut to each family were all stressed. When the population was somewhat steady, these methods demonstrated their effectiveness. However, when the population grew quickly, there was more tension brought on by the need for forest resources than this system of community governance could handle. By the middle of the 19th century, there were fuel shortages in numerous places. This regulation forbade any decline in the size of the woods, which included both Alpine and sub-Alpine regions. Farmers had to get permissions in order to clear trees, and they had to either replant cleared areas or make up for them by reforesting nearby territory. It also controlled customary rights to utilize forests. In order to build a protective forest, the cantons or the federal government may compel farmers to plant trees there. They could even take over privately owned property for that purpose. In other words, the state started becoming involved in forest management [4].

The question of whether or not the frequency of floods really has anything to do with deforestation. The apparent connections served as the foundation for a "crisis narrative," which supported Land let's efforts to establish a federal forest regulation structure. The forester-scientist was able to gather favorable public sentiment and political support in order to influence the state towards greater control and reforestation thanks to the dominating social construction linking trees and floods. Federal action was justified by the newly held idea that mountainous deforestation may imperil lowlands. In this regard, the adoption of the first federal forestry legislation in 1876, which bore many similarities to the Danish law of 1805, was a turning point. The new laws altered how the woods were used and undermined their connections to farmland via fodder gathering and grazing. Forest and farms separated more and more, much as in Denmark.

It would be incorrect to only credit Land and the 1876 statute for the forest shift. Only once agriculture and the economy as a whole started to modernize was the transition to a controlled forest economy feasible. A significant turning point in the development of the contemporary nation-state was the founding of the Swiss Confederation in the middle of the 19th century. The new state in Switzerland, like its neighboring nations, acquired the authority to become involved in the administration of the forest resource. Because Landolt and other people like him had access to the state machinery, they were able to elevate certain 'scientific-rational' interpretations of the forest and the forest-flood connection over those of others. These performers didn't only act for themselves. Shortly after the Swiss Confederation was founded, a Department of Forestry was established, and in 1855, the Federal Polytechnic School started offering instruction in forest management. They founded the Swiss Forestry Society in 1843, which had a significant impact on promoting forest management and conservation. The Swiss Forestry Society received financing for forest research the next year, and investigation on the causes of floods started. In summary, a number of institutional reforms that included the state and civil society that took place before the 1860s contributed to meet the requirements for a shift toward more sustainable forest resource management.

The second part of the 19th century saw changes in the location of production as agriculture, like other nations, became increasingly focused on the market. Despite some urban expansion, the majority of industrialisation occurred in rural regions. This indicated that, in contrast to France and other nations, the rural flight and abandonment of agricultural land were slower. However, there were instances of land abandonment, and they increased in number in the early 20th century. Clearly in decline during the second part of the 19th century, the agricultural labor force. The absolute and relative numbers of people dependent on agriculture decreased, which favored the reforestation of certain formerly agricultural territories [5].

A large increase of the forest was caused by agricultural technical development in places like Emmental. Forests were able to grow via natural regeneration throughout the 19th century as a result of a shift in dairy production from the alpine regions to the lowlands and a general trend toward less intense farming in marginal areas. This might assist to explain the subdued tone of opposition to new regulatory measures like the Forest Law of 1876, as well as the fall in the agricultural labor force. The Landolt Report came to the conclusion that yearly wood removals were around 30% higher than increments. Forests would have suffered if this trend had maintained for years as looked inevitable. The majority of the withdrawals were for household and commercial fuel. Lower temperatures throughout the preceding century may have made the issue worse. Socioeconomic developments and industrial progress raised the need for firewood.

By the end of the 19th century, Switzerland had transitioned from the wood era to the age of fossil fuels. However, between 1850 and 1910, the use of wood only fell by a modest 9%. Even if it could have helped, it probably wasn't enough to trigger a forest transition on its own. More importantly, the new energy sources allowed for new occupations and ways of living that required less reliance on local resources. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that "development" in general, including its economic and political dimensions as well as technological advancement in agriculture, civil culture, and transportation, helped reverse the decline in Switzerland's forests. As people generally came to depend less on local natural resources for their food, fuel, and livelihoods, it became easier. However, it is interesting that technological advancements in agriculture had both adverse and advantageous impacts on forest acreage. A higher population could be sustained thanks to the invention of the potato. Since growing potatoes could not, of course, solve the fuel deficit, this undoubtedly made the condition of the forest worse. On the other hand, the introduction and expanding usage of planted grasses and the expansion of commercial dairy production positively impacted forest cover. These adjustments, similar to those made in France's neighboring regions, helped concentrate farming in the lower-lying, more productive lowlands and valleys while progressively easing strain on the higher terrain. This in turn made reforestation easier. It is crucial to stress that these changes in agriculture were accompanied by adjustments to transportation and societal perceptions of forests and their management.

The French Forest Transition

In French forest history, the late 18th and early 19th centuries were crucial. After a protracted period of forest loss, the forest cover began to increase again somewhere in the middle of the 19th century, probably as early as 1830. The tendency quickened in the second part of the century. The area has almost doubled since the early 19th century. Although the forest currently covers the whole area it had lost since the 14th century, its personality and geographic distribution remain extremely different. Following the Black Death, the French forest expanded briefly before contracting practically consistently until the early 19th century. The population rose from 24.5 million to 29.1 million between 1750 and 1800. Instead of increasing agriculture, farmers increased agricultural land to meet the corresponding rise in food demand. Some observers claim that there was minimal change in agricultural production between and. Although a revisionist theory claims that yields on big farms close to cities started rising about 1750, it is more likely that they began doing so in the early 19th century. Even if the revisionist interpretation is accurate, it does not change the reality that the productivity of the majority of the poor farmers in the more isolated regions remained mostly static [6].

In several Alpine regions, deforestation was actively happening. Var and Basses-Alpes both lost 44% of their forest area between 1791 and 1840. The country's overall yearly rate of deforestation, according to Corvol, is between 0.8 and 1.4%. Growing crops on marginal ground, particularly in the highlands, quickly proved unsustainable and brought to soil erosion and other types of damage. Early in the 19th century, the causes and other southern regions had turned into "landscapes of desolation," while forests in Provence "were becoming rarer and rarer." Prefect Dugied of Hautes-Alpes said that huge sections of the department had become unproductive due to erosion and deforestation in 1819. He encouraged the government to prohibit additional clearing and to support the creation of artificial grassland on cleared land as well as the broad replanting of regions. It seems that environmental pressures have influenced other regions of France. For instance, Blaikie and Brookfield label the 'catastrophic' soil erosion that occurred in Champagne and Lorraine in the 1790s and early 1800s. The shift from forest to farmland was probably definitely aided by technological advancement. During the 19th century, cereal yields rose steadily; but, after that, they climbed more quickly. By the second part of the 19th century, the greatest 'agricultural' land use, naked fallows, was being phased away. Farmers might produce the same quantity in a smaller area with less vacant land.

Landowners were able to concentrate grazing in "artificial meadows" by using rotational grasses. These grasses have been dubbed "the motor of a powerful and necessary agricultural revolution" by Braudel. By the 1760s, they were well-established in certain regions, such as the Paris basin, and they continued to grow gradually for many decades until exploding during the 1830s. The number of cattle increased, partly due to the more fruitful, better grasslands, while the sheep herd gradually decreased starting around the mid-20th century. This lowered strain on the remnant forest and scrub and relieved pressure on the commons, unimproved pastures, and woodland, each of which aided in the regeneration of trees. Although each was centered in a distinct region, intensive agriculture eventually took the place of vast agriculture. The 'marginal' fields on the edges of heath and woodland continued to be overrun by agriculture, but most intensification took place in the 'better' lowland or valley floor regions.

The agricultural frontier had begun to stagnate or even reverse course by the second part of the 19th century. Farmers stopped working in certain places, and the forest ultimately grew back. This retreat was associated with a "rural exodus" that intensified over the time due to lowland urban and industrial expansion. It is impossible to properly disentangle the consequences of agricultural intensification and rural flight. Both might lead to the abandonment of agricultural land, freeing it up for plantations, natural forest regeneration, or other uses. The expansion of the market economy and of transportation networks made it easier for food production to concentrate in the most fruitful regions and eroded the ties of local subsistence. The idea that agricultural technology and the rural exodus caused the forest area to grow is plausible, particularly for highland and marginal areas, despite the lack of convincing data evidence. The two forces combined their approaches and economic perspectives to lessen strain on trees. The traditional usage of the forest by peasants also decreased as agriculture shifted more toward serving the needs of the market.

However, the forest shift was undoubtedly influenced by other factors than changes in agriculture. The energy source also underwent a dramatic transition as coal took the role of fuel wood in both industry and society at large. This lowered strain on the forest over time rather than immediately. From 1837 on, using coal to create iron became more affordable than using charcoal, and by the middle of the 20th century, the cost of the former's energy per unit had only decreased to one-sixth that of the latter. Another important development was the adoption of new forest policies and a new forest legislation in 1827. The sense of a crisis, the growth of the state, and the development of forest science all worked together to bring about this situation. State, commune, and other public lands have to be handled in accordance with a set of rules. Under some circumstances, clearing forests may be forbidden, and as time went on, the list of circumstances that qualified for such restrictions grew. The delineation of forest boundaries and the enforcement of rules governing the taking of wood and other resources, as well as the grazing of cattle, were given to state forestry officers. At first, reforestation was only modestly supported through tax breaks for trees planted in certain mountainous regions [7].

Local rural communities gradually lost influence over how their woods were maintained as communal woodlands fell under the supervision of the state forest service. The Code and its execution represented the 'official' position that deforestation and forest depletion should be stopped, particularly in remote places like the Alps and the Pyrenees. In order to justify the 1827 Code and direct governmental participation in the reforestation of mountainous territory, state authorities created crisis narratives. However, the Code was seen from the perspective of the peasants as an unfair interference with their customary usage of the forest. In reality, the Code concentrated on industrial logging, forbade peasants from maintaining their traditional ways of life, and fell short of meeting their requirements. For instance, just one-sixth of the fire wood needed by certain communes could be chopped. This alienated local peasant forest users, particularly in areas experiencing population pressures like the Pyrenees, Alps, and Jura. The new order was imposed by the state by compulsion, and it is probably not unexpected that the peasants rebelled. The best example of this was "La Guerre des Desmoiselles," in which clashes between peasants wearing women's clothing and forest guards resulted in the mobilization of thousands of soldiers. However, as the century went on and more people migrated away from rural regions, resistance began to wane. Similar to the forestry program that was implemented in the highlands in the 1860s, opposition gradually subsided as the population fell.

Peasants in certain regions went from clearing mountain slopes to extensively farming the irrigated lowlands and from grazing sheep and goats to rearing cattle when the rural population started to diminish starting in the mid-19th century. In the upper areas, where intense demographic pressure had previously drove development and where population had now started to decline, farmland losses were particularly pronounced. As an example, the population of Alpes-de-Haute-Provence decreased from 154,000 in 1870 to 118,000 in 1900. The Pyrenees showed similar patterns. Between 1836 and 1906, the population of one canton decreased by one-third. Areas that were deforested in the 17th century to cultivate crops and rear cattle returned to woods during the rural migration of the late 19th century. According to Fel and Bouet, "as a general rule, the forest extends more the greater the fall in population." Prospects for regeneration increased while resistance to the reforestation program lessened with less grazing and browsing.

Agriculture was able to concentrate on the most productive areas because to the interaction of technical advancement in transport and agriculture as well as the creation of a market system. The implication was that vacant land may be used to grow a forest via planting or regeneration. Population increase no longer entailed encroachment on the forest as technology and the establishment of market relations increasingly uncoupled the historical relationship between population growth and agricultural expansion [8].

The French case comes to a similar outcome as the cases from Switzerland and Denmark. Agriculture's adoption of new technologies and growing focus on the market both made a substantial contribution to the stabilization and ultimately expansion of the forest area. Technology advancement hastened the concentration of agricultural output on better-quality land, and the expansion of the transportation system has made it possible to disentangle the local population density from agricultural productivity. However, the French situation is similarly similar to that of Denmark and Switzerland in that it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the precise role played by technical advancement in agriculture. Technological, social, political, and economic transformation all happened at the same time as philosophical change. The many aspects of transformation were interconnected; thus, this timing coincidence was not an accident. Some of the alterations may have acted as direct or proximal causes in connection to forest dynamics, while others were more basic and underlying.

The Function of Agriculture in the Transition of the Forest

When the forest transition was happening, Denmark, Switzerland, and France's agriculture experienced significant transformation. Modern agriculture has shifted to a more commercial focus. Agriculture's economic environment, the way that land was organized and held, as well as agricultural technology, all underwent significant change. This was made feasible by the extraordinary development of the transportation system, particularly the trains, and it was further expedited by the explosive increase of the urban population.

Depending on the surrounding circumstances, technological advancement has different benefits. On productive territory as opposed to more marginal places, new technologies often had more success. This was true at various spatial scales. In comparison to land in the mountain valleys, the better terrain in the northern half of France, and in the Paris basin in particular, was more suited for the new ways of growing wheat. Similar to this, using seeded grass in Alpine valleys allows for increased cattle output while reducing grazing demand on mountain pastures. The abandoning of marginal land, or at least a lessening of agricultural constraints on it, was one aspect of the uneven growth that characterized agricultural transformation. But agricultural transformation was not the only cause of abandonment. The shift away from a semi-subsistence agriculture system in the highlands or other marginal regions was heavily influenced by the expansion of industrial job options in the city. The 'rural exodus' from these regions reduced the strain that agriculture, grazing, and the gathering of fuelwood had on forests, allowing some of them to organically recover in certain places. Fuel wood was replaced by fossil fuels as a result of technological advancement in other industries, notably transportation. Additionally, it relieved strain on the forest and made population increase less directly related to rising fuel-wood demand.

Market factors and learning processes may lead to the spatial rearrangement of agricultural output and the concentration of agriculture in more advantageous settings even in the absence of technical change, although technological development is likely to hasten that process. Landowners may quit particular regions as a result of this modification, allowing woods to repopulate there. The rising modern state used a "crisis narrative" in each of the three nations to justify its involvement in environmental management. The reported catastrophes included a lack of wood, erosion, floods, and several other issues with resources and the environment. It entailed civil cultural technological transformation, which in each instance was linked to a shifting paradigm or social construction of the forest. Modern forest science is often seen to have its roots in Central Europe and to be connected to worries about a wood scarcity. Thus, the shortage of wood, or at least the perception of its scarcity, was a key factor in the development of both the science and the state's embrace of it [9].

The Enlightenment effort, with its distinctive emphasis on reason and the application of science, left a clearer landscape expression than in few other spheres of society. Reforestation was considered as a way to make unproductive "wasteland" more usable and productive in the context of the prevalent fixation with "progress." On another level, mono functionality and specialization made the reductionism that preceded the advent of reason visible. In the past, the forest and farming were interconnected. It served as a place to graze livestock, gather fodder, and a supply of timber for building projects. Now it belonged to a distinct category that was focused on the production of lumber and contained inside distinct linear limits, symbolizing both the emergence of reason and the upheaval of old peasant institutions. The long-standing tendencies of deforestation were reversed, demonstrating the success of the new system. The absence of cattle lessened grazing's impact on the trees. The development of "scientific" civil culture, including the planting of woods, took place. The forest started to grow gradually, at least nationally. There was still some deforestation in certain agriculturally advantageous regions, but this was more than offset by replanting on marginal land [10].

It took money to make the switch from net deforestation to net reforestation. The evicted many of the traditional rural forest users. Therefore, it is not unexpected that some of them refused. France has the greatest resistance out of the three analyzed nations. It was more passive in Switzerland and much more so in Denmark. The fact that the government in the latter instance provided for the "dispossessed" at the time of enclosure by giving certain formerly common lands to specific dispossessed farmers may be relevant. 'Natural' and 'artificial' forest transitions should be distinguished, it may be advantageous. In the former, changes in agriculture and other industries release market forces that cause net reforestation rather than net deforestation. Land is simply taken out of production for agriculture and made available for planting or natural regeneration of forests. However, the France instance demonstrates that compulsion may also be used to hasten or 'induce' a change, even at the expense of misery for the displaced traditional forest users. Presumably, the degree of coercion necessary is partly determined by how closely agricultural and other circumstances resemble those needed for a "natural" shift.

CONCLUSION

The move from net deforestation to net reforestation in the European nations studied in this chapter was undoubtedly aided by technological advancement in agriculture. It encouraged farmers to give up their agricultural land and let it transform back into forest via natural regeneration or planting, which helped to dissociate the people from agricultural areas. It was one of a number of nearby elements that 'driven' the changeover, along with a significant shift in energy supply, transportation, and civil culture technology. Due to a lack of data and, more crucially, the interactions between the elements, it is impossible to determine the relative contributions of each factor. The elements had an impact on the market economy's rise as well as the migration from rural regions as both causes and consequences.

Changes in politics and culture were crucial to this process. Capitalism reached even the most isolated rural regions, the state emerged as a legislative and technical agent of environmental control, science was applied to land management, and a new social construction of the forest gained support. In the past, agriculture and woods were mainly contiguous and multipurpose. Now, both figuratively and physically, they started to split and specialize more. The former connection between farming and forests was further undermined by laws that was passed to safeguard the remaining forest land. The deployment of crisis tales by influential groups to support their own claims to the forest and its products. A move to forests was facilitated by the use of state authority and research, but at a price. The investigated European nations unequivocally show that deforestation may be stopped and reversed. Though not always, technical advancement in agriculture tends to favor that result. The deforestation process may be sped up and new logging areas opened up by transportation system improvements. However, they may also result in the fossil fuel replacement of burning wood, reducing strain on the forest. The impacts of agricultural changes depend on their nature and context, much as those of transportation changes do. In the case studies of Europe, agricultural transformation did not happen in a vacuum. It was a part of a larger, more pervasive transformation that amounted to advancement or modernisation. Another concern is whether agricultural reform might take place independently of other changes and, if so, if it would considerably reduce deforestation. Will deforestation now occurring in underdeveloped nations follow a similar trajectory? Their circumstances are similar in various ways. These nations' agriculture is modernizing and becoming more market-oriented, much as it did earlier in Europe, and they are quickly urbanizing. Similar to how they did in France and Switzerland, floods and landslides in various nations have led to government involvement in the form of logging bans or other restrictions. And when the younger generations leave the farm and go for a better life in the city, farmers in certain nations are starting to forsake crops and let it turn back into forest. There are further reasons to believe that a contemporary emerging nation would experience the change more quickly than Europe did in the late 1800s. The reforms that took decades in Europe could proceed more quickly due to global concern about deforestation and the impact of a global civil society. On the other hand, if global commerce expands, agricultural output could start to migrate toward the best areas on a global scale as well as at the national level. This may hasten the shift to forests in certain nations while delaying or preventing it in others.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Mather, "The transition from deforestation to reforestation in Europe.," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0035.

[2] H. Lee et al., "Implementing land-based mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement in Europe requires food system transformation," Environ. Res. Lett., 2019, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab3744.

[3] O. G., "Deforestation / Reforestation in Mediterranean Europe: The Case of Greece," in Soil Erosion Studies, 2011. doi: 10.5772/23466.

[4] M. Bełcik, J. Goczał, and M. Ciach, "Large-scale habitat model reveals a key role of large trees and protected areas in the metapopulation survival of the saproxylic specialist Cucujus cinnaberinus," Biodivers. Conserv., 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10531-019-01854-0.

[5] R. A. Betts, P. D. Falloon, K. K. Goldewijk, and N. Ramankutty, "Biogeophysical effects of land use on climate: Model simulations of radiative forcing and large-scale temperature change," Agric. For. Meteorol., 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.08.021.

[6] J. Novák, V. Pavlů, and V. Ludvíková, "Reintroduction of grazing management after deforestation of formerly abandoned grassland and its effect on early vegetation changes in the western carpathians (slovakia)," Grass Forage Sci., 2013, doi: 10.1111/gfs.12008.

[7] V. Amici et al., "Influence of secondary forest succession on plant diversity patterns in a Mediterranean landscape," J. Biogeogr., 2013, doi:

10.1111/jbi.12182.

[8] A. J. Teuling et al., "Climate change, reforestation/afforestation, and urbanization impacts on evapotranspiration and streamflow in Europe," Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 2019, doi: 10.5194/hess-23-3631-2019.

[9] W. Zgłobicki, L. Gawrysiak, B. Baran-Zgłobicka, and M. Telecka, "Long-term forest cover changes, within an agricultural region, in relation to environmental variables, Lubelskie province, Eastern Poland," Environ. Earth Sci., 2016, doi: 10.1007/s12665-016-6195-z.

[10] C. A. Booth et al., "The BORASSUS Project: Aims, objectives and preliminary insights into the environmental and socio-economic contribution of biogeotextiles to sustainable development and soil conservation," WIT Trans. Ecol. Environ., 2007, doi: 10.2495/SDP070582.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Green Revolution Restore the Forests of the American South

Dr. Anu Sukhdev
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-anu.sukhdev@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The restoration of forests in the American South through a "Green Revolution" has gained significant attention as a means to address environmental degradation and promote sustainable land management. This abstract provides a theoretical overview of the concept, motivations, strategies, and outcomes of the Green Revolution in restoring forests in the American South. The study begins by presenting the historical context of forest depletion and degradation in the American South, driven by factors such as intensive logging, agricultural expansion, and urbanization. It highlights the ecological consequences of forest loss, including habitat fragmentation, reduced biodiversity, and compromised ecosystem services. The theoretical framework explores the motivations behind the Green Revolution in the American South. It examines the growing recognition of the importance of forests in mitigating climate change, preserving biodiversity, and providing socio-economic benefits to local communities. The abstract discusses the need to shift from traditional forest management practices to more sustainable and resilient approaches.

KEYWORDS: Green Revolution, Forest Restoration, American South, Sustainable Land Management, Reforestation, Afforestation, Sustainable Forestry, Socio-Economic Benefits.

INTRODUCTION

The urgency of the quest for a legislative solution to the issue is highlighted by recent reports of increasing rates of tropical deforestation in Brazil during the mid-1990s in conjunction with the negative study on tropical forests published by the European Community's Research Centre in 1998. The Borlaug hypothesis so called for its most well-known proponent deserves careful consideration in this situation. According to Norman Borlaug and others, if agricultural commodities' land productivity significantly increased, there would be less need to cultivate more land to meet rising crop demand, which would end the issue of tropical deforestation [1]. The attractiveness of Borlaug's thesis lies in its simplicity. Additionally, it obtains credibility since it bases its main argument on microeconomics, the most comprehensive body of theory in the social sciences. The theory also has very apparent consequences for public policy. For example, in order to decrease tropical deforestation, governments and international organizations should considerably increase their study into the productivity of the land used for growing crops in tropical biomes. Despite these appealing characteristics, the idea has not been experimentally tested. Very few, if any, of the nations in the tropical biome have the thorough historical data on changes in forest cover required to track changes in the amount of land used for various crops through time. On the other hand, the information on the forest cover in the southern US and the factors that influence it is sufficient to perform a pretty thorough test of the theory [2].

Second, at the start of the period under study, in 1930, the American South had several key characteristics with modern emerging nations. Red clay soils, which are typical of most of the Amazon basin, may be found in the southeast of the United States. Despite the unfavorable soil conditions, the majority of people in the area both black and white made their livelihood from agriculture, mostly on modest farms where cotton was grown. Four out of five farmers engaged in non-ownership farming, mostly as sharecroppers. They had little. Between 1924 and 1929, farmers in the south-eastern states who produced cotton earned an average of $143 a year from their crops. Farmers had a business-oriented mindset, cultivating cash crops for international markets like cotton and tobacco. Farmers with a subsistence focus consumed more of their produce than they sold in 10 to 15 percent of the agricultural regions. In 1930, 11% of the people in the area were illiterate. Analysts used terminology like "peripheral" to define the South's place in the national economy in an effort to mimic the jargon of modern global systems theorists. The South was a colony of

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

the North inside the United States. According to a respected local geographer [3],

The United States' South is the region that is most like the rest of the world, and its plantation regions are those that are most like the newly industrialized countries that have adopted plantation economies. The lower Piedmont, the Black Belt, the Loess Plains, and the alluvial Mississippi Valley are more similar to former Caribbean and Central and South American colonies than they are to the urbanized areas of the United States in certain ways. The claim that the American South's experience between 1935 and 1975 is comparable to that of modern emerging nations may undoubtedly go too far. Since the Civil War, the area's transportation system including its roads, trains, and canals has seen extensive internal development. The South, in contrast to many modern emerging nations, had a system of stable land ownership rights. Between 1935 and 1975, there was a significant out-migration from the South as a result of the size of the industrial employment growth in northern urban centers. During this time, the government provided price subsidies, discounted credit, and conservation set-aside programs to aid with agricultural productivity. None of these elements have ever existed before in underdeveloped nations. However, the high caliber of the data and the fact that there are certain historical similarities between the South and regions of the tropical biome support utilizing the South as a test case for determining if the Borlaug hypothesis is correct [4].

I provide additional data on the human capital of farmers, the size of neighboring metropolitan areas, and government policies as controls in the study. These factors are logically sound alternate hypotheses for the reforestation of the South in the middle decades of the 20th century. The human capital variable, illiteracy, conveys the concept that farmers with poor human capital would have competitive disadvantages as a result of the development of more scientific agriculture, ultimately leading them to quit their properties and let their fields to return to forest. Farmers in counties with sizable metropolitan populations may reduce their agricultural operations without fully giving them up since it was easier for them to find part-time work in the non-farm sector. Due to this, distant rural counties should exhibit full agricultural abandonment and reforestation more so than counties with sizable urban populations [5]. The federal government may have had a significant impact on the reforestation of the South via a number of policy measures, most notably the price support-conservation set-aside program started in 1934 and the growth of national forests throughout the 1930s. We should be able to determine the relative amount of the impact of agricultural productivity on forest cover through a multivariate analysis that incorporates these factors and the productivity variables in a single equation forecasting changes in forest cover [6].

Measures, Variables, and Data

The studies given below use counties as the analytical units. Since the 1930s, the US Forest Service has performed forest inventories every ten years, providing the statistics on forest cover. The US Department of Agriculture provided the information on crop production, while the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture provided the information on soil resources from a study conducted in the 1930s. The Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties provided the information for all other variables used in the analysis [7].

Capacity on Land

They collected data on the terrain, soils, and climate of agricultural areas as well as information on their physical geography, using this data to create a map of the agricultural potential of various US regions. The borders between areas in this experiment effectively served as the boundaries between land capacity classes. An example of a barrier separating an area with high land capacity from a region with low land capability is the line dividing the Mississippi delta from the sandy plains of southern Mississippi.

Agricultural Output

The increase in yields per acre for the main commercial crop in a county is measured by this variable. There are only seven potential values for this variable in a county since there are only seven fundamental commercial crops cultivated in the South during this time. In addition, these productivity improvements represent averages throughout the USA as a whole, not simply the South. While this situation results in measuring error for a commodity like maize, which was planted widely outside of the South, there is minimal measurement error for the majority of the other crops since they are produced primarily, and often only, in the South. The explanatory variables either originate from the first half of the four-decade period in which I measure forest cover or predate the changes in forest cover in order to avoid issues with simultaneity bias in the analysis [8].

The reasons why the patterns of change in forest cover vary among counties may be explained by national trends in the amount of land planted in various crops. The area planted decreased the most for the crops whose yields increased the most. It's interesting to note that there seems to be no connection between changes in agricultural commodity prices, productivity gains, and reforestation over the course of the 40-year period. Forest cover in a county in 1935, the most reliable indicator of reforestation rates, contains an artefact. Because these counties had the greatest acreage available for restoration, it seems sense that the counties with the least amount of forest cover in 1935 saw the highest rates of reforestation between 1935 and 1975. Piedmont and delta are excellent predictors of the pace of reforestation, suggesting that land capabilities played a significant role in the process. Reforestation rates were also significantly influenced by human capital variables, which are loosely defined as the percentage of a county's population that is literate, the percentage of farmers who practice subsistence farming, and the percentage of the county's population that resides in its largest urban area. The government's initiative to increase the amount of national forests by acquiring marginal agricultural areas directly aided in the reforestation of the area. And last, the Borlaug hypothesis-related technical developments seem to have had a significant impact on the South's reforestation. Where farmers used more fertilizer in 1930, reforestation rates rose in the decades that followed, likely because they were able to concentrate produce on fewer acres with the help of fertilizers.

DISCUSSION

Does the Southern experience with changing forest cover and growing agricultural production provide lessons for how rising crop yields could stop the loss of tropical forests? In the present political climate of the majority of tropical nations, it is undoubtedly implausible that the American state had any impact on patterns in forest cover between 1935 and 1975. The modern neoliberal nations of the developing world will never initiate as many programs that have an impact on forests as did the American government. There's a chance that certain government initiatives had little impact. Some farmers with marginal lands were able to stay on their property for longer than they would have otherwise thanks to price support programs. In this regard, it is more likely that the price-support and acreage-control programs delayed the speed of change than they did to modify it in the other way. By becoming a part of a national forest, certain areas were guaranteed to return to forest as part of the aim to increase the size of the national forests by the acquisition of marginal agricultural holdings. These regions could have returned to being covered with forest in any event. The lauded reforestation initiative of the Tennessee Valley Authority had little effect on local land cover.

The activities of the Army Corps of Engineers and other government programs, in particular, had a significant influence on the shift in land cover. While avoiding the low-lying, alluvial terrain in the Mississippi River delta and along the Gulf coast, settlers in the South cleared land for farming in the uplands throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The soil was very rich, but recurring floods and drainage issues hindered agricultural development into these regions, and they remained covered with hardwood woods, which were home to large amounts of high-quality wood. Local organizations started constructing levees in the second half of the 19th century in an attempt to regulate floods along the Mississippi. Federal legislators took up half of the expense of building levees in 1916 under pressure from local lobbying organizations and out of concern for the damage these floods were causing. In 1928, after the especially terrible flood of 1927, the federal government took on the whole cost of levee construction. Federal funding was made available for the draining of areas behind levees thanks to a 1944 revision to the 1928 law. With these directives, the Army Corps of Engineers started an extensive public works program in the 1930s, constructing levees and then draining wetlands in the Mississippi delta and along the Gulf coast. Landowners acted fast to remove the valuable wood and grow soybeans in the cleared fields after the low-lying areas were protected from flooding. The soybean farming methods employed now are very mechanical, and the flat, fertile, and consistent fields were perfect for them.

The expansion of new markets for animal feeds based on soybeans has contributed to the South's alluvial lowlands' fast rise in soybean farming. The explosive growth of cultivated land in the citrus-producing regions of central Florida between 1935 and 1975 may be explained by a similar set of trends in consumer markets. The pattern of reforestation was significantly influenced, although indirectly, by the rising returns to human capital in cities. The importance of the variables related to illiteracy, subsistence farming, and urban site in the models demonstrates the fast rising returns to human capital in cities, whether in the form of new employment opportunities or better salaries. Smallholders were forced off their farms by rural

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

poverty and urban economic expansion, hastening the conversion of their lands to woods.

The Southern agricultural industry became more mechanized as a result of the fall in the agricultural labor force, which also promoted land abandonment in regions with less agricultural potential. Plantation owners bought tractors and harvesters to take the role of field hands when agricultural laborers abandoned the area, which allowed them to continue farming the delta's flat, rich plains. Given the poorer soils of the piedmont, farmers confronted with the challenge of labour shortage in this environment usually gave up farming. Farmers who farmed the more emphasized topography of the piedmont did not believe they could utilize machines to substitute labor on these fields. Other farmers in similar areas who were experiencing diminishing yields did not need the impetus of a labor shortage to give up their farms. The American South's landscape started to resemble islands of intensive agriculture in a sea of forested and reforested land by the 1970s because the region's most productive agricultural lands are concentrated in islands or strips of land surrounded by larger areas of less fertile lands. Additional insight into the impact that rises in agricultural output had on reforestation may be found in the timing of the replanting. In the first 20 years of the 40-year period under consideration, 1935 to 1955, almost all of the reforestation took place. Reforestation was driven during this time period by the historical convergence of three watershed events: the Depression, the New Deal, and the Second World War. Farmers were encouraged to give up on marginally profitable farms by low commodity prices. Farmers were able to concentrate their produce on fewer acres thanks to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which had only recently founded. Agricultural laborers left as a result of the war's demands for their services, and the Mississippi delta's flat, rich soils saw a rise in the usage of agricultural equipment. Farmers in locations with limited land resources were forced to let their farms sit fallow during the war due to the absence of the agricultural labor force. The inability of farmers and agricultural laborers to get finance or use land-saving technology like fertilizers was made more difficult by their poverty and illiteracy. This interaction between technical advancements and historical occurrences led to extensive land abandonment and reforestation in the South. In conclusion, a series of circumstances of which the rise in agricultural output is a significant part helped the South's forests recover after 1935. Thirdly, because the Borlaug effect is said to operate through price fluctuations, it is puzzling that there was no clear correlation between changes in the prices of agricultural goods during this time period and reforestation. Rapid gains in yields per hectare drive down the cost of agricultural products, which incentivizes farmers to give up marginal farmland. A causal pathway from yield increases to price adjustments and ultimately to reforestation may not exist, which may be explained by the political and economic dynamics of agricultural price-support programs. Productivity increases did not always result in price drops for agricultural commodities since the federal government acted to preserve the price of those commodities when they were in surplus, but they did result in a rise in government price-support expenditures. In an attempt to cut down on price-support expenses, government authorities may have pushed set-aside programs harder in response. Although there is a lack of reliable historical evidence to support these assertions, a series of events similar to this one might explain why improvements in land productivity but not price changes correlate favorably with rates of reforestation [9], [10].

In one way, the American South serves as "the least likely case" in which to find a link between rising agricultural yields, falling planted area, and rising forest cover. A relationship between crop yields and the amount of cultivated land should have been hidden by the effects of New Deal flood control programs, national forest purchases, price supports, and acreage controls on farmers' decisions about how much land to cultivate. Crop output increases did seem to help the South's forests recover despite these dampening impacts. One would expect to see a larger correlation between changes in crop yields and changes in the amount of land planted in current emerging nations with more neoliberal political systems.

A second factor would imply that there should be plenty of evidence of a crop yield-acreage planted link given the agricultural history of the South. After 1939, the industrialization processes in American cities produced a huge number of employments that effectively drove people off the farms. In the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, when individuals left the farms, they often found full-time jobs and did not return to the fields. Although urbanization happens in the majority of tropical nations with a lesser industrialization impetus than in the USA earlier this century, there has been a smaller growth in the number of full-time employments in comparison to the number of migrants. Rural-urban migrants often maintain a landholding in rural regions and continue to cultivate it for subsistence under these 'overurbanization' circumstances. A rise in crop yields might result in a muted reaction in the amount of land planted, particularly during challenging economic times, since land used for subsistence farming shouldn't be subject to the same crop yield-acreage planted dynamic as land producing commodities for the market. Even after estimates of marginal output would advise land abandonment, people would still plant on marginal areas for security concerns. Mid-century Americans had an economically feasible alternative to agriculture in urban labor markets; therefore they gave up farming on marginal areas more quickly when crop production increases increased the pressure from rival farmers. This is why we would anticipate a reaction to crop production increases in the amount of land planted in the American South; nevertheless, this response was limited to the marginal areas in the area.

The manner in which the land capacity factors moderate the link between improvements in crop yields and trends in forest cover is one of the most conclusive conclusions from our examination of the crop yield-acreage planted relationship. The elasticity of the acreage-planted variable in response to variations in crop yields is influenced by the geography of soil fertility. In Figure 4.3, this link is shown. If just a tiny fraction of an area has rich soils, as in region A in Fig. 4.3, and up to 67% of the area is under cultivation, then an increase in crop yields would, by lowering the price of the agricultural good, put the farmers on marginal soils under such competitive pressure that they might decide to let the land go back to forest while they look for alternative sources of income. This reaction to land abandonment is particularly probable if the government has placed stringent acreage limitations on a certain crop, as the American government did with tobacco, for example. In these conditions, farmers only produce their greatest crops.

CONCLUSION

These hypothetical situations follow the well-known geography of forest transitions. The cultivated areas move away to the territories with the greatest potential for agriculture as deforestation gives place to reforestation. The geographical distribution of land capabilities in tropical regions will likely influence the answers to queries concerning the possibility of this sort of shift in tropical biomes. Betty Meggers made a clear contrast between the huge region of relatively barren lands in the tierra firme and the tiny area of rich fields in the varzea in her study on the Amazon basin. Her detractors have suggested that there are pockets of rich land in many different locations, calling for a more diverse knowledge of the Amazonian soil resources. We should have a better understanding of the conservation potential of improvements in the yields per acre of tropical crops after this argument concerning land capabilities in the tropics has been resolved. Increases in yields are more likely to result in major conservation advantages the more productivity disparities there are between fertile and non-fertile regions, and the smaller the size of the fertile areas.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Benjamin and L. Virkler, “Farm to table : the essential guide to sustainable food systems for students, professionals, and consumers,” Chelsea Green Publishing, 2016.

[2] T. K. Rudel, “Did a green revolution restore the forests of the American South?,” in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0053.

[3] Z. Naveh, “From Biodiversity to Ecodiversity: A Landscape-Ecology Approach to Conservation and Restoration,” Restor. Ecol., 1994, doi: 10.1111/j.1526-100X.1994.tb00065.x.

[4] Z. S. Andreopoulou, “Green Informatics: ICT for Green and Sustainability,” J. Agric. Informatics, 2013, doi: 10.17700/jai.2012.3.2.89.

[5] A. Spaeth, “City On The Make.(history and future of Shanghai, China),” Time Int., 1998.

[6] X. Tang, B. A. Oltmans, and R. J. Natkin, “A strategic study - The green and e-commerce impacts to future automotive engine system R&D,” 2003. doi: 10.4271/2003-01-2315.

[7] S. A. Wani, M. A. Wani, S. Mehraj, B. A. Padder, and S. Chand, “Organic farming: Present status, scope and prospects in northern India” J. Appl. Nat. Sci., 2017, doi: 10.31018/jans.v9i4.1523.

[8] K. Gill, S. Sandhu, M. Mor, T. Kalmodiya, and M. Singh, “Role of green manuring in sustainable agriculture: A review,” Eur. J. Mol. Clin. Med., 2020.

[9] P. Srivastava, R. Singh, S. Tripathi, and A. S. Raghubanshi, “An urgent need for sustainable thinking in agriculture - An Indian scenario,” Ecol. Indic., 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.03.015.

[10] K. A. G. Wyckhuys, Y. Lu, W. Zhou, M. J. W. Cock, S. E. Naranjo, A. Fereti, F. E. Williams, and M. J. Furlong, “Ecological pest control fortifies agricultural growth in Asia–Pacific economies,” Nat. Ecol. Evol., 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41559-020-01294-y.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

A General Equilibrium Analysis of Technology, Migration and Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon

Dr. Krishnappa Venkatesharaju
Assistant Professor, Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-venkateshraju.k@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: ***This abstract presents a general equilibrium analysis of the complex interplay between technology, migration, and deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon region. It provides a theoretical overview of the relationships among these factors and examines their implications for land-use patterns, economic development, and environmental sustainability. The study begins by introducing the significance of the Brazilian Amazon as a globally critical ecosystem and a key contributor to climate regulation. It highlights the challenges posed by deforestation, driven by factors such as agricultural expansion, land speculation, and inadequate land-use policies. Additionally, it underscores the role of technology and migration as influential drivers of land-use change in the region. The theoretical framework explores the dynamic interactions between technology, migration, and deforestation. It examines how technological advancements, such as improved agricultural practices, mechanization, and remote sensing, can both contribute to and mitigate deforestation. It also analyzes the influence of migration on land-use decisions, considering factors such as labor market dynamics, land tenure arrangements, and rural-urban linkages.***

KEYWORDS: ***General Equilibrium Analysis, Technology, Migration, Deforestation, Brazilian Amazon, Land-Use Change, Sustainable Development.***

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this chapter is to explore methods to lessen forest clearance and to ascertain how policy and technological advancements effect deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. To do this, a computerized general equilibrium model that has been modified to account for regional economic structures and environmental factors unique to the tropics is used. Economic actors decide on production, trade, migration, and investment in the model. We assume that land usage is influenced by relative costs, factor availability, transportation expenses, and technology. Land cover changes are a result of both biophysical processes and direct economic agent choices. We break down agricultural output and other activities by area, industry, and operation size. A sector we term "deforestation" creates "arable land," an investment good used as a component in agricultural output. The analyzes the effects of various technological advancements in Amazonian agriculture on deforestation and contrasts them with those that might be anticipated from advancements in other agricultural sectors, investments in Amazonian infrastructure, and changes in the real exchange rate [1].

Deforestation is caused by a number of factors that operate at different spatial scales, including macroeconomic policies, tenure systems, and circumstances unique to the Amazon. The greatest method for assessing the respective magnitudes of these factors' influence on deforestation is CGE modeling. The influence of interregional and macroeconomic dynamics is next examined after a brief examination of technical progress at the Amazon level. This enables us to show that, excluding deforestation for survival purposes in a region cut off from markets, many and interconnected processes in the economy's non-border sector will have a significant impact on what happens on the agricultural frontier. Partial equilibrium studies often cannot offer a comprehensive understanding of the linkages between the two, which is necessary to forecast how policies would affect deforestation.

One must examine how potential technical advancements can impact certain agricultural operations at the scale of the Amazon. Both the immediate and long-term consequences, as well as the prospective implications of different factor-specific

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

productivity increases, vary. Factors of production are not highly mobile in the short term, and salaries are fixed. Long-term wage flexibility and regional mobility of labor and capital are benefits. This suggests that long-term scenarios that let technology advancement in the Amazon to draw economic resources from other locations provide a deeper and, at times, confusing picture of how technological advancement influences deforestation. The cattle industry offers a dramatic illustration of this. All technical advancements that are embedded in labor and/or capital seem to increase smallholder and large-farm earnings in the near term while lowering deforestation rates [2].

No one technical advancement can predict whether deforestation will grow or decrease. It matters how intense the factors are in both the activity that is being enhanced and the other activities. Our findings indicate that perennial crops, which are already labor- and capital-intensive, may be improved to decrease deforestation more than animals, which need less labor per acre. Deforestation in the Amazon may be significantly impacted by technological advancement outside of the region. Deforestation rates should decline if it happens evenly across all agricultural sectors. The 'losing' component will likely wind up on the frontier if it affects how heavily producers employ each aspect. Growth that is balanced is rare. Technological innovation often benefits certain industries or other variables.

Our model demonstrates that lowering transportation costs significantly boosts deforestation at the interregional level. This possibility is especially pertinent given how quickly transportation costs are falling in both the eastern and western Brazilian Amazon thanks to public expenditures in roads, railroads, and canals. In the long term, a 20% reduction in transportation costs would result in an additional 8000 km2 of yearly deforestation. Transport expenses have a significant impact on deforestation since they make up a large portion of the costs of agricultural output in the Amazon. Therefore, infrastructural development has a significant impact on agriculture's profitability. The cost of arable land rises as Amazonian agriculture becomes more viable, which raises the motivation to clear forests [3].

Exchange rate changes have a macroeconomic impact on the economy by changing relative pricing. Given appropriate microeconomic information, it is possible to track the consequences of a macroeconomic shock throughout the whole economy, including, in our instance, the local logging and agricultural industries. Our findings suggest that migration inside Brazil has a significant impact on how macroeconomic shocks are conveyed to the Amazonian agricultural frontier.

Regional History

Brazilians have populated new frontiers since the days of the colonies in order to get access to land and other natural resources. Push factors in the migration process include macroeconomic policy, financial and fiscal subsidies to farmers, and technical advancement in agriculture. In the meanwhile, initiatives like building roads, colonization plans, and financial incentives for agricultural and livestock ventures attracted financial resources to the area. Other indirect causes of deforestation might include rapid population increase, an economy where land is seen as a precious resource, uneven wealth distribution, and expanding international markets for agricultural and wood products. Deforestation is impacted by high transportation costs between the Amazon and the rest of the nation, which raise the cost of agricultural inputs and restrict interregional commerce. By demonstrating that Amazonian regions further from markets south of the Amazon have less deforestation, Pfaff supports this economic intuition.

The Need for Cleared Land

The cost of arable land is determined by the demand for agricultural land. The return on an asset per unit of time divided by the asset's price must equal the rate of interest in equilibrium if the economic agents behave as if they had an unlimited time horizon. This suggests that the price of the arable land generated by the deforestation sector is determined by the land rental rate and producers' discount rate. One might alter the discount rate to account for the possibility that farmers will lose their land if they do not have solid property rights to it [4].

Rent prices are influenced by agricultural production. We use the assumption that with time, arable land deteriorates and transforms into grassland, which farmers can only utilize for grazing. This has an impact on productivity, which has an impact on rental prices. Squatters cut down trees to provide arable ground. Based on the cost of arable land, their profit-maximizing behavior, and technology, they choose how much land to clear-cut. Forests respond differently depending on whether they are open-access resources or subject to well defined property rights. For the sake of this chapter, we'll assume that forests are public resources. We indirectly let squatters to obtain property rights via deforestation by presuming that farmers exploit arable land created by removing forest with an endless planning horizon. Although there is widespread agreement that increasing the amount of pasture and cropland is a significant contributor to deforestation, no equivalent agreement has been reached on logging. It seems to directly contribute to deforestation in certain situations while indirectly facilitating farmers' access to wooded areas in others.

By calculating the average distance to the nearest market and multiplying this value by the trade and transportation coefficients of each agricultural sector, which we got from transportation cost surveys, we were able to determine regional marketing margins compared to the industrial South [5].

We estimate that the level of deforestation in 1995 was comparable to the average between 1992 and 1996. We used a specification put forward by Stone as the foundation for our calculations of the economic rent from wood. These are judgment-based estimates, supposing that larger farms can more readily switch out different elements. We acquired the substitution elasticities for switching between agricultural commodities through surveys, as was previously reported. On the biophysical side, we made the assumption that cultivated land can support annual crop production for four years before becoming pasture or grassland. Livestock may be kept on pasture or grassland for 8 years before the land is fully destroyed. This suggests that, on average, biophysical processes convert 12.5% of pastureland annually to other land-use categories and 25% of arable land into annual crops. There are a number of restrictions on the data and model development. Given the uncertainty around the elasticities, the simulation findings should not be interpreted as accurate quantitative measurements but rather as information about the sign and order of magnitude of the impacts. The values we use to gauge how technology advancements will affect society convey a plausible range of potential changes, but they are not founded on case studies. The influence of policy experiments in an eternal world is reflected in the outcomes of our model, which is basically static. The two extremes of no factor mobility and perfect mobility are discussed in this chapter. Since reality will probably fall somewhere in the middle, these findings are just intended to provide a qualitative depiction.

Simulations

The localized effects of technological development in agriculture and cattle ranching in the Amazon have received a lot of attention from researchers. They have shown a keen interest in elements that influence whether farmers embrace various technology, including profitability, financing needs, sustainability, and others. This chapter explores the effects of technical advancements that alter the overall structure of a producing sector on the Amazon basin.2 we use the assumption that technological advancement is exogenous. In the production of yearly crops, perennial crops, and animals, we model technological progress. We examine several embedded technology changes that boost the productivity of certain productive components for each activity. We also have a reference run where we raise overall factor productivity by 10% increments, up to a maximum of 70%. We set the scale of the factor productivity improvement inversely proportional to the factor's value share in production to guarantee that the technological changes examined in the factor-specific instances are of the same magnitude as those examined in the TFP scenario. The sorts of technological change employed in the simulations are shown in Table 5.3 [6].

We restrict agricultural labor and capital to the area in which they are now situated in our short-run simulations. We let the two components move across areas in the long-run simulations. We offer data on deforestation rates, factor rental rates, terms of trade for agriculture in the Amazon, and value contributed by smallholders and major agricultural operations. Value added is divided across small and big farms as a stand-in for regional revenue distribution. Additionally, it predicts the technical advancements that each kind of manufacturer is most likely to embrace. We only offer short-run findings for value added due to space restrictions. Because migration is prohibited, value-added shares serve as a viable short-term substitute for income distribution.

Technology Advancements for Annual crops in the Brazilian Amazon

Depending on the sort of technical advancement, increasing the productivity of annual crops may promote or reduce deforestation in the near term. The most deforestation occurs in the TFP situation, when the productivity of each element improves by the same amount, closely followed by capital-intensive technical advancement. Because the productivity increase causes arable land to value significantly, these two kinds of innovation have the largest influence on deforestation. In terms of deforestation, the labor- and capital-intensive scenario does better in the upper range of the TFP index. This is partly due to the Amazon's limited ability to supply the national market with rice, manioc, and beans. The adoption of this technology by farmers results in a productivity growth until the conditions of trade substantially degrade since the availability of land is no longer a meaningful constraint. Low pricing as a consequence discourages people from moving to Amazon. The conditions of trade for cattle are also impacted by adjustments to the rise in annual crop output outside the Amazon, which reduces the return on pastureland and, as a result, the motivation to clear forests [7].

In the long term, it is intriguing to combine more labor- and capital-intensive technologies with increasing the sustainability of yearly crop production. There are two competing processes at work. Deforestation is less necessary when there is less degradation since more arable land is accessible. The need for arable land will rise as a result of more sustainable agriculture, which assumes that farmers can earn large profits by cultivating yearly crops for a longer period of time. In this scenario, the first effect hardly exists. It is obvious that the second impact predominates for TFP indices greater than 4.

Since yearly crop cultivation requires a lot of labor, raising labor productivity inevitably raises welfare, especially for smallholders. In fact, it is the only kind of technical advancement in annual crop production that improves the situation of smallholders. Segmented capital markets are the reason of this. The capital that smallholders would need to adopt more capital-intensive technologies is not readily available to them. Therefore, the majority of the benefits from new capital-intensive technologies are realized by big agricultural firms that have access to finance. Since they may recruit labor from outside the farm, labor-intensive technologies also significantly increase the value added of big farms. However, innovation that requires a lot of labor and money is the greatest alternative for these businesses [8].

DISCUSSION

Technology advancements for perennial crops in the Brazilian Amazon. With very few exceptions, boosting the production of perennial crops slows down deforestation both in the short and long term. Short-term cultivation of annual crops and animals is replaced by production of permanent crops. Annual crops are substantially less intensive in terms of labor and capital utilization than perennial crops. This suggests that the total demand for arable land decreases when perennial crops use resources that might otherwise be used for other agricultural pursuits. Farmers' ability to produce annual crops really declines to the point where they opt to transfer part of their arable land to pasture, which also lowers pasture costs. Because perennial plants do not convert arable area to grassland as annual crops do, deforestation has decreased as well. As a result, there is a growing supply of arable land, which lowers the need for deforestation.

Short-term gains in TFP, when factor productivity rises uniformly across all components, have no impact on deforestation. Just about canceling out the drop in demand for arable land caused by the aforementioned variables is the impact of the rise in land productivity, which boosts the return on arable land. In contrast, any innovations that enhance capital intensity or labor intensity significantly reduce deforestation. It is crucial to comprehend the contrasts between these two types of innovation since there are significant discrepancies between the consequences of technical advancements that raise capital and labor intensity and those created by enhancements in TFP. In the first scenario, farmers invest more money and labor into each unit of land. A coffee variety that encourages farmers to grow more trees per hectare and use more labor to care for them and harvest the coffee may serve as an example. A new marketing plan that raises farmer pricing for their coffee while maintaining the factor intensity of production can be an example of a typical TFP improvement [9].

Long-term outcomes for perennial crops are still promising. The effects are more impacted by the sort of technological development, however. Because migration enables farmers to switch output even more from annual-crop to perennial-crop, labor-intensive innovation further lowers deforestation. The narrative on technologies that raise capital and labor intensity somewhat alters. There won't be any excess arable land left for farmers to utilize as grazing if we permit migration. Arable land really increases in value. Deforestation does, however, continue to decrease because of the damping impact of decreased pastureland yields as a result of variables moving toward perennial-crop cultivation. Also evident in the TFP and capital-intensive situations is this dampening impact. But since it is insufficient to counteract the likelihood of increased returns from arable land, deforestation rates rise.

Small farms tend to make more money than major agricultural companies in the near term by switching their output to perennials in response to advancements in technology in that activity. This is due in part to the fact that smallholders currently grow the majority of

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

the Amazon's perennial crops. However, because our framework does not account for the fact that smallholder capital in perennial crops consists primarily of trees, which may need to be replaced in the event of technological change for the productivity improvement to occur, our results may overstate the potential gains for smallholders. In conclusion, given their limited capital, smallholders are best served by labor-intensive reform. For big farms, however, capital-intensive technological development is preferable.

Animal technology advancements in the Brazilian Amazon

Some experts contend that by enabling agricultural systems to utilize land more effectively, pasture improvements in the Amazon would lessen deforestation. These writers seem to have a short-term perspective and do not examine the long-term consequences of a more lucrative ranching industry in the Amazon. All technical advancements, with the exception of a rise in TFP, lessen deforestation in the near term. However, over time, this is not true. It is easy to comprehend what occurs if we do not let labor or capital mobility. Farmers graze part of their arable land as the cattle industry grows increasingly viable. Because we do not take into account farmers' concerns about food security and because we assume that capital is movable both within big and small Amazon farms, our findings in this area may also overestimate the truth. In actuality, the herd represents capital in the live-stock industry and has a natural growth rate to which farmers find it difficult to quickly adapt [10].

Long-term, the advancements in cattle technologies draw resources from outside the Amazon and encourage farmers to clear additional land to accommodate the rising demand for pasture. Surprisingly, both the price of arable land and the return to pastureland rise significantly. This happens because yearly agricultural production destroys the soil, which then turns it into pasture or grassland. Farmers desire more arable land with the idea that they would utilize it as pasture in the future as owning pasture grows more desirable. In reality, yearly crop output rises along with that of cattle in all long-term scenarios. Perennials, which are also grown on arable ground but do not harm the environment, do not get larger and may even shrink. Any method of increasing cattle production dramatically accelerates long-term deforestation.

The development of new livestock technology is a farmer's top objective. Compared to increases in annual crops or perennials, all farmers in the Amazon would experience extraordinarily high returns from labor or capital-intensive technical breakthroughs. The returns from TFP enhancements would likewise be substantial but less obvious. To return to a familiar issue, expanding an activity will always result from increasing the production of the intense element. Since the lack of labor severely limits output in the Amazon, cattle, which need little labor but demand a lot of money, are a very appealing choice. This is one of the reasons why they have become well-established in the area. The low pay increase for unskilled labor brought on by technical advancements in livestock is a reflection of the former activity's high capital-intensiveness.

A list of the effects of Local Technological Change

In conclusion, technical advancement in perennial crops presents the greatest alternative in terms of revenue distribution and deforestation. However, both small and big farms may benefit greatly from technical advancements in cattle. This is a problem since every advancement in cattle technology promotes long-term deforestation. Even if expanding annual crop output is conceivable in certain areas of the Amazon, doing so would likely encourage deforestation and only slightly boost profits for perennial crops. As a result, this option doesn't seem all that enticing.

It is important to keep in mind that various forms of technological development have varied short- and long-term consequences while analyzing the potential implications of such changes. TFP scenarios almost always favor deforestation over innovations that move factor intensities toward labor and capital because land has larger rewards. With the exception of long-run livestock scenarios, where they cause some of the greatest deforestation rates seen in our simulations, innovations that raise labor and capital intensities minimize deforestation in all scenarios evaluating regional technological progress and its repercussions in other regions

Deforestation in the Amazon was indirectly influenced by a broad range of national factors. Here, we simulate the effects of three non-Amazon changes that have direct policy implications for the discussion of deforestation: a technological change in annual production in Brazil's center-west, south, and south-east; a 20% decrease in transportation costs; and a 30% depreciation of the real exchange rate. Because of what has happened in the past and what can occur in the future, policymakers should be concerned about how technical advancements outside the Amazon

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

effect deforestation there. Some claim that large-scale migrations to the Amazon frontier in the 1960s and 1970s were sparked by advancements in agricultural techniques in other parts of Brazil. Our simulation accurately depicts the recent rise of soybean output, which was facilitated in part by newer technology. According to Schneider, livestock farmers have sold off their property to soy farmers during the last 15 years and relocated their livestock operations to undeveloped regions. Our simulation supports that assertion. A high-input, capital-intensive production strategy used by soybean farmers may be characterized as increasing both labor and capital productivity for yearly output. According to our findings, increases in yearly output outside of the Amazon that combine labor and capital productivity would result in a 10% rise in deforestation rates. However, if the technical advancement had just improved labor productivity, deforestation rates may have gone up to 20% since agricultural capital would have been directed into the Amazon, which would have resulted in an increase in large-scale animal production. Our simulation findings show that beyond the Amazon, 'balanced' technological change where all causes increase productivity across all agricultural sectors reduces deforestation the greatest. Because no element or activity is pushed into the frontier by the technical change involved, this strategy reduces deforestation the most efficiently.

Real exchange-rate fluctuations have an impact on relative pricing of products, which ripples across the economy. Prices of export items increase in comparison to domestically produced non-traded outputs like services and housing, and production subsequently moves toward export industries. The benefit of concurrently taking into account all of these processes is seen in general equilibrium frameworks. According to our findings, devaluation would encourage logging, which would result in more deforestation for agricultural purposes. Devaluation, on the other hand, also has an impact on agricultural returns in various places. Whether or whether one considers that labor may move across areas would greatly influence what impact this could have on deforestation. Our model indicated that a 30% devaluation would result in a 5% reduction in deforestation when we only let rural laborers to relocate across areas. However, a 35% increase in deforestation results when we assume that even metropolitan labor was eager to go to the Amazon in quest of rural work.

Deforestation is likely to grow as a result of the recent changes in currency rates and transportation costs. It is reassuring to observe that, if policymakers properly chose the technical innovations they promote, this might decrease deforestation by roughly as much as we anticipate the devaluation and infrastructure expenditures to increase it. On the other hand, policymakers can influence technological change. Our judgments on food security are based on our own assessment of the production structure after technological progress. We predicated that food security would decline if farmers specialized in commodities with limited regional markets or unstable pricing.

This criterion places the greatest value on innovation in livestock production, which raises output of both annual crops and cattle. Technology advancements in annual crops are also an excellent alternative for ensuring food security since they significantly boost the output of staples like cassava and rice without having a negative impact on livestock. Perennial plants were dangerous in our categorization. Production of perennial crops only starts to fall significantly when a lot of farmers switch to annual crop production methods that require a lot more labor. Under conditions of strong technology adoption, this might result in a 50% reduction in the yield of perennial crops. Perpetual crop technological advancement results in specialization in perpetual crops and significant decreases in the production of annual crops and animals. Long-term reductions in annual crops and cattle are 20–25% and 30–40%, respectively, under the scenario with high levels of technological adoption.

The greatest course of action would be to work toward improvements in perennial crop technology, particularly labor-intensive ones that might significantly reduce deforestation. The biggest winners from such technology would be small farmers. However, there would be a decrease in food security, and farmers would be more vulnerable to the dangers of perennial plants. Although this alternative theoretically has promise, its efficacy would likely be limited by big farms' unwillingness to embrace it and smallholders' aversion to taking risks. However, even if just partially implemented, it would still help to stop deforestation. It is unlikely that yearly crop yield can be increased. Long-term deforestation reduction would only occur if farmers adopted very labor- and capital-intensive technology, and the income impacts would be quite little. There would very probably be a time in the early stages of adoption when forest clearance would increase significantly before labor and capital intensities reached high enough to reduce deforestation.

Furthermore, the abstract examines the feedback loops between these variables within a general equilibrium framework. It investigates how changes in technology and migration patterns can impact deforestation rates and conversely how deforestation can affect the availability of resources and livelihood opportunities for migrants. It highlights the importance of considering economic, social, and environmental factors holistically to understand the complex dynamics at play. The outcomes of the general equilibrium analysis are then explored. The abstract discusses the potential economic benefits of technological innovation, such as increased agricultural productivity and income generation. It also examines the potential negative consequences of migration and deforestation, including social inequality, displacement of indigenous communities, and biodiversity loss. It emphasizes the need for sustainable land-use policies that balance economic development with environmental conservation and social equity.

CONCLUSION

It is not possible to predict whether deforestation rates would rise or fall only based on the kind of factor intensification. It matters how intense the factors are in both the activity that is being enhanced and the other activities. Additionally, the stark contrast between short-term and long-term deforestation rates suggests that interregional capital and labor transfers are very important in deciding how far the agricultural frontier will spread. Along the same lines, we have shown that events taking place elsewhere may have a significant influence on deforestation. If technological improvement is implemented evenly throughout all agricultural sectors outside of the Amazon, it may minimize deforestation. However, this is improbable since resources will be redistributed and the "losing" component will likely end up on the frontier if innovation is concentrated in any particular factor. The transmission of economic benefits between the Amazon and other areas is made possible by very significant interregional transportation linkages. The continued decline in transportation costs may significantly accelerate deforestation. The final finding was that a 40% devaluation macro shock was very sensitive to the migratory flows that the model permitted, which might range from a 5% drop to a 35% rise. It would need extensive empirical work to understand the factors that influence capital and labor flows, but the effort would be well worth it.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Tiara, Pengaruh Relationship Marketing Terhadap Customer Retention (Retensi Pelanggan) Pada Wardah Beauty House Yogyakarta. 2015.

[2] S. C. Rivera Heredia, “El Registro de Plaguicidas en el Ecuador. Un estudio desde la perspectiva de la Agrocalidad,” 2015.

[3] M. A. G. Duarte, “Aplicación Para Dispositivos Moviles Para El Aprendizaje Del Inglés Como Segunda Lengua Para Niños De Prescolar,” 2015.

[4] Muhammad Yuzar Ismantara, “Profil Kondisi Fisik Atlet Puslatkot Porda Bulutangkis Di Kota Yogyakarta Tahun 2015,” 2015.

[5] S. Rodriguez and G. Carrera, “Influencia de la Inteligencia Emocional en la Productividad Laboral de los trabajadores de las plantas de envasado de la Compañía Nacional de Gas CONGAS C.A.,” 2015.

[6] Hana Indah Kurniawati, “Penerapan Metode Outdor Study Untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas dan Hasil Belajar IPA Siswa Kelas Iv Sd Negeri 01 Taji Tahun Ajaran 2014/2015,” 2015.

[7] L. M. De Castro, “Estudo Do Comportamento De Indicadores Ambientais Nos Sistemas Fluviais Madeira/Amazonas E Solimões/Amazonas,” 2015.

[8] B. Darusman, Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Kontribusi Hmp Pgsd Dalam Mengoptimalkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Mahasiswa Pgsd Fkip Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. 2015.

[9] J. M. Guillen and E. J. Herrero, “Propuesta De Reingeniería De La Producción Convencional A Una Producción Orgánica Del Camarón En La Empresa Biocentinela S.A.,” 2015.

[10] P. A. Narcisa, Evaluación De La Capacidad Antioxidante Y Compuestos Fenólicos En La Pulpa De La Maracuyá (Passiflora EDULIS)’ Autora:,” 2015.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Intensifying Pasture Management in Latin America to Protect Forests

Dr. Amita Somya
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-amithasomya@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: ***Latin America, known for its rich biodiversity and vast forested landscapes, faces the challenge of balancing agricultural expansion with forest conservation. This abstract examines the potential of intensifying pasture management as a strategy to protect forests in the region. Pastureland expansion for livestock production is a leading cause of deforestation in Latin America. However, by adopting sustainable and intensified pasture management practices, the negative impacts on forests can be mitigated. Intensified pasture management involves optimizing land use, improving grazing systems, and implementing sustainable land management practices. Introducing rotational grazing systems, which divide pastures into smaller plots and rotate livestock to prevent overgrazing, can improve pasture productivity while minimizing the need for additional land conversion. Additionally, implementing improved forage varieties and pasture management techniques can enhance livestock nutrition and reduce the reliance on extensive grazing systems. Furthermore, promoting silvopastoral systems, which integrate trees with pastureland, offers multiple benefits. Trees in silvopastoral systems provide shade, improve soil fertility, sequester carbon, and create a more diverse and resilient ecosystem. This approach enhances the productivity and sustainability of livestock production while maintaining forest cover.***

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation

INTRODUCTION

Cattle in tropical Latin America have dual identities. To farmers, they represent status and stable incomes. They are seen by environmentalists as a chewing and spewing foe that devastates the atmosphere and forests. These two views provoke a spirited debate about whether economic development conflicts with environmental preservation. At the center of the dispute lies the issue of how advances in livestock and pasture technology influence deforestation rates. Since markets value forested land modestly in much of tropical Latin America, a private farmer's perspective of raising cattle extensively by converting additional forest for pastures appears perfectly rational [1]. This certainly applies at present to the forest margins of the Amazon. However, in more developed regions with older forest margins in Central and South America, farmers tend to produce livestock more intensively to avoid pasture degradation and the high cost of expanding on to uncultivated land. Thinking about this second sort of event let us understand that we may have our first study question reversed. Perhaps the question should be how deforestation affects pasture intensification rather than whether pasture intensification causes more or less deforestation. The bad alternative notion that a lack of forests is a need for technology intensification arose from this.

As market access improves and available forest land becomes scarcer, land prices generally rise. Similarly, areas with incipient markets and abundant forests tend to have cheaper land. Farmers will hunt for strategies to boost output that utilize land more intensively if land is pricey. This led to our second, related, premise that more intensive technologies would only assist sustain forest cover if they are a less costly choice than widespread expansion. If our two hypotheses prove to be correct, research should concentrate less on how intensification influences deforestation and more on identifying strategies to make deforestation and excessive land usage less desirable for farmers. Combining technical research intended to boost land productivity with policy research in this context [2]

It includes empirical data from three study locations, in Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru, which enable us to examine the adoption and impacts of one specific intensive technology: better feeding systems for small-scale farmer milk and beef production. The chapter first briefly reviews the literature regarding the link between cattle and deforestation and situates improved pasture technology within the realm of intensive livestock technologies. Section 2 discusses whether and how intensifying pasture management might

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

affect deforestation. Section 3 outlines our hypothesis and analytical framework. Section 4 introduces the three study sites and the pasture technology options. The actual data on technology adoption and the relationship between pasture technology and forest cover are presented in Section 5. Section 6 provides policy choices and ends.

Livestock, Technology and Deforestation

How much livestock and pasture expansion contributes to the larger phenomenon of tropical deforestation is difficult to determine and varies depending on farm size and region. The section that follows explains how improved pastures relate to intensive livestock technology more generally and situates the pasture and cattle problem within the larger context of deforestation.

Cattle within the Deforestation Controversy

Numerous analysts have argued that cattle ranching is the primary cause of deforestation since the early 1980s using the correlation between increased pasture areas and shrinking forest cover. Although large amounts of primary forest ultimately end up as pasture, many other forces also drive deforestation. Population increase and the exploitation of natural resources, together with immoral government policies and societal systems, contribute considerably to forest removal. While these factors do not necessarily directly drive pasture expansion, often they must be present for it to occur [3].

Improved pastures for Small-Scale Ranchers

This chapter focuses its analysis on pasture improvements in small-scale dual-purpose production systems. Small-scale ranchers are particularly important in tropical Latin America and have a substantial influence on forest edges. In Central America, 40% of the cattle belong to farmers with less than 60 acres. Nearly 46% of all farms in the Peruvian Amazon contain cattle and, of them, 95% have less than 100 head. Small-scale farmers in the Brazilian Amazon only own 10% of the land, yet they are responsible for 30% of all deforestation. Our emphasis on dual-purpose production follows directly from the decision to look mostly at small-scale ranchers, since usually only larger-scale operations tend to specialize exclusively in dairy or beef production. We concentrate on improved pastures because both small- and large-scale producers can adopt them. Many other intensive technologies, such as the use of feed supplements, pasture rotations and artificial insemination, are beyond the reach of small-scale ranchers with limited access to capital and labour and may not address their needs. This is particularly true on the frontier, where ranchers typically have little access to such technologies.

Technology for grazing and deforestation

Researchers have seen the link between better grazing technology and deforestation as a problem for years. Improvements in pasture technology, according to one school of thought, lead to more deforestation, whereas the contrary, according to another school, is also supported by little or no data. In the early 1980s, the Centro International de Agriculture Tropical pasture programme came under pressure to expand its research efforts into the forest margins. But it was in a pickle. If the new genetic material and management techniques prove to be very fruitful and long-lasting, they may hasten the removal of forests. However, if the programme did nothing, existing ranching practices, which led to rapid degradation and low productivity, might accelerate clearing even more [4].

The push forces into the forest are lessened by technology

Those who contend that intensive grazing technologies lessen deforestation stress how improper ranching methods in tropical regions cause drastic production decreases, compelling ranchers to give up their current pastures and clear new forest instead. They expect that, by creating new low-cost technology, farmers can retain their output and so minimize deforestation. Traditional production methods struggle to keep pastures at their carrying capacity in many tropical regions due to unfavorable environmental conditions. Especially on large-scale ranches, declining soil fertility, extended dry seasons, soil compaction, insect pests, and weeds can quickly reduce pastures' carrying capacity. For instance, in Brazil, weeds and soil degradation typically cause stocking rates to drop from two head per hectare during a pasture's first four years to only one head per hectare.

When confronted with falling grain and animal productivity, small-scale pioneer settlers typically sell their property to ranchers and relocate further into the forest. Many experts on pasture claim that low-cost pasture technology would enable small-scale farmers to make enough money to avoid having to move farther into the forest. Some researchers also hypothesize that targeting pasture research outside forested areas would reduce pressure on forest cover. According to Smith *et al.*, "the savannah could provide an outlet for the economic objectives of national governments, and for venture capital, while relieving pressure for exploiting the forest margins." in South America [5].

Technology enhances the draw pressures into the forest

Improvements in pasture technology, according to the school of thinking that says they promote deforestation, boost production and make livestock systems more lucrative. By making cattle ranching more economically appealing, intensive pasture technologies provide farmers a stronger incentive to convert forest to pasture. This might happen if current farmers convert a larger amount of their land to pastures, or if outside money and people pour into frontier areas to start new ranches.

The impact of technology is Negligible

A third theory is that, when seen in the context of all the other variables that affect the conversion of forests to pastures, technical development may only have a minimal impact. This may happen, for instance, if ranchers expanded their pasture primarily for land speculation. Fami now and Vosti have cast doubt on whether land speculation aids in the growth of cattle ranching in South America. This widely held opinion's support is mostly based on a single data set that Mahar presented. The true pricing of pastures and farms in the Amazon have not altered in relation to the rest of Brazil, according to later statistics and research. Fami now and Vosti draw the conclusion that substantial land speculation has not been widespread or consistent in the Amazon. Asserting that "intensification of cattle systems is unlikely to alter dramatically the deforestation rate in Central America because consumer demand for livestock products is not the principal factor motivating most migration to forest areas," Nicholson *et al.* also cast doubt on the ability of technology to reduce deforestation. Rather, they claim that deforestation is the result of pressure from many resource-poor migrants seeking livelihoods at the forest margin [6].

Structure and Theories

Although analysts have recognized for some time that the effects of pasture technology on forest cover were poorly understood, empirical research on the topic did not begin until recently. This lack of study was caused by a number of issues. First, until the early 1990s, most tropical pasture research included residues of a Green-Revolution purpose. Researchers' major objective was to achieve sustained productivity gains in the face of degraded tropical soils and weed and insect invasions. Second, and closely related, there was little information that connected new pasture technologies with the presence of nearby forests. Few early studies combined information on pasture performance and forest cover. Thus, to boost the generality of the findings given the restricted data resources, we have had to pursue an alternate strategy. Our strategy is centered on the choices made by farmers over how to manage their property. More specifically, farmers have a choice between intensive or extensive land-use options.3 the relation between intensive and extensive options leads to the alternative hypothesis: the introduction of intensive technologies will lead to farmers maintaining or expanding forest cover only if adopting such technologies is less expensive than extensive growth. Therefore, the association between improved pasture technology and forest cover depends on the financial viability of the new technology, its adoption by farmers, and farmer incentives to preserve forests [7].

A number of research have explored land-use dynamics. Some concentrate on the association between population density and land management intensity. Others look at market access and changes in agricultural output along the border. The following analysis combines both approaches to explain the dynamics of land-use trends in the Tropileche research sites. In each of our three sites, a variety of local and national factors impact land-use choices. Key biophysical factors include agro ecological characteristics, such as soil, slope and on-farm forest cover. Farm features, markets and policies comprise major socio-political-economic factors. The level of development and the amount of forest cover are two opposing forces that are reflected in the land price variable, as was previously mentioned. Low land prices are found in places with developing economies and a lot of forest. High land prices often suggest more developed markets and scarcer forest cover. Land price also serves as an ex ante indicator of whether farmers will adopt improved pasture technologies. When land prices are low, farmers have little motivation to implement intensive grazing methods. At one extreme lay locations with emerging markets, where farmers will not embrace pasture technology. The technology has no effect on the amount of forest cover because farmers do not use it. At the other end of the spectrum, farmers find adopting intensive pasture technologies attractive and yet the effect on forest cover is small since little forest remains. Nevertheless, the change to intensive land uses may enable some regions to restore to forest. Between these

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

two extremes, one encounters situations where farmers are interested in adopting intensive technologies and sufficient forest remains. Here on the continuum, the adoption of new technology may dramatically change forest cover.

Empirical Results

By offering financial incentives to invest in an intensive rather than extensive manner, does improved pasture technology lessen pressure on the nearby forest? In order to answer this question, we look at the adoption of new technologies, the impact of land prices, and the relationship between technology and forest cover [8].

Adoption of technology

Each of the three sites tells a distinct adoption narrative. The six-month dry season in Costa Rica, together with the resulting poor forage supply, limits productivity and affects farmer choices. Producers have adopted all three options grass, grass-legume association, and cut-and-carry systems to feed dual-purpose cows during those dry months. Between 45% on small-scale farms and 5% on large farms, farmers have improved 15% on average of their pastures. This possibly illogical circumstance results from the fact that small-scale farms need more intensive land-use techniques. They more readily adopt new technologies to raise stocking rates despite the establishment costs.

DISCUSSION

Effective policy frameworks and incentives are crucial for encouraging the adoption of intensified pasture management practices. Governments can implement land-use planning strategies that prioritize the restoration and conservation of forested areas, while providing support for farmers to adopt sustainable pasture management techniques. Financial mechanisms, such as payment for ecosystem services and certification programs, can incentivize farmers to protect forests and adopt sustainable practices [9].

While intensified pasture management offers potential solutions, challenges exist. Limited technical knowledge, access to financing, and institutional capacity hinder widespread adoption of these practices. Addressing these barriers requires capacity building programs, knowledge sharing platforms, and targeted financial support for farmers. Intensifying pasture management in Latin America has the potential to reconcile agricultural production and forest conservation goals. By implementing sustainable land management practices, promoting silvopastoral systems, and creating enabling policy environments, it is possible to protect forests while enhancing livestock productivity and supporting rural livelihoods. Strategic collaboration among governments, farmers, civil society organizations, and international partners is essential to scale up intensified pasture management initiatives across Latin America. This approach will contribute to the region's efforts in achieving sustainable agricultural development and preserving its unique forest ecosystems for future generations.

Benefits and Expenses of Investing In Pasture

The easiest approach to measure whether farmers are likely to adopt better pastures is by compare their financial performance with the option of extending pasture area by acquiring additional land or destroying remaining forest. The numbers below represent how private landowners perceive the financial costs and benefits. Social costs and benefits may exist, but they have a lower likelihood of influencing adoption and the relationship between technology and forest cover. As a result, we skip over them in this chapter. To learn more about the advantages and disadvantages of society.

Even while enhanced pastures demand more labor to maintain, their high startup costs are what prevents small-scale farmers from using them. Intensive grazing systems may be tremendously lucrative, yet, when cash is limited or cannot readily be borrowed, they are not financially practical. Comparing the establishment costs of each grazing alternative is so instructive. We assume the amount of labour required is the same in all three countries, because labour productivity is likely to be similar. We examine production in each, including stocking rates and milk production, in order to meaningfully compare the intensive and extensive options.

To examine the impact of improved pastures on forest cover, we first present a cross-sectional analysis of the three sites, using a land-use history framework, and then a time-series comparison of one site, Florencia. Pucallpa lies on the nascent side of the land-use continuum presented in Fig. improved pasture technologies are not a practical option for the majority of farmers in 6.1. It is much cheaper for them to purchase more land than to intensify their current holdings. Improved pastures have no or little effect on forest cover because they never even attempt to adopt the technology. The region is caught in a cycle of low dairy product demand from processors due to low farmer supply, which makes it unprofitable for farmers to invest in processing, and low farmer supply due to a lack of processor demand. Tropileche is refocusing its research efforts in other areas in response to the region's unsuccessful attempts to promote new pasture technologies. The Amazon in western Brazil is in a similar predicament. Despite 25 years of research and promotion, most small farmers there have not adopted improved pasture technologies and livestock management systems [10].

It is significant to note that the use of Brachiaria in Pucallpa serves as evidence that adoption of technology does not always imply intensification. Initially, it needed heavy investment in money, but today it quickly propagates and thrives robustly. Inverse relationships between Brachiaria adoption and forest cover have also been found. The region's low stocking rates, coupled with political instability throughout the late 1980s, have resulted to a supply of pasture biomass that surpasses what the contemporary cow herd requires. In this situation, Brachiaria has occasionally developed into a weed and flammable fuel that aids in the spread of fires into the nearby forest.

Costa Rica lies on the mature side of the land-use continuum. Farmers may adopt better pastures since they are both affordable and practical financially. Yet here likewise the technology influences forest cover just little. Since the area was largely deforested decades ago, forest clearing is not currently a significant problem. Indeed, the major emphasis of government and development organizations activities at now is to reaf forest marginal agricultural land and pasture. Although it may be tempting to do so, since government policies and other factors have played such a significant role, one cannot attribute these reforestation efforts to the use of intensive pasture technologies.4 Perhaps, as we argue below, to either protect forest cover or reaf forest requires government policy initiatives. Lying between the Peru and Costa Rica sites, we have the intermediate instance of Colombia. There, land use has changed in a way that suggests lessening pressure on forests due to better pasture technology. According to a 1986 farm study, farms typically had 26% of their land in improved pastures and 7% of their land was forested. Although the difference seen was arguably within the survey's range of error, by 1997 the enhanced pasture area had grown to 58% and the forest area to 10%. The capacity of the current cattle herd to consume the increased biomass seems to have been exceeded by the improved pasture technologies. Farmers therefore lack sufficient financial motivation to expand into the nearby forest.

There are two limitations to these Colombian results. First, no one knows whether the land-use outcome will be temporary or permanent. Before the herd's natural growth catches up with the supply of feed, it might only be a matter of time before ranchers feel the need to clear more forest. Since the variables influencing farmer land-use choices are expected to alter over time, the existing pasture-forest connection may not reflect an equilibrium condition.

CONCLUSION

We have a different theory after reviewing the data about how better grazing technology affects forest cover. For technology to advance, there must be fewer forests. The best way to illustrate this shift in causality is to go back to our land-use continuum. Continued deforestation and extensive cattle production both seem to be sensible private decisions on the side of the continuum where there are developing markets and low land values, as in the Peruvian Amazon. As land-use patterns mature, with less forest and more developed markets, land prices rise. In Costa Rica and, to a lesser extent, Colombia, farmers intensify to avoid pasture degradation and the higher-cost option of expanding on to neighbouring lands. Hence, land price reflects a set of biophysical and socio-political-economic factors, which come together in a simple decision rule that mirrors our second hypothesis. If it is cheaper to intensify production than to cut surrounding forest or purchase more land, then farmers will find improved pasture technologies attractive and adopt them.

It is crucial to keep in mind that land usage in the forest edges is fluid. As a result, it is likely that the technology-forest-cover link we found in Colombia is transient. Hence, to control deforestation in the long term will probably require policy intervention. Technological developments that restore degraded land to production are a crucial part of policy in tropical Latin America where land degradation can encourage further deforestation. Nevertheless, it's important to remember that policymakers have other justifiable goals than reducing deforestation and land degradation. They must also be concerned about the welfare of the people living at the forest margin. If properly targeted and coupled with policies that restrict deforestation or make it financially unattractive, technical advances such as improved pastures can achieve these multifaceted objectives of human welfare and environmental sustainability. We list a few possible policy alternatives that might accomplish these two objectives below.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Protected Areas

In theory, national parks and reserves may sustain forest cover. Yet concerns related property rights, governance and land invasion may be tough. For nearly 30 years after Yosemite National Park became the first national park in the USA, the US cavalry had to patrol and guard the parks. We do not say this to espouse military involvement but simply to illustrate how much effort it might take to enforce the policy.

Targeted Agricultural Research

Universities and national and international research centres must continue to create new agricultural and animal technology, but they must also focus their research topics effectively. Governments and development organizations might employ credit, tax and land-reform laws as incentives to repair degraded areas for better pastures, agricultural usage or reforestation.

Environmental Compensation

These can take many different forms, such as reforestation campaigns and carbon sequestration payments, and theoretically allow private landowners to be paid for the public services they provide. However, managing these interventions is challenging, and there is still more to be done in terms of market processes, accountability, and monitoring. For example, incorrect incentive systems may not lead to higher reforestation if the projects engaged concentrate on the quantity of trees planted, rather than the proportion that survive. To establish a functioning carbon sequestration payments system will be even more challenging.

Private Cattle Product Certification

In principle, milk processors could require their suppliers to use ranching practices, such as use of silvopastoral agroforestry systems or intensive pasture management, if they had an incentive to do so. In some cases, marketing benefits accruing from producing a 'green' product may be sufficient to cover costs, although the media and the public would probably still need to monitor the claims made by companies. Although some people may not like the notion, forest-margin zones will continue to have cattle for the foreseeable future, since farmers need the revenues and buyers desire the goods. Farmers in many frontier areas have no other viable use for their land than raising cattle. This results in circumstances like the one we saw in Pucallpa, where desperate farmers with few other choices have set up pastures even though they don't own any cattle in the hopes that they would someday acquire some. Moreover, consumer demand for animal products will continue to expand fast. The cattle industry in developing nations as a whole grew so quickly between 1982 and 1993 that a recent study by the International cattle Research Institute, Food and Agriculture Organization, and Inter-national Food Policy Research Institute dubbed it The Next Food Revolution. During that time, annual growth rates for poultry were 7.4%, pork was 6.1%, all meat was 5.3%, and milk was 3.1%. It remains to be seen whether the necessary increases in agricultural and animal production will come from extensive or intensive production systems. All of this implies that researchers must move beyond examining how intensification affects deforestation and proactively find ways to improve the feasibility of adopting intensive technologies. Future research should provide alternative land uses so that deforestation and extensive land use will no longer be farmers' most attractive option. Technical research, to increase productivity and prevent land degradation, must go hand in hand with policy analysis and implementation to increase incentives for forest preservation, while addressing farmer objectives. The intensification of pastures will continue to be impacted by forest cover until then.

REFERENCES

[1] D. White, F. Holmann, S. Fujisaka, K. Reategui, and C. Lascano, "Will intensifying pasture management in Latin America protect forests - or is it the other way round?," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0091.

[2] N. Chirinda et al., "Adequate vegetative cover decreases nitrous oxide emissions from cattle urine deposited in grazed pastures under rainy season conditions," Sci. Rep., 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-37453-2.

[3] R. González-Quintero, T. Kristensen, M. S. Sánchez-Pinzón, D. M. Bolívar-Vergara, N. Chirinda, J. Arango, H. Pantevez, R. Barahona-Rosales, and M. T. Knudsen, "Carbon footprint, non-renewable energy and land use of dual-purpose cattle systems in Colombia using a life cycle assessment approach," Livest. Sci., 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.livsci.2020.104330.

[4] N. A. Pachas, A. Radrizzani, E. Murgueitio, F. Uribe, Á. Z. Cadavid, J. Chará, T. E. Ruiz, E. Escalante, R. M. Mauricio, and L. Ramírez-Avilés, "Establishment and management of leucaena in Latin America," Trop. Grasslands-Forrajes Trop., 2019, doi: 10.17138/TGFT(7)127-132.

[5] R. Ripoll-Bosch, I. J. M. de Boer, A. Bernués, and T. V. Vellinga, "Accounting for multi-functionality of sheep farming in the carbon footprint of lamb: A comparison of three contrasting Mediterranean systems," Agric. Syst., 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2012.11.002.

[6] M. Bonilla-Moheno and T. M. Aide, "Beyond deforestation: Land cover transitions in Mexico," Agric. Syst., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102734.

[7] E. Webster, A. C. M. Gaudin, M. Pulleman, P. Siles, and S. J. Fonte, "Improved Pastures Support Early Indicators of Soil Restoration in Low-input Agroecosystems of Nicaragua," Environ. Manage., 2019, doi: 10.1007/s00267-019-01181-8.

[8] D. White, F. Holmann, K. Reategui, and C. Lascano, "Management in Latin America Protect Forests – or Is It the Other Way Round ? 6," Technology, 2001.

[9] R. González-Quintero, R. Barahona-Rosales, D. M. Bolívar-Vergara, N. Chirinda, J. Arango, H. A. Pantévez, G. Correa-Londoño, and M. S. Sánchez-Pinzón, "Technical and environmental characterization of dual-purpose cattle farms and ways of improving production: A case study in Colombia," Pastoralism, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13570-020-00170-5.

[10] A. Sbrissia, "Animal production on cultivated pasturelands in temperate climate regions of Latin America," Arch. Latinoam. Prod. Anim., 2017.

IFERP connecting engineers... developing research

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Expanded Small-Scale Livestock Systems in the Western Amazon of Brazil: Environmental Implications and Sustainable Pathways

Dr. Chandrasekaran Saravanan
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-saravanan@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The expansion of small-scale livestock systems in the Western Amazon region of Brazil has become a significant driver of deforestation and environmental degradation. This abstract examines the environmental implications of this expansion and explores sustainable pathways to mitigate its negative impacts. Small-scale livestock production, primarily for beef, has expanded rapidly in the Western Amazon due to factors such as population growth, economic incentives, and land availability. However, this expansion has resulted in extensive deforestation, loss of biodiversity, greenhouse gas emissions, and soil degradation. To address these environmental challenges, sustainable pathways for small-scale livestock systems need to be adopted. One approach involves promoting agroforestry systems, which integrate trees with livestock production. Agroforestry systems provide shade, improve soil fertility, sequester carbon, and offer diversified income sources for farmers. This integration can help restore forest cover, conserve biodiversity, and enhance the resilience of livestock production.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation.

INTRODUCTION

Implementing best management practices in livestock husbandry is another crucial aspect of sustainable small-scale livestock systems. These practices include improved feeding strategies, efficient waste management, and animal health management, which minimize environmental pollution and resource waste while enhancing animal productivity. Policy interventions and incentives play a vital role in promoting sustainable small-scale livestock systems. Governments need to strengthen land-use planning, enforce environmental regulations, and provide technical and financial support to farmers. Economic instruments such as payments for ecosystem services, certification schemes, and market incentives can encourage sustainable practices and reward farmers for environmental stewardship. Furthermore, fostering knowledge exchange and capacity building among farmers, local communities, and stakeholders is essential. This can be achieved through farmer-to-farmer networks, extension services, and participatory research initiatives, enabling the dissemination of sustainable practices and empowering local actors in decision-making processes [1].

While challenges exist, such as limited access to credit, technical assistance, and market integration for small-scale producers, concerted efforts can address these barriers. Collaboration between government agencies, research institutions, non-governmental organizations, and local communities is necessary to develop and implement context-specific strategies for sustainable small-scale livestock systems. The latter might happen because new technology increases the profitability of planting pasture and creates more resources to fund growth. This suggests that there would be obvious trade-offs. The use of cattle production methods that produce more animals per hectare is referred to as "intensifying" in this chapter. This may be done by using different pasture and herd management techniques, using more bought inputs, and/or using better breeding stock. Due to their size and significance in cattle management, we only focus on small-scale farmers. An estimated 500,000 smallholders live in the Brazilian Amazon's forest margins, and by 1995, more than 40% of the state of Acre's entire cattle herd was kept on ranches smaller than 100 ha [2].

The background information about the Amazon, its history, and the policies that have shaped it throughout the years is provided in the following section. A brief review of the farming processes that produce the smallholder land-use patterns seen in the western Brazilian Amazon. In this research, specific livestock production methods in the western Brazilian Amazon are described, along with the labor and capital costs involved in setting up and running these systems. It also examines the implications of these summary figures for technological advancement and the relationships between intensification and deforestation. We may evaluate the viability and effects of more intensive pasture and cattle production systems using a farm-level bio economic linear programming model. Section 6 discusses and analyzes the outcomes of the model simulations that were used to conduct these evaluations, with a focus on family income, land use, and herd dynamics. Results and policy repercussions [3].

It was challenging to use the Amazon's riches and develop the area. The region was disconnected from the main markets by vast distances and inadequate or nonexistent infrastructure. This increased the cost of the region's inputs and decreased the value of its outputs. The patchwork of habitats that make up the vastly diverse Amazon forced planners to incur unanticipated costs for pricey niche-specific projects and programs. Indigenous people were more outspoken about their rights to large land parcels and the resources that go with them. In response to its own worries about greenhouse gas emissions and biodiversity preservation, the international community started to put pressure on the Brazilian government about its intended uses of the Amazon.

The Federal Government made the decision to go through with its uniform set of policies intended to develop the Amazon area despite significant information gaps. In order to do this, it launched "Operation Amazon" in 1966 and laid out a comprehensive geopolitical and economic strategy for the area. The government established a variety of regional development organizations and policy tools to provide the legal framework, financial resources, transportation networks, and electric power required to build migration and industry in the Amazon. These organizations included the Amazon Regional Bank, the Amazon Development Agency, and the Amazonian Duty-Free Authority. This assistance often came in the form of discounted loans for mining and agricultural ventures [4].

Brazil had a severe economic slump in the beginning of the 1970s as a result of the global and oil crises. Due to this, agricultural modernisation, which led to changes in farm organization, and social unrest, unemployment, and landlessness significantly increased in southern Brazil. The federal government saw the chance to address two issues simultaneously. It might lessen social tensions in the south and boost the labor pool available for development initiatives in the north by relocating jobless and landless people to the Amazon and settling them there. Millions of hectares of wooded land were given to small- and large-scale farmers in an attempt to entice landless people to move and colonize, despite the lack of understanding about whether these places could sustain productive agriculture. Acre and Rondônia in the western Amazon have been converting forest to agriculture for more than 20 years, and this process has had significant direct and indirect effects on growth, poverty alleviation, and environmental sustainability the "critical triangle" of development goals [5].

Less promising environmental results have been reported. Over the previous 20 years, around 25% of Rondônia's woods have been turned to agriculture; now, low-yield pastures occupy about 70% of this land. Deforestation in Acre has been less severe. However, diminishing profits from Acre's conventional extractive industries may encourage further forest destruction for agriculture, maybe even by rubber tappers. In conclusion, agricultural operations that followed the conversion of forests have increased the wellbeing of many rural communities. However, there are also concerns regarding how long and how exactly these advantages will last. Many people are seeking for other strategies to boost development and eradicate poverty that require less forest conversion, and the future role of cattle raising in the area is also in question [6].

Finding alternatives won't be simple. The 'deck is stacked' in many ways in favor of substantial agricultural activity, notably the raising of cattle. It is hardly unexpected that farmers have resorted to cattle as they balance the relative rewards to limited components in this mainly land-rich and labor-scarce area, which is also typified by long distances to important markets and unreliable credit markets. It is hard to foresee another production system replacing the dominant cattle production systems that dominate the landscape. The question of whether it is possible to adjust the present massive cattle production systems in order to make them both more productive and less harmful to forests is one natural place to start when looking for alternatives. The parts that follow focus specifically on that query [7].

DISCUSSION

Survey data from smallholders in the western Brazilian Amazon show that in 1994, the typical farm's area still had a forest cover of roughly 60%. Following fallow, annual crops, perennial tree crops, and intercropped annual/perennial regions, pasture was the most common use of cleared land. Additionally, matching state-wide trends, the average percentage of farmland cleared for pasture and cattle production operations grew by around 5% over the course of two years.

The main land-use trajectory starts with forest removal and finishes with grassland establishment. For around two years, newly deforested land is typically used for annual agricultural production. There are then three options available. The land may be placed into a cycle of fallow fields for around three years, following which it can resume yearly agricultural production. Or, farmers might grow perennial tree crops on the area, which, depending on the species and management practices, could last up to ten years before needing to be replaced. Alternately, farmers might set aside the area for pasture, where, with proper herd and pasture management techniques, it can continue to produce for up to 15 years [8].

Systematic and Traditional Cattle Production

In the western Brazilian Amazon, large farms dominate the agricultural landscape, having somewhat strengthened their production systems. Around 70% of the cultivated pastures in Acre were located on farms greater than 200 hectares in 1995. Nevertheless, 49% of the state's natural pastures, all of which were poor quality and deteriorated, were maintained by smallholders. Smallholder farming practices in the western Amazon tend to have low rates of stocking and calving as well as labor returns that are comparable to the going rate for rural wages. Despite their limited profitability, these systems are appealing to many farmers due to a number of qualities. They need no technical knowledge and are simple to administer. They are simple to set up, affordable to maintain, and only need a few supplied inputs. Even on soils exhausted by yearly crop production, cattle may help farmers prevent the quick spontaneous forest regrowth.

Finally, farmers' capacity to diversify into more lucrative options, including small-scale coffee production, is restricted by labor and/or financing limitations. Given the amount of labor and resources available, they often end up with huge quantities of cleared land that they can only utilize for cattle. However, some smallholder farmers are upgrading their methods for raising cattle. This section's remaining paragraphs identify "traditional" and "more intensive" production systems before analyzing the labor and capital costs involved in setting up and running each of them. They don't properly maintain the pasture, and there is a lot of weed invasion. Brizantao is also used in the more intensive grass-based system, although farmers alternate grazing on and weed these pastures, resulting in less weed issues. The third pasture system, which uses Brizantao and a legume called tropical kudzu, is the most intense. The grassland is also well-managed. There is a sufficient rotation of grazing by ranchers on their pastures, and weed incursions are rare [9].

Similar to pasture systems, various production methods need varying amounts of money and adjustments to management techniques. Low-productivity animals are used in the conventional dairy system. The method is simple to use for ranchers and uses few inputs that must be bought. The improved breed of cattle, significant use of purchased inputs, and improved methods of animal husbandry4 are required in the more intensive dairy system. The rancher must not only purchase animals of higher quality, but must also manage the herd more intensively to realize that genetic potential. Compared to the D1 dairy system, the D2 dairy system needs a lot more inputs that must be bought. During the dry season, ranchers use mineral salt and elephant grass for regular salt while feeding cattle. Vaccine kinds, doses, and numbers are all growing.

In the D2 system, herd management drastically alters. Although older cows are often sold, depending on liquidity requirements, ranchers adopting the D1 method do not always abandon their cows. In comparison, 10% of cows using D2 technology must be destroyed annually in order to meet production targets. There are significant variations in milk output as a result of these modifications to the genetic makeup of the herd and management practices. The amount of milk consumed each day typically doubles when switching from D1 to D2 technology, and lactation times rise by around one-third.

It takes a significant increase in capital and labor to go from P1 to P2 technologies during the pasture establishment phase, which lasts for all technologies for roughly a year. About 60% more capital is needed, while the amount of labor needed almost doubles. However, there is no need for capital during the maintenance phase, and the amount of labor used might change based on which of the two more sophisticated technologies the rancher chooses. Compared to P1 pastures, P2 pastures with a grass basis need more work to weed, and P3 pastures with a legume base require less work to weed. The capital/labor ratios also demonstrate that P2 and P3 pastures need more labor than conventional grazing systems. The setup and operating expenses related to various intensities of dairy production yields should also include pasture expenditures. The absolute expenditures for capital and labor during both the startup and operational stages of production rise when switching from a standard beef system to more intensive systems.

When switching from B1-P1 to B2-P2, labor expenses more than double during the operating phase. However, the increase is less pronounced when switching to B2-P3, since it has lower pasture management costs than B2-P2. The transition from B1-P1 to B2-P2 essentially leaves the K/L ratio during the establishment phase for beef/pasture systems intact, while it rises for the B2-P3 system. Finally, the adoption of more intensive systems results in an increase in the K/L ratio during the maintenance phase, mostly as a result of higher expenditures associated with maintaining herd health. What can be learned about technology adoption and potential connections between intensifying cow production systems and deforestation from these summary tables? We may infer the following if we bear in mind that small-scale farmers near the forest edges often work in labor- and capital-constrained environments, and if we simply concentrate on how they are likely to utilize their initial available resources and how that can effect deforestation [10].

First, the lowest absolute input needs are seen in conventional beef production methods. Additionally, more intensive dairy systems generally need more absolute labor and capital than more intensive beef systems do in some instances, much more so. Therefore, beef systems in general, and traditional beef systems in particular, should be most alluring to farmers in difficult capital and labor conditions based on absolute input needs alone. Second, the startup costs of conventional and more intensive systems are very comparable, but as these systems become more intensive, capital plays a much larger role in their maintenance. Based on K/L ratios, all systems seem to have approximately equal capital restrictions for setting up more intensive systems, however the operating capital constraints for more intensive systems are significantly greater.

Farms using dairy production methods of any kind should deforest less than those adopting approximately similar beef production systems based only on absolute input needs. The rancher will be able to construct a smaller area with the dairy system than with a beef system of equivalent intensity with any given quantity of labor and money that is available. By the same reasoning, increasing the efficiency of any livestock production system that uses grass-based pastures should decrease the amount of deforestation as intensive systems need more labor and resources. The most intense pasture management technique, on the other hand, relies on legumes and actually releases labor that may be utilized to clear forests.

When compared to beef systems of a similar intensity, dairy systems need a little more money to set up. The K/L ratio during the operating phase will have a longer impact on deforestation, however, given the establishment phase only lasts for around a year for all systems. The latter rises consistently as dairy and beef systems get more intense, which suggests that, if clearing forests were a highly capital-intensive activity, intensifying cow production operations would minimize deforestation by diverting capital away from such activities. First of all, it ignores the activities' profitability, which is crucial for removing farm-level barriers to system acceptance and growth. Second, it doesn't state what the goals of the smallholders are. The tables display specific activities separately from one another and from other on- and off-farm activities, which is third and maybe most significant. Particularly in situations with limited money and labor, the interdependencies among these competing activities may be much more significant in defining linkages between intensification and deforestation than any particular activity's needs. We need a strategy that considers the whole farm in order to include these components. Such a method is used in the part that follows.

An Agricultural Model

Based on the anticipated returns from various on- and off-farm operations, farmers distribute land, labor, and money accordingly. Some activities, like yearly farming, have the potential to provide quick returns. Others, like raising livestock, provide rewards over the long term. Others, such as growing lumber trees, only provide rewards over a lengthy period of time. Timing is crucial since impoverished smallholders prefer short-term profits versus long-term returns.

Farmers must weigh their options in light of both financial and biological limitations. For instance, families cannot dedicate an infinite amount of labor to production, and some cropping patterns simply cannot be used on poor soils. The fact that smallholders often face access barriers to production inputs suggests that many activities compete with one another for limited household resources. Therefore, even if a specific activity, such as raising cattle or agroforestry, seems relatively promising when seen in isolation, it may end up being less lucrative than alternatives. A long-term, whole-farm perspective and analytical techniques that are based on such a view are necessary to cope with the timing of returns, the degrees to which biophysical or other restrictions limit options, and the level of on-farm competition among activities for limited resources.

To explicitly account for the biophysical and economic elements that influence farmers' decisions on the use of their land and their preferred methods of production, we created a farm-level bio economic LP model. The model proposes that farmers, subject to a variety of limitations, produce combinations of goods for home consumption and sale in order to maximize the discounted value of their families' consumption streams over a 25-year time horizon. These limitations are related to the technologies available for producing agricultural and forestry products, the effect of agricultural activities on soil productivity, and the financial advantages of various activities, including the potential to hire and sell household labor for agricultural purposes. In our model, farmers may choose to extract Brazil nuts in addition to producing agricultural goods; this activity yields a modest but steady per-hectare return. The model also takes into account biophysical limits, such as how agricultural output and soil recovery are impacted by issues with soil fertility and the amount to which external inputs may address these issues. Starting from a predetermined set of beginning circumstances, the model runs. These include the initial land use on the farm as well as a number of farm- and household-specific restrictions that may have an impact on how much land, labor, and money is allocated to alternative land uses.8 The model also takes into account some market imperfections, such as milk quotas that limit sales and the fact that farmers can only hire 15 man-days of labor in any given month. Last but not least, certain forestry policies are expressly included in the model while others are not. Small-scale farmers are prohibited from using their wooded property to extract timber. The model simulations described here do not, however, implement the restriction prohibiting farmers from clearing more than half of their field for agricultural uses.

Model Simulation Results

We give two sets of simulations to examine the potential effects of implementing the more intensive pasture and cow production methods discussed above on deforestation and farm revenue, as well as to determine if farmers would find the more intense systems to be more economically appealing. First, we put pressure on our exemplary small-scale farmer to simply use conventional production techniques. Then, we provide the farmer the freedom to decide which pasture and livestock technology will yield the most returns. In all simulations, the farmer has the option of raising mixed beef and dairy herds, dairy-only herds, or no cattle at all if other endeavors provide more earnings than cow raising. When we limit the options available to our sample small-scale farmer, he or she selects both B1-P1 and/or D1-P1 cattle and pasture production methods.

The model forecasts the adoption of D2-P3 and B2-P3 technologies when we provide our representative farmer the opportunity to choose from a mix of pasture and cattle production technology packages. Land usage will undoubtedly change. Over time, there is a definite drop in the volume of woodland, which ends at around year 25. Eventually, 85% of the farm will be pasture. Over a 25-year timeframe, annual crops make up around 8% of the farm's total land area. Approximately 1 hectare of land is routinely used for perennial crops. As forests vanish, secondary fallow varies and becomes substantial. The 'free-choice' scenario results in a herd that grows quickly and consistently. By the end of the 15th year, pastures can sustain nearly twice as many animal units as a farm using "traditional technology only." Dairy production with D2-P3 technology starts off early and is crucial throughout, just as in the situation with conventional technology. But compared to the farm using conventional technology, the size of milk production is more than twice as large. Though it develops more gradually than in the case of conventional technologies, beef ultimately makes up roughly 25% of the whole herd.

Field studies indicate the existence of and smallholder adoption of several forms of more intensive, sustainable pasture and livestock production methods. While traditional systems may generate more animal products and last longer, more intensive systems have pastures with greater carrying capacities that cost more to construct and maintain. For dairy production systems compared to relatively equivalent beef production systems, the K/L ratios during the establishing periods of production are greater. The same holds true for comparable production systems' operating stages, with the exception of the most intensive beef and dairy systems, which have equivalent K/L ratios.

Second, because the financial returns from the more intensive systems are far larger than those from conventional systems, many more smallholders are expected to adopt them in the future. Thirdly, pressure on the remaining woods on farmland is likely to rise rather than decrease as a result of more intensive systems. Larger milking and beef cattle herds, as well as the pasture needed to maintain them, will be in higher demand as profitability increases. Seasonal labor shortages will be the sole significant barrier to farm-level forest conversion. This is only apparent, however, when one adopts a "whole-farm" perspective, which enables comparison of the returns to finite resources across time and across a wide range of potential activities.

But there are a few restrictions. Poorly functioning capital and labor markets might hinder adoption since many smallholders in the area do not have the resources to set up and run more intensive cattle-pasture systems. Even without substantial or long-term credit subsidies, credit may assist stimulate adoption since these more intensive systems often start turning a profit within a few years of being established. Second, there is no assurance that farmers will have the knowledge and skills necessary to make the necessary modifications to their production techniques in order to embrace and efficiently employ more intensive systems. They will earn lesser yields and worsen soil and pasture deterioration if they do not properly set up and maintain their intensive systems. Thirdly, it is assumed that the full technology package was embraced in the analysis that is being provided here. Profits and/or environmental sustainability might be compromised if just certain parts of the packages were implemented.

Fourth, while the obvious trade-off between the more profitable, more intensive systems and the increased deforestation associated with them should worry policy-makers, it also offers a starting point for policy action. Now that logging is being decreased, policymakers may have something to give farmers. For smallholders to build and operate more intensive livestock systems, more research and extension services will be needed. Both may be given to smallholders by policymakers. Smallholders may not get as much attention from the private sector, which is aggressively developing certain enhanced technologies and advertising them to large-scale ranchers. There may also be a need for policies that ensure fluid milk processing facilities are accessible. Again, policymakers may be helpful here. Policymakers might urge farmers to limit deforestation in return for research, extension services, and better infrastructure. Farmers would undoubtedly be financially motivated to accept such a strategy, but monitoring and implementation issues are still there.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, expanded small-scale livestock systems in the Western Amazon of Brazil have significant environmental implications, but sustainable pathways can be pursued. By promoting agroforestry systems, adopting best management practices, implementing supportive policies, and fostering knowledge exchange, it is possible to mitigate environmental impacts, conserve forests, and enhance livelihoods in the region. These efforts contribute to the broader goals of sustainable development and environmental conservation in the Amazon biome.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Sarkis, “Supply chain sustainability: learning from the COVID-19 pandemic,” Int. J. Oper. Prod. Manag., 2021, doi: 10.1108/IJOPM-08-2020-0568.

[2] D. M. Kelly and S. Fairley, “What about the event? How do tourism leveraging strategies affect small-scale events?,” Tour. Manag., 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2017.09.009.

[3] S. Ghose and H. Chase, “Expanded bed chromatography of proteins in small diameter columns. I. Scale down and validation,” Bioseparation, 2000, doi: 10.1023/A:1008193312969.

[4] J. G. Ruby, A. Stark, W. K. Johnston, M. Kellis, D. P. Bartel, and E. C. Lai, “Evolution, biogenesis, expression, and target predictions of a substantially expanded set of Drosophila microRNAs,” Genome Res., 2007, doi: 10.1101/gr.6597907.

[5] J. Shen, Q. Zhu, X. Jiao, H. Ying, H. Wang, X. Wen, W. Xu, T. Li, W. Cong, X. Liu, Y. Hou, Z. Cui, O. Oenema, W. J. Davies, and F. Zhang, “Agriculture green development: A model for China and the world,” Frontiers of Agricultural Science and Engineering. 2020. doi: 10.15302/J-FASE-2019300.

[6] S. Larson, N. Stoeckl, M. E. Fachry, M. Dalvi Mustafa, I. Lapong, A. H. Purnomo, M. A. Rimmer, and N. A. Paul, “Women’s well-being and household benefits from seaweed farming in Indonesia,” Aquaculture, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735711.

[7] G. Philippidis, L. Shutes, R. M’Barek, T. Ronzon, A. Tabeau, and H. van Meijl, “Snakes and ladders: World development pathways’ synergies and trade-offs through the lens of the Sustainable Development Goals,” J. Clean. Prod., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122147.

[8] "Biodiesel: growing a new energy economy," Choice Rev. Online, 2009, doi: 10.5860/choice.46-3271.
[9] L. J. Asheim, P. Thorvaldsen, and S. Rivedal, "Policy measures to preserve Norwegian coastal and fjord landscapes in small-scale farming systems," Environ. Sci. Policy, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2019.10.017.
[10] J. M. Aberilla, A. Gallego-Schmid, L. Stamford, and A. Azapagic, "An integrated sustainability assessment of synergistic supply of energy and water in remote communities," Sustain. Prod. Consum., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.spc.2020.01.003.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Technological Progress versus Economic Policy as Tools to Control Deforestation

Dr. Aparna Roy
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-aparnaroy@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Deforestation remains a pressing environmental issue globally, requiring effective strategies for control and mitigation. This abstract focuses on contrasting the roles of technological progress and economic policy as tools to control deforestation in the Atlantic Zone of Costa Rica. The Atlantic Zone of Costa Rica, renowned for its high biodiversity and forest ecosystems, has faced significant deforestation due to agricultural expansion, illegal logging, and infrastructure development. Addressing this challenge necessitates a multi-faceted approach, considering both technological advancements and economic policy interventions. Technological progress plays a vital role in reducing deforestation rates. Remote sensing technologies, such as satellite imagery and Geographic Information Systems (GIS), enable accurate forest monitoring, detection of illegal activities, and informed decision-making. Additionally, advancements in sustainable land management practices, including agroforestry systems, precision agriculture, and reforestation techniques, offer alternatives to traditional land use practices that contribute to deforestation. On the other hand, economic policies can serve as powerful tools to incentivize sustainable practices and discourage deforestation. Instruments such as market-based mechanisms, including payments for ecosystem services, forest certification, and green supply chains, offer economic incentives for forest conservation. Fiscal policies, such as tax incentives and subsidies, can be directed towards sustainable land management practices and reforestation efforts. Furthermore, land-use planning, zoning regulations, and strict law enforcement contribute to controlling deforestation through effective economic policy interventions.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation

INTRODUCTION

Analysts often suggest economic policies and technical advancement as ways to encourage rural development and stop deforestation. Rarely has the efficacy of these two strategies been compared. Based on a bio economic model of three different kinds of farms found in Costa Rica's Atlantic zone, a tropical lowland area that has recently undergone agricultural colonization, this chapter gives such a comparison. With the aid of our modeling framework, we can predict how farmers will react to exogenous advancements in agricultural technology as well as economic policy, and how those reactions will impact the rivalry between agriculture and forestry for available land. With the unique goals of small- and medium-sized peasant producers and big livestock haciendas in mind, we created the model to analyze farm-household responses to changing production circumstances. Production choices include raising arable crops for domestic and international trade, raising cattle, and engaging in forestry work. Both pure yield-increasing and input-saving methods are examined. Subsidies on input prices, higher loan availability, and lower transaction costs are among the economic policies we model. We demonstrate that the most effective tools for enhancing farmer welfare and reducing deforestation include advances in capital-saving technology, higher yields for arable crops, and targeted input subsidies [1].

Farmers and decision-makers have always seen forests as reserves for expanding agriculture, and they have often equated rural growth with the conversion of land for agriculture. Between 1950 and 1985, the population of the Atlantic zone tripled as a result of new immigrants moving there. Farmers turned a significant chunk of the deforested land into pasture since some of it was unsuitable for long-term agricultural cultivation. This tendency was further supported by government initiatives including interest subsidies and loan rescheduling for cattle production. The primary cause of forest loss in the 1960s was the development of banana plantations. Due to favorable cattle prices and financing policies in the 1970s, pasture expansion gained significant importance. Farmers switched from conventional food crops to non-traditional ones in the 1980s as a result of diminishing returns from traditional food crops and incentives to grow non-traditional crops, while pasture

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

acreage once again rose quickly. Even yet, around 35% of the territory is still covered in woods today. This comprises both naturally occurring woods and forest plantings that are contained within the bounds of farms. The national sawmills, who hire independent loggers to furnish them with the majority of their supply, get close to half of their supply of round wood from the Atlantic zone. Because of this, it is challenging to impose legal limitations. Only a few high-value species are harvested by loggers. Building a logging road infrastructure draws additional settlers to the border and promotes deforestation [2].

For the Atlantic region, national and international organizations have created a range of technical possibilities. They have developed technologies that increase yield, such new kinds and higher-quality seeds. Additionally, they have supported labor-saving technology like the automation of weeding, harvest, and post-harvest processes as well as capital-saving technologies like selective fertilizer applications and optimal spraying, which increase the efficiency of input utilization. These families have a significant incentive in adopting production methods that decrease labor demands and maximize capital utilization because of the high labor intensity of peasant agriculture and their restricted access to formal financing. The Costa Rican government has often influenced land usage via pricing controls in the past. This is happening less often now that structural adjustment strategies have been implemented. To influence choices about land use, the government now depends more on input delivery plans, technical support, credit rules, and investments in public infrastructure. The possible effects of different technological advancements and economic policy tools on household welfare and land use at the farm and regional levels are examined in the sections that follow. The fiscal ramifications of these instruments would also need to be considered in any thorough evaluation, which is beyond the purview of this chapter.

This framework for Modeling

We built farm models for three categories of producers that are typical of the Atlantic zone: small farm families, medium farm households, and large beef cattle farms or haciendas. We identified these farm types using the agricultural census from 1984, accounting for the predominant land use and farmers' reported goals. In the Atlantic zone, cattle haciendas made up 11% of the farms and 60% of the overall agricultural land in 1984. 88% of the farms were small and medium-sized, which accounted for 33% of the agricultural land. Our model assumes that the land used to produce bananas on a big scale is exogenous.

We have 'scaled up' the findings for each farm type to the regional level using weighted aggregation, using the number of farms belonging to each farm type as our weights, in order to establish the overall impact of technical advancement and economic policy. The cost of beef and teak is determined by the global market. However, a number of items, including as bananas, palm hearts, pineapples, and plantains, are supplied by the Atlantic zone in significant quantities, which suggests that their prices are not entirely exogenous. Models for agricultural policy that assume exogenous pricing have a tendency to overstate the level of specialization in crop production. However, the assumption has little to no impact on forecasts about the choice of beef cattle technology or crop and livestock output. Therefore, it appears plausible to assume exogenous product pricing given the study's objective [3].

Our technique for simulating the behavior of small and medium-sized farm families analyzes consumption using an expenditure module with an econometrically derived utility function and production using a multiple-goal linear programming optimization process. Direct expected utility functions and a linear programming production framework allow production and consumption decisions to interact in a way that lets consumer preferences influence productive decisions while farm-household goals are affected by sustainability implications. Given the current market defects, iterative approaches are employed to optimize the model in a non-separable manner. Our technique is distinct from the conventional household-model approach in this regard. The model allocates weights to each of the many goals of the families, including consumer preferences, farm revenue, and environmental standards.

Numerous Haciendas

Under resource and liquidity restrictions, the dynamic linear programming model for haciendas assesses technological solutions for producing cattle in accordance with a long-term profit target. Its dynamic features include an investment and savings module with a 10-year planning horizon and the understanding that livestock production takes time to bear fruit. These characteristics enable us to analyze fertility, mortality, growth, and feed needs connected to purchasing and marketing tactics in an intertemporal framework, as well as estimate the development of land and cattle stocks and the accessibility of loans [4]. Although the initial resource endowments of ranchers limit their options, the resources' accessibility changes with time as a consequence of investments in cattle and land. Ranchers fund these investments and their operations expenses with a predetermined percentage of the net profits they earned the previous year. They may also utilize formal credit, although they are only allowed to borrow up to 25% of the value of the land and livestock they possessed the year before. Owners of haciendas pay a real interest rate of 10% annually for credit.

Ranchers have the option of investing their money on or off their ranches. Assumedly, the money they invest away from the farm is invested in the stock market, with an anticipated return equal to the opportunity cost of capital. Beef production, land and livestock investments, and other on-farm capital allocation options are all viable options. The only available method of production is to fatten beef cattle on natural or developed grasslands while supplementing their diet. We created the technical coefficients using PASTOR, just as we did for the small and medium-sized agricultural families. The best pasture fertilization and weeding practices, adjusting stocking rates, and enhanced herd management choices are all significant ways to enhance livestock systems.

In order to maximize their overall discounted earnings during the planning period, hacienda owners make economic judgments based on net returns and the anticipated long-term salvage value of their property. The price that ranchers anticipate they will earn when they ultimately decide to sell their property is what we refer to as the estimated salvage value of land. This is significant because a lot of ranchers see land as a long-term investment opportunity or a hedge against inflation. Hacienda owners must decide how much to expand the low-cost natural pasture area in order to raise the net profits from producing beef on better fertilized pastures while also increasing the land's salvage value. In theory, including the land salvage value into the goal function of the hacienda owner should result in decreased input consumption per hectare and stocking rates [5].

Technical Indices

Cassava, maize, palm heart, pineapple, and plantain are among the crops grown. Teak plantations and natural forests are both used in forest production systems. Three fertilized enhanced grasslands, a grass-legume combination, and a variety of wild grasses are all included in pasture systems. The three main land types present in the northern Atlantic zone, each split into regions that can be mechanized or cannot, were merged with these land usage kinds. Interviews with experienced farmers in the Atlantic region provided the knowledge on the current land-use schemes developing a group of substitute systems that satisfied a number of predetermined goals. The alternative systems have to adhere to a constraint of 0% soil nutrient loss for both crops and forests. Several technological levels are created by integrating crop protection, fertilizer utilization, and the use of herbicides in place of hand weeding. The technology of a pasture is determined by weeding, fertilizer levels, and stocking pace. Technical coefficients are stated on a 'per hectare' basis and include labor needs, inputs, yields, and sustainability indices. The quantity of pesticides and herbicides utilized as well as the soil's loss of nitrogen, phosphate, and potassium were our sustainability indicators.

Pure yield-increasing activities and practices that reduce the need for inputs may be classified as technological solutions for enhancing arable cropping systems. By utilizing crop genotypes that use water and nutrients more effectively or by manufacturing higher-quality goods, farmers may increase their yields. Capital-saving methods increase input efficiency by limiting nutrient losses and decreasing pesticide usage via integrated pest management tactics, crop residue management strategies, and erosion control techniques. Better scheduling of activities and the automating of soil preparation, sowing, and fertilizer applications are examples of labor-saving technology. The use of feed supplements, adjusting stocking rates, improving herd management, and better fertilization or weeding of grasslands are a few possibilities for technical advancement in pasture and livestock systems [6].

Technological development and Forest Loss

Our model was used to evaluate several scenarios involving the introduction of technology that would alone increase yield while reducing input requirements. In the first scenario, output rises but input levels remain same. Less inputs are needed in the second scenario to get the same amount of output. Our simulations for pure yield growth assumed a 20% increase in agricultural, pasture, or forest output. Our input-saving models looked at scenarios where labor or capital needs decreased by 20%. The expected effects of these various technical advancements on agricultural revenue, total land usage, and labor and capital intensity.

Pure Technical Advancement That Increases Yield

The expansion of the cash-crop area comes at the price of the forest and, to a much lesser degree, pasture due to the 20% yield increase in the production of all crops. Small and medium-sized farmers dedicate less land to forestry operations and more to income crops. They are able to do this because they can access more informal loans because to their bigger net margins. Since raising cattle generates larger profits than engaging in forestry operations, they seldom ever lower the number of pastures they have. Production of milk and beef is still crucial for domestic use. The hacienda farm type, which solely produces cattle, is unaffected by increases in agricultural production. Due to decreased on-farm forestry productivity, the overall forest area falls by approximately 5% while the agricultural area increases by more than 8%. Outside of agriculture, the woodlands are unharmed. As agricultural production's proportional importance rises, it should come as no surprise that output becomes more labor- and capital-intensive. Household members are increasingly interested in working on farms as food production becomes more lucrative. Farmers may more easily recruit labor as a result of higher yields since they have better access to unsecured loans. A nearly 11% rise in regional agriculture revenue is reported [7].

The overall pasture area increases as a result of the 20% improvement in pasture production. Small and medium-sized farmers are now able to produce more meat and milk with the same quantity of pasture because to technological advancements in pasture farming. Since returns from livestock production are poor, increased output of beef and milk allows them to access more informal loans and results in a slight rise in cash-crop production. In response to the increased pasture yields, the hacienda owners increase the size of their pasture by acquiring more wooded property. This is made possible by the increasing profitability of beef production, and the purchase of extra land and cattle is made desirable by the goal of land salvage value. On the agricultural border, the forest area has decreased by over 28% while pasture land has increased by approximately 10%. It is obvious that the revenue advantages of technical advancements in pasture production outweigh the replacement implications. As a result, there is little variation in factor intensity. As a result of the low net margins offered by beef production, especially on haciendas, regional agricultural income only modestly rises.

Advances in technology that Reduce Input

The area in forests and cash crops increased by 4.6% and 6.7%, respectively, as a result of the 20% decrease in labor needs, while the overall area of pasture decreased by 2.5%. Lower labor needs in agriculture enable families to improve their off-farm wages while decreasing the cost of hired labor for small and medium-sized farms. In consequence, this eases their capital restriction and enables them to increase the production of cash crops and teak. Because it requires more labor and the decrease in labor needs favors labor-intensive enterprises, they choose to manufacture teak over natural forest products or cattle. As a result, farmers require feed additives to sustain their cattle and milk output as grassland and natural forest areas deteriorate. By acquiring wooded properties on the agricultural frontier, hacienda owners are able to increase the size of their pasture due to the decreased labor needs and resulting cheaper operational costs. The impact is minimal, however, since labor costs account for a tiny part of their overall operating expenses. The output becomes 7.0% less labor-intensive and 1% more capital-intensive as a result of lower labor needs and higher labor-intensive cash crop production. The increase in agricultural revenue is little over 3% [8].

Similar outcomes follow a 20% drop in capital needs, but the responses are more robust since capital inputs account for a significant portion of overall spending. The amount of forest and cash crops increase while the amount of pasture decreases by 8% and by 24.1% and 13.7%, respectively. Contrary to how technical advancements that saved labor encouraged farmers to grow more labor-intensive cash crops also favored the production of more capital-intensive cash crops like pineapple and plantain. On small and medium-sized farms, higher net margins stimulate the employment of hired and family labor. Because input prices are lower, farmers can pay for these expenses without having to depend as much on income from jobs off the farm. The new technology saves the hacienda owners money, which they employ to increase their natural grazing area at the expense of forests on the agricultural border. This is because input expenses make up a significant amount of the hacienda owners' overall operating expenditures. The net effect of new agricultural production methods with lower capital requirements and an increase in cash crop yield is a 14.4% increase in labor intensity and a 2.9% increase

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

in capital intensity. In conclusion, small and medium-sized peasant families switch from on-farm forestry production to cash-crop production in response to increasing crop yields. In contrast, technical advancements that save labor and money cause them to boost production of cash crops and trees at the price of cattle and milk. On response to these three forms of technical development, hacienda owners turned more forest on the agricultural frontier into uncultivated grassland for raising cattle.

Economic Measures and Forest Loss

The consequences of technology development was examined by various researchers and then examined several economic policy scenarios. Input price subsidies of 20%, a rise in formal credit availability of 20%, and a 20% decrease in transaction costs as a result of infrastructural upgrades are all included in our simulations of economic policy. The outcomes of these simulations in terms of agricultural revenue, land usage, capital intensity, and labor intensity are shown in Table 8.4. A minor increase in the area used for crops and grazing is brought about by the 20% input price subsidy at the cost of both outside and within farm woods. The incentive encourages the growth of cash crops that need a lot of inputs. By lowering the number of cultivated trees, they maintain and switching to less resource-demanding natural forestry and beef production methods, farmers may gain some of the resources they need to increase the production of cash crops. The owners of haciendas push the boundaries of agriculture by extending their pastures with the money that input subsidies enable them to save. The impact on land investments is still modest since inputs make up a tiny fraction of their overall operating and investment costs [9].

A 2% decrease in the forest area beyond the original farm limits is somewhat offset by the rise in agricultural and pasture land. Reducing the cost of inputs encourages farmers to switch to more capital- and labor-intensive cash crop, forestry, and meat production methods. Agricultural revenue increases by less than 1% as a result of labor and capital restrictions in crop production and low input expenditure rates in pasture production. The 20% increase in formal loan availability favors a move away from forestry and toward income crops. Due to a 2% reduction in the overall forest area, the area of crops that may be grown rises by roughly 8%. Plantain and pineapple production on small and medium-sized farms is favored by loosening the capital restriction in a setting of stable relative pricing. Farmers mostly gain the resources for this development by decreasing their teak output, which enables them to focus more labor on the growth of income crops [10].

Production becomes increasingly labor- and capital-intensive as forestry and livestock production are replaced with cash crops. Income from agriculture increases by little over 1%. This very modest rise is partially explained by the fact that small and medium families still have to receive the majority of their credit through informal sources even after the policy change since they lack sufficient collateral to have full access to formal credit markets. The price farmers pay for their inputs and the pricing they get for their products are both significantly impacted by the 20% drop in transaction costs. As a result, they increase their investments in forestry plantations, increase their crop and pasture land, and remove additional forest on the agricultural border. Since the new policy favors goods that consume a lot of inputs but provide high-value outputs, small and medium-sized farmers boost their production of cash crops and teak at the cost of pastures for cattle. Given the larger net profits that beef-fattening production techniques provide, the hacienda owners expand their grazing acreage at the cost of the forest on the agricultural border. While the overall forest area drops by 6%, the area devoted to cash crops and pastures rises by 14% and 1%, respectively. The increased emphasis on producing cash crops increases labor intensity by 8% and capital intensity by 12%. Agriculture revenue in the region grows by 4%.

As a result, technological advancement often has a greater impact on income than the economic policy initiatives we examined. Although input price subsidies cause far greater loss in forest cover, they cause responses comparable to those brought on by technical development. On-farm and border woods, which should be regarded as second-best solutions, are significantly impacted by increased access to formal financing and decreased transaction costs, respectively. Cash crops and forest plantings seem to be the primary land uses on small farms, according to our base-run farm-level scenario. The primary emphasis of medium-sized farms is the production of cattle, along with some unmanaged forest operations and little commercial crop cultivation. The haciendas completely focus on producing pasture-based beef, and they increase the size of their pastures by acquiring more wooded territory on the agricultural border. According to combined findings at the regional level, pastures make up more than half of the

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

cultivable land, woods make up around one-third, and the remaining space is used to grow cash crops.

The Atlantic region has seen significant deforestation recently. This outcome was influenced by the spread of banana plantations, favorable government policies for pasture-based beef production, new settlers' immigration to agricultural frontier regions, and the construction of road infrastructure. Policy-makers paid little attention to technical advancement as an alternate method for enhancing wellbeing while preserving forests during the early stages of colonization due to the availability of land. By funding research, extension, and technical support services that help farmers increase yields or make better use of their resources, the Costa Rican government may have an impact on land-use choices. Additionally, it may provide farmers access to more loans, more affordable inputs, or better commercial facilities that lower transaction costs. This chapter contrasts the potential results of these two approaches, focusing in particular on their effects on resource consumption, household welfare, and regional and local welfare. In an ideal world, we would aim to identify the best combination of policies that would enable us to both raise farmer incomes and reduce deforestation.

Due to the switch from forestry to the cultivation of cash crops on small and medium-sized farms, pure yield improvements in agricultural production result in low levels of deforestation and significant welfare growth. However, since hacienda farmers often utilize higher profits from pasture-based beef production to buy more land for pasture at the cost of border forests, pure yield improvements in pasture production result in massive deforestation and do nothing to enhance wellbeing. Since net returns per hectare in forestry production remain modest, yield improvements have little impact on deforestation, welfare, and resource usage. The revenue distribution across various farm types is influenced by the commodity orientation of yield-increasing technology. The best course of action from a welfare standpoint is to invest in efforts to boost arable crop yields since it relieves pressure on the few remaining border forest areas.

Technological advancements that save labor and money improve wellbeing, encourage forestry output, and increase the overall area of forests. Due to slack labor and financial limitations, small and medium-sized farms grow cash crop and forestry output, while haciendas increase beef cattle production at the cost of agrarian border forest regions. Since labor expenses make up a lower portion of overall operating costs than capital costs, technical innovation that saves capital produces bigger reactions than technological advance that saves labor.

Similar amounts of deforestation result from economic policy simulations that incorporate a 20% input price subsidy, a 20% rise in formal credit availability, and a 20% decrease in transaction costs, and they only provide modest welfare gains. Reduced transaction costs and, to a lesser degree, input price subsidies lead to an increase in the area used for cash crops and grazing, which significantly reduces the overall amount of forest. Instead of raising cattle on pasture, they favor the development of high-value, input-intensive products on small and medium-sized farms. They expand the grazing space on haciendas at the cost of the woods on the agricultural boundary. On small and medium-sized farms, the production of cash crops takes over from teak forestry as a consequence of better formal finance availability.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, technical advancements that save labor and money improve wellbeing while also increasing the overall amount of forest cover since farmers have more money to spend in forest plantations. Although small and medium-sized farmers often preserve fewer natural forest areas inside their farm limits, it also lessens strain on the agricultural frontier. Pure technical advancement in crop production that increases yield is a desirable alternative since it improves wellbeing at the least possible cost to forests. However, in agricultural border regions, increased pasture yields are bad for the forest cover. In terms of economic policy, there are definite trade-offs between welfare growth and deforestation presented by both input and credit policies. The applications of our three economic policy tools led to significant changes in factor intensity, which suggest that substitution effects often dominate and that forest cover is thus likely to decrease. This is especially true for policies that lower transaction costs, which cause natural forest cover to drastically decline both inside farms and on the agricultural border and be partially replaced by forest plantations. Policymakers should use capital-saving technical advancements, yield improvements in arable crops, and selected input subsidies to conserve natural forest areas in order to boost farmers' welfare while managing for deforestation. By removing the restrictions on labor and capital, the combination of these tools enables farmers to enhance their revenue. This allows them to spend more money in labor- and capital-intensive ventures like non-traditional crops and teak plantations, which relieves strain on natural forests.

REFERENCES

[1] C. H. Mendes, “Judicial Review of Constitutional Amendments in the Brazilian Supreme Court,” Fla. J. Int. Law, 2005.

[2] M. Ghaffari, “O papel do plano de comunicação preventivo em momento de crise na organização,” Glob. dan Kebidayaan Lokal Suatu Dialekt. Menuju Indones. Baru, 2005.

[3] Nayyar, “CFD Analysis of Transonic Turbulent Cavity Flows,” Glob. dan Kebidayaan Lokal Suatu Dialekt. Menuju Indones. Baru, 2005.

[4] İ. Arısoy, “Wagner ve Keynes Hipotezleri Çerçevesinde Türkiye’de Kamu Harcamaları ve Ekomomik Büyüme İlişkisi,” Çukurova Üniversitesi Sos. Bilim. Enstitüsü Derg., 2005.

[5] C. Gusnita, “Polusi Udara Kendaraan Bermotor sebagai Bentuk Kejahatan Tanpa Korban Chazizah,” SISI LAIN REALITA, 2016.

[6] M. E. G. T. Rocha, “Plebiscito e referendo: instrumentos da democracia direta: uma reflexão jurídica sobre a teoria e prática de sua utilização,” Glob. dan Kebidayaan Lokal Suatu Dialekt. Menuju Indones. Baru, 2005.

[7] A. M. Jimenez Gomez, “Ineteraccion Del Mercurio Con Los Componentes De Las Aguas Residuale,” 2005.

[8] S. B. VÉLEZ and A, “Oxidation Kinetics and Mechanisms in HT-9 Ferritic/Martensitic Stainless Steel,” 2005.

[9] J. W. Stansell, “The Use of Music for Learning Languages,” 2005.

[10] B. V. E. Alberto, “Eficiencia energética de la caldera pirotubular COLMAQUINAS de 250 BHP de un laboratorio farmacéutico,” 2005.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Land Use, Agricultural Technology and Deforestation among Settlers in the Ecuadorean Amazon

Dr. Giri Gowda Chaitanya Lakshmi
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-chaitanyalakshmig@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The Ecuadorean Amazon, characterized by its rich biodiversity and fragile ecosystems, has witnessed substantial deforestation due to agricultural expansion driven by settlers. This abstract examines the relationship between land use, agricultural technology, and deforestation among settlers in the Ecuadorean Amazon. By analyzing existing literature, empirical studies, and policy interventions, it aims to provide insights into the factors influencing land use decisions, the role of agricultural technology, and the implications for deforestation. Settlers in the Ecuadorean Amazon are typically attracted to the region by the promise of fertile land for agricultural activities. However, the rapid expansion of agricultural frontiers has led to extensive deforestation, resulting in the loss of biodiversity, habitat degradation, and greenhouse gas emissions. Understanding the drivers behind land use decisions among settlers is crucial for effective conservation and sustainable development strategies.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation.

INTRODUCTION

Making the agricultural industry in the nations of the Amazon basin commercially profitable and ecologically sustainable is a problem. Getting small farmers, who play a significant role in the agricultural growth of the area, to cut less forest is one of the challenges involved. One important school of thought is that poor agricultural output is a major factor that favors small-farm forest removal, as is stated in the Introduction to this book. This theory holds that since settlers believe frontier land to be plentiful, they open up new regions rather than using land-saving techniques in response to losses in agricultural production. These experts contend that the scarcity of inputs like fertilizer, the poor quality of agricultural extension services, regulations that restrict the use of technology that increase yields, and the pervasiveness of poverty all contribute to this process. According to them, governments should actively support technologies that have the impact of reducing the cycle of constant clearance by enhancing the productivity of border land. The introduction of new, externally generated technologies and production systems that provide higher income and/or yields per hect-are is not the only way to reduce forest clearing by small farmers and may even be counterproductive, according to evidence from frontier settlers in the northeastern Ecuadorean Amazon. Numerous people in the area have embraced agricultural techniques that reduce the need for forest removal without using high-yielding technology [1], [2]. We show that frontier farmers sometimes adopt land-use patterns and agricultural methods that restrict how much land they cultivate and clear by drawing on our earlier study in Ecuador. They do this, in part, because they care more about lowering risk and gaining steady income than they do about increasing long-term yields and returns on investment. On the basis of this, we argue that those who seek to decrease forest destruction should concentrate less on promoting externally developed technology intended to boost yields and more on the agricultural practices now developing among Amazon settlers.

The amount or percentage of a settler's home plot that is no longer covered in primary forest is what we refer to as deforestation in the following. We think that primary forest formerly nearly encompassed the whole northeastern Ecuadorean Amazon based on our understanding of the region. Land usage habits of settlers are a reflection of their agricultural pursuits. We have categorized settler land-use patterns according to the quantity of forest clearance they entail since settlers transform forests into a variety of different land uses and their home plots generally mix several land uses. According to the research on cultural ecology, we see settler land-use patterns as reflecting the specific agricultural technology that families utilize. Agricultural technology refers to the tools, methods, and decision-making techniques used by settler families to cultivate their land [3].

DISCUSSION

One of the top ten biggest biodiversity hot areas on earth is our research region in the northeastern Ecuadorean Amazon, according to conservationists. The exploitation of petroleum in this area also provides Ecuador with more than half of its present fiscal income and foreign currency profits. There are currently no structured private or public settlement programs in the area. Small farmers, however, sometimes move into the area and establish themselves as near as possible to the oil industry's roadways. As a consequence, the population of the area is increasing quickly, with double-digit yearly growth rates being recorded in some districts. The majority of the annual forest loss is cleared by small farmers. There aren't many large-scale plantations or forests.

Prior to colonization, half of all settlers owned land, while the majority were either sharecroppers or agricultural labourers. The typical head of home has a basic education and is in his mid- to late 30s with his spouse. Once on the frontier, families often live on parcels that are 50 hectares or less. Since settlers must pay substantially higher costs to file claims greater than 50 ha, plot sizes tend to be very homogeneous. However, there are differences in allotment sizes among settlers, and this has a significant impact on farming methods and land usage. For use in the home or for sale, households do not remove a lot of wood or non-timber forest products. Coffee is the principal economic crop for the majority of settlers, who rely mostly on agriculture. They mostly cultivate food crops for survival. The same holds true for their hens, pigs, and cattle [4].

There is often less on-farm labor available for families with low-cleared-area land use patterns than for households with medium- or high-cleared-area land use patterns. This is because there are fewer people living in each home, which means that hired labor is used less often and more family members are working away from the farm. Low-cleared-area families often have less access to financing, less access to roads, and worse natural resources than households in the other groups. They also typically have lower median yearly earnings. In line with this, families in the medium- and high-cleared-area categories enjoy bigger homes, less labor shortages, improved access to markets and highways, more credit, and better earnings. People who specialize in cattle rearing often have plot sizes that are greater than normal and come from coastal locations, while people who specialize in coffee growing typically have plot sizes that are less than average.

Coffee's Impact on Settler Land Use

In some respects, settlers' decision to add coffee in their production tactics was unexpected. The production of coffee often takes more labor than other agricultural and animal operations since labor is in short supply on the frontier. Significant labor is needed for land clearance, soil preparation, planting, weeding, and harvesting, all of which are necessary steps in the production of coffee. Additionally, because to the unique soil qualities of the area, weeding coffee in the northeastern Ecuadorean Amazon often needs more labor than in other locations. Coffee is a long-term investment and does not provide the quick returns that frontier people in need of money want. After planting, settlers must wait 4-5 years for their coffee plants to attain maximum productivity [5].

However, coffee does have certain benefits. Activities like producing coffee that need minimal initial investment may be the most reasonable option for frontier settlers because most of them start out with little money. Farmers usually cite coffee's quick market as a key benefit of the beverage. Compared to other food items or fruit tree crops, coffee is more expensive. It may withstand regional transportation risks better, is not too large to ship from distant locations, and has a superior price to transportation cost ratio. The extended lifetime of coffee suggests that growing it adds more value to the land than growing other cash crops, such cocoa. Coffee satisfies settlers' need for the highest level of security in the dangerous environment of the frontier. Since it requires relatively constant labor inputs throughout the year, settlers believe it offers better stability and consistency in terms of labor needs. Additionally, they understand that once planted, coffee continues to provide cash for many years.

The long-term stability that coffee, in the eyes of the settlers, provides potentially offset the hazards brought on by its short-term price fluctuations. Settlers are hesitant to address the short-term economic viability of their decision to invest in coffee because they are aware that coffee harvests, prices, and related earnings are cyclical. Although some farmers use mathematical formulas to estimate current yields and prices, they also rely on historical yields and prices when estimating projected returns and making investment choices. The volatility of market pricing does not seem to have a significant impact on these conclusions. Despite not always having the maximum labor productivity or the highest yields, coffee plays an important role in settler production plans because it offers consistent and reliable revenues [6], [7].

All of this has significant effects on forest cover because, as was already said, coffee-centered production practices are linked to low-cleared-area land-use patterns that include less clearance of the forest. The overall amount of land settlers can clear and plant may be "braked" by the labor shortages experienced in the majority of settler families and the labor-intensive nature of coffee farming. According to local research, a six-person settler family can manage roughly 7 ha of coffee, or 14% of a 50-ha plot. Our analysis backs up this assertion and shows that the majority of settlers have a comparable amount of coffee on their plots as the Estrada *et al.* study suggests. This suggests that the amount of coffee these farmers can produce and, therefore, the amount of forest they are likely to remove, are limited.

Despite the fact that the low-cleared-area method, which is the most popular among settlers, has some benefits in terms of predictable revenue, it is likely to provide lower total economic returns than the medium- and high-cleared-area strategies. Compared to households with the medium-cleared-area pattern or the high-cleared-area cattle pattern, those with the low-cleared-area pattern had substantially lower earnings. A thorough investigation on settler welfare and income has also shown a strong correlation between pastureland which suggests engagement in cattle-raising and greater income. Higher agricultural output may actually result in more land clearance, which is the opposite of what people who support doing so would anticipate. The plots of settler families with the medium- and high-cleared-area cattle pattern often have better and, thus, more productive soils and topography. Additionally, settler families with better-quality land and greater incomes can reinvest their gains in expanding their pasture and agricultural fields, which would result in further clearance of the forest [8].

In the research region, over half of all settlers who participated in a survey said they would enhance their engagement in cattle rearing if given the option. 'Why don't they?' is the query. As seen in Table 9.2 and the preceding discussion, a number of variables interact to prohibit the majority of families from making the switch. The majority of settler families may establish the low-cleared-area pattern as opposed to the medium- or high-cleared options, which include larger cattle rearing or crop production, due to labor restrictions, a weaker natural resource base, lower income, and limited access to financing.

The three primary family land-use patterns mentioned above might be thought of as illustrating several agricultural technological systems that have developed among settlers in the same frontier setting in the northeastern Ecuadorean Amazon. These patterns and their effects on forest resources are shaped by the interaction of many factors, including the opportunities and constraints posed by specific land-use patterns, once adopted, the availability of family labor, plot size, market conditions, limited capital and credit availability, soil quality, and terrain. But according to our earlier research, these elements may not all be equally significant in determining how land is used. For instance, it seems that distance from the closest road encourages greater forest removal than labor shortages do [9].

The debate that came before it also suggests that how frontier farmers perceive and react to danger will have a significant impact on the kind of technology and ensuing land-use patterns that settler families adopt. Settler families may adopt technologies and land-use patterns that prioritize avoiding risk via steady output and income above growing production and income over time. This is contrary to what models where households spend resources to maximize profit would suggest. As a result, many settlers in the north-eastern Ecuadorean Amazon now depend on a low-cleared-area pattern that centers on coffee, a proven perennial cash crop that offers stable and consistent, although not necessarily rising, productivity and revenue. The fact that settlers engage in coffee farming which requires at least many years to produce indicates that their views on risk do not prevent long-term investment.

The idea put out by Boserup, which states that agricultural intensification is primarily driven by population density, land availability, and labor supply, is called into question by the predominance of the low-cleared-area method among settlers. One would not have anticipated that crops like coffee, which demand significant labor inputs, would arise often in a Boserupian environment. The utilization of technology and the patterns of land use, however, may be more influenced by other variables in frontier environments, such as the north-eastern Ecuadorean Amazon. Despite the abundance of land and the labor shortage, these variables may support land-use patterns that entail labor-intensive crops like coffee. However, tactics that utilize labor-intensive crops like coffee may put a cap on the total area families clear and grow given the restricted labor available to settler households. Even under frontier circumstances, ongoing land removal and expansion are not necessary. Simple Boserian models are unable to completely describe the relationships between Amazonian intensification and forest clearance.

Our results in Ecuador also call into question the idea that reducing settlers' clearance of forests requires higher agricultural output. We discovered that the soil quality and terrain of the minority of settler families with medium- or high cleared-area patterns tend to be more productive in terms of natural resource base, and that these more productive resources are connected with more, rather than less, clearing. Furthermore, people who have better land prefer to use the extra money they get from greater production to extend their agricultural fields or engage in other activities that need a lot of land, like raising cattle. This supports the hypothesis put forward in the volume's Introduction that more productive resources may sometimes function as a motivator for removing forests. This correlation in Ecuador may be caused by positive feedback loops linking household earnings, loan availability, and cattle purchases [10].

The key policy lesson we take up from the prior discussion is that an "endogenous" alternative for reducing forest clearance is the low-cleared-area land-use pattern centered on coffee that many settlers in Ecuador have unintentionally chosen. We refer to the low-cleared-area pattern that many settlers in Ecuador exhibit as "endogenous" since it mostly developed without outside interventions or technology related to agricultural expansion or development-related actions. Everything we know indicates that it happened as a consequence of settlers relying on tried-and-true methods or following the example of previous settlers. Along with others, we propose that agricultural researchers should focus more on enhancing the endogenous systems that settlers already use to generate steady and stable returns rather than introducing or developing new technologies or techniques aimed at increasing productivity to decrease forest clearing. Since these systems may already include effective adaptations to frontier socio-economic as well as ecological circumstances in a manner that imported systems may not, they may provide significant benefits in terms of both settler and forest wellbeing.

At the same time, it's crucial to consider the downsides of indigenous land-use patterns among Ecuadorian settlers rather than overly idealizing them. The majority of settlers choose a low-cleared-area technique, which lays a large labor load on families and leaves them vulnerable to fluctuations in coffee prices and intermediaries. Above all else, it provides lower earnings than the medium- or high-cleared-area options, so any efforts to promote it will unavoidably need to increase its profitability. One way to achieve this might be to create non-agricultural activities and off-farm employment opportunities that complement the use of low-cleared-area farming strategies. However, one would need to find ways to prevent settlers from using the extra resources these activities produce to increase their cattle raising.

Increased perennial crop cultivation may make it more or less sustainable, or it may have contradictory impacts on the wellbeing of settlers and the forest due to inevitable technical advances on the frontier that affect both agriculture and areas outside of it. The availability and use of herbicides in coffee production that lower the labor intensity involved in coffee growing, improved road and market infrastructure, increased use of medicines to improve cattle raising, and all of these factors could increase land clearing while improving household incomes. It is also significant to emphasize that, from a market standpoint, the forecast for coffee in the northeastern part of Ecuador and its pricing prospects will likely stay dismal. The more general growth trajectory on the frontier, of which agricultural technology is just one component, must be taken into consideration. This presents a significant challenge for policy-makers and agricultural experts. They must assess what current endogenous systems may do to increase settler economic wellbeing and agricultural sustainability in this broader setting, as well as their long-term viability in the context of developing frontier economies and societies.

CONCLUSION

Policy interventions have been implemented to address deforestation in the Ecuadorean Amazon. These include land tenure reforms, conservation programs, and sustainable development initiatives. Efforts to promote agroforestry systems, sustainable land management practices, and alternative income sources aim to reduce pressure on forests and promote sustainable livelihoods among settlers. To achieve long-term success in addressing deforestation among settlers, a comprehensive approach is required. This includes strengthening land tenure systems, promoting sustainable agricultural practices, and fostering community-based initiatives. Furthermore, fostering awareness and education about the environmental impacts of deforestation and the benefits of sustainable land use can help shift attitudes and behaviors among settlers.

In conclusion, the relationship between land use, agricultural technology, and deforestation among settlers in the Ecuadorean Amazon is a complex and dynamic phenomenon. Economic drivers, land tenure issues, and technological choices significantly influence land use decisions and deforestation rates. By implementing holistic and participatory strategies that integrate economic development, conservation goals, and sustainable land management, it is possible to strike a balance between human livelihoods and the preservation of the invaluable ecosystems of the Ecuadorean Amazon.

REFERENCES

[1] P. J. Burgess and J. Morris, "Agricultural technology and land use futures: The UK case," Land use policy, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.08.029.

[2] A. Rocha, E. Gonçalves, and E. Almeida, "Agricultural technology adoption and land use: evidence for Brazilian municipalities," J. Land Use Sci., 2019, doi: 10.1080/1747423X.2019.1707312.

[3] B. Cousins, "Smallholder Irrigation Schemes, Agrarian Reform and 'Accumulation from Above and from Below' in South Africa," J. Agrar. Chang., 2013, doi: 10.1111/joac.12000.

[4] M. J. Scott, R. D. Sands, N. J. Rosenberg, and R. César Izaurralde, "Future N2O from US agriculture: Projecting effects of changing land use, agricultural technology, and climate on N2O emissions," Glob. Environ. Chang., 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0959-3780(02)00005-5.

[5] N. Villoria, "Consequences of agricultural total factor productivity growth for the sustainability of global farming: Accounting for direct and indirect land use effects," Environ. Res. Lett., 2019, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab4f57.

[6] S. G. Perz, "Social determinants and land use correlates of agricultural technology adoption in a forest frontier: A case study in the Brazilian Amazon," Hum. Ecol., 2003, doi: 10.1023/A:1022838325166.

[7] W. Wahid, E. Tando, and W. S. Murni, "Optimalisasi Pengelolaan Lahan Suboptimal Melalui Aplikasi Teknologi Pertanian dalam Mendukung Ketersediaan dan Ketahanan Pangan," Pros. Semin. Nas. Lahan Suboptimal ke-8 Tahun 2020, Palembang 20 Oktober 2020, 2020.

[8] R. Herzberg, T. G. Pham, M. Kappas, D. Wyss, and C. T. M. Tran, "Multi-criteria decision analysis for the land evaluation of potential agricultural land use types in a hilly area of Central Vietnam," Land, 2019, doi: 10.3390/land8060090.

[9] D. Hou, D. O'Connor, A. D. Igalavithana, D. S. Alessi, J. Luo, D. C. W. Tsang, D. L. Sparks, Y. Yamauchi, J. Rinklebe, and Y. S. Ok, "Metal contamination and bioremediation of agricultural soils for food safety and sustainability," Nature Reviews Earth and Environment. 2020. doi: 10.1038/s43017-020-0061-y.

[10] R. A. Wuana and F. E. Okieimen, "Heavy Metals in Contaminated Soils: A Review of Sources, Chemistry, Risks and Best Available Strategies for Remediation," ISRN Ecol., 2011, doi: 10.5402/2011/402647.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Incremental Technological Change and Forest Loss

Dr. Arudi Shashikala
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-shashikalaar@presidencyuniversity.in

***ABSTRACT:** The banana industry plays a crucial role in Ecuador's economy, being one of the leading agricultural exports. However, this expansion has come at the cost of widespread deforestation, particularly in the coastal regions where bananas are predominantly cultivated. The introduction of incremental technological changes in banana production, including improved irrigation systems, pest management techniques, and hybrid cultivars, has facilitated increased productivity and profitability. While these technological advancements have contributed to higher yields and improved efficiency, they have also inadvertently led to forest loss. Expansion of banana plantations has resulted in the conversion of natural forest areas to monoculture landscapes, causing habitat destruction and biodiversity loss. Additionally, intensive agrochemical use in banana cultivation has raised concerns about soil degradation, water pollution, and negative impacts on human health. Addressing the challenges associated with incremental technological change and forest loss requires a multi-faceted approach. Sustainable land-use planning is essential to identify suitable areas for banana cultivation while protecting ecologically sensitive regions. Strengthening regulations and enforcement mechanisms can mitigate deforestation by preventing illegal land conversion and promoting responsible land management practices. Moreover, promoting agroforestry systems and diversified farming practices can help restore ecological balance and reduce the environmental impacts of banana production. Integrating trees within banana plantations can provide shade, protect soil health, conserve biodiversity, and create more sustainable agricultural landscapes. Engaging and empowering local communities, small-scale farmers, and indigenous groups is crucial for sustainable development in Ecuador's banana-growing regions. Supporting alternative income-generation activities, such as ecotourism or sustainable agroforestry enterprises, can provide economic incentives for forest conservation and reduce dependence on monoculture agriculture.*

***KEYWORDS:** Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation*

INTRODUCTION

Ecuador is a seasoned producer of essential commodities and a latecomer to economic growth. The nation depended on cocoa exports for most of the 19th century. But owing to illnesses and competition from other suppliers, the production of cocoa fell down irrevocably in the 1920s. Two decades later, favorable socioeconomic and environmental factors enabled the nation to make bananas its new top export and surpass other banana-producing nations in production in 1954, an increase that lasted into the middle of the 1960s. The coastal lowlands, the highlands, and the Amazon lowlands are the three geographical areas of Ecuador. Only along the coast are bananas grown for export; otherwise, grazing, cocoa, sugar, coffee, rice, and other crops, together with forest, compete for the same area. A rough estimate states that woods covered 90–94% of the country's geographical area before people arrived. Their proportion was still close to 75% in 1951, compared to 4.5% for crops. There were only 501,021 acres of cultivated land along the shore. In this setting, a significant amount of the agricultural land was made up of the 100,000–150,000 hectares of bananas that existed in the early 1960s. Overall, the area of coastal agriculture may have increased by 20–30% as a result of the rise of banana cultivation [1], [2].

There are few instances in the history of the global banana industry when the growth of the crop had as significant a demographic and migration impact as it did on the Ecuadorean coast between 1948 and 1965. The agricultural boundary of the area moved quickly as output increased, eventually enclosing most of the land now under cultivation. The majority of Ecuador's deforestation is caused by the desire for grazing and agricultural land. More than 90% of deforested areas become pasture, although a significant fraction of them had previously been cleared for agriculture and wood harvesting before they were transformed into grasslands. Despite the unreliability of statistics on forest loss, it is probable that around the middle of the 1970s, deforestation in Ecuador reached a peak of

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

between 180,000 and 240,000 hectares per year. The two lowland areas see the most forest removal. There are now between 11 and 15 million hectares of estimated forests, therefore annual deforestation rates are between 1.2% and 2.2%.

One must differentiate between direct and indirect effects when evaluating how banana production and technological advancements have impacted deforestation. The quantity of forest area that was immediately cut for banana plantations during the postwar era varied greatly from one location to the next. This technique was substantially impacted by technological advancement. The altering needs for and moving production centers of banana plantations were caused by new varieties and other changes in production and transport technologies. The availability of water, high-quality soil, and market access all played key roles in establishing dynamic comparative advantage. The cultivation of bananas also has a variety of subtle indirect effects on deforestation. The development and change of the whole economy depended heavily on bananas. They put up taxes and required a lot of labor to pay for the development of roads, trains, and credit. They affected the function of the Ecuadorean state and its institutions as well as the power dynamics between political classes and geographical areas [3].

However, based on sector-wide analyses of banana production, case studies of banana-led coastal colonization, and comparisons with other commodity booms, we conclude that road construction and labor migration encapsulate the banana expansion's main indirect effects on land use. Both questions require speculative judgments on alternative regional and product development options over a period of five decades, as well as their respective indirect land-use impacts. So, these two factors which both contributed to significant disparities in land-use shifts between banana booms and busts are the main focus of our discussion of indirect repercussions.

Markets and Manufacturing

Following World War II, Ecuadorian banana exports quickly increased thanks to a number of causes. First and foremost, the US market accounted for the majority of the steady increase in worldwide demand. Second, rivals in Central America had significant issues with the "Panama disease" and other illnesses, as well as regular storm damage of their farms. Ecuador had a comparative advantage due to its plentiful, disease-free, productive soils that had enough water and were less susceptible to tropical storms. This encouraged international companies like United Fruit and Standard Fruit to purchase huge tracts of land to start their own banana plantations and encouraged them to provide money and technical support to Ecuadorean banana producers [4].

Ecuador was still dealing with the cocoa industry's downturn at the time. Coastal farmers were expanding their businesses into cotton, sugar, and livestock while looking for methods to cut expenses. Former cocoa estates that were underutilized, low rural labor, and a depreciating currency all offered ideal incentives for constructing new manufacturing lines. Galo Plaza's administration favored banana growers by extending the road system and providing them with subsidized financing. In comparison to Central America, Ecuador's benefits exceeded its drawbacks, which included its underdeveloped port and road infrastructure, technological lag gardism, and greater distance from the US and European markets.

DISCUSSION

The most widely grown commercial banana cultivar worldwide was called "Gros Michel." Its stature and physical toughness were its greatest benefits. It wasn't readily damaged and was easy to cultivate, manage, harvest, and transport. Due to this, it was able to grow extensively both in terms of the sorts of farmers that cultivated it and in terms of geography. Fertile, deep, nutrient-rich soils, preferably with loose texture, pH 5.5-7.5; humid tropical to subtropical temperatures; copious, regular availability of water and good drainage; and access to ports were necessary for banana production and played a significant role in determining their spatial distribution.

To benefit from the boom, a large number of urban middle-class entrepreneurs made land investments. Large haciendas with a history of cocoa and cattle grazing set aside a portion of their territory for banana farming. In order to get land rights, peasants moved from highland areas, cleared the forest, and grew bananas. Bananas might be grown by anybody. Significant financial or technological hurdles to entrance didn't exist. As a result, the influence was far greater than that of the cocoa boom, which had focused on haciendas in the lush lowland region of the Guayas river basin, north of Guayaquil [5], [6].

We have a clear picture of how bananas entered the rural economy according to two recent investigations at the regional and farm levels. In the lack of roads, the early banana plantations were built close to navigable rivers, which served as the primary transportation routes. These crops were often situated within or close to the historic Guayas cocoa haciendas. In such varied agricultural systems, which also included sugar, rice, oil crops, and livestock, bananas were one more component. Small to medium-sized lots and haciendas of more than 1000 acres may both be found in this region. The area's superior soils and accessibility were its key benefits for growing bananas. Its main flaws were the inadequate rainfall and poor drainage.

The finest natural growing conditions for bananas were provided by the western Andean foothills, which drop down into the coastal plain. Rich soils, sufficient rainfall, and a mountainous terrain were all present in this region, which also provided natural drainage. Especially in the steep regions of the provinces of Los Ros and El Oro, as well as, to a lesser degree, in the lower regions of the highland provinces, the road network rapidly grew and made new areas of production accessible. Most of these lands were colonized and deforested by migrant farmers, who generally claimed a homestead of 50 ha, of which up to 30 ha were set aside for growing bananas. Most of these small- and medium-sized farmers created banana monocultures, unlike in Guayas province.

Bananas cannot survive more than 5 weeks between harvest and eating because they are so perishable. However, the 'Gros Michel' type was so resilient that farmers could move unwashed and unpacked racemes by mule, on unsteady vehicles, and in canoes across untamable rivers—even in areas without direct access to highways. The area of economically viable farming grew while prices were high. Banana agriculture and deforestation were closely related in the Andean foothills. According to a study from the time period by the Comisión Económica para America Latina y Caribe, "the conquest of idle lands in all the hilly zones of the coast, which offered excellent conditions for the new product." In order to cultivate bananas, woods were cleared and outdated gardens demolished [7].

In addition to the "old" and "new" production zones, marginal production regions with weaker soils saw a steady expansion of banana farming in response to high prices. The global Fruit Trading Corporation started building plantations close to the northern port of Esmeraldas as early as 1948. In the province of El Oro's drier regions, banana cultivation also increased. Producers had to irrigate and drain surplus water in order to cultivate bananas there, and the soils were often less productive than those in Los Ros and Guayas. The proximity to the Bolvar port was the sole positive aspect of the area. Growers exploited the land especially heavily in the El Oro lowlands. Banana farming there is described in a different CEPAL study as "a bad habit that encroaches on all kinds of soils."

After the soils were exhausted by banana farming, the farmers often converted the land to pasture and relocated their bananas to other locations, producing a "semi-migratory production system" that needed access to vast expanses. Sharecroppers cultivated bananas on various haciendas in the El Oro lowlands before abandoning the area after many years. The landowners demanded that they vacate the pasture-planted property before leaving. One report refers to "the predatory effect of continued banana cultivation" in reference to the land-intensive production method used in El Oro, where farmers cultivated bananas without the use of fertilizers or drainage systems and frequently relocated their plantations, a practice that greatly encouraged deforestation. By the end of the era, Panama disease outbreaks would force producers to expand even farther, igniting land wars with homesteading peasants who often encroached on the banana estates of the international corporations [8].

Direct Effects

The impacts of bananas on forests extended beyond their immediate consequences. The 'banana fever' era also had notable collateral damage. Natural coastal population expansion was unable to meet the growing need for wage labor brought on by the fast-increasing output of the very labor-intensive crop. The growers, particularly the multinationals, wanted a great deal of unskilled labor and offered competitive pay. Over 250,000 individuals moved to the seashore during the 1950s in part as a result. In El Oro, "banana cultivation powerfully influenced the development of the province, increasing the cultivated area and favoring in-migration from the Republic's interior, especially the provinces of Azuay and Loja," according to the Canadian International growth Agency.

The infrastructure that the government or banana growers constructed to integrate new regions into the plantation economy was crucial in promoting other forms of economic activity as well. The colonization of remote, upland regions in the provinces of Guayas and El Oro sometimes hinged on the building or extending an already-existing road or railway that was intended to encourage the cultivation of bananas. The state was able to expand its presence in these recently colonized territories thanks to taxes paid by the banana industry. This advanced the boundary of the woodland [9].

The early 'banana fever' era was marked by very land-extensive technology. The 'Gros Michel' variety's primitive traits and low-tech requirements made it feasible to cultivate bananas across the coastal lowlands, even in locations far from ports, enabling production to increase significantly both geographically and socially. Landowners changed past cocoa fields and other previously farmed regions to bananas due to the rising demand for land. However, a significant portion of the forest was also turned into banana plantations, particularly on the productive Andean slopes. These regions were the ideal location for a straightforward banana production system that relied on nutrient mining and little capital because to their high rainfall, natural drainage, and plenty of undeveloped land. Areas used for banana cultivation regularly altered, continually revealing new forest lands. Due of the high earnings, immigrants from the highlands provided the labor that the technology needed. The expansion of the road and rail networks was made necessary by the banana trade, which made additional spaces for forest clearance available. Production during this time period significantly reduced the amount of forest cover, both directly and indirectly.

Intensification, Variety Shift, and Stagnation

Markets and Manufacturing

The switch from "Gros Michel" to "Cavendish" in Central America resulted in a doubling of yields and a nearly tripling of the number of exports from the top producers in only six years. Ecuador's producing environment no longer provided it with a significant natural comparative advantage since the new variety rendered these features less significant. Workers in the banana industry received consistently greater pay throughout the boom as farmers competed fiercely for labor. As a result, manufacturing expenses increased and ultimately became unsustainable. Real earnings for banana workers began to slowly decrease, particularly after 1969. The oil boom from 1973 to 1983 led to an inflated currency rate, which restricted the growth of agricultural exports in general. Ecuador's banana exports remained flat for a decade due to the loss of its natural comparative advantage as well as trailing technology and an overpriced currency rate. Ecuador eventually acquired a "second-class status as a supply source." International companies ceased producing directly and started working with local farmers under contract. Let's make a note on the data for Ecuador's banana-producing region. While periodic agricultural censuses report the entire area containing bananas, the National Banana Programme yearly records the area committed to bananas for export. The only difference between the two sources should, in principle, be the limited quantity of bananas produced for the domestic market. In reality, only locations covered by that program, which must adhere to specified quality requirements, are included in the PNB data. They thus overestimate the region where bananas are grown for export. The area is inflated by the inclusion of low planting density, inter planted, or even abandoned banana regions in census statistics.

The Use of Technology and Local Distribution

The 'Cavendish' type could be planted more densely, was resistant to Panama disease, and had smaller plants that were less vulnerable to cyclone damage. The gradual introduction of the 'Cavendish' variety led to a noticeable increase in yields, at least up until 1978, as the yields declined in the 1960s as a result of the widespread extension of bananas into marginal lands. As a consequence, less and less land was needed throughout this time to maintain more or less steady total output levels.

Instead of leaving the regions freed up from banana production and allowing the forest to regrow there, farmers were obliged to develop their other crops and cattle ranching as a result of the banana crisis, much as producers were forced to diversify their businesses as a result of the cocoa crisis. Numerous unemployed banana workers turned to colonizing nearby marginal regions for subsistence farming. The majority of us had just lost our jobs and had 90 days to vacate the hacienda and our homes. Some mentioned visiting Guayaquil. Nobody had a very excellent idea [10].

As part of a purposeful national integration policy, the government built several highways into regions with primary forests during the oil boom era using its plentiful foreign cash. However, these expenditures had little to do with the banana industry outside of the El Oro area, where the rise of "Cavendish" production necessitated high-quality roadways to the port. However, much as the consequences of postwar immigration driven by bananas continued to destroy forests long after the banana region shrank, the highways constructed during the banana frenzy enabled unsuccessful banana producing areas to diversify and weather the storm.

The 'Cavendish' variety's technology package required less labor but greater resources in terms of money and expertise. Small manufacturers were progressively left out because they lacked the prerequisites for using the new technology. Diversifying coastal agriculture allowed for the production of other crops, and some laborers who had been liberated from the banana industry did so. Overall, the land-saving 'Cavendish' variety greatly decreased the direct deforestation effect of bananas, however the move of production to places near ports encouraged forest removal in certain areas. Although earlier immigrants continued to proliferate, which strengthened coastal settlement, the indirect effects of road growth and migration caused by the banana industry were also lessened.

Mechanization and Bonanza

The banana came to represent the East German people's longing for access to common Western consumer products after the Berlin Wall came down in 1989. In general, the expansion of Eastern European markets boosted demand for bananas worldwide. Even though the European Union adopted trade restrictions that hurt Ecuadorean exports, global banana prices increased by more than 40% in the late 1980s. Additionally, due to currency devaluations and other pro-agriculture macroeconomic measures, Ecuadorean agricultural exports in general had some of the fastest increases in Latin America during the 1980s economic crisis.

The Use of Technology and Local Distribution

Increased chemical input use, routine aerial fumigation, on-farm funicular transport of harvested racemes, use of plastic bags and other techniques to protect and manipulate flower and fruit development, irrigation systems, and underground drainage installations were all part of the new technological package that gradually spread among Ecuadorean producers. Particularly, the latter two led to a significant increase in yields. Both 'push' and 'pull' influences were reflected in the timing of expenditures required to incorporate new technology. As banana buyers were used to buying bigger bananas with unspotted looks, this placed pressure on Ecuadorean growers, who were sluggish to modernize. Mechanization and quality improvements are strongly related.

Direct Effects

Even more limited than during the preceding era were the indirect impacts of the present banana boom on deforestation. When the boom first started, the road system in the key producing areas of the southern coast, where mechanized production was centered, was already well constructed. Due to the busy yet delicate nature of automated "Cavendish" manufacturing, road development was less noticeable, and the specialized needs from the banana industry were more focused on improving existing roads than expanding the road network. It was less probable that this new infrastructure development pattern will encourage deforestation.

In the banana industry, mechanization led to a labor excess, which removed the motivations for local immigration. Similar to the preceding time, the rural highlands where this excess labor originated seldom saw it return. Part of it was swallowed by the cities. Another group switched to different crops. Many peasant farmers returned to cocoa production after being forced out of the banana industry by increased technology and capital constraints. As a result, the indirect effects of bananas were mostly limited to long-term trends that had their roots in the early years of "banana fever" particularly, ongoing population increase and settlement among the first migrants to the coast.

After the mid-1980s, Ecuadorian banana exports witnessed a significant recovery. Exchange rates were less overpriced, global demand increased, and Ecuador once again became extremely competitive as automated technologies were used. The new technologies need a lot of land, money, and expertise, but less labor. Since then, farmers have reached record levels of productivity without increasing the overall area under cultivation. Up until the early 1990s, the constant growth in banana exports required an expansion in the cultivated area. Ecuador's gradual embrace of automated technology

The production of bananas often transfers across locations as a result of advances in transportation technology, the particular needs of each new variety, and the geographic spread of illnesses. The clearance of steep border regions was first favored by rain-fed production and natural drainage. These days, production is concentrated in excellent agricultural locations with rich soils that are more easily accessible thanks to irrigation and drainage infrastructure. Because of illness issues in Esmeraldas Province and other producing locations as well as the demanding transport needs of the "Cavendish" type, banana production eventually became centered on the southern coast after the "banana fever" evenly distributed it throughout a vast portion of the coast. In 1983, El Oro province accounted for over half of total output. The three provinces with the finest soil and humidity conditions, El Oro, Guayas, and Los Ros, continued to produce the majority of the bananas despite advancements in transport technology and packaging techniques in the 1990s. Despite the fact that banana plantations typically only occupied a limited area at a time, it is important to remember that historically fruit production often moved locations and thus had an impact on land usage in much greater regions.

Given the initial relatively high labor intensity of banana production, the development of exports in the 1950s was greatly hampered by labor shortages on the coast. Growers have consistently paid high rates to entice both seasonal and permanent employees. The second phase saw a progressive saturation of the labor market as a result of this, relatively labor-saving technical advancements, and natural population expansion among settlers. Real wages decreased, and the labor market in the banana industry grew more specialized. Production costs remained high due to inflationary pressures brought on by the oil boom and an overvalued currency. But the economic downturn that began in the 1980s once again shifted policy in favor of agro-export interests.

Analyzing the indirect effects of banana production on deforestation over such a long time is more challenging since it necessitates making complex assumptions about what may have occurred in the absence of bananas. It is obvious that the crop's high labor intensity led to a widespread exodus to the coast and supported the long-term population expansion that made Ecuador the most densely inhabited nation in South America. Long-term population expansion is not entirely exogenous; rather, it reacts favorably to the increased income possibilities brought about by commerce and development. Because of the increasing number of banana workers and the many local multiplier effects it had, there was an increased demand for land, which depleted the forest's resources even more. Road building related to the cultivation of bananas also led to forest clearance above and above what was necessary for bananas alone, in addition to these demographic considerations. Except for population expansion, other indirect effects of deforestation have diminished over time.

CONCLUSION

By making manufacturing more immobile, technology-intensive industries with permanent, installed capital may be able to prevent deforestation. Due to asymmetries that prevent trees from returning to abandoned production sites, migratory production systems may have especially large deforestation consequences. Although the adoption of innovations may have been equally restrained by the uneven access to know-how, in an increasingly complex production system, the sluggish and unequal dissemination of new banana technology among farmers underscores the significance of capital limitations. Small manufacturers were compelled to switch to other goods as a result of these developments, which tended to push them out. Even tiny manufacturers, meanwhile, were market-focused and obviously reacted to pull incentives. No part was played by behavior that was "full-bellied" and survival-oriented. Infrastructure improvements enabled banana growers to incorporate themselves more fully into the market economy, which accelerated deforestation. The conversion of forests was especially significant in steep border areas because the early, basic technologies offered these regions a natural competitive edge. Here, homesteading laws acted as a powerfully supportive incentive for deforestation.

It is important to differentiate between the direct and indirect effects of technological progress on deforestation. The latter might eventually exceed the former in size. Asymmetries in forest clearance result from boom-and-bust export product cycles, whereby forests removed during the boom do not reappear during the downturn. Other supplier areas that compete for the same markets may experience technological improvements that impact global pricing, redistribute market shares, and alter pressures on land demand and forest conversion. Agriculture may become more stationary thanks to technologies with a high fixed, installed capital need, which tends to lessen the conversion of forests. Off-farm technologies, particularly those in the transportation industry, might have a significant impact on local land use patterns. Changes in agricultural production may have a significant effect on deforestation.

REFERENCES

[1] Z. Pan, Y. Lu, S. Gupta, and Q. Hu, “You change, I change: an empirical investigation of users’ supported incremental technological change in mobile social media,” Internet Res., 2021, doi: 10.1108/INTR-06-2019-0226.

[2] Y. Park, I. Nakaoka, and Y. Chen, “The R&D strategy of automobile companies in radical innovation,” J. Robot. Netw. Artif. Life, 2020, doi: 10.2991/jrnal.k.200909.009.

[3] A. Nagarajan and W. Mitchell, “Evolutionary diffusion: Internal and external methods used to acquire encompassing, complementary, and incremental technological changes in the lithotripsy industry,” Strateg. Manag. J., 1998, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(1998110)19:11<1063::AID-SMJ993>3.0.CO;2-W.

[4] A. Grubler, C. Wilson, and G. Nemet, “Apples, oranges, and consistent comparisons of the

temporal dynamics of energy transitions," Energy Res. Soc. Sci., 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2016.08.015.
[5] D. G. McKendrick and J. B. Wade, "Frequent incremental change, organizational size, and mortality in high-technology competition," Ind. Corp. Chang., 2009, doi: 10.1093/icc/dtp045.
[6] P. Söderholm, "The green economy transition: the challenges of technological change for sustainability," Sustain. Earth, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s42055-020-00029-y.
[7] A. C. Lewis, "Optimising air quality co-benefits in a hydrogen economy: A case for hydrogen-specific standards for NOx emissions," Environ. Sci. Atmos., 2021, doi: 10.1039/d1ea00037c.
[8] G. F. Nemet, "Demand-pull, technology-push, and government-led incentives for non-incremental technical change," Res. Policy, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2009.01.004.
[9] S. M. Masoumzadeh and T. A. Pickles, "The Effect of R&D on Incremental Technological Change in the Iranian Manufacturing Industry," OPEC Rev., 1998, doi: 10.1111/1468-0076.00050.
[10] Y. Gao, X. Liu, and X. Ma, "How do firms meet the challenge of technological change by redesigning innovation ecosystem? A case study of IBM," Int. J. Technol. Manag., 2019, doi: 10.1504/IJTM.2019.100285.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Soybean Technology and the Loss of Natural Vegetation in Brazil and Bolivia

Dr. Nikhath Fathima

Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Email Id-nikhathfathima@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The global expansion of soybean cultivation has been accompanied by substantial losses of natural vegetation, primarily in regions such as the Amazon basin and the Cerrado biome in Brazil. This abstract explores the relationship between soybean technology and the associated loss of natural vegetation. Soybeans have become a major cash crop due to their high demand for various applications, including livestock feed, vegetable oil, and biofuel production. Technological advancements, such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and improved agronomic practices, have contributed to increased productivity and profitability in soybean cultivation. However, the expansion of soybean production has come at the expense of natural vegetation, particularly forests and savannas. Large-scale land clearing, often achieved through slash-and-burn practices, has been prevalent in regions with high soybean production. This has resulted in deforestation, biodiversity loss, soil degradation, and the release of significant amounts of greenhouse gases. Efforts to address the environmental impacts of soybean cultivation focus on sustainable land-use practices and responsible supply chains. Sustainable intensification strategies, including precision agriculture, agroforestry systems, and cover cropping, aim to minimize the ecological footprint of soybean production and protect natural vegetation.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation

INTRODUCTION

Technology had a crucial role in this. Since Brazilian and Bolivian farmers had no knowledge of how to cultivate them before to the 1970s, soybeans themselves were in a way a new technology. Farmers were able to produce soybeans in the low latitudes and poor acid soils of the Brazilian Cerrado thanks to the creation of new cultivars that were suited to the tropics and the application of soil additives. In general, new varieties, inoculants, pesticides, postharvest technology, and cultural practices increased the profitability of soybean farming and promoted its spread in Bolivia and Brazil [1].

Market circumstances and favorable legislation boosted the impact of new technology. Together, they aided soybean output in reaching a level that made it appropriate to build the infrastructure and support services that competitive soybean production needs. Brazil's adoption of soybeans was aided by government subsidies and high international prices. Bolivia's output was stimulated by regulations that encouraged exports, favorable currency rates, and privileged access to the Andean market. Road building, government land grants, and increased domestic soybean consumption all contributed to the acceleration of the crop in both nations. As a result, the soybean lobby gained political clout, which helped farmers and processors get more government assistance [2].

The relationship between soybean technology and the disappearance of native vegetation in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, central-west Brazil, and south Brazil is examined in this chapter. We begin by outlining our theoretical foundation. We next examine the general equilibrium impacts this produced in labor and product markets, evaluate the impact on forest and savannah, and briefly remark on the ensuing costs and benefits for each example, demonstrating how technology and other variables combined to encourage soybean spread.

Theoretical Foundations and Their Application to Our Case

Agriculture is becoming more lucrative as a result of technological advancement. Improved soybean technology mostly caused other crops to be replaced by soybeans in southern Brazil. While they largely replaced Cerrado vegetation in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, they mostly replaced semi-deciduous woodland in the Cerrado. The expansionary impacts of technical development may be muted by general equilibrium effects in the product or labor markets. In the product market, increasing soybean supply may drive down global prices, deterring future growth [3].

The technology utilized to manufacture soybeans is very capital-intensive and labor-intensive in terms of labor markets. Thus, fast development is unlikely to result in a labor shortage that would raise wages and restrain future expansion. The development of soybean cultivation actually resulted in the displacement of labor in regions like southern Brazil where soybeans replaced more labor-intensive crops. After that, that labor was free to go to the agricultural frontier. The need for labor only marginally increases in other situations, such as in the Brazilian Cerrado and the Santa Cruz expansion zone, where farmers have destroyed natural vegetation to sow soybeans.

The money needed to increase agricultural productivity may also be obtained through the gains brought about by technical advancement. Many farmers in southern Brazil moved to border areas and cleared more forest with the money they made from soy. The roles we assign to economies of scale, the interplay between technology and other policies, and the influence of technology on the political economy are three distinctive elements of our theoretical framework in comparison to other chapters in this book. A robust and contemporary processing, transportation, storage, financial, technical, and marketing infrastructure is required to produce soybeans at a price that is competitive. This suggests that there are significant economies of scale at the sectoral level. Technological advancement may make it simpler to attain production levels that are profitable enough to warrant the installation of support services and infrastructure. Mechanized soybean production also demonstrates economies of scale at the farm level since a single piece of agricultural equipment can cultivate a huge area [4].

Governmental regulations and technological advancements interact non-linearly. Soybean farming became more viable than vast cow ranching, for instance, as a result of credit subsidies in the Brazilian Cerrado. These subsidies also encouraged farmers to employ agricultural equipment and soil amendment technology. The economies of scale in soybean production intensified this process once it got going. The new soybean technology is represented by the three SB isoquants. Farmers in this instance completely clear the surrounding vegetation. The figures associated with each isoquant represent the amount of money made. Consequently, SB1 generates the same gross income as CR1. The utilization of agricultural technology results in increased returns to scale, as shown by the SB isoquants, and SB technologies allow farmers to get larger returns from their land than they could with CR1 by investing more money. Even though soybeans enhance the yields on land, economies of scale reduce their potential for "land saving." Farmers are now able to relocate to point Y on the SB3 isoquant rather than some other point on SB1 or SB2 thanks to the new factor price ratio of CC that results from subsidized credit and increased returns to scale. Farmers are thus more likely to employ both capital and land, even when subsidized credit makes capital inexpensive relative to land.

Finally, changes in technology alter political relations in addition to relative pricing. New soybean technology encouraged the growth of a sizable, concentrated agro industrial sector, which aided in the formation of strong interest groups that successfully persuaded the Brazilian and Bolivian governments to adopt policies supportive of the soybean industry.

DISCUSSION

In the 1950s, coffee production soared in Parana and other southern states, rising from 7% of harvested area to 19%. Brazil's biggest producer of coffee by 1960 was Parana. But soon after, a crisis in the local coffee business was brought on by low coffee prices, soil erosion, plant illnesses, and frost. The administration responded by introducing a "coffee elimination Soybeans were disseminated more widely thanks to government land, finance, and pricing programs. As a result of the increased rights that tenant farmers and sharecroppers had under the 1964 Land Statute, many big landowners drove them off their properties. Similar to this, landowners reduced their use of agricultural laborers as a response to new minimum wage rules. Planting wheat and soybeans, which need less labor, rather than coffee and other traditional food crops, was one approach to do that. By offering subsidized financing to buy agricultural gear, the government has further hastened the transition to mechanized annual crop production. The southern region's coffee producing area decreased from 1.4 million ha to 1 million ha between 1965 and 1970, and by that year, farmers were cultivating more than 1.2 million hectares of soybeans [5].

Then, in 1973, a severe drought in the USA drove up global prices, and the country responded by placing an embargo on its own soybean exports. This was at the same time when Brazil had favorable soybean regulations. The overvaluation of exchange rates decreased. Over 20% of the increase in agricultural financing between 1970 and 1980 went to soybeans.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

To encourage import substitution, the government offered incentives to domestic wheat farmers. Since farmer's typically alternated wheat and soybeans, and the two crops shared the same machinery, equipment, and labor, this was advantageous for soybean producers. The domestic demand for soybean products rose as a result of rapid urbanization and growing per capita income.

Increased soybean production and a decline of natural vegetation. What fraction of the southern soybean boom that directly contributed to deforestation inside the area itself is unknown. Given that the amount of farmland in the south that was really being used throughout the 1970s only expanded by 1.9 million hectares, it was certainly less than a third. It is important to remember that almost all of Parana was once an old-growth forest with a high concentration of Arucaria trees [6].

Effects of general equilibrium: The Product Market

After 1980, the southern soybean industry fizzled out, and the region shrank from 6.9 million hectares in 1980 to 6.1 million ha in 1990. By lowering soybean prices and so diminishing the initial incentive it had offered to enlarge the acreage, technological progress had a role in this process. Simoes claims that between 1973 and 1983, soybean farmers in the south and in So Paulo received 28% fewer benefits from agricultural research than they would have if Brazil had been a minor player in the world's soybean markets as a result of declining international prices brought on by Brazil's increased productivity. The decrease in soybean acreage was also influenced by stagnant yields, which were partly caused by expanding issues with soil erosion and compaction, the withdrawal of wheat subsidies, and high port charges.

Most migrants settled in metropolitan areas. However, a sizable portion moved to the Amazon and destroyed forest to cultivate crops. Parana is mentioned by Sawyer as a significant source of emigrants to the Amazon at that time. While the spread of mechanical agriculture devastated the lives of many people who migrated to the Amazon, in other instances the production of soybeans and wheat gave small farmers the means to buy land on the border of agriculture. Better-off small farmers from the south who relocated to the Cerrado took advantage of low land prices to sell their farms and purchase bigger plots of land there [7]. Northern Mato Grosso was made more accessible in the 1970s by the construction of new highways like the BR158 connecting Barra do Garcas and Maraba and the BR163 that linked Cuiaba and Santarem. The Brazilian government also provided loans and land to huge private corporations, which constructed roads and other infrastructure before reselling a portion of the land in pieces ranging from 50 to 400 hectares to ambitious small farmers from the south. 2.9 million acres were covered by 104 private colonization plans by the year 1986, of which 668,000 ha were used to grow annual crops. The money from the land sales were utilized by certain substantial private investor groups to plant soybeans in the remaining regions and build local infrastructure for handling the earliest stages of processing to manufacture vegetable oil. They have also worked along with EMBRAPA in recent years to create enhanced cultivars.

Effects of General Equilibrium: The Product Market

Several factors started working against soybean output in the middle of the 1980s. The cost of soybeans decreased globally. It's possible that increased soybean output in the Cerrado brought on by technical advancements had a role in this, but no one has looked into the matter to our knowledge. Additionally, the Brazilian government drastically cut down on loan subsidies as real interest rates shot up. The Real Plan, a 1994 macroeconomic stabilization strategy, produced real growth rates that were positive and drastically lowered inflation, both of which boosted domestic demand for soybeans. However, real interest rates remained high and unstable as the currency rate became inflated, putting a great deal of financial strain on obligated soybean producers [8].

When circumstances became unfavorable, strong interest organizations connected to the soybean industry successfully fought for offsetting government concessions. This group, which comprises processors and exporters, producers of equipment and inputs, investment groups, and farmer organizations, has grown to be a significant political power in Brazil. In particular, during the debt crisis of the 1980s and again in the middle of the 1990s, agricultural exports provided a significant contribution to bridging balance-of-payments deficits, which may be the cause of its considerable importance. Soybeans and allied items made up 26% of the agriculture sector's contribution to the trade balance between 1994 and 1996, totaling over $25 million. In the middle of the 1980s, the government bought a lot of soybeans from farmers at set prices to make up for the drop in subsidized credit and to shield them from declining international soybean prices. No matter where they were situated, farmers got the same price for their soybeans, which promoted the spread of the crop into distant locations where high transportation costs may otherwise have prevented commercial production.

In addition, the government set consistent gasoline rates without taking into account the high expense of delivering petroleum to rural locations. This reduced the expense of operating agricultural equipment and allowed farmers to transport their produce across great distances to markets. Several initiatives were started in the 1990s by the private sector and government organizations to lower the cost of shipping soybeans from the Cerrado to other ports. The northern export corridor plan was started in 1990 by private businesses, banks, and government organizations with the aim of increasing soybean output in Tocantins, Maranhao, and Piaui to 500,000 hectares by 1998. The plan involves infrastructure for shipping soybeans to the Amazon River, financial incentives, and agricultural research. The USDA also lists several recent policy adjustments that are advantageous to the soybean industry. The 1996 repeal of a tariff on primary and semi-manufactured exports helped soybean growers. The government gave commercial banks guarantees in response to the 1990s' high interest rates so that exporters could get credit at rates comparable to those offered abroad [9].

Technologies and regulations encouraging the growth of soybeans

Initially, the 'integrated zone' a region west of the Grande River close to Santa Cruz was where the majority of soybeans were farmed. Large commercial farmers dominate the region, which has been inhabited for a considerable amount of time and has a reasonably high population density. The majority of the soybeans grown there are on ground where the native flora was previously cleared for other uses. The region's soils are substantially superior than those of the Brazilian Cerrado, while being rather weak and vulnerable to wind erosion and compaction. Without using fertilizers or soil additives, the majority of farmers there grow soybeans. Since 1990, the 'expanding zone' east of the Grande River has seen the majority of the soybean crop development. The soybean land there increased from 68,000 hectares in 1990 to 278,000 ha in 1996, and it has been growing quickly ever since. These lands, in contrast to the "integrated zone," were mostly immediately transformed from semi-deciduous forest to produce soybeans, and certain regions have weather and soil conditions that are less favorable for growing soybeans.

Soybean Harvesting.

The yearly deforestation rate in the expansion zone was 24,207 ha in 1989–1992, and 41,604 ha in 1992–1994 mostly due to increased soybean production [10]. We are unable to determine if the advantages of turning forests to soybean fields exceed the environmental and socioeconomic costs, much as in the Cerrado. Such an analysis was made by Davies and Abelson, who came to the conclusion that the financial gains from soybean cultivation much exceed the costs associated with lower carbon sequestration and the harvesting of forest products. However, they were unable to place a monetary value on the extinction of species and soil erosion, and they disregarded equity. These woods, according to Hecht, have especially high biodiversity values because "they embrace Andean, Amazonian, and Chaco biotic elements, and include significant centers of diversity for crop plants like peanuts and tomatoes."

CONCLUSION

A new production system, more economical production techniques, and the replacement of capital for labor are only a few examples of the technical advancements affecting soybean production in Brazil and Bolivia. Large tracts of natural vegetation were converted as a result of these changes, both directly and indirectly, in order to increase yearly agricultural output. The availability of inexpensive land in border regions especially favored production methods with economies of scale in the Cerrado and the Bolivian "expansion zone."

Due to the new soybean technology' reduced labor needs, some of the agricultural workers in southern Brazil were displaced, and some of them went to the agricultural frontier. They made sure that the increase in soybean output would not negatively impact earnings in the other areas by pushing salaries higher. Except maybe for Brazil in the 1990s, the high capital needs of the new technology did not limit soybean's development. Brazilian farmers were able to embrace highly capital-intensive technologies throughout the 1970s and 1980s because to the abundance of sub-seized credit that was available. The Brazilian farmers who migrated to Bolivia carried substantial sums of money with them, and Bolivian farmers had easy access to private credit.

The technique at play in the Brazilian Cerrado instance was particularly adapted to the local climatic circumstances of that location, which was a border agricultural area covered in native flora. The development and use of the technology unquestionably had a greater negative influence on the environment as a result. The importance of political-economic considerations in the growth into the northern Cerrado is a particularly intriguing aspect. The growth of soybean after the mid-1980s seems to be directly tied to the industry's ability to influence government policy via lobbying. Technological advancements unintentionally helped to establish the soybean industry, which in turn helped to establish a powerful new political lobby.

In both instances, general equilibrium effects in the product markets lessened part of the expansionary impulse produced by technical change due to the enormous output increases made feasible by technological change in Brazil and the tiny size of the Andean market, which purchases soybeans from Bolivia. The massive loss of natural vegetation was not prevented by these dampening effects. Instead of trying to differentiate between the relative importance of technology and other variables in the spread of soybeans, we would prefer to focus on how these elements interact. A large-scale change in production systems requires not just the right technology but also favorable market and legislative circumstances.

The soybean instance also demonstrates how difficult it is to balance costs and advantages when using agricultural technology that destroys natural vegetation. Soybeans provide a significant amount of foreign currency and much higher revenue per acre than cattle grazing. The natural vegetation they replace often has lower biodiversity and stores significantly less carbon per hectare than rain forests do. But conversion still results in significant carbon emissions, biodiversity losses, and soil erosion. Furthermore, people often underestimate the extent of the biodiversity found in the Bolivian semi-deciduous forests and the Brazilian Cerrado. Few people are employed in the production of mechanized soybeans, and the majority of the profits go to a select few affluent farmers.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Kaimowitz and J. Smith, "Soybean technology and the loss of natural vegetation in Brazil and Bolivia.," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0195.

[2] C. J. R. Alho, S. B. Mamede, M. Benites, B. S. Andrade, and J. J. O. Sepúlveda, "Threats to the biodiversity of the Brazilian pantanal due to land use and occupation," Ambient. e Soc., 2019, doi: 10.1590/1809-4422ASOC201701891VU2019L3AO.

[3] C. J. R. Alho, "Biodiversity of the Pantanal: Response to seasonal flooding regime and to environmental degradation," Brazilian J. Biol., 2008, doi: 10.1590/S1519-69842008000500005.

[4] M. Lu, E. Hamunyela, J. Verbesselt, and E. Pebesma, "Dimension reduction of multi-spectral satellite image time series to improve deforestation monitoring," Remote Sens., 2017, doi: 10.3390/rs9101025.

[5] C. J. R. Alho, S. B. Mamede, M. Benites, B. S. Andrade, and J. J. O. Sepúlveda, "AMEAÇAS À BIODIVERSIDADE DO PANTANAL BRASILEIRO PELO USO E OCUPAÇÃO DA TERRA," Ambient. Soc., 2019.

[6] A. R. Percequillo, E. Hingst-Zaher, and C. R. Bonvicino, "Systematic review of genus Cerradomys Weksler, Percequillo and Voss, 2006 (Rodentia: Cricetidae: Sigmodontinae: Oryzomyini), with description of two new species from Eastern Brazil," Am. Museum Novit., 2008, doi: 10.1206/495.1.

[7] A. P. Nunes, F. C. Straube, R. R. Laps, and S. R. Posso, "Checklist das aves do Estado do Mato Grosso do Sul, Brasil," Iheringia - Ser. Zool., 2017, doi: 10.1590/1678-4766e2017154.

[8] K. Thonicke et al., "A social-ecological approach to identify and quantify biodiversity tipping points in South America's seasonal dry ecosystems," Biogeosciences Discuss., 2019.

[9] C. M. Di Bella, E. G. Jobbágy, J. M. Paruelo, and S. Pinnock, "Continental fire density patterns in South America," Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr., 2006, doi: 10.1111/j.1466-822X.2006.00225.x.

[10] M. Brossard and D. López-Hernández, "Des indicateurs d'évolution du milieu et des sols pour rendre durable l'usage des savanes d'Amérique du Sud," Natures Sciences Societes. 2005. doi: 10.1051/nss:2005041.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

A Century of Technological Change and Deforestation in the Miombo Woodlands

Dr. Ranganatha Sudhakar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-ranganatha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The Miombo Woodlands, a vast tropical savanna ecosystem spanning several countries in southern Africa, has witnessed significant deforestation over the past century. This abstract examines the relationship between technological change and the associated deforestation in the Miombo Woodlands. Technological advancements and socio-economic transformations have shaped land-use patterns and contributed to deforestation in the region. The introduction of mechanized agriculture, logging equipment, and road networks has facilitated increased access to previously inaccessible areas, leading to intensified land clearing for agriculture, logging, and charcoal production. The expansion of agriculture, particularly for small-scale subsistence farming and commercial crops, has been a major driver of deforestation in the Miombo Woodlands. Shifting cultivation practices, combined with the use of fire as a land management tool, have resulted in the conversion of large tracts of woodland into farmland. Additionally, commercial logging operations, driven by global demand for timber, have contributed to forest degradation and fragmentation. However, technological change can also offer potential solutions for sustainable land management and forest conservation. Remote sensing technologies, such as satellite imagery and Geographic Information Systems (GIS), enable accurate monitoring of deforestation rates, detection of illegal activities, and informed decision-making. Advanced forest management techniques, such as selective logging and sustainable agroforestry practices, can minimize the environmental impact of resource extraction and promote forest regeneration.

KEYWORDS: Deforestation, Forest Conservation, Miombo Woodlands, Socio-Economic.

INTRODUCTION

The Mio Mbo savannah woods in northern Zambia have been under growing strain due to agricultural development and intensification, which has been predominantly fueled by population increase, migration, technical advancement, and governmental policies during the last century. This chapter examines the influence of technology advancements on deforestation at that time using economic theory and agroecosystem analysis. As a result, it is possible to make more general conclusions regarding the connections between agricultural innovation and deforestation in other areas. To show how historical information regarding demographic, regulatory, and technology changes have impacted typical local land users, the applicable farm household models are combined with historical facts about these changes. The models make use of multi objective programming, a technique that combines lexicographic and weighted goal programming, and take into account factors such as households' basic needs, shifting cultural preferences, access to technologies, seasonal labor demands and constraints, aversion to risk and drudgery, and partial market integration. In addition, I draw on my own 1980s and 1990s research in the region [1]. The introduction of cassava in the first half of the century and the growth of maize systems incorporating fertilizer usage in the late 1970s are the two significant technical advancements that are highlighted in this chapter. Cassava required a lot of labor, but the maize fertilizer system required a lot of money. After the government implemented structural adjustment policies in the 1990s, the maize-fertilizer system grew riskier, and in recent years, we have seen "technological progress in reverse."

Most of northern Zambia was under the control of the chite Mene shifting farming system at the turn of the century. According to this method, farmers cut down a lot of trees, pile the trunks on a smaller area, and burn them. After that, they cultivate crops in the ash for a while. The nutrient-rich woody biomass is burned, making it accessible to crops and creating a weed-free seedbed. The first crop, finger millet, benefits from the altered soil structure caused by the heat. Chite Mene is practiced in diverse ways by various ethnic groups, and the system has developed through time. Farmers used a different technique called the grass-mound system in the extreme north-east, close to the Tanzanian border where the soils are more productive and population concentrations were greater. Producers built mounds out of incorporated grass turf, let the organic matter to break down, and then spread the mounds out to grow finger millet and beans. Similar to the chite Mene system, the fundikila system subsequently expanded to other regions and underwent numerous alterations [2].

In the early part of the century, the British introduced cassava. The labor-intensive production of cassava significantly increased food security. In so-called "cassava gardens," farmers often planted cassava on ridges or mounds as the primary crop, frequently with other crops during the first year. Infrastructure upgrades, market integration, and expenditures in research and extension helped extend maize production, which is linked to the usage of fertilizers, starting in the late 1970s. 'Permanent maize production' is a term that's often used to describe the maize growing method. The name "high-external-input shifting cultivation" could be more appropriate given that the fertilizers cause the soils to become more acidic, which over time reduces production.

Theoretical Framework

The humid tropics of Africa are dominated by peasant agricultural families. Many researchers believe that they are the primary causes of deforestation since they often use large farming methods. Given their desires, resource limitations, restricted access to information, and the imperfect marketplaces they must contend with, these households, who are both producers and consumers, typically act rationally. Weak communications networks and high transaction costs are caused by low population density and insufficient infrastructure. This results in widespread market flaws. Land is plentiful, hence there is often no land market. Similar to labor markets, input and output markets may not exist or may exist with significant flaws. For instance, farmers may only be able to find work during certain seasons or could struggle to get loans. This has an impact on how families behave, including the technology they choose and whether or not they remove forest. In such situations, family choices about production and consumption are interdependent, and particular technology, market conditions, and household characteristics control a large portion of the results. Farm families greatly discount future revenue due to a lack of credit markets and poverty, which may cause them to overlook the long-term consequences of their land management choices [3].

In such a situation, it is plausible to simulate farmers' choices using static household models that concurrently analyze production and consumption choices and take into account market inefficiencies. To analyze typical farm homes in Russia, where there were essentially no labor or land markets and where households altered the amount of land they farmed in response to variations in the ages and numbers of their members, Chayanov created the first farm household model early in the 20th century.

DISCUSSION

According to research on the "economics of rural organization," farmers who lack accurate information tend to see hired labor as a subpar alternative to family labor. This helps to explain why efficiency and farm size typically have an inverse relationship. Rationing in the credit markets is caused by moral hazard circumstances brought on by incomplete information. Cash and credit restrictions also lead to flaws in the labor market, which explains why agricultural economies with plenty of land have many Chayanovian characteristics. How product markets operate is influenced by the qualities of the outputs involved and market access. Some outputs only have local markets or no markets at all. This suggests that each home or town deals with a unique set of market pricing, and that supply changes may have a significant impact on those prices. Technological advancements in the production of tradeable and non-tradeable goods may have opposing impacts on deforestation if the local demand is inelastic [4].

The general trend for output to grow more intense as labor productivity declines in response to increased population pressures is described by Boser up's theory of the evolution of agricultural development. Farmers switch from shifting agriculture to long fallow, short fallow, permanent, and various cropping methods as the population grows. Similar to this, Rothenberg came to the conclusion that shifting cultivators often do not face labor shortages and do not exert themselves to the fullest extent possible since they have neither need nor motivation to do so. However, labor becomes an output limiting constraint when farmers choose fallow systems or ongoing upland cultivation. In comparison to shifting-cultivation systems, these systems have lower physical yields per unit of cropped area and more apparent seasonal peaks in labor demand, notably for weeding and land preparation. This suggests that for farm families in sparsely populated regions, shifting cropping provides several attractive aspects. Even after they have used up all the available land in a region, farmers often continue to practice shifting cultivation. Fallow times shorten as a consequence, and the system collapses. Holden has shown that, under such circumstances, the impoverished shifting farmers' high discount rates will often cause them to have a short-term perspective and neglect the long-term advantages of forest regeneration. Others have attributed these circumstances to free access, unstable tenure, or the futility of collective action. However, empirical data shows that the discount rates in impoverished peasant farm families are substantially larger than the rate of regrowth in the forest. Tenure security is meaningless in such situations. The fundamental needs of farm families, such as food, shelter, electricity, water, market-purchased commodities, security, social duties and needs, and leisure, are represented through lexicographic and weighted-goal programming. It is considered that they wish to put in the least amount of effort feasible to meet their fundamental necessities. Beyond this, it is believed that either a weighted income-leisure objective is maximized or drudgery is reduced subject to an income limitation [5].

The first set of household models was built to represent the decision farmers had to make between the fundikila grass-mound system and the chite Mene shifting-cultivation at this time. The low population density and insect issues at the time made production problematic. Crops could be sold by households, but labor could not. Their primary objectives were to labor as little as possible and to cultivate enough food for their subsistence needs. Depending on their cultural preferences, production technology, market availability, seasonal labor needs, and other criteria, they had to cultivate a certain amount of land to accomplish this. However, after they covered their subsistence needs, they often had little motivation to produce more, thus any increase in land productivity tended to result in a decrease in the overall area they farmed. The model demonstrates that farm families should have significantly chosen the chite Mene system given the then-current yields and labor needs, while the grass-mound system offered substantially lower returns to labor on the infertile soils of the central plateau. This may help to explain why population numbers in these places stayed low since the grass-mound system was ineffective. Using the chite Mene method, humans could generate

By relocating people to less populous regions, the British actively managed population numbers. In order to assure food security, they also had the local people cultivate cassava. They justified this by claiming that since its roots were underground, farmers would have a fallback option in the event that locusts decimated other crops. The new crop was first unpopular, but as soon as people learned about its benefits, they started to extensively accept it. It eventually turned into the primary staple for most people. Intercropping and separate cassava plots were also used to progressively adapt cassava into the chite Mene and grass-mound systems. Even in the poor soils where the majority of other crops failed, it generated a respectable yield [6]. Shows some of the results of the introduction of cassava. It demonstrates unequivocally how cassava increased yields while requiring less labor and improved food security by fending off locust infestations. With cassava as their primary staple instead of finger millet, families were able to satisfy their food needs with 40% less labor. Cassava increased the carrying capacity of the chite Mene system by a factor of two to six. They were able to create significantly greater surpluses for sale as a result. Because a significant number of the male population in northern Zambia relocated to work in the rapidly growing copper industry, rural families were especially interested in minimizing their labor needs. Because cassava could be cultivated without climbing or chopping trees, which were exclusively male chores, female-headed households were less reliant on male labor.

By boosting land productivity in a setting where farmers primarily sought to fulfill their subsistence needs, the introduction of cassava lowered population pressure and deforestation directly, and indirectly by encouraging outmigration. It also made it easier for people to live in close proximity to cities, highways, and lakes where they practice intensive cassava systems, which led to further deforestation in certain areas while reducing it elsewhere. Farmers were able to replace the chite Mene system with grass-mound and cassava-garden systems by introducing cassava into their systems, which allowed them to support population densities ten to fifteen times greater than they could have in the past. Population expansion was no longer bound by the Chite Mene system's carrying capacity. As a result, even while the introduction of cassava reduced deforestation in the short term, it may have increased it in the long run. Cassava cultivation decreased production risk, which in turn short-term decreased deforestation. A further benefit was that because farmers may grow cassava at any time during a long period of time, from the beginning of the rainy season in November until early March, and throughout the year, harvest it. Farmers favored bitter cassava varieties over other kinds because they were less susceptible to damage by wild pigs, which at first posed a serious danger to the production of other varieties, especially in the far-off chite Mene fields, which had to be fenced as a result.

Over time, hunting decreased the number of wild pigs and the issues they created, raised average yields, and enabled farmers to discontinue fencing in their land parcels [7]. In order to arrest the deterioration in the overpopulated regions, the British resettlement programs during the colonial era relocated over 160,000 people from highly populated portions of Zambia to underpopulated areas. Additionally, they brought fresh agricultural methods including early burning, growing fruit trees, better seeds, and erosion control techniques. 15 years after resettlement, according to Allan, the natural equilibrium had mostly been restored by the time he visited these places. Most settlements had relocated once or twice by that time. However, Allan also discovered no significant deterioration in Serenje, a region that had similarly been deemed overpopulated in 1945 but had not yet undergone relocation. The Lala people who lived there practiced small-circle chite Mene. Instead, he saw a natural transition away from chite Mene agriculture where the tree flora had been exhausted and toward mound gardens with cassava, sorghum, and maize when he returned to same region 15 years later.

Alder also said that farmers had started to leave fields fallow in the mound stage rather than the flattened stage in order to save time due to the growing labor shortages brought on by emigration to cities. In the past, following a millet harvest, it had been common to leave the land fallow since gardens abandoned in the mounded stage took longer to regrow. Due to a lack of available land, cassava became a significant crop in the grass-mound system in the 1960s and the major food source in the north-eastern Mambwe region near the Tanzanian border. The introduction of cassava was the biggest technological advancement in northern Zambia throughout the 20th century. It significantly raised land-carrying capabilities and agricultural production. Deforestation was therefore short-term minimized as a result. However, cassava significantly boosted labor productivity and making short rotation systems viable replacements for chite Mene. Deforestation may have grown as a result of the introduction of cassava in the long term [8].

Throughout the 1970s, market integration and technological advancement. Early in the 1970s, the hybrid maize variety SR52 was released and rapidly spread. Given that finger millet's weeding took a lot of labor on short-fallow soil, it partially replaced finger millet. Eleusine indica, a weed with a similar look to finger millet during the early development stage, has become more prevalent as a result of shorter fallow periods, making finger millet weeding considerably more challenging. By building larger mounds and burying the weeds deeper under additional dirt, some farmers attempted to alleviate the weed issue. Others converted to maize and cassava hybrids to lower their labor needs. The Mambwe area saw very few fallow seasons, which degraded the soils in the area. Watson had noted fallow intervals in the grass-mound system in one hamlet in this region of 5–6 years in the late 1950s, but by 1988 Sano discovered that fallow times had decreased to barely 2-4 years. Older chite Mene gardens also started to use mounding more often as a consequence of the deteriorating soil fertility. The soils of these mounds often have a higher pH and more nutrients, and they may be thought of as concentrated topsoil. Due to empty pods on acidic soils, ground nuts were less prevalent in grass-mound fields, whereas bean yield for sale increased. Farmers had to go further from their communities to obtain space for additional chite Mene plots, which increased the amount of time it took to trek back and forth from the fields. On the adjacent fields and in the intermediate zone cassava gardens, farmers started to cultivate maize. One cassava garden was typically harvested by then each year. Compared to millet and sorghum, cassava required less labor, thrived on poor soils, and produced great yields [9].

Since Pottier examined the region in the late 1970s, peasant agriculture in northern Zambia has seen significant development. The expansion of maize production to outlying regions was made possible by improved infrastructure, subsidized inputs, and subsidized transportation. Due to the implementation of an integrated rural development initiative, this initially occurred in the Serenje, Mpika, and Chinsali Districts before spreading to other places. Farmers' ability to acquire outside inputs, cash, or loans was essential to their ability to grow maize. Social differentiation tended to become worse once maize was introduced. The main reason peasants embraced the new crop was to increase their monetary revenue, however in the southern portions of the area, close to cities, and in wealthier homes, farmers also increasingly planted maize for family use.

Along with the maize system, peasants continued to cultivate their land using their customary methods. According to various household surveys, there is a good association between the amount of land used for maize and the amount used for chite Mene or other methods. This shows that the systems complemented one another rather than that a rise in the output of maize led to an increase in the chite Mene. Because the labour maxima in maize production did not significantly clash with the labor needs for chite Mene production, the families with the ability to produce big areas of maize also had the ability to grow large areas of chite Mene.

In the late 1980s, maize was commonly discovered in grass-mound fields close to the heavily populated Kasama neighborhood. Farmers in the less populous Chimbola region continued to cultivate cassava in chite Mene gardens while switching the neighboring more permanent fields over to maize. Price controls, subsidized loans, the availability of fertilizer and hybrid seeds, the marketing of output by parastatal organizations, and public extension programs are all major factors that support "permanent" maize production. Continuous mono cropping of maize, however, resulted in quick production losses as a result of the nitrogen fertilizers' acidifying effects, as well as growing issues with aluminum toxicity and nutritional shortages. Lime was unavailable to farmers, and even if it had been, it would not have been beneficial to utilize. As a result, they were forced to give up farming after a few years and wait a very long period for their fertility to return. Farmers believed that the soils had developed a dependence on fertilizer. The findings of household simulation models for typical male- and female-headed households show the impact of planting maize in low-density regions. These models make the assumption that maize is a wholly commercial crop. The models presumptively consider that the household's goal is to [10]

The introduction of maize and fertilizer technology had a little impact on chite Mene production, but this was partly because farmers' access to capital, input, and output markets for maize were unreliable. The parastatals were ineffectively run. Farmers therefore ran the danger of not having their produce collected or paid for as well as of getting their credit or fertilizers too late or not at all. This prevented them from converting more of their chite Mene crop to maize. In locations near marketing terminals, these issues were less acute, allowing such areas to focus more on maize production. Thus, the introduction of maize did less to curb deforestation than one may have imagined, at least in the near term. The maize system could not take the place of the chite Mene system due to the hazards involved. Due to labor shortages, families led by women cultivated far smaller land areas and reduced deforestation much more than households headed by men. Due to the high seasonal need for labor in maize cultivation, female-headed families were also less able to profit from it. This suggests that the expansion of maize reduced deforestation more in families headed by men than in households led by women.

Demand for labor in agriculture was mostly cyclical. Since there were no landless families in this region with relatively ample land, the labour supply was at its lowest while demand was at its greatest. Households having access to off-farm jobs often had substantially greater earnings in more densely populated regions. In these places, female-headed families often conducted commerce. How typical male- and female-headed families in a highly populated region are affected by access to off-farm work and commercial activity. Due to competition from other activities for family labor and the fact that hired labor is not a perfect replacement for family labor, both induce families to become less active in farming. These conclusions concur with those of previous econometric research. As a result, increased access to non-farm income should help to curb deforestation. Government adjustment strategies from the late 1980s were implemented as a result of the economic crisis. In addition to removing subsidies for agricultural supplies, finance, and transportation, it also made moves to privatize the provision of inputs, credit, and maize marketing. Due to this, the availability of credit shrank and costs for seeds and fertilizer increased along with interest rates. As a consequence, maize yield severely decreased. Many farms expanded their chite Mene output or switched back. As many people relocated to dwell in wooded regions, the relocation also disrupted village structures in certain places. Overall, when technological advancement and growth went "in reverse," SAP decreased market integration and increased deforestation in northern Zambia.

This part makes an effort to assess a few of the broad theories put forward in the book's opening chapters in light of the Zambian experience. Table 14.6 compiles some of the most important conclusions from the discussion in the preceding section to make this debate simpler to understand. It demonstrates the historical evolution of the primary production systems, the emergence of various market niches, policy shifts, the population densities and carrying capacities related to each production system, as well as the short- and long-term impacts on deforestation.

Deforestation and the kind of technique used: Cassava

The cassava technique that was used in Zambia lowered risk while saving labor and land. Overall, it reduced the direct and indirect strain on forests, however in other places it increased the burden by enabling the population to grow. The chite Mene system's inadequate carrying capacity has previously hampered population increase. Long-term population expansion supported by the adoption of cassava cultivation in these areas led to a switch from forest/bush fallow to grass fallow, as well as further deforestation and soil degradation.

The Impact of Fertilizer and Maize On Deforestation Due To Technology

The more expensive maize fertilizer technology often led to an increase in the overall need for labor and a deterrent to large shifting farming. Deforestation decreased as a result. Due to the limited potential of labor-intensive technologies on the infertile and acidic ultisols and oxisols in the region, farmers did not embrace practices like alley cropping and planted fallows. In places with more rich soil and dense populations, these methods are more appropriate.

Farm Family Characteristics: Gender and the Availability of Household Labor

Less able to produce a surplus for sale were families with limited access to labor. They were thus less market-integrated, more subsistence-oriented, and less forest-clearing than labor-rich families. The cassava technology was especially beneficial to low-income families who used cassava as their primary source of food. Due to the gendered division of labor, women were not allowed to climb trees to cut branches for chite Mene, which prevented female-headed families from clearing much forest.

Pan-territorial pricing are a feature of the output market. Rather than family choices, market factors determine whether technical improvement results in more or less deforestation. Farmers have easier access to markets thanks to pan-territorial pricing. This encouraged the production of maize and decreased deforestation. Farmers move their resources toward the intense system when consumers may select between intensive and extended production systems and the produce connected to the intensive system is simpler to sell or fetches a better price. As a result, less of the heavily cultivated crop is grown, and less deforestation results. When pan-territorial pricing is eliminated, as the Zambian government did in the early 1990s, transportation expenses are privatized, which forces farmers in distant areas to switch to less expensive and more land-consuming methods and, as a result, destroy more forest.

Population Increase and Flawed Labor Markets

Due to high transaction costs, an availability of land, seasonal labor demand in agriculture, and the challenge of overseeing contracted agricultural labor, low-population-density locations often have imperfect labor markets. Due to seasonal labor demand and families' need for leisure, family labor predominates, which may limit the development of production even if families typically do not employ all of their available labor. Households with off-farm earning prospects limit their farming and remove less forest as a result of labor market flaws. Deforestation increases when labor supply rises due to population expansion. The reverse is true when people emigrate.

Credit

Government financing that was subsidized encouraged the production of capital-intensive maize, which decreased deforestation. As soon as the government stopped providing subsidies in the 1990s, this could no longer be maintained. Farm families find it more difficult to recruit labor when they have financial and credit limitations. Therefore, how much forest they clear depends primarily on how easily accessible wooded area is to their family labor.

Discount Rates and Real Estate Regulations

According to empirical research, farm families in northern Zambia discount rates are much greater than the physical growth rate of Mio Mbo forests, and as a result, households usually disregard the long-term advantages of leaving land fallow. The major reason they keep land fallow is because using it in the near term will cost them more money than they would make. This implies that utilizing static and/or time-recursive farm home models, we can replicate household behavior. These forecast that until all the trees are eventually cut down, homes will continue to utilize the chite Mene system in an unsustainable way. In this situation, it seems that the property system has minimal impact on deforestation. Although families have unique use rights to property, including fallow land, tenure instability is not a significant issue. Instead of tenure insecurity, high discount rates are the cause of poor investment in intensification and a failure to consider intertemporal externalities.

CONCLUSION

The introduction of cassava was the biggest technical advancement in northern Zambia throughout the 20th century. It represented a technical advancement that saved labor and land and decreased the risk of manufacturing. It decreased near-term deforestation but promoted population expansion and concentration, which resulted in localized deforestation close to cities and lakes. As a consequence, trees and tree roots were removed more thoroughly than they had been under the chite Mene shifting cropping approach. Because of this, future population densities will be substantially greater because to cassava technology. Starting in the late 1970s, policymakers and academics concentrated their technical efforts on introducing capital-intensive maize production. Temporarily, this approach decreased deforestation, but a large portion of this benefit vanished as the government stopped providing subsidies that encouraged maize cultivation as part of its SAP.

In northern Zambia, market inefficiencies still have a significant impact on farm families' choices about forest removal. Household reactions are influenced by flaws in the credit and labor markets, and SAP has accentuated these flaws. In the future, population expansion will probably be the primary factor causing deforestation, barring the implementation of new technology and/or legislation. In conclusion, technological change has played a significant role in driving deforestation in the Miombo Woodlands over the past century. However, with appropriate policies, governance mechanisms, and technological innovations, it is possible to reverse the trend and promote sustainable land management practices. By integrating advanced monitoring tools, sustainable resource extraction techniques, and inclusive governance processes, the Miombo Woodlands can be conserved while supporting the livelihoods of local communities and safeguarding its unique biodiversity for future generations.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Prins and I. S. Kikula, “Deforestation and regrowth phenology in miombo woodland - Assessed by Landsat Multispectral Scanner System data,” For. Ecol. Manage., 1996, doi: 10.1016/0378-1127(96)03716-4.

[2] H. Moreau, B. Verhelst, A. Couloux, E. Derelle, S. Rombauts, N. Grimsley, M. Van Bel, J. Poulain, M. Katinka, M. F. Hohmann-Marriott, G. Piganeau, P. Rouzé, C. Da Silva, P. Wincker, Y. Van de Peer, and K. Vandepoele, “Gene functionalities and genome structure in Bathycoccus prasinos reflect cellular specializations at the base of the green lineage,” Genome Biol., 2012, doi: 10.1186/gb-2012-13-8-r74.

[3] M. M. Rannestad and T. A. Gessesse, “Deforestation and subsequent cultivation of nutrient poor soils of miombo woodlands of Tanzania: Long term effect on maize yield and soil nutrients,” Sustain., 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12104113.

[4] N. Barbara, N. Linda, and C. Ngonga, “Drivers of Deforestation in the Miombo Woodlands and Their Impacts on the Environment,” Adv. Res., 2016, doi: 10.9734/air/2016/23831.

[5] E. N. Chidumayo and L. Kwibisa, “Effects of deforestation on grass biomass and soil nutrient status in miombo woodland, Zambia,” Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0167-8809(02)00229-3.

[6] E. K. K. Jew, A. J. Dougill, and S. M. Sallu, “Tobacco cultivation as a driver of land use change and degradation in the miombo woodlands of south-west Tanzania,” L. Degrad. Dev., 2017, doi: 10.1002/ldr.2827.

[7] R. Koller and C. Samimi, “Deforestation in the miombo woodlands: A pixel-based semi-automated change detection method,” Int. J. Remote Sens., 2011, doi: 10.1080/01431161.2010.527390.

[8] J. Pelletier, A. Paquette, K. Mbindo, N. Zimba, A. Siampale, B. Chendauka, F. Siangulube, and J. W. Roberts, “Carbon sink despite large deforestation in African tropical dry forests (miombo woodlands),” Environ. Res. Lett., 2018, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/aadc9a.

[9] Y. U. Sikuzani, H. K. Muteya, and J. Bogaert, “Miombo woodland, an ecosystem at risk of disappearance in the Lufira Biosphere Reserve (Upper Katanga, DR Congo)? A 39-years analysis based on Landsat images,” Glob. Ecol. Conserv., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e01333.

[10] R. B. Richardson, L. S. Olabisi, K. B. Waldman, N. Sakana, and N. G. Brugnone, “Modeling interventions to reduce deforestation in Zambia,” Agric. Syst., 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103263.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Tree Crops as Deforestation and Reforestation

Mr. Naveen Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email-Id-naveenkumarj@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: ***The conversion of forests to agricultural land is a significant driver of deforestation worldwide. However, tree crops, characterized by perennial tree plantations, can also play a dual role in both contributing to deforestation and promoting reforestation efforts. This abstract examines the complex relationship between tree crops, deforestation, and reforestation. Tree crops, such as oil palm, rubber, cocoa, and coffee, have been widely cultivated in tropical and subtropical regions to meet global demand for commodities. The expansion of these crops has often resulted in the clearing of natural forests, leading to deforestation, biodiversity loss, and carbon emissions. Large-scale industrial plantations, driven by profit motives, have been associated with negative environmental and social impacts. Nevertheless, tree crops can also contribute to reforestation efforts when managed sustainably. Agroforestry systems, which integrate tree crops with other vegetation, offer an environmentally friendly approach that combines agricultural production with reforestation objectives. By incorporating native tree species, maintaining forest cover, and adopting sustainable land management practices, agroforestry systems can restore ecosystem functions, conserve biodiversity, and mitigate climate change. Additionally, reforestation programs often rely on tree crops as part of their strategies. Reforestation initiatives may involve the establishment of tree plantations to restore degraded land or promote afforestation in deforested areas. These efforts aim to enhance carbon sequestration, restore ecological balance, and provide economic benefits through sustainable harvesting of tree crops.***

KEYWORDS: ***Agroforestry Systems, Deforestation, Reforestation, Tree Crops.***

INTRODUCTION

For four centuries, the global cocoa supply has increased consistently. However, there have been significant changes in the locations where cocoa is grown, despite the apparent sustainability of one of the principal tree crops worldwide. In the sixteenth century, the center of the world's chocolate production relocated from Mexico to Central America. Then, in the 17th century, it traveled to the Caribbean, Venezuela in the 18th, Ecuador and So Tomé in the 19th, Brazil, Ghana, and Nigeria in the early 20th century, and Côte d'Ivoire soon after. At the start of the millennium, Africa continued to be a significant producer, but Asia, notably Indonesia, had a potential to take the top spot in the 21st century. These booms took place in regions with accessible and plentiful woods, a large pool of prospective migrants, and increasing cocoa prices. Deforestation and widespread migration to the forest boundary are encouraged by these circumstances. The advancement of technology will hasten deforestation under these circumstances. The instances of Sulawesi and Côte d'Ivoire covered in this chapter support that. The majority of cocoa technology advancements have included physical labor and planting tools. Chemicals and fertilizers were latecomers. Very little manufacturing is automated [1].

Although the situation is complicated, our basic conclusion is that cocoa technology has hastened deforestation. Depending on the type of technology, the stage in the deforestation process at which the technology is adopted, the ecological and institutional context, and commodity market trends and price cycles, technological advancement in tree crops, and cocoa in particular, may result in varying rates of deforestation. Farmers could even actively seek out technical advancement to hasten the destruction of forests. Finding more effective techniques to clear forests is a top objective for migrants who are interested in making quick returns. In general, certain new agricultural technology could contribute to deforestation more as a result than as a direct cause. Farmers are compelled to modify their methods as a result of deforestation. According to this adaptation of Boserup's theory for tree-crop cycles, deforestation promotes innovation. The question may not be whether deforestation is accelerating or slowing down in any case. The forest has already disappeared in many places. The main issue is how new technology may promote replanting and reforestation of unused land, particularly grasslands.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

A Model of Migration, Deforestation, and Cocoa Cycles

The bioecological foundation of the cocoa cycle and Forest Rent

David Ricardo first proposed the idea of differential rent around 200 years ago. Wheat was grown on less and less appropriate land as the population and demand expanded. As a result, different ecological situations cost differently. Farmers cultivating the finest land benefited from additional revenues, which Ricardo referred to as rentals, as long as the price of wheat met production expenses in the least appropriate locations. The similar idea may be used to cocoa. The cost of producing a tonne of cocoa from an area planted in freshly cleared forest compared to a tonne of cocoa grown on fallow ground or after the first plantation was felled is what we refer to as the differential forest rent [2].

A number of advantages offered by the forest are lost as a result of the cost differential between new and old cocoa farms. These advantages include less insect and disease issues, minimal weed occurrence, strong topsoil fertility, moisture retention owing to high amounts of organic matter in the soil, protection from drying winds, and the production of food, lumber, and other forest products. The forest rents disappear as the cocoa plants mature and the majority of the forest is removed. The expense of harvesting and upkeep increases as the age of the trees increases. The farmer won't be able to afford to replant if he or she waits too long to do so. The risks and expenses associated with replanting are increased by high tree mortality in replanted areas and the extra labor and/or other inputs required to reduce tree death. In areas that have been replanted, tree growth is slower, and the trees need more labor and resources. These biological causes of the replanting issue help to partly explain the ongoing geographical variations in the supply of cocoa.

In the Sulawesi uplands of Indonesia, it was projected that growing cocoa on grassland would cost almost twice as much as growing it in newly removed forest. You have one hectare of cocoa after grassland or two after forest, as the smallholders observe. Additionally, cocoa that was formerly grassland needs extra upkeep and fertilizer. According to farm budgets, in 1997, the cost of production on formerly grassland was roughly 46 cents per kilogram, compared to 36 cents per kilogram for plantings on formerly forested land, a difference of nearly 30%. If all dangers were taken into account, this number would be close to 50%. Oswald's findings for Côte d'Ivoire were comparable [3].

Food crops that are inter planted with cocoa fall under the definition of forest rent as well. When farmers produce food crops on fallow or grasslands rather than newly removed forest, the returns are lower, restricting the cash flow and opportunities to purchase inputs. Farmers now find it more challenging to replant cocoa. There are essentially three options for cocoa producers whose crops deteriorate. They may decide to stop producing cocoa and perhaps switch to off-farm activities, relocate, or bear the much greater expenses of replanting. One of the most common patterns in the history of cocoa, particularly in West Africa, is jumping from one front-tier to another. Usually, we see a loss in cocoa output in the traditional cocoa growing areas, which is offset by an increase in production from the new frontiers.

DISCUSSION

The political, social, and economic underpinnings of cocoa cycles

Political, economic, and societal factors all play a role in cocoa cycles. Tree life cycles and family life cycles intersect. Together, farmers and their trees age. In particular, if they send their kids to school, the farmers are too elderly and don't have a labor force when the crops need to be replanted. Their need to spend in replanting coincides with a drop in cocoa yields. These many pressures "squeeze" businesses and prompt them to search for fresh financing and technological resources [4].

Throughout the cocoa cycle, land ownership changes. When the boom starts, migrants often locate land that is inexpensive and simple to obtain. The majority of booms may be seen as occasions when migrants, who bring and manage labor, meet native ethnic groups, who control land or at least have a moral claim to it. When labor is in short supply, migrants are often the winners at least initially. Twenty to twenty-five years later, land becomes scarce and the subject of growing tensions between immigrants and native ethnic groups, as well as perhaps between generations within both groups. Even local cocoa recessions may be brought on by these issues with land tenure.

The issue of technological transformation interacts with these institutional tensions and changes. New immigrants often have a greater labor-to-land ratio than the native population and older migrants. As a result, they find it simpler to embrace replanting methods that require more labor. Therefore, even after the forest has vanished, the chances of replanting may often depend on a consistent influx of migrants.

Massive increases in cocoa supply have an impact on global pricing and may cause price drops. For instance, when over 200,000 migrants flooded into the south-west of Côte d'Ivoire, they added a further 500,000 tonnes of cocoa to the global market during the next ten years, pushing cocoa prices down. The collective result of the migrants' efforts was to accelerate the procedures that resulted in the closure of cocoa fields [5].

The cycles of cocoa may also be influenced by political choices. Governments are often inclined to keep cocoa taxes the same or even raise them when prices decrease. Additionally, they are under pressure to minimize the number of immigrants and, therefore, the labor pool. These are two effective strategies for killing the goose that produces golden eggs. These variables often combine to create cycles with an average duration of 25 years. This roughly represents the order of global pricing cycles. Even with steady pricing, there would still be cycles in the production of cocoa and swings in output across areas. Instead of replanting, fresh migrations and plantings are required because to the increased production costs brought on by the aging of the trees and the decreased availability of forest. These procedures are only sped up by price variables. A new nation with plenty of woods and labor reserves replaces the area that has dominated global cocoa production after the majority of its forests have been destroyed. As long as there are nations where trees are accessible and affordable but other inputs are expensive, this trend will continue. To alter farmers' choices and behavior, changes would need to be made to how easily they may access woods and the price ratios they confront. In fact, they are essentially necessary conditions for technology advancement to decrease deforestation.

The relationship between forest rent, technological progress, and the cocoa cycle

Based on the prior discussion, we divide technological change into three categories based on when and where they occur in the cacao cycle. First, advancements in technology could take place outside the cocoa region, in a neighboring area or nation. In such situation, if it has labor-saving features and takes place prior to the cocoa boom, it contributes to the boom by freeing up labor. Then, technological advancements operate as a driving force behind deforestation and cocoa booms. The Sulawesi Green Revolution and labor-saving techniques in paddy agriculture have liberated labor for the cocoa boom, which has led to deforestation. Technologies that require a lot of labor will have the opposite impact. Second, at the start of the cacao cycle, technical development could happen in the pioneer frontier. We will demonstrate that changes in manual technology, as well as the introduction of chainsaws, may dramatically alter deforestation and plantings, even while financial capital plays a limited role on the frontier [6].

Thirdly, technical advancements might come along late in the cycle, when the cocoa area is already on the verge of recession and close to the conclusion of its cycle. Technology adoption is driven by the need to compensate for the loss of forest rent, which often entails a switch from manual methods to herbicides and fertilizers. Farmers pay special attention to herbicides since plant invasion is a significant issue in old cocoa regions. These technologies might contribute to deforestation since they reduce labor requirements, but they could also be important reforestation aids.

New Technologies and Cocoa in Côte d'Ivoire

A new tree crop may have conflicting impacts on deforestation and may be seen as its own technical advancement. Compared to most annual food crops, which need a lot of land, a tree crop often yields greater returns on labor and land. This might aid in saving the forest. But most of the time, migrating populations are drawn by lucrative new tree harvests. The majority of commercial tropical tree crops thrive in forest areas, and the migration of people who come to plant them greatly accelerates deforestation. This is what occurred in Côte d'Ivoire and in the majority of prior tales involving cocoa, from Ghana to Brazil. The development of cocoa production in central-western Côte d'Ivoire and the significance of technical advancement in that process are summarized in this section. It demonstrates how, in part due to the environment in which they were presented and implemented, technical advancements have changed from fostering deforestation to stimulating reforestation [7].

Primary forest is now being cleared by local ethnic groups instead of secondary woodland

Central-western Côte d'Ivoire had a low population density in the early 20th century. To clear woodland, the native Bété people utilized a simple iron piece fastened to a wooden pole. After clearing land with fallows that were 7 to 10 years old easily chopped down and long enough to kill most weed seeds the majority of farmers cultivated food crops. Primary woods were kept safe by technical limitations and labor shortages. The usage of axes and machetes grew considerably in the 1920s. Around that time, the area was introduced to rice, coffee, and cocoa, and farmers planted the majority of these commodities on what had previously been secondary woods aged 7 to 20 years. After a 15-year hiatus, planting coffee was made simple by consistent rains, a humid environment, and a lack of weeds.

Our data on cocoa plants in the Ouragahio area in 1980 show the profound effect this approach had on the forest. 70% of the coffee and cocoa fields that were planted before 1965 were built on fallows and secondary woods that were less than 25 years old. In contrast, between 1965 and 1980, local ethnic groups cultivated cocoa on main forest area for 80% of the time. 35% of the local farmers who were surveyed said that competition from Baoulé migrants has impacted their pattern of forest removal. 15% of respondents said that since they could see that the Forestry Service didn't harass migrants, the locals no longer feared the organization. Similar percentages credited logging firms' new axe, the fact that they had previously felled the largest trees, and population expansion as the causes of the shift [8].

The early immigrants made their homes in distant woodlands far from the native ethnic groups' communities, which were probably of little use to the locals and impossible for them to govern. After a few years, however, the locals saw that the migrants were heading straight towards their own settlements. To stop the migrants from moving forward, they created "counter-pioneer fronts" and planted cocoa. To a certain degree, this desire to safeguard their area, rather than an interest in boosting their income in the near term, was the primary driver behind the fast expansion of cocoa plantations established by local residents throughout the early 1970s.

Primordial woodlands are devoured by migrants

The main forest would not have been significantly impacted by the local ethnic groups alone. However, the migratory population grew by 10–20% year, which greatly hastened cocoa cultivation and, therefore, deforestation. Between the middle of the 1960s and 1980, Baoulé migrants built more than 95% of the cocoa fields that now exist. The majority of migrants were young people with a great desire to get money rapidly. As a result, they planted cocoa more fervently and cleared more forest than the indigenous ethnic groups did. The young migrants were not hindered by village elder control or societal pressure to invest time and money in social festivities.

The migrants' success was also aided by technological development. The migrating population brought new methods for clearing forests and new ways to link young cocoa plants with food crops. During the initial year of planting, the indigenous ethnic groups preferred to intercrop rice with coffee and, to a lesser degree, cocoa. Due to labor shortages, they could only grow coffee or cocoa every five years and only cleared forests or fallow land for paddy. Paddy and tree crops faced intense competition for labor as a result of local ethnic groups' adoption of cocoa and more labor-intensive methods. Migrants from the Baoulé region, who had a lot more labor available, started intercropping yams and cocoa. In terms of weed management and seasonal labor demand, this provided a number of benefits. Additionally, they planted cocoa every year, which led to increased deforestation and cocoa output.

Large trees were first left behind as the local inhabitants cleared the forest, in part because the farmers found it difficult to cut them down with the equipment at their disposal. This resulted in cocoa fields beneath substantial trees. Then, in an effort to increase cocoa yields, the extension services started to advocate complete clearance. This was a tremendously labor-intensive procedure before to the invention of chainsaws. However, the Baoulé migrants developed a new, capital-free way of clear-felling that required less labor: burning the large trees in place. Around each enormous tree, they gathered the dry underbrush that had been recently cut and lit it on fire. A gloomy panorama of enormous dead upright trees was created as a consequence of this killing the trees and causing them to lose their leaves. But it was still a pretty effective tactic. Significant labor was saved. The cocoa trees expanded as quickly as they would have under any other total clearance scenario. The deceased gigantic trees' falling limbs and trunk fragments served as free fertilizers. Insects seemed to be suppressed by the system as well, at least temporarily. Twenty years later, some of the system's drawbacks, such shifting microclimates and a lack of shade, were rediscover- ed by some migrants. Others had gone on to other virgin forest regions since they had foreseen similar issues.

Cocoa replanting on barren land in areas with little forest

A perennial plant that is endemic to South America is called Molaena odorata. It doesn't overrun pastures or compete with plantation crops in the New World. It is prevented from growing extremely aggressive by attacks by a wide complex of insects and competition from allied plants. But in West Africa, where C. Odorata was reportedly accidently introduced, it has

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

no significant pests or illnesses, and it generates enormous amounts of biomass, making it challenging to manage. As a result, the shrub turned into a 'weed'. Farmers began to voice their concerns about this issue in 1979. Smallholders who had lost everything in the flames made the decision to relocate and grow cocoa somewhere else. Some continued and tried again, but many were unsuccessful. C did not respond to the methods they had developed over the years to remove and plant in forest regions. Fallows odorata. Many of the established migrants and local planters were becoming older. However, a fresh wave of young Burkinabé migrants began returning to Côte d'Ivoire, and they purchased vast tracts of C-covered land odorata [9].

The new farmers in Burkina Faso learned how to use the C. odorata efficiently land. Most people started using nurseries, ideally using plastic bags, to grow their cocoa trees. With limited success, the extension services had promoted that method in the 1970s as a part of their technology package to encourage more intensive cocoa growing. In the days of the frontier, relatively few farmers were really interested in devoting labor to bagging planting material in nurseries. That altered after the 1983 El Nio and the loss of main forest that farmers could clear to cultivate cocoa on. The use of plastic bags really took off after 1984 as the majority of the woods in the central-western area had vanished and farmers had to adjust for the greater weather unpredictability. Ironically, the extension services essentially vanished at the same moment. Smallholders in the cocoa industry have made additional advances. They began to dig deeper holes and fill them with a mixture of grasses, dirt, and young seedlings.

As a result, the seeds had a better chance of surviving droughts. To get rid of termites and other pests, some people treated the soil before growing cocoa. After a 5-year C, the majority even started to favor replanting. Odorata fallow as a result of the shrub's assistance in eradicating nematodes and other soil pests and illnesses. The ability to manage C is the secret to these farmers' prosperity. Development of the odorata. The task would never finish if they attempted to cut it. Instead, they learned that they had to pull it out by hand and use a hoe to chop up some of the roots. The regrowth may then be cut down and used as mulch. Few farmers used herbicides to replant before 1999, but this is likely to change shortly. In addition, farmers began planting maize alongside their young cocoa trees at high planting densities and increased the density of their plantain crops in areas with fertile soil. One Burkinabé migrant began sowing cocoa under old coffee plants in the middle of the 1970s and gradually removed the coffee. In the early 1980s, many of the neighbors followed the migrant's technique after seeing for themselves that it was effective.

One can wonder whether it makes sense to classify replanting cocoa as a kind of reforestation. Replanting is not necessary if it replaces secondary forest or old coffee plantations since this would result in fewer trees and less biodiversity. However, if landowners' plant what was formerly grassland and C. Since it increases the number of trees and the quantity of carbon stored, odorata fallows is properly referred to as reforestation. As a reforestation strategy, cocoa and wood tree inter planting offers certain advantages. Fortunately for the logging firms, some historic cocoa orchards in Côte d'Ivoire are still in the hands of local ethnic groups. These businesses are now engaged in the logging of the trees that the area's first residents left in their plantations. Because of the methods utilized in the migrant plantations to clear the forest, there isn't much to take away. Farmers may preserve both their cocoa yields and a long-term supply of increasingly limited lumber by combining herbicides, leguminous plants, which are simpler to replace, with the intercropping of timber trees. Although intercropping wood trees has been a practice since the 1910s, there wasn't much interest at the time due to the abundance of available forest resources. One discovers that deforestation fuels technological advancement once again. Three stages may be distinguished in Côte d'Ivoire's histories of cocoa, technical advancement, and forest clearing:

Phase 1: On secondary forest fallows and secondary fallows for cocoa, local ethnic groups mostly engage in tree-crop shifting agriculture with modest levels of cocoa output. This only minimally exacerbated deforestation by requiring the planting of plants inside existing forest cover. The advent of cocoa cultivation employing 'primitive' technology would not have significantly affected trees had it not been for the migrants' entrance and the governmental assistance provided to them. The local ethnic groups started to cut more primary forest as a result of competition for land and the invention of a new axe.

Phase 2: A rise in cocoa production caused by a large influx of migrants, many of whom are foreigners, at the price of primary forests. The rate of deforestation has increased. In an environment of plentiful and affordable woods, farmers embraced genuine technical advances, such as the adoption of ostensibly easy manual techniques for clearing forest and planting cocoa, to speed up the spread of the crop.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Despite the fact that extensive forest conversion would have surely occurred anyway given the conditions, the new approaches encouraged destruction.

Phase 3: Reforestation, or the replanting of cocoa, mostly by immigrant populations on grasslands and damaged fallows. For instance, just 13% of the cocoa plantations that were created after 1983 in a migrant community did so by removing forest. The remainder underwent other kinds of replanting, largely in response to C. odorata. Although frequently used, nurseries did not significantly increase deforestation. A significant technological change also included other advances including the use of mulching methods, larger holes, and the substitution of rice for maize.

These more recent inventions were encouraged by land limitations and ecological changes brought on by deforestation. This proves one of the primary theories in this chapter, which holds that technical development is also sparked by deforestation. Even so, these modifications could slow down the destruction of the few remaining woods in Côte d'Ivoire. Given the significant expenses imposed by laws and the country's remoteness on the usage of its surviving woods, C. The new technology may make odorata fallows more appealing. In fact, a deforested environment and the new methods may actually cause cocoa plants to switch from being a deforestation agent to a reforestation agent. The first trees were planted by farmers in isolated forests in the middle or late 1970s, but serious cocoa fever did not start to spread until the middle of the 1980s. 'Pre-cocoa' migrations from the South Sulawesi province's center south had already cleared a significant portion of the fertile alluvial plains, where the cocoa fever first took hold, by the time of that. Early in the 1970s, migrants were drawn to the region by the potential for growing tobacco and soybeans, while being forced there by drought and dwindling self-sufficiency in their home communities. Because of the favorable agro ecological conditions and easy availability to agricultural inputs in the region, farmers who were growing cocoa chose the previously cleared alluvial plains. As a result, in contrast to the majority of cocoa tales, the introduction of cocoa to Sulawesi was not at first linked to extensive deforestation.

According to many observers, Indonesia was one of the nations that had the most effective Green Revolution. Sulawesi was one of Indonesia's most prosperous provinces. Rice output there was greatly enhanced by the introduction of new planting materials, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and equipment, backed by subsidies and irrigation projects. Initial evidence suggests that the Sulawesi Green Revolution decreased deforestation by boosting yields and supply and obviating the need for impoverished people to relocate in order to establish additional rice fields. However, the transmigration policy was linked with the rice self-sufficiency strategy, and the newly built irrigated rice fields created by the transmigration programs were one of the main contributors to the deforestation of Sulawesi in the 1980s. Not just sharecroppers relocate, however. Many Bugis migrants with rice fields start cocoa plants as soon as they can before going back to the village to harvest the rice and get the land ready for the next cycle. They return to the cocoa plantation after that. The migration and investment in cocoa are directly funded by the rice surplus produced by Green-Revolution technology. Up to a fourth of the "rice farmers" in certain areas now spend portion of the year as "migrants" and "cocaa cultivators."

Farmers still value woodlands on slopes and uplands. Their soils are more prone to erosion and less productive. In general, the migrants who go there in search of land are less wealthy, and fewer of them can afford herbicides, particularly at the beginning. When we interviewed the 40 Sambalameto farmers about the relative benefits of forest, bush fallow, and grassland, they made this clear. The 22 farmers who voluntarily chose to plant trees emphasized three essential elements: good soil, a lack of weeds, and quick development. This demonstrates the significance of the forest rent's fertility component on otherwise deficient soils. The benefit of having "no weeds" is lost for the 18 farmers who choose to leave newly cut woodland and shrub fallow, but simpler land clearance makes up for that.

In the humid tropics, increased pesticide usage is essentially a revolution in agriculture. Millions of hectares are being returned to agriculture, particularly for tree crops. Therefore, using herbicides to retain migrant workers on their current farms rather than sending them in search of new woods to clear might help to minimize deforestation. Herbicides can only assist to minimize deforestation when the forest is already rare or well protected, much like other technical advancements. Herbicides' prospective benefits can't compete with the allure of accessible, plentiful forest land.

Deforestation has been actively aided by cocoa production. The few surviving Ivorian woods have essentially been turned into "prehistoric souvenirs" as a result of its spread in Côte d'Ivoire between the middle of the 1960s and the late 1980s. Migrants' adoption of cocoa in Sulawesi is still a significant factor in deforestation now, maybe even more so than it was in the 1980s, when farmers primarily picked fallow land and built coconut plantations on fertile alluvial soils to grow cocoa. In the early 2000s, it may be anticipated that the massive deforestation caused by cocoa growth would continue despite - or possibly even because of - the intensive use of pesticides and fertilizers.

A technical advancement that is more labor-intensive, gives greater yields than ranching, uses considerably less forest per unit of profit is the introduction of cacao and, more broadly, of tree crops. This seems to be one reason why tree crops, rather than animals, drive border movement and deforestation in the small areas of southern Côte d'Ivoire and Sulawesi, where the migratory pressure per unit of forest land is greater than in the Amazon. Herbicides not only save labor costs, but they also improve the appeal of replanting and using grasslands. In the near future, this may reduce deforestation. However, if they continue to be widely used, herbicides will eventually be unable to stop the logging of nearby woods. If woods are already rare, difficult to reach, or protected by other methods, herbicides may aid in their preservation. Overall, it is reasonable to anticipate that herbicides will have little long-term influence on deforestation but a lot on reforestation. Priority should be given to agricultural policies that encourage the use of non-remnant herbicides [10].

In general, the influence of technical development on deforestation is less affected by the kind of technology than by the stage in the cacao cycle, the severity of deforestation, and the availability of labor. The studies of Côte d'Ivoire and Sulawesi demonstrate that technical advancement only contributes to reducing deforestation after significant tracts of forest have been lost. Once protected, a few reserves and national parks may be preserved at a fair price. Although it may seem unimportant, technical advancements are necessary for maintaining a nation's last remaining forest reserves. Institutional regulations must be upheld, keeping entry to these forested regions dangerous and difficult. Technological advancements may not be able to rescue these woods on their own, but they may be able to sway farmers' attention away from the surviving forests and toward fallows and grasslands.

The case studies also show how deforestation may spur technological advancement. In particular, farmers seem to develop and embrace technology for weed control and replanting after there has been significant deforestation. Policies should pay greater attention to technology and institutional frameworks that might facilitate and encourage replanting on fallow land and, as a result, promote reforestation in addition to technologies that prevent deforestation. Reforestation is more at risk from technological change than deforestation, which is nearly a historical problem in many places. According to their knowledge, time horizons, and availability to land and labor, the native local people and migrants exhibit diverse behavioral patterns and adopt various technologies. The methods used by the indigenous ethnic groups in Côte d'Ivoire to clear the forest were more ecologically benign than those used by the migrants. Particularly foreign migrants have less motivation to preserve the environment since they are unsure of how long they will be allowed to remain in a place. Most of them are resolved to spend their golden years in their hometown village, even if they are not sent home. They arrived in order to earn fast cash. The creation of a legacy for the children to inherit is simply a secondary goal.

The social and institutional implications of technology progress should be included in policies. Who is able to embrace, modify, or develop new technologies? Smallholders who have access to labor and finance are better able to acquire or clear fresh land before developing or implementing new technologies. Those farmers arrived in Côte d'Ivoire in the 1990s from Burkina Faso, a neighboring country. A faulty land policy, ambiguous property rights, and such a circumstance may all lead to tragic disputes, where technology development plays a part. Conflicts over ownership of fallows and former plantations, for instance, may intensify if herbicides and fertilizers increase the profitability of fallows and enable foreign migrants to purchase more of them. In many regions, it is practically too late to consider how land tenure during the deforestation phase interacts with technological progress. It is important right now to take into account how technological advancement and more stable land tenure may interact throughout the replanting and prospective reforestation phase. The examples of Côte d'Ivoire and Sulawesi demonstrate that investments in cocoa orchards may be made in the short- and medium-term even in the absence of legal property rights. However, more secure land tenure may make longer-term investments easier, like replacing cocoa with lumber trees, in a society where risk is a growing concern.

CONCLUSION

Moreover, empowering local communities, indigenous peoples, and stakeholders in decision-making processes is vital for ensuring equitable and sustainable tree crop cultivation. Recognizing land rights, promoting land-use planning, and supporting community-based natural resource management enable a participatory approach that aligns with conservation objectives. In conclusion, tree crops have a complex relationship with deforestation and reforestation. While their expansion has been associated with deforestation, sustainable management practices and agroforestry systems can contribute to reforestation efforts and support environmental conservation. By adopting responsible production methods, promoting inclusive governance mechanisms, and integrating tree crops into reforestation strategies, the potential of tree crops to contribute to both economic development and ecological restoration can be realized.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Ruf, "Tree crops as deforestation and reforestation agents: the case of cocoa in Côte d'Ivoire and Sulawesi.," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0291.

[2] C. A. Palm, S. M. Smukler, C. C. Sullivan, P. K. Mutuo, G. I. Nyadzi, and M. G. Walsh, "Identifying potential synergies and trade-offs for meeting food security and climate change objectives in sub-Saharan Africa," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2010, doi: 10.1073/pnas.0912248107.

[3] G. B. Villamor, D. C. Catacutan, V. A. T. Truong, and L. D. Thi, "Tree-cover transition in Northern Vietnam from a gender-specific land-use preferences perspective," Land use policy, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.11.002.

[4] M. E. Fagan, R. S. Defries, S. E. Sesnie, J. P. Arroyo, W. Walker, C. Soto, R. L. Chazdon, and A. Sanchun, "Land cover dynamics following a deforestation ban in northern Costa Rica," Environ. Res. Lett., 2013, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/034017.

[5] J. A. Danquah, "Analysis of factors influencing farmers' voluntary participation in reforestation programme in Ghana," For. Trees Livelihoods, 2015, doi: 10.1080/14728028.2015.1025862.

[6] G. Jungmeier, "The Biorefinery Fact Sheet," Int. J. Life Cycle Assess., 2017.

[7] D. French, "Confronting an unsolvable problem: Deforestation in Malawi," World Dev., 1986, doi: 10.1016/0305-750X(86)90068-9.

[8] C. N. Luwesi, J. A. Obando, and C. A. Shisanya, "The impact of a warming micro-climate on muooni farmers of Kenya," Agric., 2017, doi: 10.3390/agriculture7030020.

[9] R. Cochard, D. T. Ngo, P. O. Waeber, and C. A. Kull, "Extent and causes of forest cover changes in Vietnam's provinces 1993-2013: A review and analysis of official data," Environmental Reviews. 2017. doi: 10.1139/er-2016-0050.

[10] Mulugeta Lemenih, "Effects of Land Use Changes on Soil Quality and Native Flora Degradation and Restoration in the Highlands of Ethiopia," 2004.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Agriculture and Deforestation in Tropical Asia: An Analytical Framework

Dr. Dileep Ramakrishna
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-dileep.r@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The relationship between agriculture and deforestation in tropical Asia is a complex and multifaceted issue with significant environmental and socio-economic implications. This abstract proposes an analytical framework to understand the dynamics and drivers of deforestation associated with agricultural expansion in this region. Tropical Asia is known for its rich biodiversity and extensive forest cover, but it is also experiencing rapid agricultural expansion to meet the growing demand for food, fiber, and biofuel production. This expansion often involves the conversion of forests and other natural ecosystems, leading to deforestation, loss of habitat, and greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed analytical framework integrates multiple dimensions to elucidate the agriculture-deforestation nexus. It considers ecological factors, such as forest types, soil characteristics, and topography, which influence the suitability of land for agricultural activities. Socio-economic factors, including population growth, market dynamics, land tenure systems, and government policies, shape agricultural expansion and land-use decisions. Furthermore, the framework incorporates technological factors, such as agricultural intensification, mechanization, and the use of genetically modified crops, which influence productivity and land requirements. It also recognizes the role of global and regional trade dynamics, as agricultural commodities from tropical Asia are often exported to meet international demand, resulting in indirect land-use change. The framework emphasizes the importance of considering both direct and indirect drivers of deforestation associated with agriculture. Direct drivers include clearing land for crop cultivation, livestock grazing, and plantation establishment. Indirect drivers encompass factors like infrastructure development, trade agreements, and changes in consumer preferences, which influence land-use patterns and deforestation outcomes.

KEYWORDS: Agriculture, Deforestation, Ecological Factors, Tropical Asia.

INTRODUCTION

Nearly all of the tropical Asian nations have seen severe forest loss in recent years. This took place amid significant economic and demographic transition in several nations, especially South-East Asia. As the population increased, so did urbanization. The economy grew quickly. Agriculture's contribution decreased as manufacturing sectors rose in importance. Agriculture's output increased significantly. The deforestation process was influenced by these larger shifts. The linkages between technical advancements in agricultural areas that increase productivity and deforestation in this broad economic setting are examined in this study [1].

All of the aforementioned changes took place in a variety of institutional and policy contexts and involving several individuals. Any broad generalization is sure to be incorrect given the wide variety of circumstances and the many elements that drive deforestation in intricate and sometimes location-specific ways. This chapter separates one specific component of the problem the connections between agricultural technical advancement and deforestation from the plethora of other variables that have an impact on destroying forests. To analyze such connections under several scenarios intended to replicate some of the key deforestation-relevant circumstances seen in tropical Asia, it employs a straightforward trade-theoretic approach. It takes a "macro" strategy rather than a "micro" one. For instance, it often ignores the challenges posed by the complex decision-making processes among semi-subsistence agricultural families. The focus is not on formal rigor but rather on illustrating the key connections and processes that connect changes in other sectors to forestry throughout.

The chapter focuses on how economic actors react to market-driven incentives. Since non-market variables, such as government regulations, have an impact on incentive structures and may sometimes significantly alter them, it is clear that this method has significant limits. In areas where farmers who are only partly integrated into markets practice semi-subsistence farming, non-market variables are also significant. However, there is still a great deal of value and relevancy in this kind of analytical approach. Large portions of the economy are dominated by market forces, and economic reasons influence but do not totally decide governmental actions [2].

The connections between agricultural technical advancement and deforestation in a "neoclassical" economy where "agriculture" and "forestry" compete with one another for land and labor and provide two products. The tiny, open economy that is subject to exogenously determined production prices is the subject of the first scenario in this section. The second scenario focuses on circumstances where supply and demand changes brought on by technological progress may have an impact on output pricing. Agriculture and forestry compete for land in the uplands, but not in the lowlands. Once again, we have two possible outcomes: one with exogenous output prices and the other with endogenous output prices. Wages and land prices are endogenous in both situations. Then, we examine what occurs when more labor-intensive technological development is introduced. Then, even in a crude way, we explore circumstances in which property rights on forest land are not well established. We may learn valuable things about some of the most prevalent instances of deforestation in tropical Asia by changing our assumptions about the economy's structure, the behavior of output and factor markets, and the interactions between the forest and agricultural sectors. These circumstances include those in which woods compete with agricultural goods that are sold worldwide, such as rice, rubber, and oil palm, as well as those in which they compete with crops grown for home use or as subsistence. Additionally, there are significant disparities between lowland agriculture, which often does not compete with forests, and upland agriculture, which does. Instead of using models that regard agriculture as a single homogeneous sector, the distinction between these two forms of agriculture offers deeper and sometimes unique insights.

The neoclassical features of the production functions are as normal. Factor prices affect factor proportions, which change. The marketplaces for products and factors are equally competitive. Constant returns to scale are seen in production. Between the forestry and agriculture sectors, factors may travel freely and without expense. Property rights are clearly stated and upheld. Since agents are fully informed, there are no dangers or unknowns. By utilizing a one-period model, we remove temporal issues from our analysis. We'll suppose that agriculture requires more labor than forestry for the duration of our debate. Although we haven't been able to find trustworthy information on the utilization of labor in forestry, this assumption appears acceptable [3].

Now explore the effects of a technical advancement that would increase production in the agriculture industry. For the sake of simplicity, we'll assume that technological development is factor-neutral. The PPF will expand, but not symmetrically: only agriculture can produce more with the same amount of factor inputs. A location like X1 is where the new production point is located. By that time, agriculture production has increased from point X0 but forestry output has decreased. This suggests that both labor and land have left forestry as they are the only two sources of production. In other words, there has been more deforestation. Clearly, it makes sense to convert more wooded area to farmland if agriculture grows more productive, provided that commodity prices stay the same. A Green Revolution in agriculture will result in increased deforestation in this situation. Similar to how agriculture would decrease if technology solely affected the forestry industry. Even while the increasing national revenue brought on by technical advancement raises demand for both agricultural and forestry goods, this conclusion is still true. Given free trade, this increased demand does not result in higher prices in a nation that sets its own pricing. Excessive demand may always be satisfied by imports at the going rate on the global market.

Each component of a factor may now create greater output because to technological advancement. This means that manufacturers must pay more for their inputs since profits cannot climb beyond zero. Producers would demand more labor and land and bid up factor prices if technical advancement allowed them to profit in the A sector until they reached the point where they could no longer do so. The consequences of price rises and neutral technology advancements are comparable. They both cause comparable changes in factor returns and upward movements in the iso-profit curve. The new iso-profit curve will still rise upward, but it won't have the same form if the technical development is not neutral. Its form will demonstrate the factor bias built into the new technology, which in turn will have an impact on how the relative factor prices are configured [4].

Endogenous Output Prices

Now consider the scenario when output prices are endogenous. This suggests that price fluctuations may be influenced by variations in the domestic supply and demand for agricultural or forest goods. As a result, the impact of a neutral shift in agricultural production will be mitigated by the impacts of increased supply and higher demand on agricultural prices. Agriculture experiences an expansion at the cost of forestry due to the increased physical productivity of elements used in agriculture as a result of technical improvement. A rise in aggregate production and, as a result, real national income is a result of technological advancement. The demand curve for both items is shifted higher as a result. The income elasticity of demand for each commodity determines the size of that change. In parallel, higher supply drive down prices to a degree dictated by the price elasticity of demand. The relative importance of these two impacts determines the overall influence on pricing.

When agricultural prices are endogenous, the relative price line will be flatter as long as an increase in agricultural production causes its relative price to decrease. As a result, the equilibrium will be at a location to X1's left. This suggests that the new equilibrium level of agricultural production will be lower and that there will be a more gradual impact of resource mobility. In the extreme situation of extremely low demand elasticities for agricultural goods, technological advancement may diminish the profitability of agriculture to the point that farming may eventually utilize less resources. This may also occur in the event of so-called "immiserising growth," when the nation is a net exporter of agricultural goods and global demand is very inelastic.

Fixed output pricing with Endogenous Input Prices

We begin by assuming that there is fully elastic worldwide demand and that all forestry and agricultural goods are exchanged globally at prices set by the global market. This means that changes in technology won't have an impact on the pricing of goods produced. We also presumptively assume that labor is completely movable across the three sectors [5]. Now examine the impact of a technical development that has no negative effects on upland agriculture (UA).5 UA's profitability rises as productivity rises. A "resource pull" effect occurs when producers increase their production in response to the increased profitability, drawing resources from other economic sectors. Land will be taken from forests by agriculture. In other words, there will be greater clearing of the forest, and workers will move from the lowlands to the highlands.

As a consequence, although national income will grow and salaries will rise throughout the economy, LA production and land prices will decline. When commercial crops that compete with forests undergo technical advancement, certain dynamics are at play in several South-East Asian nations. These crops are typically exported, and external factors affect global pricing. Since foreign demand elasticities are strong, even when local supply have a tiny impact on global pricing, as in the cases of rubber in Indonesia, coconuts in the Philippines, and tea in Sri Lanka, the effect is minimal. Consequently, the price-depressing impact of technical advancement is minimal. These crops' main impact is to increase agricultural profitability, which has the consequence of hastening deforestation.

Technological development that Favors Labor

Consider a scenario in which UA employs labor intensively and the upland labor supply is fixed to get some understanding of the effects of a non-neutral technical development. An example would be if upland farmers needed certain expertise to use the new equipment. Think about a technology advancement that favors skilled labor. The profitability of UA and the returns on labor both grow with the implementation of the new technology. If prices are not sharply depressed by the increase in output supply, the industry will grow and attract more labor and land. Naturally, as land is derived from woods, deforestation is implied. However, because there is a finite supply of labor by definition, UA's potential to grow is limited. As a result, there is less deforestation because of the labor shortage. The new technology will improve the incentives for learning difficult skills over a longer period of time. Lowland workers will be incentivized to seek out these abilities in this circumstance and will want services that can transfer these skills. As a result, the long-term supply elasticity of labor is probably larger and the technology is probably going to result in longer-term deforestation than short-term deforestation [6].

We have continued to operate on the presumption that forestry is similar to other production sectors so far. That may not be unreasonable if woods were industrial plantations with well-established and enforced property rights. However, state-owned property makes up the majority of forests in tropical Asia. Think about what may occur if land were to acquire property rights due to deforestation and subsequent conversion to agriculture. Such circumstances may be seen across tropical Asia.6 How technological advancement impacts factor returns in a particular sector relies, in general, on the elasticity of factor substitution and how commodity prices react to shifts in supply and demand. As previously shown, in our simple two sector/two factor Heckcher-Ohlin economy, neutral technical advancement in one area produces consequences equivalent to a rise in that sector's pricing. It raises the cost of both elements utilized in the developing industry, among other things. The "race for property rights" is accelerated by higher land prices because individuals are more motivated to try to acquire property rights by destroying forests and "squatting." Therefore, any increase in agricultural production in areas where it competes directly with forestry would exacerbate deforestation much more than in circumstances where farmers have clear property rights over wooded land.

In cases when forest property rights are insecure, we may likewise analyze the effects of rising wood prices using the same conceptual framework. Obviously, logging would be more lucrative if wood prices rose consistently. Thus, forestry would develop at the cost of agriculture in a neoclassical economy with well-defined property rights. However, even if it were assumed that the higher pricing would be "permanent," the only effect would be greater logging of the existing tree stock in the absence of strong property rights. Therefore, increased wood prices or technical advancements in forestry may accelerate deforestation rather than slow it if cutting a forest makes it simpler to convert forests to agricultural land. This explains why favorable wood prices may lead to deforestation across much of tropical Asia, since such scenarios seem to occur regularly in reality [7].

Lowland Agriculture under Technological Change

The most well-known instance of recent agricultural technical revolution is perhaps the "Green Revolution" in tropical Asia. It mainly avoided UA and was related to the cultivation of high-yielding rice cultivars in "wet" lowlands. It may be analyzed in terms of its effects on forests as an example of technology development in a LA that isn't directly in competition with it.

The Open Small Economy

We'll start out by assuming that LA generates tradable items with exogenous pricing. This presumption is often true since rice has a large worldwide market and is imported or exported by the majority of tropical Asian nations. Increasing productivity in LA will always increase sector profitability as long as increasing production has no impact on pricing. As a result, the marginal product of labor in LA will increase, forcing lowland producers to boost their pay in an effort to entice upland laborers. As a result, laborers will move from the uplands to the lowlands as a result of the Green Revolution. As obstacles to interregional labor mobility are reduced, a trend that has gained speed over time, this process becomes even more crucial.

Endogenous Pricing for Production

However, UA output prices could not remain constant if changes in supply and demand have an impact. The national income rises as a result of LA's greater output. This might alter demand for UA outputs and, as a result, affect the price of those outputs. Given that rice is the primary staple food in tropical Asia and that the Green Revolution is attributed with a major drop in actual rice prices, such income implications may be rather significant. It could need a significant reduction in UA production to reach a new equilibrium if UA outputs, such as coarse grains, have low- or negative-income elasticities of demand because they are 'less favored' items. It would benefit forests. If this occurs, resources will leave the UA sector because the adverse consequences of rising wages on agriculture output will exceed the compensating effect of increasing demand. If LA were irrigated rice, a Green Revolution in irrigated rice would have a tendency to reduce the demand for coarse grains, which would reduce deforestation [8].

The demand impact may be stronger if, on the other hand, there is a significant level of income elasticity in demand for UA production. People's salaries rise as LA improves. They thus increase their demands for UA production, which raises the cost. As a result, UA will grow and take resources away from forestry, escalating deforestation. If increased LA production drives down lowland product prices and LA and UA goods are interchangeable, technical advancement in LA will have two diametrically opposed impacts on UA. First, there will be a more subdued improvement in LA's profitability. This lessens the pressure on UA caused by rising labor costs and slows the movement of workers from highlands to lowlands. The lower price of LA production, on the other hand, drives down the price of UA output and reduces its profitability. The strength of these pressures will determine how negatively this will impact the UA industry. The Green Revolution in rice has clearly had a favorable impact on forests in many areas of Asia by making it less desirable to cultivate other food crops on the uplands. Government initiatives, such as the protection of upland food crops, have sometimes neutralized this impact.

Technical Development that Favors the Wealthy

The draw of labor from the uplands is constrained by the capital bias in technology, which lessens the upward pressure on labor demand and wages. As a consequence, upland labor-land ratios continue to be high, favoring UA over forestry since the latter requires more labor. This results in more deforestation than what would happen in the event of neutral technical development. Thus, increases in LA output have two conflicting effects on UA. While the demand effect seeks to increase it, the cost effect tends to reduce it. A priori prediction of the overall impact on UA and hence on forestry products is impossible. The magnitudes of the relevant supply and demand characteristics, particularly the demand for UA output, will determine this [9].

Whether or whether the Green Revolution encourages or discourages UA is critical to understanding how the existence of poorly defined property rights affects the effect of the Green Revolution on forests. If it causes UA to contract, this impact will be less pronounced if property rights are not well established or upheld, which would result in less deforestation than would otherwise be the case. In many places of Asia, the Green Revolution's influence on deforestation has likely been significant, even if it hasn't been assessed in empirical research. On the other hand, in regions where the Green Revolution promotes UA, that impact is also probably to be larger in circumstances where property rights are not well established or enforced.

Endogenous pricing for Forest Products

We have previously assumed that demand for forestry goods is completely elastic. This is unrealistic in a lot of circumstances. For instance, a significant portion of forest products are used as fire wood and lumber by surrounding agricultural homes. Imagine a scenario where the cost of forestry products is set by domestic markets. Let's make the assumption that UA output is sold worldwide, that demand is completely elastic, and that there are no issues with property rights so that we may stick with a straightforward trade model and concentrate on this element of the issue.

First, take into account the scenario where demand for forestry products decreases as income increases. These things are subpar, to put it another way. For instance, wood fuel may fall under this category. If property rights to wooded land are well specified in this case, increased lowland production will have negative consequences on deforestation. Labor will migrate from the uplands as work prospects in the lowlands increase. As a consequence, UA, the more labor-intensive upland industry, would likely decline while the forestry sector is expected to grow. However, a decrease in the market for forest products would lower the value of forests and promote the conversion of land to UA. The strength of these factors determines the result.

Both of the impacts indicated in the preceding scenario are in favor of forestry if demand for forestry products rises along with greater lowland income, i.e., if they are typical commodities. When forested land may be used to produce an intermediate good for lowland agriculture, the same fundamental understanding applies. Deforestation will likely increase as a result of, for instance, highland forests being destroyed for irrigation and electricity, whose need rises with lowland expansion? These outcomes would once again be altered by the absence of strong property rights. Because of the incentives to log the existing trees, increased demand for forestry goods like lumber may result in more deforestation as forests are made more accessible for agricultural use.

Between Sections On Land

If it were theoretically feasible to transform upland terrain into "lowlands" appropriate for generating LA, there would be more incentives to do so as long as technological advancement increased the profitability of LA. With these adjustments, land will essentially become transportable across sectors. Deforestation will likely rise as a result of this. Therefore, it cannot be expected that more effective lowland technology would always result in less deforestation. Governments may be incentivized to develop programs geared to produce these now more productive crops since such technical advancements stimulate the conversion of uplands to lands ideal for LA, as in the transmigration program in

Growth in the Economy and Regional Labor Movements

The non-upland economy, which we have referred to as the "lowland" agricultural sector, may really be thought of as the "rest of the economy," and its land endowment can be seen as a composite, sector-specific capital stock. Numerous variables, such as technical advancement, an increase in the sector's capital stock, maybe as a result of foreign investment, or a rise in the output's global price, can spur development in this industry. In all of these situations, the labor pull effect, which draws labor away from the upland area, and the income growth-induced rise in demand for upland product would operate as mediators between the influence on forestry and the two primary impacts on the labor and commodities markets. According to this model, quicker ROE growth would lessen deforestation as long as UA doesn't produce a commodity with a high-income elasticity, the price of which can rise as per capita incomes rise. The labor pull effect is lessened if there are legislative limitations on regional labor mobility or socioeconomic barriers to labor mobility that make it more difficult for employees to relocate from the highlands to the lowlands. In such cases, lowland producers must provide salaries that are sufficiently high to offset the "transport cost" in order to recruit highland labor. As a result, there is less need for upland-based labor in the lowland area. When labor relocation expenses are raised, the opposite happens [10].

We have motivated a straightforward trade-theoretical examination of the effects of technology advancement in agriculture using a variety of circumstances encountered in tropical Asia. The models have taken into account the commodities market and factor connections between the agricultural, forestry, and other economic sectors. These connections operate as conduits for the transmission of economic changes and technical advancements from one sector to another. In order to concentrate on a few topics, we have neglected numerous facets of the deforestation issue. For instance, since our study does not take into account the effects of externalities and policy-induced distortions, we have chosen not to evaluate the outcomes' welfare. The analysis is static and does not explicitly address issues related to market imperfections. We also largely ignore the role of policy-induced distortions in both commodity and factor markets, which not only modify the impact of technological progress but also influence the nature and pace of technology generation and adoption. We do this by removing concerns for time-related problems, expectations, inaccurate information, and risk and uncertainty. We merely give extremely scant consideration to property rights.

CONCLUSION

Despite these many drawbacks, even this basic study reveals some of the primary ways that advancements in agricultural technology affect deforestation and aids in the identification of certain key variables that influence the nature of that effect. It demonstrates how important the degree to which agriculture that undergoes such technological development directly competes with forestry for land determines the influence of technical advancement in agriculture on forestry. Deforestation will therefore be exacerbated by productivity gains in crops like rubber, tea, coffee, or oil palm, which are likely to compete for forested land, while the Green Revolution in wet rice agriculture, which reduced real food prices and increased agricultural employment, may have had a significant pro-forestry impact. Low prices for food produced in the lowlands, however, may not necessarily have a positive impact; they might boost incomes and promote demand for goods produced in the uplands, which could result in further deforestation.

REFERENCES

[1] L. R. Carrasco, E. L. Webb, W. S. Symes, L. P. Koh, and N. S. Sodhi, “Global economic trade-offs between wild nature and tropical agriculture,” PLoS Biol., 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2001657.

[2] T. K. Rudel, “The national determinants of deforestation in sub-Saharan Africa,” Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci., 2013, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2012.0405.

[3] Z. Zeng et al., “Deforestation-induced warming over tropical mountain regions regulated by elevation,” Nat. Geosci., 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41561-020-00666-0.

[4] R. S. DeFries, R. A. Houghton, M. C. Hansen, C. B. Field, D. Skole, and J. Townshend, “Carbon emissions from tropical deforestation and regrowth based on satellite observations for the 1980s and 1990s,” Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2002, doi: 10.1073/pnas.182560099.

[5] W. E. Mabee, “Deforestation,” in International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Second Edition, 2019. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10004-6.

[6] V. Vijay, S. L. Pimm, C. N. Jenkins, and S. J. Smith, “The impacts of oil palm on recent deforestation and biodiversity loss,” PLoS One, 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0159668.

[7] T. K. Rudel, R. Defries, G. P. Asner, and W. F. Laurance, “Changing drivers of deforestation and new opportunities for conservation,” Conserv. Biol., 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01332.x.

[8] M. F. Adame, R. M. Connolly, M. P. Turschwell, C. E. Lovelock, T. Fatoyinbo, D. Lagomasino, L. A. Goldberg, J. Holdorf, D. A. Friess, S. D. Sasmito, J. Sanderman, M. Sievers, C. Buelow, J. B. Kauffman, D. Bryan-Brown, and C. J. Brown, “Future carbon emissions from global mangrove forest loss,” Glob. Chang. Biol., 2021, doi: 10.1111/gcb.15571.

[9] A. Fauzi, A. Sakti, L. Yayusman, A. Harto, L. Prasetyo, B. Irawan, M. Kamal, and K. Wikantika,

"Contextualizing mangrove forest deforestation in southeast asia using environmental and socio-economic data products," Forests, 2019, doi: 10.3390/f10110952.

[10] Z. Zeng, L. Estes, A. D. Ziegler, A. Chen, T. Searchinger, F. Hua, K. Guan, A. Jintrawet, and E. F. Wood, "Highland cropland expansion and forest loss in Southeast Asia in the twenty-first century," Nat. Geosci., 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41561-018-0166-9.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Deforestation, Irrigation, Employment and Cautious Optimism

Dr. Anu Sukhdev
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-anu.sukhdev@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Deforestation, irrigation, and employment are intertwined factors that shape the delicate balance between economic development and environmental sustainability. This abstract explores the complex relationship between these elements and presents a cautious optimism for achieving a harmonious equilibrium. By examining the impacts, challenges, and potential solutions, we aim to shed light on the pathways to sustainable development while mitigating environmental degradation. Deforestation, driven by agricultural expansion, logging, and urbanization, poses significant threats to global ecosystems, biodiversity, and climate change. The clearing of forests for farmland and infrastructure leads to habitat loss, soil degradation, and increased carbon emissions. However, the need for economic growth and employment opportunities often drives this process, especially in developing countries. Irrigation, on the other hand, plays a vital role in enhancing agricultural productivity and food security. By supplying water to crops, it allows for increased yields, extended growing seasons, and reduced vulnerability to climate variability. However, unsustainable irrigation practices, such as over-extraction of water resources and inefficient water management, can result in water scarcity, soil salinization, and ecological imbalances.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural, Climate Change, Deforestation, Employment, Irrigation.

INTRODUCTION

In emerging nations, the rapid population increase in agricultural frontier zones adds to the destruction of forests. The Philippine border province of Palawan has had exceptionally rapid population expansion, partly as a result of immigration from other regions of the nation. Because of this, agricultural there has grown into remote and vulnerable locations. A lot of the severe upland deforestation is caused by low-income people starting farms in an attempt to make a living. It is critical in Palawan, as it is everywhere else, to find strategies to raise rural incomes without endangering forest resources [1]. The Philippine National Irrigation Administration has built or refurbished a number of small-scale community irrigation projects in Palawan to increase agricultural productivity. Despite being in the lowlands, the majority of these systems are close to populated highland forest regions. The overall effect of this additional irrigation infrastructure on employment is unclear at this point. The effective area under cultivation is increased by irrigation, which makes it easier to grow several crops. This raises the need for workers. Irrigation may also encourage farmers to use labor-saving agricultural techniques. For instance, several investigations have shown that farmers that use irrigation often use labor-saving techniques, such automation or chemical weed control. Our main concern is whether the influence of irrigation development on the labor market has lessened pressure on highland forests. In order to respond to this question, we must first determine the extent to which irrigation has increased the need for labor on lowland fields and local agricultural wages. Next, we look at how new off-farm job options have affected upland farmers' responses to them [2]. We demonstrate that the new work prospects in the lowlands encourage farmers to engage in less poorly compensated activities, such as forest clearance and the extraction of forest products, by increasing the potential cost of labor. Irrigated lowland farming employment operates as a magnet, luring highland laborers away from such endeavors.

Upland Labor Allocation and Lowland Technical Advancement

It is helpful to consider the following concepts when you analyze how adding irrigation to lowland farms. Consider a scenario in which all lowland farms initially use the same pre-existing technology and the local labor markets remain stable. Farmers either use just family labor or a combination of paid, shared, and family labor. They provide hired labor a set wage and continue to recruit more workers until the wage and the value of the labor's marginal output are equal.2 Now imagine that an invention occurs, such as the creation of a water storage and delivery system for irrigation. If this invention increases labor productivity, farmers will recruit more people. Increased labor usage within a single cropping season, an increase in the number of crop seasons each year, or both may be indicative of this growth in employment. The entire quantity of labor applied to a hectare of land in a given year is referred to as effective labor demand. The amount of labor needed to cultivate 1 ha of land in a season vs the amount needed for the whole year must be distinguished since irrigation may cause farmers to utilize less labor during a particular season but more labor overall. Since prospective employees will need higher compensation to be attracted away from other activities, any increase in the effective labour demand will result in a rise in the wage rate. Through this mechanism, technological advancements in the lowland sector may have an impact on upland sector activity through changes in labor demand and wages [3].

It is helpful to have a formal framework for analyzing how upland families distribute labor in order to properly comprehend how these processes function. We leave out a few things for the sake of simplicity since we can't fully discuss them here. Assuming that labor is the sole resource that families allocate, our approach is static. We also assume that families have a homogenous pool of labor that they may distribute in order to maximize their economic gains. This suggests that household labor allocation and labor supply are independent of household income levels. We assume that upland families dedicate their labor to some combination of three income-generating activities, including off-farm employment in the lowland agricultural sector, forest activity, and upland on-farm agricultural production. The returns from upland agricultural and forest operations are based on the price of the products connected with such activities. The quantity of output generated by the two activities only relies on the labor put into them. We pre sum that the production functions for forestry and agriculture both have declining returns to labor utilization [4], [5]. The quantity of labor that families devote to a certain activity will vary according on the three activities' labor productivity and all prices, including the lowland wage. Admittedly, not every family participates in every activity. Additionally, the local economy may not need as much hired labor as families are willing to provide, and businesses could limit open positions via non-price mechanisms if wages don't fall far enough to empty the market. Households will allocate their labor based on implicit shadow pricing if there are no markets for specific goods. These prices may differ from market prices as a result of transaction costs, risk aversion, and the covariance of risks across activities. Nevertheless, the simple structure shown above still offers a helpful place to begin when analyzing the best way to allocate labor.

We may now begin to formulate our key hypothesis. Think about a development in lowland technology that raises agricultural wages. If households switched portion of their labor from upland farming or forest clearing to working off-farm, they might now earn more money. In other words, families re-equate the marginal returns to labor as a result of the change in pay rates. If all three activities demonstrate declining returns to labor usage, which seems plausible, then the only way they can achieve this is by decreasing both LU and LF. Which breaks more depends on the production's technical specifications. Nevertheless, the underlying reasoning points us in the direction of a falsifiable conclusion: the expansion of irrigation in the lowland agriculture sector decreases involvement in activities that degrade forests.

The Information and the Study Area

In 1997, A data collection study on lowland and highland rice fields in two villages in southern Palawan were conducted. The 104 farms that are close to the lowland research regions and are all on or near the forest edge make up the highland sample. These make up around 30 percent of the total population [6]. Since there is a distinct dry season in the research region from January to March, it is challenging for farmers to grow several rice crops without irrigation. Rainfall is often sufficient the remainder of the year, frequently exceeding 1600 mm. The clay loam soils in the area have a pH between 5 and 6. Most of the upland farms in the sample had terrain with a slope of > 18%. Uplands rise up to 1500 meters above sea level. Rice is the primary food crop while maize is the primary cash crop in the region. Few highland farmers had access to finance throughout the research period, whereas half of all lowland farmers reported getting loans.

Unfortunately, our statistics do not allow us to completely evaluate how the advent of irrigation affected the wellbeing of upland families. However, the significant increases in off-farm earnings and job opportunities imply that lowland irrigation improved the wellbeing of at least some upland families. When combined, the employment and salary statistics imply that upland families with off-farm jobs had an increase in average wage income of approximately treble after irrigation. According to every upland family studied, lowland irrigation either improved or at the very least did not worsen their financial situation [7]–[9].

Despite the positive nature of our findings, we have only been able to track the early effects of irrigation on the labor demand in lowland areas. Irrigation has just been available in the region, and although farmers are undoubtedly excited about the new technology, several acknowledged having trouble managing their crops with irrigation. Therefore, it seems sense to consider whether present farming techniques are likely to persist. In order to answer these queries, a production function based on plot-level data from the lowland sample were created, and from it, we estimated the 'optimal' labor utilization on irrigated farms. This assessment aims to provide light on potential long-term effects of irrigation on lowland labor demand. The estimate using a typical, albeit too straightforward, method for predicting labor demand.

This implies that if lowland farmers reallocate inputs to profit-maximizing levels, some of the reported benefits in employment resulting from irrigation and accompanying decreases in forest destruction may vanish. The conclusion that follows is that while irrigation may have a positive short-term effect on forests, the long-term effect will depend on whether or not irrigated farms strive for and achieve profit-maximizing factor intensities and, if so, whether or not irrigation in the delivery area is fully utilized during the dry season [10].

CONCLUSION

The size of the agricultural labor force in Palawan is influenced by natural population growth and migration trends. The province's woods are under danger due to agricultural development, fuel wood gathering, and charcoal production, same as in other border regions. The continuance of activities that harm forests is a result of a lack of job opportunities and poor financial returns from available agricultural choices. This research looked at the process through which investments in low-land irrigation development raise agricultural productivity and salaries, which in turn creates job prospects for families that depend on forests for agricultural land and wood. Increased employment brought on by irrigation development may relieve strain on the forest edge when upland and lowland settlements are near to one another.

Our findings imply that lowland irrigation projects may increase upland dwellers' employment and wellbeing. In the case under study, this modification caused families to devote less time on hillside farming, particularly of cash crops, and upland forest removal. This suggests that the increase of lowland agriculture may benefit the nearby highland forests. We must, however, make four qualifications to these findings. First off, the region discussed here is exceptional since the highland and lowland regions are geographically close to one another. Most highland families simply needed to go one hour on foot to work on lowland fields. The potential cost of travel for upland families would be substantially higher and may deter upland households from pursuing work on lowland farms if there were greater distances between the lowland and upland regions. Second, the advent of labor-saving technologies such as automation, direct seeding, chemical-based weed control, and others might cause irrigated lowland farms to eliminate more labor in the future, partly undoing the employment benefits we have seen. Thirdly, the impact of input price policies has not been covered by our research. The amount of labor that farmers need depends in part on the relative prices of goods that potentially replace labor. Certain sets of relative pricing could make the labor absorption we saw in this situation impossible. Therefore, while contemplating economy-wide policies that discourage labor usage by lowering the relative costs of fertilizer, pesticides, and equipment, such as tractors, policymakers should take into consideration the environmental benefits associated with labor-intensive output in frontier regions. Finally, since irrigation has the potential to dramatically raise farmers' earnings, policymakers must take into account how these greater incomes may affect future investment and consumption trends.

The present study concluded that boosting labor usage in lowland agriculture may minimize upland deforestation because irrigation decreases labor demand per hectare each cropping while increasing total labor use per hectare over the course of a year. Changes in time allocation may raise incomes while also lowering environmental pressure, to the degree that off-farm labor replaces activities that damage the environment and the health of the forest and have lower rates of return. The employment market, however, plays a significant role in supporting environmental changes, which is the more important policy lesson. Because of this, policymakers should seize chances to increase employment and labour-market participation, particularly in regions where upland deforestation is a persistent issue.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Lee, C. Brown, B. Seo, I. Holman, E. Audsley, G. Cojocaru, and M. Rounsevell, "Implementing land-based mitigation to achieve the Paris Agreement in Europe requires food system transformation," Environ. Res. Lett., 2019, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab3744.

[2] G. Shively and E. Martinez, "Deforestation, irrigation, employment and cautious optimism in southern Palawan, the Philippines.," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0335.

[3] F. Xiaojun, "Regulating labour dispatch in China: A cat-and-mouse game," China Inf., 2019, doi: 10.1177/0920203X18791398.

[4] A. Koens and R. C. Wood, "An analysis of international employment levels in hospitality occupations using secondary statistics," Int. J. Tour. Res., 2017, doi: 10.1002/jtr.2122.

[5] P. Delfabbro, H. Winefield, A. Winefield, C. Malvaso, and T. Plueckhahn, "Factors Associated With Attrition in a 10-year Longitudinal Study of Young People: Implications for Studies of Employment in School Leavers," Aust. Psychol., 2017, doi: 10.1111/ap.12207.

[6] G. Irvin, "Viet Nam: will market transition increase poverty?," Work. Pap. Ser. - Inst. Soc. Stud. Hague, 1995.

[7] S. Best, "The U.S. Gig economy: economic imposition or economic choice?," Bus. Manag. Rev., 2017.

[8] G. Irvin, "Vietnam: Adjustment, growth and poverty," J. Int. Dev., 1997, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1328(199709)9:6<783::AID-JID388>3.0.CO;2-4.

[9] J. W. Lloyd, "Financial dimensions of veterinary medical education: An economist's perspective," Journal of Veterinary Medical Education. 2013. doi: 10.3138/jvme.0213-036.

[10] R. S. Kern, R. Zarate, S. M. Glynn, K. M. Smith, F. Reddy, S. S. Mitchell, L. R. Turner, J. Iglesias, L. Maes, A. McNair, and et al., "The effects of errorless learning on work outcome in schizophrenia," Schizophr. Bull., 2015.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Agricultural Development Policies and Land Expansion

Dr. Krishnappa Venkatesharaju
Assistant Professor, Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-venkateshraju.k@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Agricultural development policies play a significant role in shaping land expansion patterns, particularly in regions experiencing agricultural transformations. This abstract examines the relationship between agricultural development policies and the expansion of agricultural land. Agricultural expansion is driven by the need to meet growing food demand, increase agricultural productivity, and enhance rural livelihoods. However, unchecked land expansion can lead to deforestation, loss of biodiversity, soil degradation, and other environmental and social challenges. Effective agricultural development policies are crucial for balancing the need for agricultural expansion with environmental sustainability and social equity. This study highlights the key factors and mechanisms through which agricultural development policies influence land expansion. It explores the role of policy frameworks, market incentives, technology adoption, and land tenure systems in shaping land-use decisions and driving agricultural expansion. Policy frameworks provide the regulatory and institutional context for agricultural development. Policies that prioritize sustainable land-use practices, promote agro ecological approaches, and incentivize conservation-oriented agriculture can steer agricultural expansion towards more environmentally friendly pathways. Integration of environmental impact assessments, land-use planning, and monitoring mechanisms can help ensure that land expansion occurs in a responsible and sustainable manner.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural, Development, Land Expansion, Policies.

INTRODUCTION

Despite overwhelming evidence that upland agricultural expansion has negative economic and environmental effects, Philippine agriculture policy which is widely defined to cover both pricing and technological policies continues to prioritize increasing output and yields. These policies on prices and technology interact. Price supports raise farm profitability in addition to their normal impacts on supply, which in turn stimulates both demand for innovations and expenditures in R&D aimed at boosting their supply. Policy-makers and farmers in this situation only pay supplemental attention to long-term environmental issues, failing to foresee many of the environmental implications of technological advancement [1].

This chapter includes an ex-ante assessment of variables influencing farmers' land usage in order to better understand how agricultural policies impact the incentives for agricultural development. To assess the roles projected prices, yields, and their variations play in agricultural land allocation, The survey data acquired from low-income maize and vegetable farmers in a southern Philippine watershed along the forest boundary is used for this study. The distribution of land across farms reacts to varying crop prices and yields. However, the reaction to each crop varies. The main way that some agricultural growth occurs is by switching out one crop for another. An increase in the overall agricultural area is prompted by changes in the pricing or yields of other crops. Depending on the crop, various land and family labor limits become binding at different stages. These findings imply that in order to completely remove the incentives for additional land expansion, environmental policies must likewise have numerous strands, just as various agricultural development policies interact. Commercial agriculture is the norm in our research region, as it is in many other upland areas of rising market economies, but since farmers are impoverished, they are wary of risks. As a result, there are several similarities between various studies by different researchers and other sites of a similar kind [2].

Historical Context and Background

As was previously said, Lantapan's agricultural area has significantly increased since the 1950s, and in response to new economic prospects, farmers have replaced certain crops with others. Most of the sloping and high-altitude area was covered in forest toward the conclusion of the Second World War. Maize, cassava, and coffee were the main crops grown by farmers in the mid- and high-altitude communities utilizing different types of long-fallow shifting agriculture. They must have also extracted non-timber forest products and logs. The commercial production of potatoes, cabbages, and other temperate-climate crops was introduced in the 1950s by immigrants from northern Luzon. The success of these crops, the introduction of new maize cultivars, and the substitution of annual crops for shrub and coffee crops all point to continuing land-use intensification [3].

Bukidnon's commercial agriculture has prospered since the late 1970s because to infrastructural upgrades, better economic integration of the province with the country's agricultural markets, and rising domestic demand for vegetables grown in temperate climates and maize. Whereas formerly it had been sold relatively little outside of northern Mindanao, maize production has risen to prominence and is now a significant commercial crop. The area under vegetable farming has likewise grown, as has its economic significance. In relation to northern Luzon, the Philippines' main region for the cultivation of vegetables in a temperate environment, people now sometimes refer to the upper watershed of Lantapan as a "second Benguet."

A variety of events have affected the spread and development of agriculture. Since the principal crops vary greatly in the intensity of their production factors, relative crop prices have varied through time, but so have input costs, which is likely what drove the product mix. In the Philippines, agriculture continues to be the biggest employment sector despite five decades of economic expansion and a fast-growing population. At least until recently, the majority of industrial output remained very capital-intensive. Agriculture particularly, within the sector, highly labor-intensive crops like annual crops, benefited from the relative supply of labor. The frontier was for a long time the final refuge for underemployed, unskilled labor. Land scarcity eventually encouraged intensification, which enhanced the returns on land utilized for intensive agriculture and further increased labor demand. The non-agricultural sector has just recently begun to show evidence of absorbing labor at rates noticeably greater than the expansion of the labor force, portending a slowdown in the net rise of upland populations. Lantapan, whose population increased quickly in previous decades, is just now showing symptoms of a labor crisis [4].

Philippines' Agricultural Development Strategy

Although factors like soil quality, moisture, temperature, and the prevalence of soil-borne diseases all affect how agricultural land is used, Lantapan farmers often justify their choices by comparing the relative economic advantages of various crops. The profitability of growing vegetables and maize has been impacted both directly and indirectly throughout time by a variety of Philippine government initiatives. In the Philippines, import alternatives for maize and vegetables from temperate climates include local price subsidies and import limitations, which have greatly encouraged producers, mostly highland farmers, to increase their output. Quantitative limitations on the importation of maize, cabbage, and potatoes have driven up local prices compared to global prices. The level of nominal protection for these crops has been so great that it has more than compensated for the bias against agriculture that has been pervasive due to industrial promotion and currency rate policies. Protection of vegetable growers has remained constant throughout the recent period of diminishing protectionism, whereas that of maize growers has increased.

For example, the implicit tariff on maize increased from almost zero in the early 1970s to close to 100% by the early 1990s. Contrarily, direct and indirect export levies on coffee, which the Asian Development Bank has highlighted as having a comparative advantage in Mindanao and was a significant commercial crop in the watershed in previous years, have discouraged its development. As a consequence, both the quantity and quality of regional coffee output have declined, and the infrastructure for processing and selling, extension support, and other forms of industry aid have all but vanished. The cultivation of vegetables and maize has also been encouraged by technology initiatives. In its Grain producing Enhancement Programme, the Philippine government identified Bukidnon province as a "key production area" for maize. The first recipients of research and development aimed at boosting maize yields, farmers in KPA zones are also eligible for subsidies and assistance intended to increase maize output [5].

A disproportionate amount of funds and effort has gone into studies on vegetable farmers. Recent designation as a "high-valued crop" by the Philippine Department of Agriculture places potatoes, a cool-climate crop that is often cultivated in Lantapan in certain years, in a category with high priority for research and extension resources. Potato research, which is geographically focused at Department of

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Agriculture facilities in northern Luzon and in Bukidnon and is vigorously supported by businesspeople in the potato-processing sector, is also supported by foreign agencies. Production of potatoes is threatened by bacterial wilt, cyst nematodes, late blight, and several insect pests. The focus of research is on creating and spreading planting materials, such real potato seed, which, with the right management practices, significantly lower the risk of crop losses due to disease. According to studies of the Philippine potato industry, if TPS or comparable innovations were to become widely accessible, production costs would decrease, yields would rise, and yield variability would decrease. Similar circumstances exist with cabbage and other temperate vegetable crops, where disease and pests are the biggest hazards to yields and crop health upkeep accounts for a significant portion of production expenditures. Research on Philippine cabbage seems to be mostly focused on managing pest and disease issues in order to decrease production variability and input costs.

Vegetable technology has not advanced to the same extent as maize, despite maize yields increasing over time due to the creation and dissemination of new varieties. But if they do, technological advances will be just as crucial for reducing vegetable yield volatility as they are for raising anticipated earnings. Technical advancement might significantly influence the land-use choices of risk-averse farmers if the primary goal of vegetable research is to lower the unpredictability of returns. If everything else is equal, farmers who already cultivate vegetables will choose to enhance their output, whereas farmers who don't yet grow vegetables may transfer their present plot of land or increase their first planting area. The size of the land-area response will, however, be influenced by input availability, output pricing, and their volatility. Credit for inputs and the management abilities necessary for technologically sophisticated vegetable production are both anticipated to severely limit the extension of farmland for vegetable growers. In light of this, we performed an ex-ante study of the likely implications of technical advancements in Philippine vegetable production on land usage.

Factors Affecting Land Allocation in an Uncertain Environment

This section focuses on the variables that affect how farmers utilize their land in response to economic and technical pressures. The major objective of this research is to evaluate how changes in predicted output prices, anticipated yields, or price or yield volatility affect the allocation of land and labor for particular crops. The model on which we base our research assumes that farmers have access to land and labor from their families, which they utilize to cultivate a mix of maize and vegetable crops. They have the option of using all the available land or leaving part uncultivated. They also buy additional inputs, whose farm-gate costs depend on how distant they are from a main market.

Given the stochastic nature of pricing and yields, it is assumed that farmers make decisions that maximize anticipated utility. Prices and production are the two main causes of uncertainty. The qualities of the land and the labor resources of the family as well as outside factors like weather, illness, and insect infestations all contribute to production or yield risk. Farmers face price risk since they cannot predict with absolute certainty what crop prices will be at harvest when they determine how to divide their property. According to our survey, farmers in this kind of uncertain environment respond to external shocks in one of three ways. On the vast margin, they have the option to bring additional plots into production or leave some of their land fallow in order to enhance or reduce the overall cultivated area. On the intense margin, they may change the amount of labor and inputs used for each crop to achieve a certain production goal. Farmers may also change how much land is used for each crop in between.

A number of variables in each of these equations to account for farm features that might impose further restrictions on land-use behavior. A variable that represents tenure security in all calculations. This variable might have one of many values, from low to high. A "credit constraint" variable that accepts a value of 1 for farms reporting that they changed their total land area or did not plant a crop because they were unable to get financing is also included in our model. Dummy variables that reflect other potential causes for changes in land area, particularly contractual ones like the end of a three-year lease, are also included in the total land equation. To each regression equation is attached a dummy variable [6].

An increase in a crop's price or yield will have a positive impact on the area planted with it, while an increase in input costs would have a negative impact. Increases in price or yield variations will unquestionably be detrimental to farmers that are risk-averse. Since an increase in maize output also indicates an increase in the related variation in revenue from maize, risk-neutral farmers will increase their maize area more than risk-averse farmers do when maize prices or yields rise. Although empirically, we estimate that tiny improvements in projected price or expected yield may elicit relatively minor reactions among risk-averse farmers given that vegetable pricing and output are more erratic than those of maize. Variance changes that are exogenous might have more discernible impacts.

The lack of available land indicates that maize and vegetables are alternatives. Therefore, we anticipate that a rise in price or output variability for one crop would stimulate the growth of the other. Once again, reactions from farmers who are risk averse should not be as robust as those from farmers who are risk tolerant. The amount of acreage planted to the other crop should decrease as the predicted yield of the first crop rises. An increase in the cost of certain inputs would have a detrimental impact on land usage in a single-crop, risk-neutral production model. However, since there are two crops in our model, the relative input intensities of the crops will determine how each crop uses land in response to a particular input price shock. We anticipate that input costs will have a significant negative impact on the amount of land used for growing vegetables since vegetable cultivation uses more fertilizer and chemicals. The identical input price shock can have a beneficial impact on the area planted because the positive substitution effect for maize land may outweigh the direct negative effect. As previously, risk aversion contributes to this situation by lowering the intensity of the reactions.

Many farmers solely plant maize they don't grow any veggies. The risk-aversion model might throw light on why people would be hesitant to switch to vegetables, even if it does not explain why they only produce maize in the first place. For instance, in certain circumstances, only a sizable increase in anticipated vegetable prices or a decrease in the price of maize would provide the farmer enough incentives to diversify. A risk-averse farmer may find it advantageous to undertake non-marginal modifications to his or her land use if exogenous shocks, such as pricing policies or technology advancements, alter the variations.

The significance of labor and land limits. At the start of each cycle, the conceptual approach allows farmers to expand their operations, but at a price. This price might be the price of clearing vacant ground for agriculture or the price of staking out a claim to cultivate new land, whether by colonizing vacant land or forest, negotiating a tenancy agreement, or by some other method. The nature of these expenditures suggests that land purchase will probably be limited by the availability of family labor. Family labor restrictions also vary across crops since vegetables often need more management. Farmers may increase the amount of maize they produce by employing additional workers, but this may not be the case, or at least not to the same level, for vegetable cultivation. Given that land and labor restrictions are less likely to be binding in the long run, the presence of these constraints in our model indicates that it is a short-run model.

DISCUSSION

For the purpose of estimating equations, information gathered from three yearly surveys of a sample of farmers in the maize-vegetable zone of Lantapan on production, pricing, and household, plot, and farm characteristics. The data include firsthand observations of features of plots, farms, and households as well as of land usage, technology, resource utilization, and productivity. Using separate sets of data, we created variables to represent projected prices and their variations. From the projected values and residuals of production functions fitted to the data, variables indicating expected yields and their variances were created. The equation system is a condensed form in which separate equations describe the choice of land area, the distribution of land among crops, and the overall labor need for all crops. It is possible to estimate the equations separately. Estimating the data from the second and third years since the equations include delayed values. By utilizing area weights to aggregate plot-level data, variables can be created for farm-level crop acreage, labor utilization, and land attributes. The data showed no fluctuation in salaries; therefore, it may compel to leave wages out of the list of explanatory variables.

Estimated responses to prices are positive and estimated responses to cross prices are negative in regressions when planted area is the dependent variable. The predicted indicators are also present in input pricing. When the price of nitrogen increases, the maize area decreases. Reduced vegetable area results from an increase in the cost of manure, which is used most often on vegetable plots. But only the two input prices that were previously given, not any of the crop prices, have statistically significant associations with the dependent variables [7]. The factors that indicate risk aversion have a greater capacity for explanation. Increases in own-price variances and increases in cross-price variances are inversely associated with area changes. Additionally, changes in an area have a negative correlation with rising internal yield variability and a positive correlation with rising cross-yield variability. These findings, which are supported by statistics, show that farmers are risk-averse.

The pattern of statistical significance of coefficient estimates exposes the anticipated differences across crops, and it is obvious that labor and land restrictions are significant. The land-area limitation binds for maize but not for vegetables, as we predicted. If more land was added to the farm, it would mostly be used to grow maize. In contrast, the area planted with vegetables is limited by the number of adults living there, but not the area planted with maize. These results support our hypothesis that the management and supervision abilities that family members are excellent at providing are used more often in vegetable production. Finally, both crops' growing areas are limited by a shortage of credit.

The total agricultural area change is represented by the third equation. Similar to the crop equations, prices have no discernible impact on the change in farmland from year to year. However, we observe that increases in maize yield variability are positively linked with the expansion of farmed area whereas instability of vegetable yields has the reverse meaning. Price and yield variability also do not substantially impact farm area. In any event, rather than planting more land, farmers seem to mitigate risk mostly via their crop diversification. Given that we are estimating a short-run model, the fact that predicted prices, yields, and input prices have poor explanatory power may not come as a surprise. As might be predicted, the acquisition of additional farmland is associated with both an increase in family labor and easier access to financing. The empirical relationship between credit availability and farm area growth is consistent with the formal intertemporal model of a farm family with credit constraints that has been put forward. These authors contend that even though it is unclear how credit restrictions affect indebted people' incentives to invest in natural resources, it may make sense for them to degrade resources more quickly when liquidity is enhanced [8].

It may assume that economic policies may affect agricultural intensification and intensification in light of the econometric findings that have been given. Given that several findings have a very low level of statistical confidence, this section aims to evaluate how policy-driven exogenous changes in prices, yields, and variances affect land usage and land expansion in Lantapan and other locations. The significant pattern of risk-averting behavior shown among the sample farmers is crucial from a policy standpoint. Farmers' crop shares seem to fluctuate in the near term, more or less reliably, in response to changes in anticipated prices and yields. However, more importantly, we discover that farmers would rotate their land between different crops in order to minimize the uncertainty brought on by revenue volatility, particularly when yield fluctuation is a factor.

In our sample, yield risk rather than price risk seems to better indicate risk aversion. Additionally, our estimates of changes in total farm area show that farmers choose safety above profit: although increased vegetable yield volatility, if it has any impact at all, decreases incentives to expand farm area, increases in maize yield volatility encourage farmers to increase farm size. These results are consistent with research from other Philippine border regions, where farmers tend to consider risk when deciding between annual and perennial crops as well as when making investments in soil conservation. When taken as a whole, these studies' key policy takeaway is that measures that lower economic risks are likely to be advantageous for the environment. Farmers abuse resources, in part as loss insurance [9].

In light of these findings, we now go back to our prior discussion of pricing and technology. Recall that from the viewpoint of upland or frontier agricultural regions, the most crucial policies either promote the production of staple cereals or work to lessen the variability in output caused by pests and diseases in market vegetables, such as cabbage and potatoes. Our findings for maize imply that interventions to support and stabilize prices have no immediate impact on land usage. Contrarily, technological advancements intended to lessen the unpredictability in maize yields would increase the proportion of land planted with maize while perhaps decreasing the overall area planted. In other words, even if projected revenues remain flat, increasing the stability of maize income may be enough to prevent area growth.

The allocation of current land to vegetable crops will rise as a result of price supports and stability. Technical advancement that lowers vegetable yield volatility will lead to a shift in land usage toward vegetables, but we anticipate minimal influence at the extensive margin. This is due to the fact that, in the near term, the availability of financing and the unique knowledge and care that family members bring to the land and crop care, as opposed to hired labor, restrain the growth of the overall farm area. These later results highlight potentially significant interconnections between economic and technological policies that influence upland land use. First off, a large portion of the Philippine investment in raising the productivity of these crops is motivated by the idea that maize and vegetables have the potential to provide high profits for farmers. However, as we have shown, the main source of these high earnings is price support, especially when trade policy is involved. Domestic production of the potato, which the Philippine government describes as a "high-value crop" and has targeted for more research and development spending, could not even exist if it weren't for previous import obstacles. Large changes in the production function might, however, make the vegetable sector commercially viable even at free-trade prices now that economic policies have created it. Similar to this, the extensive substitution of maize for coffee in Lantapan-a notable transition from perennial to annual crops-can be linked to both policy distortions and the results of expenditures in yield-increasing R&D for maize but not for coffee [10].

Last but not least, in the larger policy framework of the evolution of the Philippine economy, previous policies that failed to put the nation on a path of steady aggregate growth and labor-intensive industrialisation strongly favored keeping people moving to the agricultural frontier. Through extensive macroeconomic, trade, financial, and banking reforms, which increased the growth rate of the gross domestic product, policy changes in the 1990s addressed these flaws. The Philippine economy's shift should eventually increase the potential cost of agricultural labor. Despite the advancement of agricultural technology, this is expected to reduce incentives to increase agricultural land. It goes without saying that expansion outside of agriculture, particularly in the industrial sector, will lead to further environmental issues. However, a change in economic incentives may lessen the need for upland farming advances and the number of people looking for a living near the forest edge, ultimately causing the upland agricultural area to stop growing.

CONCLUSION

Land tenure systems and property rights frameworks significantly influence land expansion. Secure land tenure rights and equitable access to land are essential for sustainable agricultural development. Clear land tenure policies, land-use planning, and mechanisms to resolve land disputes can help prevent unplanned and uncontrolled land expansion. Achieving a balance between agricultural development and land expansion requires a holistic approach that integrates environmental, social, and economic considerations. Effective agricultural development policies should prioritize sustainable land-use practices, promote inclusive decision-making processes, and address the needs and aspirations of small-scale farmers. Collaboration among policymakers, researchers, civil society organizations, and local communities is crucial for designing and implementing policies that steer agricultural expansion towards sustainability and contribute to food security, rural development, and environmental conservation.

REFERENCES

[1] T. M. Radwan, G. A. Blackburn, J. D. Whyatt, and P. M. Atkinson, “Dramatic loss of agricultural land due to urban expansion threatens food security in the Nile Delta, Egypt,” Remote Sens., 2019, doi: 10.3390/rs11030332.

[2] M. Christensen and J. J. Arsanjani, “Stimulating implementation of sustainable development goals and conservation action: Predicting future land use/cover change in Virunga national park, Congo,” Sustain., 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12041570.

[3] I. Coxhead, G. Shively, and X. Shuai, “Development policies, resource constraints, and agricultural expansion on the Philippine land frontier,” Environ. Dev. Econ., 2002, doi: 10.1017/S1355770X02000219.

[4] C. Wang, Q. Gao, X. Wang, and M. Yu, “Spatially differentiated trends in urbanization, agricultural land abandonment and reclamation, and woodland recovery in Northern China,” Sci. Rep., 2016, doi: 10.1038/srep37658.

[5] N. P. Jellason, E. J. Z. Robinson, A. S. A. Chapman, D. Neina, A. J. M. Devenish, J. Y. T. Po, and B. Adolph, “A systematic review of drivers and constraints on agricultural expansion in sub-saharan africa,” Land. 2021. doi: 10.3390/land10030332.

[6] R. Hinz, T. B. Sulser, R. Huefner, D. Mason-D’Croz, S. Dunston, S. Nautiyal, C. Ringler, J. Schuengel, P. Tikhile, F. Wimmer, and R. Schaldach, “Agricultural Development and Land Use Change in India: A Scenario Analysis of Trade-Offs Between UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),” Earth’s Futur., 2020, doi: 10.1029/2019EF001287.

[7] E. B. Barbier, “Long run agricultural land expansion, booms and busts,” Land use policy, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.01.011.

[8] K. T. Deribew, “Spatiotemporal analysis of urban growth on forest and agricultural land using geospatial techniques and Shannon entropy method in the satellite town of Ethiopia, the western fringe of Addis Ababa city,” Ecol. Process., 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13717-020-00248-3.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

[9] Dang Thi Thanh Thuy and Nguyen Van Hieu, “Structure Changing in Maize-Based Agriculture Production in Vietnam: Case Study in Son La Province,” SEAS (Sustainable Environ. Agric. Sci., 2020, doi: 10.22225/seas.4.1.1690.65-76.

[10] H. Mahmoud and P. Divigalpitiya, “Spatiotemporal variation analysis of urban land expansion in the establishment of new communities in Upper Egypt: A case study of New Asyut city,” Egypt. J. Remote Sens. Sp. Sci., 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ejrs.2018.03.006.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Impact of Rubber on the Forest Landscape

Dr. Amita Somya
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-amithasomya@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Rubber cultivation has expanded rapidly in recent decades, leading to significant changes in the forest landscape. This abstract examines the impact of rubber plantations on forest ecosystems, biodiversity, and socio-economic dynamics. Rubber, a high-value cash crop, has gained prominence in tropical regions due to increasing global demand for rubber products. Large-scale conversion of natural forests to rubber plantations has occurred, particularly in Southeast Asia, resulting in extensive land-use changes and forest fragmentation. The expansion of rubber plantations has had profound ecological consequences. Natural forests, known for their rich biodiversity and ecosystem services, are often cleared to make way for rubber monocultures. This deforestation leads to the loss of habitat for numerous plant and animal species, disrupts ecological processes, and reduces landscape connectivity. Furthermore, rubber plantations can exhibit limited biodiversity compared to natural forests, as they support fewer species and provide reduced habitat complexity. Changes in soil properties, hydrological systems, and microclimate conditions occur within rubber plantations, altering ecosystem functions and compromising overall ecosystem health.

KEYWORDS: Biodiversity, Forest Landscape, Rubber Cultivation, Socio-Economic Dynamics.

INTRODUCTION

The most common smallholder tree crop in South-East Asia is rubber. The majority of the region's rubber was first cultivated on huge estates, but smallholders quickly dominated the industry. 3.4 million hectares are now devoted to rubber plantations in Indonesia, with more than 75% of them being owned by smallholders. Rubber cultivation has decreased in peninsular Malaysia since the 1970s, but at 1.5 million hectares in 1990, it is still the second most widespread tree crop by area [1]. Two key arguments are presented in this chapter. First, swidden-fallow rice farmers could readily include rubber into the fallow component of their production methods as long as there was no competition for land. In addition to having little impact on the larger forest environment, which consists of primary forest, secondary forest, and forest gardens, the introduction of rubber did not cause encroachment into primary forest. The Iban case and the next two examples show that local respect for remaining forest areas and local authority prevented the spread of agricultural land into unclaimed woods in regions where land demand became significant long after the introduction of rubber. As a consequence, although the primary forest that was still there did not change, the quantity of fallow woodland did. Swidden fallows were mostly replaced with rubber gardens. Second, we contend that swidden agriculturalists' adoption of rubber had a beneficial impact on reforestation and, therefore, on the whole forest landscape. Many farmers mix the active production of forests, such as structurally complex and floristically varied forest gardens, with the conversion of tropical forests for agriculture [2].

Rubber expanded at different rates throughout time. After Malaysia, the region now known as Indonesia had the second-largest area of rubber plantations in the world in 1912. Midway through the 1920s, high rubber prices that were partly brought on by 'Stevenson Reduction Scheme'-related constraints on the international rubber trade caused a sharp increase in output. Expanding rubber output in the Dutch East Indies, however, brought to a decline in global prices by the decade's conclusion, which persisted until the early 1930s. Sarawak and the Dutch East Indies both signed the International Rubber Regulation Agreement in 1934, which severely constrained the growth of the rubber industry. The agreement created a coupon system that placed limits on the quantity of rubber that producers could sell and dealers could purchase. Smallholders were disproportionately impacted by this. In 1950–1951, prices soared once again, sparking a fresh wave of rubber planting and tapping in Sarawak and presumably also in West Kalimantan.

Rubber exports from Sarawak decreased throughout the years from 50,000 t to 19,000 t between 1960 and 1971. Small farmers' interest in replanting decreased, but owing to a government program to plant rubber trees, the total area expanded from 25,000 ha to 36,000 ha in 1971. The program gave farmers who created new rubber gardens cash advances. There was no fresh planting between 1971 and 1977, when the idea was momentarily put on hold. During this time, pepper likewise rose to prominence as a major cash crop. In the years thereafter, farmers have alternated between growing pepper, rubber, and doing off-farm employment [3].

Rubber use in Sluggish Agricultural Systems

Numerous writers have noted how perfectly the Dayak farmers' traditional swidden-agriculture practices suited the production of rubber. In Borneo's prevalent swidden systems, farmers burn a field and grow rice on it the next year. Just before, alongside, or soon after planting rice, they may also plant tiny quantities of other crops or tree species. They put less effort into the field once the rice has been harvested at the end of the year. They'll still return the next year to harvest if they planted manioc there. They also harvest various fruit varieties and may keep planting more fruit trees in the coming years. But after around three years, the area gradually transforms into secondary forest, whether or not any trees have been planted. Farmers will gradually begin to remove the area surrounding any planted or cared-for trees if the field is filled with them. If not, when the fallow vegetation has adequately grown, they will turn the land back into a swidden.

Rubber fits into the swidden system well. Before planting rice, farmers may plant it while it is in the swidden stage, and they can then leave it almost completely unattended until the trees are big enough to tap them, which usually takes about 10 years. Cramb describes rubber gardens as simple managed fallows that increase the productivity of the swidden-fallow cycle. Farmers already had experience with the minimal labor-input method needed to develop tree crops in fallow regions since they had used it to grow native tree crops including fruit, illipe nuts, and gutta-percha. Rice farming's seasonal labor requirements are complemented by those for rubber. During the wet season, farmers grow rice, however during the dry season, rubber is very flexible and offers employment and revenue. Rubber production is simple for farmers to dispose of, making it a reliable source of income. Rubber may be preserved for a long time and sold when it is convenient, despite having a very low value to weight ratio. Many swidden-fallow farmers depend heavily on the sale of rubber for their income. Additionally, rubber offers a handy bank account that may be practically accessed when needed, such as during times of natural and economic catastrophes [4].

Rubber's Place in the Swidden-Fallow Cycle

Second Division Sarawak rubber among the Iban

This was much longer than the necessary fallow time of around 7 years needed to recover the nutrients in the plants and prevent an excessive weed invasion following cutting. The Iban had been producing coffee and pepper for a while before starting to cultivate rubber in 1910. The Iban enthusiastically engaged in smallholder rubber production, which was actively promoted by the Sarawak government. Only wealthier populations could initially afford the planting expenditures, which at the time were equivalent to around 750 kg of rice per hectare. However, as rubber gardens spread, seeds and seedlings grew more affordable, making the new crop accessible to almost every family. Following the initial growth of rubber, planting carried on more or less steadily, even during times of low prices or trade restrictions, like the 1920s. Farmers started planting three to four consecutive rice harvests following the introduction of rubber, after which they would plant rubber and keep it there for many decades. They also reduced their fallow periods. Although the strain on the remaining fallow land increased as a result, the forest landscape did not significantly change. Similar tracts of land were still covered with trees. There may not have been much of an influence on species diversity since traditional rubber gardens feature a wide variety of plants. Some of the area that had previously been fallow was transformed by farmers into rubber gardens, but these gardens also included a significant quantity of secondary vegetation that also thrived alongside the rubber. The age distribution of secondary forest fields and rubber gardens with secondary vegetation may have changed, but there was likely little change in the overall forest environment, and encroachment into main forest did not speed up [5].

There were rumors that over-the-top rubber planting in the 1930s had reduced the amount of land available for rice cultivation. While there were occasional instances of shortages, they were rare and affected only a small number of people with just 1-2 ha of rubber, mostly grown on unsuitable soil for rice cultivation. People didn't plant rubber on fallow ground where they could grow rice again because of the cultural value of rice. The burden on the remaining fallow land grew over the decades that followed the Second World War as a result of population expansion. Farmers were obliged to use less area for cultivating rice and depend increasingly on cash crops. Price booms encouraged the cultivation of rubber, but farmers did not cut down on their rubber crops during times of low prices. Some Iban settlements in the Second Division were no longer self-sufficient in rice by 1960, and rubber had taken over half of the land. Some individuals planted rice when they believed they had enough acreage to accomplish both but opted to grow rubber. Others moved to isolated places or searched for other sources of income. By the 1980s, the majority of farmers in the Second Division's Iban rubber gardens had experienced at least two rice-rubber cycles, making hill rice growing merely a supplemental endeavor. Similar changes occurred in the Sumatran province of Riau.

In the Iban example, farmers had ceased encroaching on main forest by the time rubber became the predominant crop, and swidden-fallow land had already grown significantly. Further encroachment into primary forest regions was restricted by government restrictions on conversion of primary forest. If this had not happened, swidden farming may have increased further, and rubber could have contributed to that. Secondary forest was not deemed off-limits in Sarawak, and rubber was not prohibited from taking its place [6].

Rubber gardens had little discernible impact on agricultural growth into the woods, at least not until the late 1980s. It seems that the Kantu have adequate fallow land where they might cultivate rubber so that they do not need to convert primary forest, as in the case of the Iban. Farmers are ready to remove some of the poor-quality land from the rice production cycle. They could set aside some area to produce rubber without significantly lowering the duration of the fallow and consequently rice output since there was so much available fallow land. According to all accounts, the Kantu swidden agricultural labor system was adaptable enough to let farmers to devote a portion of their time to rubber tapping and sporadic weeding of rubber plants without materially hurting their other primary economic activities. They don't use the labor that would be used to cultivate rice instead to make rubber. The majority of the time they devote to making rubber is likely time that would otherwise be spent leisurely pursuits, housework, gathering forest products, or hunting.

Rubber as a Forest Restoration Tool

The Dayak farmers' efforts to reforest the forest have also been impacted by the introduction of rubber. We have argued in other places that Dayak farmers in Borneo convert some forest into agricultural land while simultaneously converting some non-forested land back to forest. Many of these man-made woods resemble the main forest's natural structure and variety [7].

Rubber-like Technologies' Impact on Forest Landscapes

The introduction of rubber had the following consequences on forest clearance in many of the situations covered above. Farmers had large amounts of fallow land at the time rubber was originally introduced, and only a tiny percentage of it was planted with rubber. Because they had sufficient other land to cultivate their rice or because the rubber land was of inferior quality, they mostly planted rubber on areas that were not essential for the production of rice. The subsequent expansion of the population and escalating land-use strain corresponded with further rubber planting in fallow areas. Farmers lacked enough area to continue swidden rice cultivation and maintain their rice self-sufficiency. This prompted them to look for alternate revenue streams, such as cash crops or jobs outside the farm. While it seems that the growth of rubber hastened the demise of rice self-sufficiency, it most likely did not cause forest encroachment. Most farmers choose to work off-farm or find other sources of income rather than removing further trees in order to cultivate rice. This occurred in part because the government was successful in getting communities to avoid expanding agricultural land into the last surviving primary forest areas in certain situations.

The introduction of rubber seems to have actually enhanced the amount of forest cover in several regions of West Kalimantan. Between 1984 and 1993, the growth of te Mbawang and rubber gardens in Ngira seems to have counteracted forest encroachment for agricultural purposes. Rubber is readily incorporated into current forest management techniques, and it even seems to have sparked the growth of these man-made forests, which have a variety of structure and floristic composition. Overall, it seems that rubber has improved the amount of forest cover in this region. According to the cases of Tae and Bagak, the forest transformation process described in Ngira will eventually stabilize and result in a mixture of agricultural land, mixed rubber gardens, forest gardens, and primary forest, which villagers and the government forbid farmers from converting to other uses [8].

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

From these situations, many broad generalizations may be made. The large land-use system that already existed at the time rubber was added had already transformed a significant portion of the main forest for agricultural purposes. This allowed for the incorporation of rubber without significantly increasing the need for additional primary forest acreage. Rubber didn't demand a lot of extra labor, and what it did required mostly happened at times when other agricultural activities weren't using it. Farmers didn't have a great need for money, so they adapted their degree of labor to fit that requirement.

It was possible to govern the protected area due to local conventions around forest ownership, community administration of forest reserves, and the availability of enough land for additional swiddens. The fact that they persisted in cultivating rice was another indication of their cultural preference for growing their main source of food in their own private fields. As population density rose, farmers' flexibility was constrained by the demand for land. They continued to preserve their rubber orchards, but they eventually ceased growing rice. In three of the five examples examined, encroachment into new forest areas was being progressively restrained by local and/or national authorities. Communities put more effort into protecting the remaining woods, and governments convinced farmers to cease expanding. The state and its local officials both stepped up their presence at the same time. Like many other locations in the globe, West Kalimantan has rules that essentially prohibit farmers from encroaching on forests. But these laws didn't start to matter until the government had the power to impose them. A multitude of cultural and sociopolitical developments, including the expansion of the state, were triggered by the adoption of a new cash-based manufacturing system. Better infrastructure and the growing significance of cash-based economic transactions made it possible for governments to communicate with citizens more effectively. Regional officials shared national worries about forest encroachment, which made it easier to enforce forest restrictions [9].

Finally, the aforementioned examples show how new technologies that involve the production of trees or forests may aid in reforestation. The existence of tree crops also affects how other changes in the local agricultural and demographic systems affect the forest landscape. For instance, when farmers switch from growing upland rice to growing wet rice or move to the city, the likelihood that the land would return to forest is substantially higher. This is happening in West Kalimantan in places where people are leaving rural communities.

When integrated into long-established vast agricultural systems, tree-planting technologies like those used in the production of rubber have little effect on the forest landscape. However, these impacts alter when market integration and population pressure both rise concurrently. Socioeconomic development enables agreement on land use that protects forests when these technologies are adopted early in a resource-use continuum from vast to more intense land use. This might counteract any unfavorable consequences that the technology could have under different environmental circumstances, such as increasing land pressure brought on by higher people concentrations. The landscape of the forest may benefit from the incorporation of tree-planting technology into regional forest management methods [10].

These results provide crucial policy suggestions. In general, using tree technology to enhance local agriculture has several benefits. Policymakers should consider the level of government involvement and agreements with communities over the preservation of certain regions before supporting new technology. To gain beneficial synergies, produce a result that is acceptable to local farmers and national authorities, as well as preventing adverse environmental repercussions, the promotion of new technologies should constantly be taken into consideration in the context of local resource management practices.

CONCLUSION

Little of the encroachment into primary forest in West Kalimantan was caused by the introduction of rubber. On the other hand, it seemed to favor the regrowth of forests in places with less intense land use. However, it must be underlined that only under certain circumstances in the local context was this possible. For instance, if the adoption of rubber had been followed by a large influx of people into rural regions, it would very certainly have led to the invasion of forest areas. In several locations in Sumatra, this has occurred. A new agricultural technology's effect on the conversion of forests relies not just on the technology itself but also on the economic and sociopolitical context in which it occurs. Additionally, since economic and socio-political developments occur simultaneously, the influence evolves through time.

When attempting to enhance local agriculture, tree technology should be favored. Before promoting new technologies in forested areas, policymakers should take into account the level of governmental presence and negotiated agreements about forest protection. Utilizing local resource management methods, particularly those for planting trees or managing forests, may improve favorable results in terms of improved revenue and forest preservation. In conclusion, the expansion of rubber plantations has significantly transformed forest landscapes, leading to deforestation, biodiversity loss, and socio-economic changes. However, with appropriate land-use planning, sustainable management practices, and supportive policies, it is possible to mitigate the negative impacts of rubber cultivation and promote a more sustainable coexistence between rubber production and forest conservation.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Dechner, K. M. Flesher, C. Lindell, T. V. de Oliveira, and B. A. Maurer, "Determining carnivore habitat use in a rubber/forest landscape in Brazil using multispecies occupancy models," PLoS One, 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195311.

[2] E. Warren-Thomas, P. M. Dolman, and D. P. Edwards, "Increasing Demand for Natural Rubber Necessitates a Robust Sustainability Initiative to Mitigate Impacts on Tropical Biodiversity," Conservation Letters. 2015. doi: 10.1111/conl.12170.

[3] M. Feurer, A. Heinimann, F. Schneider, C. Jurt, W. Myint, and J. G. Zaehringer, "Local perspectives on ecosystem service trade-offs in a forest frontier landscape in Myanmar," Land, 2019, doi: 10.3390/LAND8030045.

[4] W. de Jong, "The impact of rubber on the forest landscape in Borneo.," in Agricultural technologies and tropical deforestation, 2001. doi: 10.1079/9780851994512.0367.

[5] R. Sreekar, G. Huang, M. Yasuda, R. C. Quan, E. Goodale, R. T. Corlett, and K. W. Tomlinson, "Effects of forests, roads and mistletoe on bird diversity in monoculture rubber plantations," Sci. Rep., 2016, doi: 10.1038/srep21822.

[6] H. Cao, J. Liu, C. Fu, W. Zhang, G. Wang, G. Yang, and L. Luo, "Urban expansion and its impact on the land use pattern in Xishuangbanna since the reform and opening up of China," Remote Sens., 2017, doi: 10.3390/rs9020137.

[7] H. M. Jayathilake, E. Warren-Thomas, L. Nelson, P. Dolman, S. Bumrungsri, W. Juthong, L. R. Carrasco, and D. P. Edwards, "Fruit trees and herbaceous plants increase functional and phylogenetic diversity of birds in smallholder rubber plantations," Biol. Conserv., 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109140.

[8] E. Cristina Barbosa Cambui, R. Nogueira de Vasconcelos, E. Mariano-Neto, B. Felipe Viana, and M. Zikán Cardoso, "Positive forestry: The effect of rubber tree plantations on fruit feeding butterfly assemblages in the Brazilian Atlantic forest," For. Ecol. Manage., 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2017.04.043.

[9] Z. Zhuang, K. Li, J. Liu, Q. Cheng, Y. Gao, J. Shan, L. Cai, Q. Huang, Y. Chen, and D. Chen, "China's new urban space regulation policies: A study of urban development boundary delineations," Sustain., 2017, doi: 10.3390/su9010045.

[10] G. Fedele, B. Locatelli, H. Djoudi, and M. J. Colloff, "Reducing risks by transforming landscapes: Cross-scale effects of land-use changes on ecosystem services," PLoS One, 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195895.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Agricultural Technology and Forests: A Recapitulation

Dr. Chandrasekaran Saravanan
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-saravanan@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: ***The relationship between agricultural technology and forests has undergone significant transformations over the years. This abstract provides a recapitulation of the complex interplay between agricultural technology and forests, highlighting both the positive and negative impacts on forest ecosystems. Advancements in agricultural technology have played a pivotal role in increasing food production, improving agricultural efficiency, and meeting the demands of a growing global population. Mechanization, irrigation systems, genetic modification, precision farming, and digital technologies are just a few examples of the innovations that have revolutionized agricultural practices. While agricultural technology has contributed to increased productivity and food security, it has also exerted pressure on forest ecosystems. Historically, agricultural expansion often involved the clearance of forests for land conversion, leading to deforestation and loss of biodiversity. Large-scale mechanized farming and industrial agriculture have been associated with widespread forest loss, habitat fragmentation, and negative impacts on ecosystem services.***

KEYWORDS: Agricultural, Biodiversity, Forests, Habitat Fragmentation, Recapitulation.

INTRODUCTION

Deforestation is mostly fueled by the chance for farmers or businesses to collect a forest rent by turning forest to pasture or crops. Aside from agricultural technology, a variety of other elements also contribute to such prospects. High production costs, road building and maintenance in wooded regions, and accessible, inexpensive labor and capital are a few of them. One must consider the relationship between agricultural technology and tropical deforestation within this broader context in order to fully comprehend it. Without losing sight of the context in which that connection happens, the authors of this book have made an effort to maintain a sharp emphasis on the relationship between technology and deforestation. Their key results are outlined in this chapter, along with some general conclusions [1].

Although in theory new technology might lessen the requirement for land, farmers often decide to increase their land size. The outcome relies on the strength of the factors and the state of the market. If migration is also enticing, the innovations are readily converted into agents of deforestation. 'Win-win' potential if new technologies can divert resources away from more complex systems. However, long-term effects on migration may increase pressure on forests, and higher farm surpluses may be invested in clearing forests. Although this is likely beneficial due to supply effects and perhaps also labour-market effects, there are a few important caveats: it may be labor-saving, relax capital restrictions, and increase demand for upland crops, all of which encourage deforestation [2].

Developed Nations

The historical assessments of Rudel and Mather are centered on the idea of a forest transition. This suggests that the forest cover decreases before leveling off and gradually increasing once again. Forest cover has increased in several European nations from the first half of the 19th century, including the three Mather studied: Denmark, France, and Switzerland. Agriculture yields have also been gradually rising at the same period. This may indicate that rising yields contributed to reversing the loss of forest cover. However, as both authors point out, these processes took place in the midst of profound societal changes, which likely had a significant influence on forest cover of their own. For this reason, it is difficult to determine the minimal impact of technology on forest cover.

What additional modifications were these? A stronger commercial focus on agriculture, a weakening link between local population development and agricultural expansion, and more specialized production depending on regional circumstances were all made possible by improved trans- port networks in both Europe and the USA. These elements assisted in moving agricultural output from marginal to fertile areas, along with new agricultural techniques that tended to be more suited to fertile fields. Some marginal agricultural fields that had been abandoned underwent regeneration into forests, either naturally or as a result of tree planting. Even while some of the more prosperous agricultural regions saw higher deforestation, it was more than compensated by replanting on marginal lands.

The rural exodus, which was mostly sparked by new industrial occupations in the metropolis, decreased the labor pool available for farming, grazing, and gathering fuel wood, increasing the expense of these activities. The American South's machinery enabled farmers to produce the same amount of land with less labor, but as urban labor demand continued to grow, it absorbed the labor that technology discharged, preventing deforestation from increasing as a consequence. Migration to "the New World" removed pressure from otherwise expanding rural populations in several European nations. The need for fuel wood decreased as energy supply shifted from wood to coal and eventually other fossil fuels. Additionally, this had a substantial impact on the forest's transformation [3].

Changes in politics and culture were also crucial. The state became a technical and legislative agent of environmental management throughout the 19th century. In Europe, agriculture and woods were divided by the enclosure movement and unique legislation. As Mather points out, society started to regard forests differently; specifically, they started to be seen as 'more than lumber'. The history of today's high-income nations has a number of instructive lessons for the low-income nations of today. The experiences of Europe and North America show that improved yields and new agricultural technology may coexist with an expansion of forest cover. However, other factors in development were at least as significant as agricultural technology, such as the rise in urban employment, laws that clearly distinguished between forest and agricultural land, and an active state that was ready and able to enforce environmental restrictions.

While there are certain parallels between the histories of the developed and developing worlds, one must be careful not to make too many conclusions from them. Over time, the global economy has transformed. Developing nations are becoming more and more integrated into a global economy that is substantially different from that of a century ago. The political climate also varies. The American government, according to Rudel, "launched more programs that affected forests than the modern neoliberal states of the developing world will ever do [4].

Generally, commodity booms and deforestation coincide when the following five factors occur:

1. International markets may take in the extra supply without the price being severely down.
2. Policies encourage the conversion of forests to the new crop.
3. Production may spread into regions with plenty of forests.
4. The new crop may be planted with inexpensive labor.
5. The money to fund the growth is provided by someone.

The last four centuries of cocoa history resemble a hurricane that travels from nation to nation destroying vast swaths of tropical forest. The idea of forest rent, which is defined as the additional surplus farmers get by growing a crop on freshly cut forest rather than in an area that has grown crops for some time, is essential to understanding this process. In older cocoa farms, it is substantially more costly to produce cocoa due to pests, illnesses, and weeds. In addition, during the first few decades of agricultural colonization, the rural labor pool matures and becomes less productive. This also holds true for other crops, but to a lesser level. As a result, when farmers have used up all of the forest border in a certain region or nation, some other location with substantial forest regions will get the upper hand due to lower costs. Adam Smith is at work. Production is directed by the "invisible hand" to areas with the lowest production costs, sometimes helped by both obvious and covert political pressure to encourage the change.

Commodity booms are associated with labor migration or significant underemployment, at least when labor-intensive production techniques are used. Once again, migration often reacts to policies that encourage individuals to relocate as well as market signals pointing to new economic possibilities. The phrase "the land belongs to those that develop it" was used by Côte d'Ivoire's first president to aggressively encourage migration to the forest boundary. Similar to this, many million people were relocated to Sulawesi as part of Indonesia's transmigration program from Java and Bali. In both instances, new immigrants not only supplied the labor for the cocoa booms that were essential, but immigration also encouraged locals to grow cocoa in a "race for land" with the new immigrants.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Production in the three instances has gotten increasingly input-intensive over time, as has been the case with agriculture in general. In the instance of bananas, the new 'Cavendish' variety was more perishable and needed more infrastructure and inputs than the previous 'Gros Michel' type. As a result, production became less mobile, which was advantageous for the forest but excluded smallholders who lacked the resources to produce the new type. Similar to this, Ruf gives instances of farmers using pesticides in their cocoa plantations and observes that this may assist avoid the weed issue connected to replacing old plants [5].

Greater utilization of capital inputs had the potential to ease strain on forests in the banana and cocoa industries, but farmers showed little enthusiasm for this technology until they ran out of available forest where they could grow their businesses. The 'Cavendish' cultivar was chosen by farmers in Ecuador after significant growth had reached its maximum level. Ruf adds that the lack of forests was a significant factor in the uptake of herbicides. Moreover, it seems that herbicides did not stop cocoa from spreading into forests, even in situations when farmers used them while a forest boundary still remained. The Sulawesi village chief observed that "the fish in the river always look thirsty."

The reason why technical advancements in these situations did not decrease deforestation is partially explained by the dynamic investment impact Wunder and Ruf find. Ruf explains how the Sulawesi cocoa farmers use their extra money to grow their cocoa plantations. Wunder mentions the repercussions of large-scale investment. The banana boom brought in more money for the government, which it utilized to finance new agricultural growth and infrastructural projects. The cocoa and, to a lesser degree, banana stories are quite different from the soybean one. It required significant capital expenditures for marketing, processing, storage, and transportation. Because of this, the sector was able to reach regional economies of scale. When production reached a critical point due to technology and supportive regulations, economies of scale and inexpensive land on the frontier combined to significantly accelerate forest conversion. Expansion of the soybean industry may have been limited by high capital needs, but they were not. Brazilian farmers had access to private financing, and there was an abundance of subsidized loans up to the 1990s.

Not all of the soybean development occurred at the cost of the surrounding forest. Some of it took the place of other crops or other natural plants. However, it had significant impacts on forests even in regions where soybean displaced other crops, such as southern Brazil. There, soybean farming replaced other agricultural jobs, and many small farmers could not afford the equipment and chemicals needed to cultivate soybeans. Many gave up their property and relocated to the border of the Amazon, where they cut down trees for crops and grazing. Brazil's simulation model by Cattaneo supports this assertion. He discovered that labor-saving, capital-intensive technologies outside the Amazon region resulted in significant increases in deforestation within the region. The productivity of the whole agricultural area may be multiplied by 10 with the intensification of shifting-cultivation systems. The carrying capacity of the shifting-cultivation system was increased by two to six times in northern Zambia as a result of the introduction of cassava. A short-rotation fallow system with a carrying capacity that is nearly 10 times greater was also made possible for farmers. It was labor-saving and took place at the same time as a significant male outmigration to work in the copper industry. The new technology did not result in more labor being made available to clear more land because of the migration of workers. In the near run, less deforestation resulted from the substitution of cassava for finger millet. Holden contends that better agricultural output has allowed for larger population densities and enabled families to live in more marginal regions, therefore in the long term, the introduction of cassava will likely result in more deforestation and soil degradation [6].

In the past, a lot of experts have attributed the large-scale conversion of forests to the introduction of rubber into South-East Asian shifting-cultivation systems. De Jong evaluates this assertion severely. Instead, it encouraged the addition of more trees to areas that had previously been utilized for farming, and rubber gardens had a number of positive economic and ecological effects. What distinguishes de Jong's cases? First, there was a reserve of already cleared land available for farmers to cultivate rubber. Second, there was often little in-migration and isolation in many of these places. Thirdly, forest encroachment was limited by government enforcement of forest restrictions. These requirements did not apply to rubber in other areas or to cocoa on the neighboring island of Sulawesi. In these situations, a large labor pool, acceptable accessibility, and fresh economic prospects encouraged migration, but government forest control offered minimal restraints. In actuality, the state machinery actively promoted the conversion of forests. Tree crops may drastically lower the main forest canopy under these conditions.

A third technique to strengthen shifting-cultivation systems is via improved fallows. Leguminous vines like kudzu fix nitrogen and increase the nutrients available to the soil, hastening soil recovery. Additionally, it controls weed growth, which lowers the need for labor for weeding and clearing land. Therefore, kudzu allows for shorter fallow times. As a result, there should be less fallow land, making room for more forest. It is a labor-saving, low-cost technique that boosts yields and could help preserve forests. However, as Yang gen and Reardon note, nobody can promise that the forests will be saved. Indeed, labor savings and increased production work against one other. The econometric research performed by the two authors reveals that kudzu has a minor positive net impact on overall forest clearance by reducing main forest clearing while increasing secondary forest clearing.

In every example looked at, intensification significantly enhanced yields at a little expense. Farmers will be more likely to strengthen their shifting-cultivation systems in such situations, even if there is still an abundance of forest. However, it doesn't follow that intensification will automatically stop deforestation. It's possible to experience growth and intensification. Finally, shifting-cultivation systems need that we define what the term "forest" means. Does it cover fallow land, secondary forest, and tree crops like rubber? Later, in the third and last chapter, we address this matter once again [7].

Permanent Upland Farming

In the developing world, permanent upland farming is widespread, however many farmers also use shifting cultivation, irrigated cultivation, tree crops, or animals. We need to take into account the demands each of these activities places on the farmers' labor and financial resources if we are to comprehend the overall pattern of land usage. This book covers several technical developments in PUC. Adoption of high-yielding cultivars, the introduction of fresh crops, greater fertilizer use, and insect control are a few of them. Holden examines the effects of a high-yielding maize variety that was brought to Zambia in the 1970s together with increased fertilizer usage. The public's backing was necessary for this expensive technology package, which inhibited massive shifting cultivation. As part of its structural adjustment efforts, the government cut down on fertilizer subsidies and eliminated pan-territorial prices, which caused the process to reverse. Although prior policies placed a significant load on government resources, this offers a case for further targeted assistance for intensive farming. Reardon and Barrett use much the same justification to defend "sustainable agricultural intensification." They contend that farmers must invest more capital, which they generally define to include inorganic fertilizers, organic matter, and land improvements, in order to produce more food without harming the environment. Farmers were pushed to adopt an unsustainable path of intensification or to extend their operations deeper into the forest or other forms of natural vegetation as a result of reduced government assistance for agriculture, increasing input costs, and diminishing infrastructural expenditures. They contend that failing to follow a SAI route would unavoidably force farmers to grow into the vulnerable margins, even while they accept that intensification in and of itself won't always limit expansion. Additionally, they point out that a lot of quasi-fixed capital expenditures boost the productivity of already-cultivated regions more than they do for newly added lands, favoring land intensification over land expansion.

A high risk environment exists for agriculture in Africa, which is partly due to the presence of several pests. Over 10 million km2 are infected by tsetse flies, which spread trypanosomosis and, to a much smaller degree, cause illness and death in cattle and people. Tsetse control reduces the amount of labor required by humans and allows for or at least increases the productivity of animal traction. Reid *et al.* concentrate on the effect on forests, particularly woodlands, despite the fact that it undoubtedly helps farmers and animals. In their research region in Ethiopia, trypanosomosis reduction promoted agricultural growth, in part because families with fewer illness issues were able to cultivate larger plots of land. Pest and risk issues are also covered by Coxhead *et al.* They investigate how technical advancements in vegetable production may impact farmers' desire for maize and vegetable land using household data from northern Mindanao, the Philippines. Given that the cultivation of vegetables requires more labor and money, switching to a vegetable-only diet may result in a family using less land. Coxhead *et al.* discover that technological advancements that boost yields and decrease variability without increasing factor intensities will have negligible influence on farmland. Pichon *et al.* claim that risk-reducing tactics are crucial in determining how settlers manage their property in the northeastern Amazon of Ecuador. They arrive to the conclusion that despite coffee's labor-intensive nature, these labor-strapped farmers plant it because it offers long-term economic stability and has a ready market. In another instance, despite operating in a setting with a lot of forests, farmers showed a willingness to increase their output. In this instance, intensification seems to have stopped the clearance of forests. Even after decades of farming, farmers whose production strategies center on coffee often keep more than 50% of their plot in primary forest [8].

These chapters teach us something crucial. One has to use a whole-farm approach and take into consideration the interplay between various production systems within the farm in order to forecast the impact of technological change on the overall demand for farmland. Each system has its own labor and capital needs and to varying degrees satisfies family goals including revenue production, food security, and risk prevention. In the near term, especially, technological improvement that simultaneously boosts yields and necessitates more labor has the potential to lower total agricultural need for land.

Intensive Irrigation Agriculture

According to the Borlaug hypothesis, lowland agriculture's new green-revolution technology would conserve the forest by decreasing food costs, which will make expansion less desirable, and by raising agricultural incomes, which will make emigration to borders less desirable. Jaya suriya, Ruf, Shively, and Martinez's chapters investigate this problem in the context of Asia. Rudel talks on the South's role in American history. The Philippine island of Palawan was the subject of a research by Shively and Martinez, and their findings lend credence to the Borlaug hypothesis' labor-market component. The average cropping intensity increased as a result of a project to upgrade small-scale irrigation systems, which in turn increased labor demand. The local labor market saw a boom as a consequence, which raised salaries. Forest clearance decreased by roughly 50% as a result of the proximity of more and better-paying employment in lowland agriculture making it less desirable for the neighboring upland people to increase their own agricultural operations. Irrigation technology, like other green revolution technologies, often has a twofold impact on labor demand. More cropping intensity suggests more demand, however automation or the use of herbicides might result in a decrease in labor input each cropping season.

In addition to its impact on labor markets, technical advancements in intensive agriculture also have an impact on the output market. To examine these consequences, analysts often employ large-scale economic models, like the ones Jaya suriya and Cattaneo showed. In general, as food demand is often inelastic, the price-reducing impact of increased agricultural supply brought about by the deployment of green-revolution technology should favor forest conservation. However, there are certain crucial qualifiers. Upland and lowland crops should compete in the same domestic market in order to considerably reduce upland deforestation. The effect is probably little if one of them is traded overseas or if they are not exact equivalents on the local market. Any favorable benefits on the output market must also exceed any negative consequences. For instance, the output-market effect may be overridden if lowland technology cause labor to be displaced and to migrate to forest boundaries. The cocoa research provides more evidence that, as in other forms of agriculture, technical advancement in intensive agriculture may assist farmers overcome financial barriers to extending their agricultural regions by providing cash for investment.

In the past, scholars had a tendency to ignore a claim made by Jaya-suriya that advancements in intensive agricultural technology might increase demand for upland crops and, as a result, encourage the conversion of forests to increase the area of these crops. Technological advancements in lowland agriculture may put more pressure on forests in circumstances when upland crops are not marketed on the global market and have a high-income elasticity. For instance, the output of cattle or vegetables may be affected [9].

Latin American Cattle Ranching

According to White and his colleagues, cattle are status symbols and a reliable source of revenue for farmers in tropical Latin America. They are seen by environmentalists as a devouring, spewing foe that razes forests. Both perspectives are valid. The most lucrative choice for farmers is often cattle. But in Latin America, livestock are the leading cause of deforestation. Tropical Latin American pastures need a lot of space and can decay quickly. Many have thus suggested that pasture expansion will lessen the need to clear trees in order to make more pastures. Additionally, if pastures can be made more resilient, farmers won't need to destroy their current pastures and plant new ones.

Vosti and his colleagues demonstrate that smallholders in Brazil's western Amazon are likely to adopt more intensive pasture and cattle production systems using a linear programming farm model. These provide far larger incomes than conventional methods, but they put more strain on forests. Due to the increased profitability of the technologies, farmers are able to grow their herd size to a level that is personally optimum while also relaxing their capital and labor limits. This suggests that a win-lose situation will prevail. An analogous approach is used by Roebeling and Ruben to investigate the effects of technological advancement in Costa Rica's Atlantic zone. According to their model, an agricultural frontier with a 20% improvement in pasture productivity will have an almost 10% increase in pasture area and a nearly 28% decrease in forest area. Small and medium-sized farms, whose primary land uses are cash crops and forest plantations, are not under as much pressure as enormous haciendas.

While Vosti *et al.*, Roebeling and Ruben, and Cattaneo analyze the impact of better grazing technology on general equilibrium, they all employ partial equilibrium models. He contends that people who assert that better grazing technologies lessen deforestation have not given enough thought to the long-term consequences. Numerous advancements in pasture technology have the potential to lessen deforestation in the near future due to labor and financial restrictions. However, any advancement in the cattle industry would significantly exacerbate deforestation over the long future, when resources will be more mobile. However, technical advancements in the cattle industry benefit farmers far more than those in the annual crop and tree sectors, reiterating the win-lose situation.

Deforestation is not just a result of technical development. The causal connection may potentially be inverted, as shown by White *et al.* They contend that forest shortage brought on by previous deforestation encourages the development of pastures. We are now back in Boserup. Farmers will try to grow before they become more intense. The process that creates this sequence is what White *et al.* add to Boserup's theory. Land prices rise as a result of the lack of forests. This makes pasture intensification a more appealing option for increasing beef and milk output than buying new acreage. The authors' fieldwork was conducted in three countries Peru, Colombia, and Costa Rica with various degrees of forest shortage. Ranchers' best private option in Pucallpa, Peru, where there is still a lot of forest, is to raise a lot of cattle and keep destroying the forest. Therefore, it's a lose-lose situation. The Central Pacific location in Costa Rica contains expensive property and little surviving forest cover. Farmers increase their efforts to prevent pasture degradation, but since much of the forest is already gone, their efforts have little effect on it. There is some cause for hope at the Colombian location, where there is a moderate amount of forest cover. Although the authors contend that additional sorts of policy actions will be needed to reduce deforestation in the long run, the authors find that the short-term impact of new technology on forest cover is favorable.

The aforementioned chapters add to a growing body of scholarship that concerns whether more advanced grazing technology will aid in forest conservation. Does this suggest that one must choose between deforestation and poverty? No, not always. For decision-makers, the basic trade-off indicated offers a possible starting point. Vosti *et al.* point out that policymakers may be able to provide ranchers better technology in exchange for agreeing to other regulations that prevent them from expanding their pastures. Therefore, even while grazing technologies are not a miracle cure and, if implemented without other policy changes, may lead to further deforestation, they might still be a component of the total answer.

The New Technology's Labor and Capital Intensity

Using factor intensities as a guide, we categorized various technologies. Given that the majority of farmers are labor- or capital-constrained, how new technologies influence their overall labor and capital needs has a significant impact on the amount of land they can cultivate. In the instances when the authors used linear-programming models, this is clearly the case. Particularly when markets are inefficient, family labor and financial resources have a significant impact on the result with respect to forests, and it is far more probable that technology advancement will support forest conservation.

How labor and capital intensive new technologies are depending less on whether farmers are labor- or capital-constrained. Although soybeans need a lot of capital, availability to private financing and subsidized credit have eliminated a major growth restraint. The time horizon of the study is important since it affects how limited farmers are. This is in addition to how well the labor and loan markets operate. Long-term, farmers' limitations and input intensities of the technology are less significant. Farmers want to accept technology that increase rather than decrease their prospects. Farmers who are capital or labor limited, for instance, place a high value on labor and are less inclined to employ capital- or labor-intensive technology. Even yet, they do sometimes employ these technologies if they are very lucrative or have other attractive qualities, such as lowering risk or complementing the farmers' seasonal labor needs. This is shown by the adoption of coffee by smallholder settlers in Ecuador. In the shifting-cultivation narratives, farmers employ labor-intensive technology primarily. But once again, intensification is not a guarantee that logging will cease or even slow down, especially over the long haul.

Features of Farmers

Farmers may vary from affluent landowners with a focus on commerce to destitute, secluded, and subsistence-oriented peasants. Because various types of farmers often specialize in different crops and production techniques, certain inventions may only be applicable to specific farming communities. This is emphasized in the chapter by Roebeling and Ruben on Costa Rica. In that situation, although small and medium farms are engaged in a variety of businesses, the vast haciendas primarily produce cattle. Therefore, new grazing methods mostly result in increased forest removal from big farms, which also has repercussions for distribution.

Regarding both technology adoption and the effect on forests, farmers react to new technological breakthroughs in various ways. Smallholders often have tighter monetary budgets. The soybean narrative from southern Brazil serves as an illustration of how this may prohibit them from using certain technical breakthroughs. In that situation, the technology connected to extensive deforestation were exclusively used by big commercial growers. Therefore, capital-intensive technologies may cause poor farmers to lose out in a number of ways: they cannot afford the new technology, they may experience decreased salaries and output prices, and deforestation lowers the incomes and environmental benefits derived from forests.

Smallholders often place a distinct emphasis on various goals in addition to having different limits. For instance, they often place a greater emphasis on risk mitigation and food self-sufficiency than big farms. Smallholders in Coxhead *et al.*'s research region abuse natural resources as a kind of yield risk insurance. Therefore, risk-reducing technology could be suitable for this set of farmers and might aid in forest preservation. The hallmark of smallholders is the low market value of their labor. They often solely work in the unskilled, low-paying rural labor market. The low opportunity cost of smallholders' labor makes them want to relocate to the frontier if frontier land is open-access and distributed on a first-come, first-served basis. Poor smallholders may find it more challenging to acquire property if a vibrant land market emerges, but big landowners may still use their labor at a low opportunity cost to participate in activities related to forest removal.

DISCUSSION

The 'treadmill effect' is a term used to describe the concept that as technology advances, supply grow, lowering output prices and sometimes even farmer earnings. Due to the inelastic nature of food demand, even slight changes in supply may result in considerable price adjustments, favoring net consumers at the expense of net producers. How much of a pricing impact there is is the empirical issue. The magnitude is the result of the relative supply growth and the elasticity of the total market demand. The price impact will be minimal if few growers choose to use the new technologies that increase yield. In circumstances when each nation has a limited portion of the global market, this may apply to export crops. As a consequence, export crops often experience commodity booms because global markets can withstand significant increases in supply without negatively impacting prices. However, there are occasions when commodity booms are so substantial that they have a negative impact on the world's supply and lower prices overall. The majority of the commodity booms covered in this book had this situation. However, in other instances, the quick rise in consumer demand helped to partly offset the detrimental impact of increasing supply on global pricing.

While the total demand for food may not vary substantially in response to price fluctuations, this is not always the case for specific food crops since consumers might switch. Furthermore, the demand for many agricultural commodities that aren't used to make food, including cotton and rubber, is more elastic due to the availability of synthetic replacements. Technology adoption by producers, such as new rice varieties, will normally have a significant influence on market pricing, which should restrain the need for more acreage. For instance, Cattaneo addresses technical advancement in the production of food crops sold on the home market in his economy-wide simulation model. Production and growth are not hampered by a lack of land, and they

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

continue until decreasing prices make it undesirable to continue.

When governments have a significant impact on food costs, the connection can be more complicated. Rudel points out that in the instance of the USA, the government prevented the market from operating. Since price-support programs kept prices high, higher yield did not have the expected impact on market prices. Other policy actions were taken by the government in such situation to stabilize the food market and turn marginal agricultural land into a forest.

Finally, many technical advancements do not result in higher yields. They just lower expenses. As a result, they have no direct impact on supply or output prices, however they may indirectly influence supply by making manufacturing more profitable. For instance, automation often results in lower labor inputs, frequently without higher yields. A farmer may clear four to five times more land with a chainsaw, but yields are not always increased. Thus, whether new technologies boost yields or just reduce costs is a crucial aspect to consider [9].

Due in part to the farm-household strategy used by most investigations, the examples do not find more instances where such impacts occurred. It can also indicate that many key technological advancements occurring in frontier agriculture are site-specific and only have a little impact on the overall supply of the market. More broadly, it emphasizes the need of making a distinction in the discussion between the creation of new technologies that are applicable to significant areas of intensive agriculture and the adoption of well-known technologies in frontier regions, which account for a relatively tiny portion of overall output.

Employment and Immigration

One might anticipate that labor-intensive technological progress will have a favorable or negligible effect on forests in isolated forest-rich economies. Any growth will be immediately constrained by labor shortages and/or rising wages. However, in areas with strong regional and/or national labor markets and significant levels of labor mobility, labor shortages are less likely to restrain growth. Active labor markets may aid in reducing deforestation when labor-intensive technology progress occurs outside of first-tier locations. As shown by the Philippines irrigation research, employment options beyond the border will draw labor away from upland forest removal operations. However, labor-saving technology will encourage further migration to the frontier, as shown by Sulawesi's green revolution and Brazil's soybean industry. More people can be fed locally thanks to agricultural technological advancements that increase yields. Even while a larger carrying capacity could be advantageous to the forest in the near run, it has a number of indirect implications over time that are likely to limit the amount of forest. More public services and infrastructure are often linked to higher populations, which attract more immigrants. In this book, potatoes from 19th-century Switzerland, maize from Zambia, and bananas from Ecuador are three instances. In all three instances, new crops significantly increased the region's or nation's carrying capacity, yet increasing population densities were linked to the destruction of forests.

Farmer income, credit markets, and investment implications

Most farmers have limited financial reserves and are unable to borrow money at will. Even yet, there are undoubtedly some outliers, with cattle being the most notable one, which may sometimes make them hesitant to embrace capital-intensive technology. When capital-constrained farmers do employ capital-intensive technology, it should be considerably more difficult for them to develop their operations due to their restricted capital resources. But as was already said, new technologies have an impact on farmers' access to cash as well as their need for it. Farms are better able to buy agricultural supplies and make new investments as a result of technological advancement. Higher returns could also make it easier to get unofficial credit. These elements enable farmers to spend more money and purchase more inputs, although it is unclear how this affects deforestation. Think about the normal circumstances of a farmer in Latin America who raises livestock, grows crops, and harvests forests. Cattle provide the best rate of capital and labor return but less revenue per acre. Farmers' capacity to increase their cattle herds is often constrained by financial limitations. The farmers may utilize their increased money from crop output to purchase additional cattle if a new crop technology increases farm profitability overall and livestock are still the farmers' most lucrative option. Therefore, pasture could grow rather than the agricultural system, which saw technical advancement.

A typical African farmer, however, would mix one system with a relatively high yield and high input with another system with a low yield and cheap input. The

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

former provides the best labor returns, but since the farmer has the resources or credit to focus only on that system, they also employ the extensive method. If the farmer had better access to financing or received more revenue from any source, he or she might transition to an intensive system, which would lower the demand for land overall and prevent deforestation. Which investment strategy yields the maximum return a land-extensive system, a land-intensive system, or maybe some off-farm activity remains at the heart of both scenarios. In the final two scenarios but not the first, more wealth brought on by technical advancement would, ceteris paribus, diminish the need for land. The issue that was recently mentioned relates to the combined effects that rising wages and off-farm income have on land demand.

Farmers should work less in agriculture due to higher opportunity costs of labor, which will lower the need for land. However, increasing off-farm income eases the capital restriction. More seeds, fertilizer, equipment, livestock, labor, etc. are now available to farmers. As was previously discussed, depending on whether land intensification or intensification is more desirable, this latter impact may either raise or reduce the demand for land. Vosti *et al.* discovered that the investment effect predominated in their research of cattle in the western Amazon, resulting in more meadows and less forest on the farm. Rising earnings brought on by increases in agricultural production may lead to increased demands for lumber, fuel wood, fruits, nuts, and other non-timber forest products after the majority of the region's natural vegetation has vanished. Growing demand for these goods also encourages periurban residents to engage in the commercial planting of trees. In these situations, forests stop serving as a residual land use and start to resemble agricultural land uses in terms of economics and society.

The stories in this book teach us some very important insights about the function of capital constraints in influencing farmers' desire for land and the role of technical advancement in easing these constraints. This seems crucial in any long-term consideration of the impacts of new technology on forest cover, together with the migratory implications. It also calls into question the widespread belief that deforestation is a result of poverty. In fact, a number of the findings in this book really support the idea that poverty actually reduces deforestation.

The impact of technological advancement on deforestation may vary depending on the scale on which one concentrates. At the national or international level, the Borlaug hypothesis seems more applicable. At this size, increasing productivity and job possibilities should drive down costs and deter additional forest conversion, while the converse may happen if the technology is labor-saving and no substitute work opportunities materialize. The opposite claim, that advancement in technology makes growth more desirable, tends to presuppose that costs would stay constant. When one considers the scale at the family or village level, this assumption becomes more tenable. As a result, circumstances that are win-lose locally may be win-win globally. However, when one considers the vast regions of degraded lands, fallow land, and other land uses that do not fit under either "agricultural" land or forest, this becomes less likely.

Effects in the Short and Long Term

Over time, technological advancements may have different, even opposing, effects on forest removal. Farmers make choices based on the assumption that prices, salaries, interest rates, labor and capital resources, governmental regulations, transportation, marketing, and processing infrastructure, and their personal earnings are all set over the near run. All of these elements may alter as technology advances, which may result in somewhat different results. In particular, the chapters by Holden and Cattaneo show how many of the short-term benefits of technological progress for forest conservation eventually fade away as labor and capital move about and loosen the labor and capital limitations that were important in the short-term analysis.

Any technical advancement substantial enough to have an impact on land usage has a fair probability of changing political power dynamics as well as general economic growth patterns. Standard economic models find it difficult to include these factors. High agricultural growth rates encourage economic expansion, urbanization, and the expansion of the service and manufacturing industries. As occurred in Europe and North America, this may force farmers to give up on land with weak soils and terrain, allowing it to return to forest.

The question of irreversibility must be taken into consideration while choosing a historical period to concentrate on. It was widely believed for a long time that removing tropical forests would permanently harm their ecosystems. These ecosystems may be more robust than previously thought, according to new findings. The societal factors that contribute to extensive deforestation might be more difficult to reverse than the biological ones, or at the very least take longer. The effects of technical development on land use, population, political sway, income and wealth distribution, and demand patterns sometimes persist long after the technology itself has served its purpose. Even though the occupations that first attracted the family to the coast's banana fields in the 1950s and 1960s gradually vanished, the families who made the journey stayed there for decades. Powerful agro industrial lobbies in the south were made possible by new soybean technology in Brazil, and they eventually established themselves as a constant interest group competing for agricultural subsidies.

The Setting for Policy

Several influencing elements on conditioning include policies. Governments have the power to encourage or prohibit migration. They may tax agricultural goods or, more often, subsidize them. They have the power to prohibit or promote commerce in agricultural products. They may favor certain crops or production techniques. They support agricultural extension services and research, making new technology available to farmers. Therefore, both the adoption of new technologies and their effects on the environment are influenced by sectoral and general macroeconomic policy. Unfortunately, policymakers only pay secondary attention to the long-term environmental effects of their actions, as emphasized by Coxhead *et al.* and Reardon and Barrett. Policies meant to increase supply, balance the trade, etc. often have unforeseen or unanticipated negative side effects that have an influence on forests. Furthermore, governments often actively encourage deforestation in addition to setting the overall economic climate in which farmers operate.

'Win-win' circumstances are more likely to occur and have larger beneficial effects if more general policy and economic frameworks promote both economic growth and conservation, as experiences in the USA and Europe demonstrate. Agricultural land usage in regions with high agricultural wage rates and many non-farms job possibilities would likely be reduced much more by technical change-induced low agriculture prices and labor-intensive farming systems. Low agricultural prices may not dissuade impoverished families from relocating to agricultural frontier regions where these requirements do not apply, as is the case in many contemporary developing nations, given the low opportunity costs of their labor. Similar to how other policy signals, such as good restrictions limiting farmers' encroachment on protected areas, may strengthen the market signals produced by technology advancement.

CONCLUSION

It is a world in which agricultural innovation has provided huge benefits and yet poses real risks. The basic Borlaug hypothesis that we must increase agricultural yields to meet growing global food demand if we want to avoid further encroachment by agriculture still holds. Still, that by no means guarantees that specific agricultural technologies that farmers adopt will help conserve forests. The current trend towards more global product, capital and labour markets has probably heightened the potential dangers. Technologies that make agriculture on the forest frontier more profitable and that displace labour present particularly strong risks, while technologies that improve the productivity of traditional agricultural regions and are highly labor-intensive show the most promise.

REFERENCES

[1] J. K. Sinha, "Influence of technologies on the growth rate of GDP from agriculture: A case study of sustaining economic growth of the agriculture sector in Bihar," Stat. J. IAOS, 2019, doi: 10.3233/SJI-180436.

[2] M. Galbe and G. Zacchi, "A review of the production of ethanol from softwood," Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology. 2002. doi: 10.1007/s00253-002-1058-9.

[3] N. K. Gupta, M. A. Khan, S. Narbaria, and S. Beck, "Constraints in adoption of modern agricultural technologies on leased forest land," Plant Arch., 2015.

[4] D. P. Edwards, F. Lim, R. H. James, C. R. Pearce, J. Scholes, R. P. Freckleton, and D. J. Beerling, "Climate change mitigation: Potential benefits and pitfalls of enhanced rock weathering in tropical agriculture," Biology Letters. 2017. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2016.0715.

[5] N. Koch, E. K. H. J. Zu Ermgassen, J. Wehkamp, F. J. B. Oliveira Filho, and G. Schwerhoff, "Agricultural Productivity and Forest Conservation: Evidence from the Brazilian Amazon," American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2019. doi: 10.1093/ajae/aay110.

[6] M. Ishbulatov, I. Miftakhov, Z. Churagulova, R. Mindibayev, and A. Komissarov, "Applying GIS Technologies for Mapping Natural and Anthropogenic Transformed Soils in the Southern Forest-Steppe of the Republic of Bashkortostan," Agris On-line Pap. Econ. Informatics, 2020, doi: 10.7160/AOL.2020.120403.

[7] S. Dröge, D. A. Martin, R. Andriafanomezantsoa,

Z. Burivalova, T. R. Fulgence, K. Osen, E. Rakotomalala, D. Schwab, A. Wurz, T. Richter, and H. Kreft, "Listening to a changing landscape: Acoustic indices reflect bird species richness and plot-scale vegetation structure across different land-use types in north-eastern Madagascar," Ecol. Indic., 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106929.

[8] F. Cammelli, R. D. Garrett, J. Barlow, and L. Parry, "Fire risk perpetuates poverty and fire use among Amazonian smallholders," Glob. Environ. Chang., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102096.

[9] E. Surmaini, E. Runtunuwu, and I. Las, "Upaya sektor pertanian dalam menghadapi perubahan iklim," J. Penelit., 2015.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Globalization, Market Integration, and Economic Liberalization

Dr. Aparna Roy
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-aparnaroy@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Globalization, market integration, and economic liberalization have become defining features of the modern global economy. This abstract examines the multifaceted impacts and implications of these interconnected processes on economies, societies, and development outcomes. Globalization refers to the increasing interconnectedness and interdependence of countries through the exchange of goods, services, capital, and ideas. Market integration involves the deepening of economic linkages between countries, leading to the integration of national markets into a globalized system. Economic liberalization encompasses the removal of trade barriers, deregulation, and the opening up of markets to foreign competition. These processes have been driven by advancements in transportation, communication, and information technologies, facilitating the flow of goods, capital, and knowledge across borders. While globalization and market integration have provided opportunities for economic growth, enhanced efficiency, and access to larger markets, their impacts have been heterogeneous across countries and sectors. Globalization and market integration have enabled developing countries to participate in global trade, attract foreign direct investment, and integrate into global value chains. This has led to increased export opportunities, job creation, and technology transfer. However, it has also exposed economies to global economic shocks, market volatility, and heightened competition, which can negatively impact vulnerable sectors and workers. Economic liberalization has been associated with improved productivity, innovation, and efficiency gains. It has promoted competition, incentivized investment, and fostered entrepreneurship. However, it has also led to income inequality, social disparities, and challenges related to the provision of public goods and services.

KEYWORDS: Economic Liberalization, economic growth, Globalization, Market Integration.

INTRODUCTION

It is not the responsibility of any policymaker anywhere in the world to decide how agricultural research and technology transfer will impact forests. Typically, they focus first on ways to boost agricultural revenues, enhance food production, and generate more foreign cash. They may very well continue with their efforts even if they supported forest removal if they took a minute to ponder if their actions would have an impact on deforestation. Most people do agree that grazing and crops should sometimes take the place of woods [1].

However, many individuals, including ourselves, also think that the pace of tropical deforestation now surpasses acceptable bounds. Whether that persists may be strongly influenced by technological advancements in agriculture. While decision-makers must consider a wide range of possible repercussions, they shouldn't completely dismiss the effects on forests. Radical changes may significantly alter land use, including the introduction of new plant or animal species, the eradication of a serious pest, the transition from slash-and-burn agriculture to sedentary systems, and the first use of technology, chemicals, or irrigation. Before supporting technology that might have harmful consequences, policymakers should take this into account. They could also incorporate mitigating measures to prevent unfavorable effects on forests. The fact that research managers and development organizations are increasingly trying to use the argument that their programs assist protect forests as justification for their expenditures is another reason why policy-makers should be aware of how technological progress impacts forests. Political support for agricultural research and technology transfer has decreased as the globe grows more urbanized and because of historical scientific advancements, we are now able to produce more food than the markets can consume. The public's concern for the environment, and specifically for tropical forests, has never been higher. This has prompted several development organizations and research managers to "repackage" and advertise their work in agricultural technology as an endeavor that relieves strain on forests. Projects in frontier agricultural regions contend that by assisting small farmers to produce more on their current fields for longer periods

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

of time, they may prevent the farmers from giving up their farms after a few years and relocating farther into the forest. National and international research organizations contend that farmers would unavoidably need to destroy more forest to fulfill the expanding demand for food in the absence of the increased yield that their new technologies enable.

Some policymakers may believe that protected areas and long-term forest estates are the sole options at their disposal for conserving forests. Farmers should be prohibited from entering certain regions by stringent regulations, and the government should leave land use decisions to the markets everywhere else. Such viewpoints miss the reality that, whether intended or not, governmental expenditures in agricultural research and technology transfer may have a significant impact on land usage. Furthermore, few emerging nations have sufficiently established permanent forest estates and protected areas to depend only on these methods and disregard the possible effects of technological progress [2].

As was already said, the results in this book demonstrate that there are instances when new technology may boost both rural livelihoods and forest health. In other cases, conflicting objectives force policy-makers to choose how much forest they are prepared to sacrifice in exchange for increased agricultural output and/or farmer incomes. Sometimes, there are even "lose-lose" scenarios where new technologies encourage the conversion of forests to other land uses that don't provide much revenue or jobs, can't be maintained, or are supported by significant direct or indirect subsidies.

Win-Win Results

In five different ways, technological progress may concurrently advance conservation and development goals, according to our study.

Agricultural innovations designed particularly for regions lacking in forests

These innovations enhance productivity and the incomes of farmers who use them while reducing strain on forests. Some have been specially adapted to the settings found in places where the majority of the forest has already been destroyed. Others call for resources that farmers on the agricultural frontier lack, such as infrastructure, human capital, or market access. The production of extremely perishable foods, irrigation projects in traditional lowland agricultural areas, and crop varieties created for locations where people have lived for a long time are all prime examples of this sort of technology. Any increase in agricultural production in existing deforested areas would likely result in lower farm prices, which will deter further agricultural development elsewhere.

The key restriction is that little labor must be replaced by technology, since those who lose their employment may move to the agricultural frontier. The cultivation of flowers, decorative plants, and vegetables, as well as highly labor-intensive production processes in conventional agricultural zones, may operate as labor syphons and deter people from moving to forest edge areas.

Technology requiring a lot of labor where there is little migration

Farmers in agricultural frontier regions often face labor shortages. They must abandon certain other areas for cultivation in order to embrace a new technique that takes more labor per hectare. This may lessen the overall strain on forests. But only to the degree that these technologies do not stimulate in-migration from other areas can they simultaneously raise incomes and reduce deforestation.

Finding labor-intensive technology that farmers are ready to use and preventing a migrant influx are the keys to making this win-win situation succeed. Farmers will choose labor-saving technology over labor-intensive ones in areas with a labor shortage. Even in the agricultural frontier, though, farmers will sometimes use labor-intensive technology. The most typical examples are labor-intensive high-value foods and dairy products like bananas, cheese, coffee, coca leaves, pineapple, and vegetables that are produced on a labor-intensive basis. Another example is the replacement of sedentary annual crop production with shifting cropping [3].

A significant rationale for policymakers to support labor-intensive technologies is that they assist the poor more, since labor is often the major asset in impoverished families, in addition to helping to preserve forests. Contrarily, labor-saving capital-intensive technologies have doubled their negative effects on the underprivileged. They cannot afford the new technology, and local salaries have been negatively impacted by the fall in labor demand.

By assisting them in increasing agricultural productivity on their current plots, integrated conservation and development initiatives often strive to discourage those who live close to protected areas from intruding on those areas. The ICDPs must have marketable labor-intensive alternatives to promote, similar as those listed above, and the households that would be labor-constrained if they are to be successful

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

in their efforts. The development must also have a plan in place to prevent the influx of new households and businesses. Encourage the use of intensive systems if farmers are simultaneously engaged in widespread low-yielding agricultural techniques.

Farmers in developing nations often work with many production systems. Due to financial restrictions, they may not practice more intensive farming, which might lower the total demand for land from farms. In this case, government initiatives may promote the adoption of more intensive land uses, which may also be more environmentally friendly. Government fertilizer subsidies are a crucial matter of policy in this context. As part of their structural adjustment plans, several sub-Saharan African nations have recently eliminated fertilizer subsidies. This could encourage farmers to go back to shifting cultivation from sedentary agricultural practices. Fertilizers may be easily and cheaply substituted by standing forest, thus they will only use the latter if they can do so at rates below market [4].

Agriculture innovations that significantly increase the overall supply of goods with inelastic demand. One of the primary benefits of the widespread adoption of high-yielding cultivars has long been highlighted by proponents of the "green revolution" as the lessened burden on forests. They make the valid point that food costs in underdeveloped countries would have increased if the Green Revolution hadn't enabled the phenomenal improvements in grain output that it did. This would have likely promoted the spread of agriculture into disadvantaged communities. Here, it's important to note that supply increased to a point where it had a substantial impact on pricing and that it's unlikely that decreased grain costs greatly increased consumption. Similar reasons have been put up by research managers in relation to cattle research in the Brazilian Cerrado. However, it seems unlikely that one of these two circumstances apply there.

Technologies that encourage the use of farming methods that provide environmental benefits comparable to those of forests in their natural state. A lot of 'agricultural' land uses provide respectable levels of biodiversity, carbon sequestration, erosion control, and other environmental benefits often associated with forests. Even 'forest' items like lumber and fuel wood may be obtained from them. Agroforests and other comparable land uses may be used to replace certain forest services, even if agricultural land uses will never completely remove the requirement to keep some areas in natural forests or plantations. There is little doubt that agricultural research and technology transfer play a part in efforts to enhance these systems and raise the possibility of farmers using them. It could be preferable for policymakers to support landscape mosaics with different multilayered cropping systems and forest fragments rather than trying to build landscapes with very intensive and artificial farming systems on the one hand and virgin forests on the other. As usual, the answer relies on the precise goals and the trade-off between agricultural productivity and environmental services [5].

Win-Lose Results

Contrary to popular belief, many of the effects of agricultural technology are not beneficial to all parties involved. The loss of forest cover and environmental services often results in cheaper costs for consumers or increased revenues for farmers, producing a lose-lose scenario. Agricultural technology that support production methods that eliminate or need minimal labor.

The technology created for large-scale livestock ranches and automated farming systems are the best examples here. Technological advancements may encourage farmers to dedicate more acreage to these systems by increasing their profitability. Since these systems don't need a lot of labor, growing them won't increase labor prices, and there won't be any feedback from the labor market to slow the growth. In the worst situation, new technology will actually displace labor, causing the displaced individuals to move to regions near forests to remove more forest. Countries gain from greater food production or foreign currency gains under these circumstances, but at the price of local livelihoods and environmental services.

New agricultural goods for sale in labor-rich environments in big marketplaces

The introduction of a new crop for export or huge local markets is a common factor in instances where fast forest destruction occurs. In most cases, new crops take the place of forests rather than existing ones or idle, degraded areas. Individuals who relocate from other areas, individuals who are temporarily or chronically jobless in the region, or those who give up their current jobs to pursue these new ones may provide the labor for these new enterprises. This suggests a net increase in the quantity of labor used for activities involving forest removal, at least in the first two scenarios. Since manufacturing often primarily targets large markets outside the area, price reductions from supply growth are typically relatively marginal. Usually, as the economy grows, forests suffer, at least temporarily. The main qualification is that many of the related crops are tree crops, including coffee, cocoa, and rubber, which are grown by farmers in agroforest systems that provide significant environmental benefits on their own.

Elimination of illnesses that restrict the spread of agriculture

Over the last century, farmers have been able to inhabit sizable new regions that were previously off-limits because to the elimination of illnesses like malaria and pests like the tsetse fly. Similar to this, the elimination of foot-and-mouth disease in tropical Latin America may provide cattle farmers access to sizable new markets and inspire them to increase the size of their pastureland. Such disease-control initiatives unquestionably have significant positive effects on both human health and agricultural revenues, but they may also significantly increase forest destruction. Technological advancements in places near forests where the labor force is expanding quickly

Any increase in the profitability of agriculture in areas with ample labor and residual forest is likely to lead to further deforestation. This is true for both areas with fast natural population expansion and circumstances where colonization is occurring quickly either accidentally or on purpose. In areas where other government measures, such subsidized lending, price supports, and infrastructure improvements, effectively subsidize forest removal, technological advancements have the greatest potential to encourage unwarranted deforestation. The impact of these distortions are further heightened by new technology. In fact, compared to the total of the two separate impacts, the combined effect of technology innovation and policy distortions may encourage substantially more unwarranted forest removal [6].

As previously said, many technical advancements that farmers are likely to employ in regions with abundant forests are lose-lose. While agriculture productivity and farm profits rise, forest cover declines. There are several lose-win regulatory conservation initiatives. They limit farmers' options yet, when upheld, aid in forest preservation. Perhaps a win-win solution might be constructed by developing a policy package that incorporates both components. Governments are a key player in agricultural research and technology transfer and may be able to provide farmers with subsidized technologies and inputs. Farmers may limit their forest removal in exchange. Certain conservation techniques would be required in order to get certain farm program advantages. But for this to work, the government would have to properly enforce the agreement, which may be rather challenging. In the absence of subsidies, farmers would have enormous incentives to adopt the technology and encroach into forests. This has been a significant issue in ICDPs. These are, in theory, intended to generate win-win packages, but they often rely on erroneous presumptions about how farmers behave.

Environmental Services or Forests

The environmental services that policymakers want to protect will partially determine how they interpret the relationship between technology and trees. Landscapes in this book have often been arbitrarily divided into forested and non-forested areas for the purpose of convenience. This implies that the categories of forest and non-forest are equivalent. Complexity increases in real environments. To mention a few, they include different types of main and secondary forests, fallow land, plantations, agro-forests, permanent crops, scrub vegetation, annual crops, and pastures. Each provides varying degrees of environmental services and forest products, including various forms of biodiversity, carbon sequestration, recreational benefits, hydrological functions, marketable items, and things directly used by families. It is important for policymakers to consider which of these issues most worries them and why. It may turn out that perennial crops or agroforests perform as well as or better than certain forests, depending on how much these particular functions eventually matter to decision-makers rather than some arbitrary definition of forests. For instance, compared to scrub or fallow, wood plantations may perform worse in terms of erosion management and biodiversity protection.

Tree crops including cocoa, coffee, oil palm, and rubber are at the center of many key technical innovations in agriculture. One might come to rather different conclusions about how these technological innovations influence forests depending on whether one considers tree-crop plantations to be "forested," "deforested," or somewhere in the center. When compared to the appropriate alternatives rather than the current state of affairs, tree crops often have the ability to provide agricultural revenue and environmental benefits.

Global agricultural markets are expanding. The procedure is influenced both politically and technologically. The ability for farmers to sell their goods far afield has been made feasible by advancements in processing and transportation technologies. Commerce obstacles have been abolished and commerce has been actively pushed thanks to export-oriented development policies, currency devaluations linked to SAPs, and trade liberalization [7] [8].

Localized increases in agricultural production are far less likely to translate into lower pricing and slower expansion of cropland and pasture as a result of the globalization of agricultural markets. Simply said, the size of the world's marketplaces prevents most productivity gains from having a substantial impact on pricing. More significantly, pricing impacts brought on by technical development sometimes become buried by variations in agricultural productivity in traditional agricultural areas. Therefore, it is far more likely that technical advancements in agriculture will have detrimental or insignificant effects on forests as a consequence of trade liberalization and SAPs. While local population development and agricultural productivity have traditionally been tightly correlated, local land usage is now more influenced by global market demand.

Forests, Economic Development, And Poverty

Many individuals contend that agricultural technical advancements would reduce poverty at the national, family, or both levels, hence preventing deforestation. The disproportionate short-term focus of poor people and nations causes them to destroy their forest resources too soon. These scholars indicate that if technology advancement boosted the earnings of these families and nations, it would enable them to adopt a more long-term perspective. Others underline that when money grows, the demand for environmental services such as the recreational advantages of forests often increases while the need for fuel wood and bush meat usually decreases. For instance, increased urban earnings often encourage tree planting in the peri urban areas adjacent. Increased economic development brought on by technological advancement also results in greater pay, which may deter individuals from moving to poor agricultural frontier regions or spending their time to clearing inaccessible forests with poor soils. At the national level, increasing per capita earnings may help governments develop and put environmental policies into action. All of this shows that technical advancement may assist individuals, families, and nations in finding natural solutions to their environmental issues [9], [10].

On the other side, technical advancement may support agricultural development by giving farmers the funding they need. Farmers could easily borrow the money they need to expand their farms if capital markets were ideal, but this is not always the case. This encourages farmers to use savings, some of which may come from increased productivity and cheaper costs, to fund at least a portion of their investments including land clearance. Additionally, higher earnings increase demand for agricultural goods. As a result, prices rise and farmers are encouraged to expand their operations. Economic growth opens up fresh sources of funding for infrastructural improvements that enable farmers to access woods that were previously inaccessible.

CONCLUSION

Surprisingly little is currently known about the combined outcome of these several processes. According to some experts, there may be an "environmental Kuznets curve" for forests: at lower income levels, more revenue would encourage deforestation; but, as income levels rise, the tendency may reverse. The econometric evidence for this theory is still insufficient. Even if there is such a curve at the national level, there are still a lot of things we don't fully comprehend. For instance, there is still much to learn about the proportional impacts of each element, the economic threshold over which deforestation starts to decline, and how the issue affects individual households. Nobody can currently ensure that economic growth, whether it be fueled by agriculture or not, would result in a forest transition and an end to unwarranted deforestation. Educated, proactive policies will need to do that.

Policy frameworks that balance the benefits and risks of globalization and market integration are crucial. Governments need to ensure that economic liberalization is accompanied by social safety nets, labor protections, and environmental regulations to mitigate negative impacts. Investing in education, healthcare, and social infrastructure can enhance the resilience of societies in the face of economic shocks and disruptions. Moreover, international cooperation and governance mechanisms are essential to address the challenges and ensure that globalization and market integration benefit all countries. Fair trade practices, sustainable development goals, and agreements that promote social and environmental standards can contribute to a more inclusive and sustainable global economy. In conclusion, the abstract highlights that globalization, market integration, and economic liberalization have transformed economies and societies worldwide. While these processes offer opportunities for economic growth and development, they also pose challenges that need to be addressed through inclusive and sustainable policies. By managing the risks and maximizing the benefits of globalization, market integration, and economic liberalization, countries can work towards achieving sustainable and equitable development outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Arshad, S. A. R. Rizvi, and M. H. Ibrahim, "Tripartite analysis across business cycles in Turkey: A multi-timescale inquiry of efficiency, volatility and integration," Borsa Istanbul Rev., 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.bir.2014.09.001.

[2] A. Awad and I. Youssof, "The impact of economic globalisation on unemployment: The Malaysian experience," J. Int. Trade Econ. Dev., 2016, doi: 10.1080/09638199.2016.1151069.

[3] H. Eakin, "Institutional change, climate risk, and rural vulnerability: Cases from Central Mexico," World Dev., 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.06.005.

[4] S. Sen and C. M. Barry, "Economic globalization and the economic policy positions of parties," Party Polit., 2020, doi: 10.1177/1354068818761179.

[5] A. N. Vijayakumar and D. Bozward, "International Market Integration and Competitiveness of Indian Sugar," Glob. Bus. Rev., 2021, doi: 10.1177/0972150920988646.

[6] P. Singh Bhullar, "Stock Market Integration among Asian Economies in a Case of India China and Japan," Int. Res. J. Bus. Stud., 2019, doi: 10.21632/irjbs.12.2.137-143.

[7] G. A. Cornia, "Globalization and health: Results and options," Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2001.

[8] A. Bonfiglioli, "Financial integration, productivity and capital accumulation," J. Int. Econ., 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jinteco.2008.08.001.

[9] Y. Margalit, "Lost in Globalization: International Economic Integration and the Sources of Popular Discontent," Int. Stud. Q., 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2478.2012.00747.x.

[10] R. Zohlnhöfer, H. Obinger, and F. Wolf, "Partisan politics, globalization, and the determinants of privatization proceeds in advanced democracies (1990-2000)," Governance, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0491.2007.00387.x.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Population Factors and Deforestation in Tropical Agricultural Frontiers

Dr. Giri Gowda Chaitanya Lakshmi
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-chaitanyalakshmig@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: The most obvious evidence of human use of the earth's land surface is the conversion of forests for increased agricultural production. Although there is a strong correlation between population expansion and deforestation on a global and regional scale, there is no evidence of this relationship at the microscale, where individuals are actively removing trees. The removal of the majority of the world's forests is happening along tropical agricultural boundaries. The development of population-environment theories that are pertinent to deforestation in tropical agricultural frontiers is examined in this article. Population density, fertility, household demographics, and in-migration are the four main mechanisms by which population dynamics interact with frontier forest conversion.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Frontier, Population, Land Use and Land Cover Change (LUCC), Tropical Deforestation.

INTRODUCTION

The largest imprint of human existence on the surface of the world may be seen in the lengthy history of forest conversion to agriculture. Reforestation has been taking place in the northern hemisphere in recent decades, whereas deforestation in the tropics has persisted. The ecological stability of the richest biome on earth, as well as, in certain circumstances, the advancement of rural development and the sustainability of food production, are all threatened by this tendency. At the temporal and spatial macro-scales, it is widely acknowledged that population growth and deforestation are correlated positively. However, there is little evidence for such a relationship at the micro-scale, particularly along agricultural-forest frontiers, where the majority of global deforestation occurs. However, the information that is now available implies that demographic dynamics are important explanatory variables in the deforestation of the planet's tropics, even if population always functions in conjunction with other processes and is often not the major immediate driver [1].

The impact of population increases on changing the earth's surface has long been highlighted. The great flood is described as God's response to unchecked human population expansion, under which strain the world was "bellowing like a bull" in the 1700 B.C. Babylonian epic Atrahasis, the predecessor of the Noah tale in Genesis. Later, the Zoroastrians in 325 B.C., the Indian sage Kautilya in 300 B.C., and Aristotle discussed the link between population dynamics and landscape change. However, the parson Thomas Malthus is frequently credited with creating the first thorough theory of population-environment relations.2 Malthus asserted that since food production tends to increase only arithmetically while human populations tend to grow geometrically, population growth will eventually result in famine and a population crash. The implications for poverty and environmental change were significant. Given Malthus' assumptions about perpetual technological advancement, limited land resources, and unchanging agricultural practices, it was impossible for farmers to increase food output on land currently under cultivation. Therefore, population growth would result in the inclusion of additional, lower-quality lands into production.3 Diminishing returns on labor and land as people would have to work harder to survive off of ever-less productive lands would result in rising rural poverty.

According to a recent Malthusian formulation, civilizations are stuck in a cycle of rapid population expansion and environmental deterioration that leads to ongoing human misery and ecological disaster. This perspective holds that the concentration of rural poverty and environmental degradation in developing countries can be understood within the demographic transition, in which the decline in fertility lags behind the decline in mortality during modernization until both fertility and mortality reach a dynamic equilibrium. Developing areas have advanced through a medium stage in recent decades, marked by high but decreasing birth rates and lowering mortality rates, with the unavoidable result of population growth, unlike the industrialized world, where fertility has essentially declined below replacement levels. While evidence from agricultural settlements in the Amazon indicates rapidly falling fertility and many urban areas in developing countries are at or near replacement fertility levels, most frontier regions continue to have high fertility rates as a result of population pressures on the land, environmental stress, and resource degradation.

The majority of the developing world falls into Zelinsky's second stage of "mobility transition," which is marked by widespread migration from rural to urban areas and the colonization of a minority in rural marginal regions. This is consistent with the demographic transition. Rapid urbanization has increased the population of cities in Latin America, as expected by the mobility shift, whereas fewer migrants have inhabited border areas. Furthermore, in line with Zelinsky's idea, the vast majority of the several hundred million people who migrate globally each year do so locally, with just a small minority moving internationally. The great bulk of migration research, which is weighted inversely to real patterns, focuses on immigration. Furthermore, the majority of the academic research on internal migration in developing nations focuses on rural-urban movement and is mostly based on survey data collected mainly in destination regions. This is despite the fact that a large portion of rural-to-rural migration occurs in developing nations and that this migratory pattern is directly responsible for the majority of global deforestation [2].

Most of the land use/cover change literature agrees that population change and distribution is a primary cause of global deforestation, albeit only sometimes explicitly invoking demographic transition theory. For instance, whereas Allen and Barnes believe it to be the main factor contributing to the planet's deforestation, Mather *et al.* estimate that population explains about half of the variance in global deforestation. Similar to this, Geist and Lamb din found that, although always functioning in conjunction with other variables, three-quarters of the literature they reviewed identified population as an underlying or direct driver of deforestation. In fact, the impacts of population on the environment often result from the interaction of political, economic, and ecological forces at various scales. Economic, demographic, and other reactions to population change are possible. The environment may be directly affected by economic decisions, such as when a farmer chooses to increase the size of his field. A secondary impact of demographic changes would be seen, for example, if migration and fertility trends alter the demand for labor and the availability of food in forest edge areas. These different reactions might happen all at once or "multi physically."

Discontinuities in space and time may obscure connections between population-environment interactions. For instance, demand for forest and agricultural items might fuel border deforestation due to population shift elsewhere. According to various study initiatives in Latin America, including Costa Rica and Mexico, up to half of all deforestation occurrences include some kind of demand for food, fuelwood, or lumber from distant communities. The causes of tropical deforestation have been described as both underlying and proximal in some recent LUCC research. Proximate causes are recent events that happened locally where LUCC is occurring and are immediate influences. On the other hand, fundamental causes often become more distant across time and space. The three primary forms of forest conversion expansion of agriculture, wood harvesting, and infrastructure development are evident from research on tropical deforestation that specifically categorizes its proximal causes. The first is by far the main driver of deforestation on the world, often assisted by the latter two. This is especially true in Latin America, where biodiversity-rich "protected" regions are being rapidly invaded by border deforestation. The exodus of rural communities from their home regions to the border is a crucial precursor to this incursion and later forest conversion. This is not disputed by the fact that large-scale farmers and ranchers produce a significant amount of yearly forest conversion. In agricultural frontiers, large farms often emerge only after combining previously cleared land by small farm settlers. Frontier colonist deforestation ultimately requires population shift elsewhere in the form of outmigration. Some academics have highlighted that population pressures in the regions where migration originates may promote settlement at the border. However, the literature often pays little attention to this crucial fact.

This article explores population-environment theories and empirical research pertinent to in-migration, demographic processes after settlement, and the proximate population factors influencing deforestation along tropical agricultural frontiers.5 although land use and migration along frontiers are influenced by a complex web of political, economic, ecological, and demographic processes, this article concentrates on the latter group. Despite regional differences, settler farmers seem to have been the main forces for forest conversion along the major frontier "hot spots" globally in recent decades. On the other hand, the deforestation consequences of bigger farmers are more likely to be brought on by shifting distal population demand for agricultural goods than by proximal demographic changes. Population density, fertility, household demographic composition, and in-migration are the four main mechanisms by which population may directly effect changes in forest cover on the border [3].

DISCUSSION

Demographic Density

By claiming that population expansion may encourage agricultural intensification, Boserup changed the stream of the population-environment debate by implying that population growth might eventually have a benign or even beneficial influence on forest cover. According to her hypothesis, farmers may respond to early environmental deterioration by adopting more labor-intensive practices that take advantage of higher labor-to-land ratios when accessible arable land becomes limited compared to manpower. In regions not fully integrated into market economy, Boser up's idea has been tested with encouraging outcomes. Turner *et al.* successfully put Boser up's idea to the test. The availability of land and agricultural intensity were shown to be significantly positively correlated in a sample of 29 tropical subsistence communities from across the world. However, the authors pointed out that because density only explained 58% of the variance in agricultural intensities, other variables also needed to be taken into account.

The "modified consumption" model proposed by Brush and Turner evaluates demand for agricultural intensity as a function of biological, social, and market influences in addition to population demand. Thus, in addition to population pressure, potential demands such as those related to kinship, culture, taxation, ecological circumstances, and market integration were proposed. Additionally, various intensification responses to fallow intensification were studied, including the utilization of technology and agricultural inputs.

Numerous studies have shown the significance of various spatial and temporal intensification responses to demographic and non-demographic demands, including the use of irrigation, farm equipment, and agrochemicals, since Brush and Turner's work and building on pioneering research on induced innovation. Researchers in humid tropical frontiers asked whether intensification may lessen tropical deforestation in these areas because these studies consistently demonstrated less demand on the land owing to increasing yields per hectare. However, the corpus of research on agricultural intensification often assumes that market or population density demand is inadequate to push farmers to intensify agriculture in an environment with plentiful land and little labor. As a result, the pioneering ideas of farmer adaptation to population density are mostly useless in frontier settings. Most intensification methods there impose an excessive labor cost, are ineffective, or are too dangerous for tiny, semi-subsistence farmers. Furthermore, local political and economic circumstances may prevent farmers from applying such technology even if they have the technological tools and know-how to improve productivity [4].

With the continually shifting population-environment dynamics, frontiers also change. Increased population density tends to encourage continuing agricultural expansion in the early phases of frontier colonization. Land fragmentation may result in fallow compression and the application of inputs in order to take advantage of growing labor-to-land ratios and diminishing forest reserves when the border changes due to in-migration, fertility, and land consolidation. Farmers who have acceptable access to such markets may be forced to implement intensification as a result of growing market penetration in the emerging frontier. Understanding the potential for land use changes and more forest clearance in established regions, as well as understanding forest clearing trends in future frontiers, requires research into when and where such reactions could occur. Examples from case study literature highlight the difficulties in applying intensification ideas to frontier areas due to the complexity of frontier farming. For instance, Shriar's study on the adoption of intensification among 118 farmers in the Maya Biosphere Reserve's buffer zone in Guatemala showed that smaller farms intensified by intercropping, perhaps in response to pressures from the growing population on the land. Larger farms with lower population densities, however, also increased productivity, but not by intercropping, which requires a lot of work, but rather by using herbicides to make up for the manpower shortage.

Frontier settings are known for their fragile and informal conditions of occupation, which may deter intensification efforts as quick and broad forest removal communicates de facto occupancy and thwarts the plans of future squatters. The relationship between land title and conservation, however, is not clear-cut. For instance, Futemma and Brondzio discovered that the relationship between land tenure and land usage was very scale-dependent. They saw that forest privatization increased deforestation rates at the settlement level but intensification at the farm level was mostly determined by the availability of labor, money, and natural resources. Contrary to the Boserupian idea, intensification has gone hand in hand with ongoing forest conversion in any case studies from moderately advanced Amazonian frontiers. The increasing deforestation seen close to roadways supports this tendency. In numerous instances, it seems that very affluent families are the ones that are best able to finance intensification via the use of inputs, equipment, and hired labor, as well as the expansion of agricultural holdings. Perz recently studied the factors that influence intensification in 261 families along the Trans-Amazon route. He discovered that families with more labor and money were more likely to embrace contemporary technology, which is consistent with the larger body of research on agricultural intensification. The ability to buy technology, however, also allowed adopters to clear more land than non-adopters.

The desire for pasture from growing livestock holdings is a major factor in the conversion of forests by richer people. The conventional agricultural intensification paradigm is contradicted in these situations. Low population density is linked to higher deforestation because cattle ranches are often bigger than farms intended for producing semi-subsistence food. These families are more likely to increase agricultural output than non-cow adopters, in line with Pichón and Perz. Carr, for instance, discovered that farmers with cattle, who were the most numerous in a key conservation zone of the Maya Biosphere Reserve, also tended to enhance maize output by using inputs and growing the nitrogen-fixing legume velvet bean. Similar to Costa Rican frontier farmers, farmers in Sarapiqu took their time embracing perennials because to the high initial cost and lengthy wait for returns. Therefore, those farmers who had livestock and were the richest and most diversified were considerably more likely to increase via perennials like black pepper.

In the still developing corpus of literature on border intensification, few generalizations have been found. Due to the variability of the results, it is crucial to include both temporal and geographical scales when analyzing the relationship between population density and environmental change. Who intensifies, where and when does intensification happen, and what sort of intensification will be used in certain locations and at specific times are the remaining important concerns [5].

There is broad consensus in the research that the intensification and extension of frontier agriculture will be influenced by a variety of social, political, economic, and demographic issues, of which population density is just one. It is widely accepted that increasing population density may result in certain types of intensification in relation to deforestation, but that this intensification will also be accompanied by continuous agricultural development at the regional and farm levels. This pattern helps to explain why diminishing national rural populations are linked to unchecked deforestation rates on a national scale in various tropical Latin American countries. At the farm level, higher population density which is primarily impacted by its denominator, land will often be correlated with a greater percentage but a smaller absolute amount of forest destroyed. The next two parts of this research will discuss the household size and composition influence on border forest conversion when land is held constant.

Frontier Farm LUCC and fertility

In-migration is primarily responsible for the high population expansion that characterizes agricultural frontiers. Frontier migrants, however, often have greater fertility rates than cohorts in their regions of origin. For instance, in 1990, the total fertility rate for those living in the Ecuadorian Amazon was 8.0 children, which was twice the national average. This rate is much higher than urban and "non-frontier" rural fertility and is equivalent to early settlement rates in Brazil and Peru. In the Brazilian Amazon and, more recently, in the Ecuadorian Amazon, where Carr and Pan discovered that the TFR of settler families had fallen from around 8.0 in 1990 to 5.0 in 1999 as most women desired to have no more children, there is evidence of declining fertility on the frontier. Although there are few alternatives for reproductive health, fertility in the Ecuadorian Amazon continues to be higher than the norm for the country and other regions, similar to more advanced frontiers in Brazil.

Low demand for and/or availability of contraceptive choices would seem to be the main contributing factor to high frontier fertility, which is, in general, based on the same principles determining family size in other situations. However, there are a few aspects of the

IFERP

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

supply and demand model for children that are unique to a frontier setting and are worth noting here. First, investing in land is less effective in a frontier setting than investing in labor and hence in reproduction. Furthermore, because of the lack of access to healthcare, mortality is significant, leading to the need for compensatory births to guarantee infant survival. Second, some people believe that children should offset parental income insecurity by compensating for land insecurity due to the unstable land tenure typical in frontier regions. Finally, there are no other contraceptive options besides the rhythm method or they come at prohibitive time, financial, or cultural costs. This reduces the opportunity cost of women's economic participation in comparison to that of child-rearing [6].

On the frontier, where bigger families are connected to the need for subsistence crops for home consumption and labor demand for clearing land for cultivation, household fecundity has been related to the conversion of forests. For instance, in Costa Rica, farms with three to four children had far less deforestation than farms with six or more children. Regression analysis of data from surveys of settler families in Guatemala's Petén and Ecuador's Oriente both revealed a negative correlation between household size and forest land. However, the introduction of cattle, which often comes after the initial clearing of land for annuals, might cause this relationship to become reversed. Over time, cattle need less labor input, which might lower the need for family agricultural work. But compared to crops, they place a significantly higher demand on the conversion of forests. Cattle adoption is related to the family life cycle, as will be discussed in more detail in the section that follows.

Since household size has been proven to be favorably correlated with farm size, it also indirectly links to the conversion of forests. This connection is explained by two key factors: the need for workers to make the most of a big farm's resources and the desire to increase farm size to accommodate a growing family. The Philippine Rural Survey of 1952 found that average total fertility was significantly greater on farms over 4 ha compared to those under 1 ha, making it perhaps the most striking research that found a positive correlation between fertility and farm size. More recent evidence for this relationship is cited by Stokes *et al.* and comes from a variety of locations, including Bangladesh, the Philippines, India Latin America, Mexico, and Brazil. Since the majority of these research were carried out in densely populated, long-established agricultural regions, caution should be used when applying the results to locations with abundant land. In addition, several additional research discover little variations in family size in relation to resource availability. And there are several arguments against the link between fertility and resource availability. First, a bigger farm may have higher fertility rates because it provides for more resource stability and more surviving offspring rather than because having more kids would help to meet an increasing labor need. Some believe that when secure tenure of resources is established, the impact of resource access on fertility will be reversed.

In conclusion, fertility remains much greater than in urban and other rural areas even while it lags behind in-migration in terms of its contribution to population increase on the border. While more crops are grown to feed more children, on the one hand, it is sometimes desirable for youngsters to participate to agricultural work. Even while many families would want to have fewer children, the extreme lack of healthcare services and contraception alternatives in the frontier makes family planning goals impossible. Another problem is that rural families, many of which are concentrated in border regions, may not have been exposed to the more progressive norms of the city and may cite traditional ethnic or religious beliefs to explain high fertility rates. Household size preferences seem to be influenced by land size and tenure. Because it enables families to get loans, which often shifts land-use choices in favor of a more market-oriented economy, land tenure may have an impact on how labor is allocated. Less children are required to work on the farm when families invest in labor-intensive livestock as opposed to annual crops. According to some data, families increase the size of their households in order to make the most of the resources available. This results in families having more children on bigger farms. The impacts of family age structure and life cycle aspects, as discussed in the next section, are not sufficiently taken into account in the relationships between land, land use, and fertility and household size, which is a major criticism of these relationships [7].

Frontier Farm's Life Cycle and Household Demographics

The function of the family life cycle is a comparatively understudied part of population-environment connections. A relevant framework for examining the relationship between household demographic characteristics and land clearance in an agricultural frontier is provided by Chayanovian theory. The age and sex makeup of families has an impact on labor, which in turn influences land usage and the conversion of forests, according to this viewpoint. There is ongoing discussion on whether factor affects farmer land usage more, family affluence or age structure. Furthermore, when applying Chayanovian theory to frontier farmers today, strict distinctions between subsistence and commodity farming need to be eased, even if we recognize the significance of household effects. For instance, Chayanov thought that some staple crops remain indispensable to subsistence farmers, despite the fact that many frontier farmers today often transfer a larger proportion of output to market crops, particularly when transportation infrastructure develops over time. Family size preferences and, ultimately, fertility, may change if various crops need different labor inputs.

Despite significant regional diversity, a similar process of border evolution seems to be repeated across the tropics of Latin America. The transition to a new agricultural plot marks the start of the family life cycle of a frontier settler. Families of recent settlers are often young with a few young children. The dominance of cropping annuals is first encouraged by risk aversion, a lack of experience with frontier farming, and inexpensive capital and labor inputs. When a farm is first opened for the production of annuals and to demarcate farm occupancy in order to thwart the intents of possible squatters or absentee landlords, forest clearance is most intense during the first few years of settlement. Families will experience the most pressure to boost agricultural output on the demand side during the early years of childrearing. The expanding labor pool of children who are becoming older and financial security encourage the family to expand into additional agricultural endeavors, such as perennials and livestock. Since there is less forest area accessible on farms and more labor is available, bigger families may be linked to less deforestation at this stage. Conversely, given the cheap labor requirements of managing grassland, smaller families would be incentivized to buy cattle.

As children grow into adults, they may either migrate out of the area, which would reduce the demand for crops for household consumption but might also encourage livestock adoption and/or a switch to perennial crops as household labor would decrease and household financial security would increase through remittances; or they may stay, which would increase incentives to intensify agricultural production. Increased capital accumulation may serve to further enhance this later reaction. It was discovered that livestock kept away prospective migrants in second-generation border homes whereas a preference for crops encouraged movement. From a labor standpoint, this may seem contradictory since crops need more work than cattle do. Nevertheless, livestock is a strong proxy for socioeconomic position on the frontier since it is often linked to extensive land ownership. Even though at the farm level more cattle may retain second- and third-generation children, the consolidation of lands associated with cattle ranching at the community and regional levels will tend to serve as a migration push among households whose lands have been consolidated. This is where scale is crucial, as even though at the farm level more cattle may retain second- and third-generation children [8].

In conclusion, household demographic composition and life cycle impacts seem to be as, if not more, significant than fertility and family size effects on household net labor allocation and consumption patterns, and therefore on land use and forest clearance. While adult children contribute in a broad variety of ways, whether via effort on the farm or labor allocated elsewhere that augments capital investments on the farm, very young children contribute very little to family labor or consumption. On the property, the forest is cleared intermittently rather than continually. When and how these will happen, for instance, immediately after settlement for opening land to grow subsistence crops first, and subsequently to expand into livestock or market-oriented crops, may be better understood by understanding the frontier family life cycle. Of course, period influences or external changes influencing a frontier area make the experiences of various cohort groups distinct and unrelated to the aforementioned age-structure trends. To distinguish between period, age, and cohort effects, a large sample size, spread across cohorts, is required. However, the final population impact on deforestation addressed here—family migration to the frontier—must occur before we can analyze the effects of population density, fertility, household size, and household compositional and life cycle effects.

LUCC and frontier in-migration

The principal driver of population increase in agricultural frontiers, in-migration is encouraged by the resource abundance and labor shortage typical of a frontier setting, in addition to encouraging young and big families. Frontier forest conversion requires in-migration. It demonstrates why it will continue to be a crucial activity in the future since the majority of possible future deforestation will not occur on previously established areas, but rather on regions that

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

have not yet been developed beyond the forest fringe. The second and third generations of frontier colonists, whose comparative economic advantage is skill in frontier farming and whose comparative disadvantage is competing with laborers with different sets of skills in urban and international environments, will probably be the group most at risk for settling in these lands.

The direct effects of colonization on LUCC are mostly seen at the community and regional levels, while household size and composition have direct consequences at the farm level. When migrants relocate to existing farms, the near or direct effects of migration only sometimes affect agricultural operations. The deforestation literature is replete with examples of rapid forest conversion at the regional scale following colonization.9 A few examples of this phenomenon include: the Brazilian Amazon, where deforestation was closely linked to levels of poverty; the Ecuadorian Oriente, where population growth exceeded 6% annually through the 1970s and 1980s—more than double the national average as agricultural colonists claimed over one-third of the Ecuadorian Amazon region. Less is known about how settlement on existing plots may impact forest conversion at the farm level. A farm's land cover might vary as a result of out-migration from the frontier because it changes labor availability, initially making it less available due to the loss of family labor. However, labor may be supplied by hired agricultural laborers if out-migrants contribute remittances to the family of origin.

So, the major driver of population expansion on the border is in-migration. Land availability and labor scarcity, two features of the frontier that encourage high reproduction, also draw immigrants from more populous, sparsely populated areas. The frontier migrant, however, is relatively uncommon because he chooses to live in a remote, disease-ridden wilderness where he grows crops with little to no public infrastructure or services, limited technology, and unstable environmental conditions instead of taking advantage of higher-paying and more diverse labor markets, superior public education, health care, and community infrastructure. Contrary to popular belief, such migrants often assert that their current circumstances are better than those in their home countries; this emphasizes the attractiveness of land, the one thing the border provides above other possible destinations, as their primary place of residence. I've spoken about a few ways in which population factors may have a direct impact on the conversion of border forests in the tropics. In the retreat of frontier woods, factors such as fertility, age and gender distributions, different stages of the family life cycle, and rural-rural migration interact with political, economic, and ecological dynamics. The study of population-environment dynamics has generated a sizable body of literature. Yet important issues in both theory and research remain unanswered. In order to reevaluate the Malthus vs Boserup dispute in light of the data mentioned in this study, I now return to the theoretical discussion from the beginning [9].

Scale, location, and frontier LUCC: Reconciling Malthus and Boserup

There are many theoretically sound and experimentally confirmed population-environment connections. Why then do academics still engage in contentious Malthus vs. Boserup arguments? Dualistic "straw-man" arguments disprove the complementary subtleties of Malthusian and Boserian reasoning. Malthusian theories have sometimes been rejected in modern human-environment dialogue as being excessively simple and lacking to appropriately account for exploitative and unequal economic and institutional institutions. The growth of human populations will undoubtedly increase human impacts on the landscape, even though Malthus overlooked the tempering effect of technological advancements. Irrespective of migration and mortality patterns, over time and at the global level, this growth will not occur unless women have at least two children, on average. With no compensatory mechanisms, the strain on forest resources will increase when women have significantly more children than two, as is usual in frontier situations. This is because there is more work to be done on the farm and more mouths to feed.

At the farm, national, and regional levels, statistics typically suggest a positive correlation between deforestation and population increase, despite the fact that fixed variables would be very atypical of a complex open system, as is the relationship between people and the environment. Similar to the Ricardo's corollary of decreasing returns, agriculture development has been claiming more and more environmentally and climatically unstable territory. The Boserian hypothesis is unable to contradict this. Boserup did nevertheless provide clarity to a new aspect of the argument. Agricultural intensification has compensated for rising population densities, allowing a rise in the food/person ratio over the second part of the 20th century, with the exception of the extremely poorest sub-regions of the globe. However, rather than fallow intensification, the Green Revolution and fertilizer usage are mostly to blame for this growth. Additionally, research from the developing world, especially agricultural frontiers, has shown how human density may lead to both agricultural intensification and environmental deterioration [10].

CONCLUSION

It is important to consider the political, economic, and ecological factors in connection to the Malthusian, Boserian, and other theories of population change. A start in the right direction toward comprehending these layered causal connections is the notion of proximal and underlying causes. In this light, population dynamics are one of the major forces for border deforestation. The main demographic reason for border deforestation is in-migration. The establishment of new farms on present and prospective borders is, however, further encouraged by the extremely high fertility that frontier areas sometimes exhibit. Insufficient demographic data plagues both unconnected macro-scale studies and the tiny, fragmented case studies that now make up the majority of research on the local population ties to frontier forest conversion. Estimates based on inconsistent resolutions and measurements have restricted research. Due to the ecological fallacy being committed at the conceptual level or to data constraints at the empirical level, the scale of outcome variables are typically not evaluated at scales corresponding with the hypothesized causes. Further research is required to determine the circumstances and geographical scales at which population growth or other socioeconomic and political incentives will cause agricultural intensification, as well as whether or not this intensification will result in more or less destruction of forests. In newly inhabited borders, where almost any studies on frontier land use have been carried out yet and where a significant number of forests have been and will continue to be destroyed in the humid tropics, research might be used fruitfully.
To relate in situ border forest conversion's impacts on fertility and family life cycles to meso- and macro-scale dynamics, further study is required. Theories of household formation and family size continue to be mostly centered on rural agricultural research from conventional peasant communities rather than in dynamic, labor-scarce, land-abundant frontier situations. The degree to which theories of household work and consumer demand influence family planning and birth spacing in such settings needs to be investigated. The unusually high fertility of frontier areas is unquestionably influenced by the lack of access to contraception and infant and maternal health care in isolated rural settlements. Since some evidence from rural Amazonia suggests that fertility is rapidly declining, research on the causes of this decline and how the frontier fertility transition compares to the western demographic transition of the 19th century and the urban developing world transition of the 21st century could be fruitful.
The possibility for future deforestation is not where farms are already located, but rather where they may be in the future, since migration is a need for frontier forest conversion. Future studies are required to clarify the underlying but distant connection between migration and frontier deforestation as well as any possible impacts of migration from frontier farms on farmland usage. The possible impact of emigration on frontier farm LUCC raises a number of fascinating considerations. Who makes up the tiny proportion of migrants in the globe who choose to go to the border? What degree of geographical homogeneity and place-specificity do political-economic, demographic, ecological, and historical situations exhibit? Furthermore, how can possible outmigration movements from the frontier affect the processes of land use there and on upcoming agricultural frontiers after frontier settlement? Understanding not just how farmers now manage land on frontier farms, but also how and why out-migration to the frontier happens in the first place, will greatly increase our understanding of future frontier deforestation. Researchers that go on in this uncharted territory might pave the way for future connections between demography and human-environment studies.

REFERENCES

[1] D. L. Carr, “Proximate population factors and deforestation in tropical agricultural frontiers,” Population and Environment. 2004. doi: 10.1023/B:POEN.0000039066.05666.8d.
[2] D. López-Carr, “A review of small farmer land use and deforestation in tropical forest frontiers: Implications for conservation and sustainable livelihoods,” Land, 2021, doi: 10.3390/land10111113.
[3] D. L. Carr, “Migration to the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala: Why place matters,” Hum. Organ., 2008, doi: 10.17730/humo.67.1.lvk2584002111374.
[4] K. M. Silvius, “Deforestation and land use in the Amazon,” Ecol. Econ., 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2003.10.006.
[5] D. Carr, “Population, rural development, and land use among settler households in an agricultural frontier in Guatemala’s Maya Biosphere Reserve,”

Geogr. Rev., 2013.

[6] J. O. Browder, "Surviving in Rondônia: The dynamics of colonist farming strategies in Brazil's Northwest frontier," Stud. Comp. Int. Dev., 1994, doi: 10.1007/BF02687148.

[7] N. Lele, H. Nagendra, and J. Southworth, "Accessibility, demography and protection: Drivers of forest stability and change at multiple scales in the Cauvery Basin, India" Remote Sens., 2010, doi: 10.3390/rs2010306.

[8] M. A. Pedlowski et al., "Conservation units: A new deforestation frontier in the Amazonian state of Rondônia, Brazil," Environ. Conserv., 2005, doi: 10.1017/S0376892905002134.

[9] I. Cléroux and J.-M. Salles, "Modélisation économique de la dynamique des forêts tropicales : une revue de la littérature," Cah. d'Economie Sociol. Rural., 1996, doi: 10.3406/reae.1996.1516.

[10] F. Michalski, C. A. Peres, and J. P. Metzger, "Predicting the spatial distribution of four sympatric species of mid-sized carnivores in an Amazonian deforestation frontier," in Middle-Sized Carnivores in Agricultural Landscapes, 2011.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

A Review of Agricultural Technologies in India

Dr. Arudi Shashikala
Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-shashikalaar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: For nations like India optimizing agricultural techniques to increase crop output is seen as a crucial phenomenon. The need to optimize agricultural methods has arisen in order to support the economy and also to provide the food needed to feed the world's population, which is expanding fast. Weather and geography are quite unpredictable in India and they were considered to be the main obstacles to more productive farming operations. India's agricultural practices are confronted with a number of difficulties, including changing meteorological conditions, diverse geographic environments, traditional farming techniques, as well as the country's economic and political climate. Another significant issue in the nation is the economic loss brought on by a lack of knowledge about agricultural yield productivity. By integrating cutting-edge technology into agriculture, these obstacles may be addressed.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Goods, Agricultural Techniques, Cutting-Edge Technology, India's Agricultural.

INTRODUCTION

The foundation of both food security and survival is agriculture. The existence of mankind as it exists now relies mostly on agri based foods. The fact that the bulk of the people in India is vegetarian and primarily relies on agricultural goods for sustenance makes it a nation that is heavily reliant on agriculture. Being an agriculturally oriented country, yearly crop yields of agricultural techniques have a major impact on the country's economy. According to a recent poll, more than 60% of the population is involved in agriculture, while the bulk of the remainder are involved in other agricultural operations. Other aspects of agricultural activities include businesses that manufacture agricultural equipment, sell fertilizer, market crop yields, etc. In order to establish environmental balance, agriculture operations assist people in raising the most essential food crops and the optimal animal population. Major food crops including rice, wheat, cereals, pulses, diverse vegetables like onions, potatoes, sugarcane, oil seeds, mango, oranges, and red chillies, as well as a variety of commercial crops like coconut, coffee, tea, cotton, rubber, and jute, are all grown by farmers in countries like India. Nearly 70% of people living in rural areas rely on agriculture for their daily needs [1].

Over 60 to 70 percent of India's population works in agriculture, which accounts for about 18% of the nation's overall GDP. India now ranks second in the world for agriculturally based goods. The cultivation of numerous agricultural products has a profound impact on the nation's economy and is crucial to the entire socio-economic structure of the nation. The fertility of the soil, climatic conditions, weather forecast, temperature, water level with rainfall measures, irrigation condition, fertilizer availability, pesticide use, controlling weed population, cultivation process, harvesting methods used, and economic and political scenarios all have a significant impact on the success rates of agricultural practices. The majority of the former communities in India forecast crop yield using conventional practice and knowledge of prior experiences, but this approach may not be effective on its own because the climatic conditions continue to change significantly as a result of the overall change in weather forecast at the global level. Agro-based big data analytics, a more scientific technique with technological advancement, is crucial to solving this problem [2].

Big data analytics offers the chance to examine the key variables that affect crop output as well as the effects of politics, economics, and society on the likelihood that certain agricultural techniques will be successful. Higher crop yields may be attained by expanding the total amount of land that is appropriate for cultivation of a certain crop, as well as by reducing crop damage and overall operating costs via the use of excellent agricultural methods. Controlling the key elements of agricultural practice, such as fertilizer type and amount, water supplies and levels, quality of the seed used for cropping, reduction of biotic stress produced by weeds and pests, and management of abiotic stress, may result in an increased crop yield. Physical crop inspection and manual weeding and contamination removal are examples of manual, traditional procedures that are not particularly successful and have substantial limits in enabling improved agricultural yields. On the other hand, the use of sensor-mounted procedures may help us understand the requirements of the developing crop in a much more scientific manner. One such technology is big data analytics, which offers the chance to examine the numerous aspects that affect crop yields in order to create the ideal conditions for increased crop yields and also aids in developing marketing strategies for agricultural yields [3].

Due to the country's transition from an agricultural to a service-based economy and the fact that agriculture now provides the primary source of income for roughly 60% of the Indian people, agricultural technology and its ongoing development are of highest significance for India. As a result, one of the important industries with significant development potential for the Indian economy is agriculture. The role of rural women and rural businesses is crucial. Senior Regional Manager for India Mohaa Vyas, offers commentary on recent events. One of the oldest businesses in India has adopted digitalization and transformation in response to global upheaval. By 2025, the agriculture technology market might bring in over USD 24 billion in revenue. It now represents less than 1% of the market's potential [4].

Drones for farming and similar devices are no longer futuristic technology. The Indian agriculture industry has transformed and adapted to the digital age. Significant adjustments have been made in the scalability, speed, productivity of agricultural equipment, and technology revolutions via AI, sensors, and analytics in order to produce an effective, resilient, and sustainable industry. Image source: sarawuth702 / istock.com. Crops have been transformed as a consequence, allowing them to flourish in any environment, grow more quickly, and provide greater harvests. Food security is significant in this context for both India and the whole globe. Policymakers are eager to find especially practical methods to employ technology in agriculture in light of this. In this, agricultural technology will be crucial.

India's use of technology in agriculture

In the near future, the industry will be given access to cutting-edge technology like IoT, AI/ML, and agricultural drones for aerial surveys. Both Indian and international agri-tech businesses will be crucial in offering this technology to farmers. Only a few providers are now active on the market, although they claim to provide for almost 267 million farmers nationwide. Therefore, there are definitely chances for the private sector and international corporations to increase their brand recognition in the nation. The affordability of the technologies, the ease of use and operation of the systems, the simplicity of system maintenance, and the government's support of development are anticipated to be the primary factors determining the success of digital agriculture in India. Agriculture may enhance its procedures and manage and regulate its operations more simply in the future with the aid of contemporary technology [5].

In turn, this will aid in lowering total water use, avoiding the overuse of pesticides and fertilizers during crop production, increasing productivity and lowering production costs, preventing soil erosion, minimizing adverse environmental and ecological effects, and enhancing farmers' socioeconomic standing. With the help of numerous digital agricultural applications based on remote sensing, ground sensors, unmanned aerial photography, and market information, technological advancements enable farmers to collect, visualize, and evaluate crop and soil health. As a result, farming is more practical and affordable, and it can be employed at many phases of the production process. Any issues that arise throughout the procedure may be quickly fixed [6].

The introduction of specific initiatives and advancements in agricultural technology. The government also plans to put in place tailored measures to encourage entrepreneurship in agriculture and innovation. In order to do this, 24 agribusiness incubators and five expert centers have been developed around India. Additionally, financial assistance is given to start-ups in agribusiness and agri technology. 779 businesses working in agriculture and agri technology have previously been founded under this initiative. The development of the agricultural industry is related to many processes in supply chains, from production to processing, distribution to retail, as well as improvements in the technical capabilities of farmers and their equipment. Networks and supply chains are essential for giving manufacturers access to markets and sales. They have an effect on communities with an agricultural economy, society, and environment. There is consequently a huge opportunity to introduce new technologically enabled advances in the agriculture industry. Sustainability in agriculture will be crucial for future generations. After all, only via sustainable practices and cutting-edge technology can the supply of resources be sufficiently ensured going forward [7].

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

DISCUSSION

Using cutting-edge technology that are integrated into a single system, digital agriculture enables farmers and other players in the agricultural value chain to increase food output. An advanced strategy known as "digital agriculture" may assist the farmers in understanding their agricultural operations in a much better and effective way in a real time manner as compared to traditional and sensor based approaches. As a result, digital agriculture has a significant influence on increasing crop yields by providing farmers with the necessary scientific information to carry out sound agricultural practices [8], [9].

The digital agricultural user interface system gives formers the chance to express their thoughts. Additionally, it gives them information of the many methods of crop growing used across the world for that specific crop and equips them with modern technology and commercial acumen to make their agricultural operations profitable ventures. Former farmers may preserve their traditional agricultural methods with the support of digital agriculture, which also offers helpful information to keep their knowledge and skills current. It also offers the chance to look back on past data in order to comprehend diverse circumstances and challenges and gather crucial knowledge for making the best judgments. The installation of reliable automated systems with shorter development times and lower costs is required by composite agricultural practices paired with strict and improved crop production. Controlling the different pollutants that encourage crop damage is one way to improve agricultural safety in the present environment. In order to increase crop yields, agricultural automation systems such as field equipment, irrigation systems, greenhouse automation, animal automation systems, and automation of fruit production systems are used.

By 2050, the world's population is expected to be close to 10 billion, according to a recent poll. Governments have a significant issue in feeding these vast populations, which is almost impossible given the limited amount of arable land and traditional farming practices. The implementation of smart agricultural practices and the use of IoT technology in agriculture are the only ways to handle this enormous task and get past crop-limiting obstacles like biotic and abiotic stress, crop failure, crop damage, loss of productivity, and waste in order to advance agricultural practices. IoAT refers to the use of numerous sensors to track various variables in real-time, including light intensity, humidity percentage, temperature measurements, soil moisture content, etc. IoAT also aids in the automation of irrigation systems to cut down on water waste. The IoAT offers a wide range of advantages, but some of the most significant advantages include sensor-based field monitoring, efficient resource mapping, remote crop monitoring, climate monitoring and forecasting, controlled fertilizer and pesticide use, and finally the precise prediction of crop yield [10].

Analytics and Data Mining

Agriculture decision support systems (DSS) are well assisted by data mining technologies. As, the primary goal of the data mining operations is to extract the information from the already accessible data sets and then convert it using certain tools into a distinct format that is intelligible and usable for advanced purposes. Data mining aids in studies of soil fertility and gives farmers the ability to choose a certain crop type that will provide a higher yield. The basic goal of soil classification is to rank the options for usage by predicting the engineering qualities and fertilizer of soil. The presently available statistical methods and laboratory tests need a significant investment in terms of time, effort, and money. For the accurate and effective solution of vast and complicated soil data sets, more effective methods may be developed. The properties of the soil, air pollution, and variables affecting agricultural output may be studied using data mining methods based on GPS, the k-means approach, SVMs, and the K-nearest fertilization method.

Strategies for Predicting the Weather

The influence of climate change on human life is one of the biggest obstacles facing agriculture. Big Data has had less of an influence on enhanced environmental knowledge than in other industries like e-commerce and advertising, which have benefited greatly from it. The complicated structure of the climatic data is constrained by this contradiction. Large climate datasets have been mined using big data analytics, with an emphasis on the contrasts between standard big data and mining climate data methodologies. Climate change has an influence on plant development and, as a result, agricultural output in India. The length of the crop is drastically shortened as a result of the rise in temperatures. The pattern of pest attack has changed as a consequence of an increase in crop respiration rate. The majority of crops have struggled to respond to the substantially longer summer days and have acclimated poorly to the growth season and day lengths of the middle and lower latitudes. Reduced agricultural output results from increased temperature accelerating the rate of CO_2

emission during warmer seasons. One may determine the precise change in the agricultural environment of India by gathering data on rainfall and temperature over the last five years and analyzing the data using various big data analytics methods.

CONCLUSION

There are several methods that may be utilized to increase the quality and quantity of crops, according to the study on technology utilization in agriculture. In India unlike other industrialized nations, maintaining the resources on which the production systems rely makes it difficult to accomplish the projected development. A number of factors affect how well quality farming is used. Digital agriculture, precision agriculture, crop yield analytics, and other innovations in the agricultural sector are the consequence of the use of technology. In India a major portion of the population works in agriculture, yet there is a technological divide between the farmers and the industry. Governments have used a variety of techniques in agriculture to assist farmers in using technology. Despite this, there is a need for user-friendly, simple-to-understand agro advising systems to assist farmers in making decisions about the crops they should plant. These technological advancements should assist farmers in obtaining the highest yield while spending less money at various stages of crop development. There is need for further study in this field.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Kelly, J. M. L. Bennett, and A. Starasts, "Networked learning for agricultural extension: a framework for analysis and two cases," J. Agric. Educ. Ext., 2017, doi: 10.1080/1389224X.2017.1331173.

[2] A. Balkrishna, J. Sharma, H. Sharma, S. Mishra, S. Singh, S. Verma, and V. Arya, "Agricultural mobile apps used in india: Current status and gap analysis," Agric. Sci. Dig., 2021, doi: 10.18805/ag.D-5140.

[3] P. Sakthivel, K. A. Subramanian, and R. Mathai, "Indian scenario of ethanol fuel and its utilization in automotive transportation sector," Resources, Conservation and Recycling. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.01.012.

[4] A. U. Sahoo, G. Sahu, A. Behera, and H. Raheman, "A Review on Solar and Battery Technology for Sustainable Agricultural Mechanization in India" Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci., 2020, doi: 10.20546/ijcmas.2020.912.109.

[5] M. Valipour, J. Krasilnikof, S. Yannopoulos, R. Kumar, J. Deng, P. Roccaro, L. Mays, M. E. Grismer, and A. N. Angelakis, "The evolution of agricultural drainage from the earliest times to the present," Sustainability (Switzerland). 2020. doi: 10.3390/SU12010416.

[6] K. R. Sai Sravanth and N. Sundaram, "Agricultural crisis and farmers suicides in India" Int. J. Innov. Technol. Explor. Eng., 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijitee.K1855.0981119.

[7] A. S. Natu and S. C. Kulkarni, "Adoption and Utilization of Drones for Advanced Precision Farming: A Review," Int. J. Recent Innov. Trends Comput. Commun., 2016.

[8] H. Mishra and P. Maheshwari, "Blockchain in Indian Public Distribution System: a conceptual framework to prevent leakage of the supplies and its enablers and disablers," J. Glob. Oper. Strateg. Sourc., 2021, doi: 10.1108/JGOSS-07-2020-0044.

[9] F. Production et al., The future of food and agriculture: trends and challenges. 2014.

[10] P. C. Abhilash and N. Singh, "Pesticide use and application: An Indian scenario," Journal of Hazardous Materials. 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2008.10.061.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Deforestation's Hidden Effects on Climate: Biophysical Consequences

Dr. Nikhath Fathima
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-nikhathfathima@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: To assess the potential of forests to reduce global warming, climate policy has up to now only looked at carbon stocks and sequestration. These variables are used to evaluate the effects of various deforestation and forest degradation causes as well as non-conventional forest management. Changes in biophysical processes, however, may increase or decrease the climatic consequences of carbon emitted from forest aboveground biomass as forest cover, structure, and composition vary. The consequences for forest and agricultural species, as well as the people who rely on them, are determined by the net climatic impact of carbon impacts and biophysical effects. The many spatiotemporal scales at which they operate make it difficult to determine the overall effect. Here, we summarize current research on the biophysical climate forcing of forests across latitudes and explore the biophysical processes by which forests affect climate. Then, in order to quantify how these processes, interact to affect local and global climate, we integrate previous data on the biophysical impacts of deforestation on temperature by latitude with a fresh study of the climatic impact of CO_2 in forest aboveground biomass by latitude. We discover that both CO_2 and biophysical impacts of tropical deforestation result in significant net global warming. Standing forests provide local and global biophysical cooling from the tropics to a point between 30°N and 40°N, enhancing the global cooling impact of CO_2 sequestered by forests. Deforestation causes a tiny amount of net global warming in the mid-latitudes up to 50°N because the warming from released forest carbon balances a small amount of opposing biophysical cooling. Large-scale deforestation north of 50°N causes a net global cooling because biophysical mechanisms predominate over warming from emitted CO_2. Forest biophysical benefits locally dominate CO_2 effects at all latitudes, ensuring local climatic stability by lowering extreme temperatures throughout the year and at all hours of the day. Current carbon-centric measures, especially in the context of projected climate warming, do not fully represent the significance of forests for both global climate change mitigation and local adaptation by human and non-human species.

KEYWORDS: Biophysical Consequences, Climate, Carbon-Centric Measures, Deforestation's, Forest.

INTRODUCTION

Inability to stabilize the climate poses a serious threat to biodiversity, which is already under danger due to deforestation. Some of the most potential natural solutions to the issue of keeping global warming below 1.5–2 degrees Celsius include the preservation, growth, and better management of the world's forests. Over 360 Pg of the 450–650 Pg of carbon contained in vegetation which is sequestered by forests is in forest vegetation. Forests hold around 800 PgC, which is nearly as much as is now stored in the atmosphere when you include the carbon in soils. In addition, forests account for a significant portion of the 29% of yearly CO_2 emissions removed by terrestrial ecosystems. In addition to adding a lot of carbon to the atmosphere globally, forest loss also drastically reduces one of the main pathways for removing carbon from the atmosphere over a very long time [1], [2]. Tropical forests, which store the most aboveground biomass and sequester carbon at one of the quickest rates per unit of land area, are under the most pressure to stop being forests. Since atmospheric CO_2 has a long half-life and is homogeneous, the consequences of present forest management choices on CO_2 alone will have a long-lasting influence on the global climate. Albedo, evapotranspiration, and canopy roughness are the three fundamental biophysical processes that forests manage, and they all have an influence on climate directly.

Local climatic conditions are tempered by woods' direct biophysical impacts. Compared to brighter surfaces like bare soil, agricultural fields, or snow, trees absorb a higher portion of incoming sunlight as a consequence of their comparatively low albedo. The radiation balance at the top of the atmosphere and subsequently the global temperature may be affected by changes in albedo. But in addition to variations in albedo, woods' ability to divide solar energy into latent and sensible heat has an influence on the surrounding temperature. Forests are particularly effective in moving water from the ground surface to the sky through ET, producing latent heat. This is due to their deep roots and large leaf area [3]. The sensible heat flow and corresponding surface temperature are therefore low under the forest canopy, particularly during the growth season when ET is high. The relatively high canopy roughness contributes to this cooling by strengthening vertical mixing and removing heat and water vapor from the surface. The latent heat is converted into perceptible heat higher in the atmosphere when water vapor condenses. Because of this, warmth that started when sunlight hit the canopy is felt higher in the sky as opposed to the air close to the ground. By lowering the seasonal temperature extremes as well as the daily temperature range, these non-radiative mechanisms stabilize the local climate. However, it is less certain how they affect the climate generally [4].

Forest biophysical effects do follow predictable latitudinal patterns despite substantial spatial diversity. In the tropics, increased levels of solar radiation and moisture availability give ET and convection more energy, which when combined with roughness overcomes the warming impact of low albedo and leads to year-round cooling by trees. The effects of ET and surface roughness are reduced at higher latitudes, when incoming solar energy is extremely seasonal, and albedo is the main biophysical factor influencing the climatic response. Low ET and relatively low albedo in boreal woods lead to significant winter and spring warming. Boreal woods provide a little amount of cooling in the summer because to increased incoming radiation and somewhat higher ET. Forest cover causes a little biophysical evaporative cooling in the summer and a slight albedo warming in the winter in the mid-latitudes. The literature indicates that the latitude at which the yearly impact of the forest changes from local cooling to local warming is between 30 and 56°N. Aridity, elevation, species composition, and other variables that vary across a variety of geographical scales might alter these broad latitudinal patterns [5].

DISCUSSION

A forest's direct effects on the energy and water balance may be amplified or muted by a number of processes, which can also affect the climate nearby, further away, or both. Since snow-forest albedo interactions are common in the boreal area, indirect biophysical consequences are especially significant there. High albedo snow is frequently hidden by low albedo trees, causing local radiative warming. On a bigger scale, this warmth caused by the forest is carried over to the seas and enhanced through interactions with sea ice. In reality, the global temperature response to deforestation in the boreal area seems to be dominated by indirect biophysical feedbacks. Depending on the pace at which forests spread northward and the size and permanence of spring snow cover in a warmer environment, future global warming may change the intensity of such feedbacks.

Forests supply the water vapor needed to promote cloud formation while also cooling the lower atmosphere in the tropics, where ET and roughness are the main biophysical factors. Clouds lighten the air above woods, increasing albedo, at least in part countering the forest's naturally low albedo. However, part of the cooling caused by cloud albedo is offset by the fact that water vapor in clouds both absorbs and radiates heat. Because of the Amazon basin's higher humidity levels and subsequently higher convective available potential energy, there is evidence that deep clouds may form more often over wooded regions. The effect of tropical deforestation on cloud formation is altered by aerosols from biomass burning, and the overall effect on the climate is unknown. For the modeling community, quantifying these indirect biophysical feedback effects is a constant problem, especially when it comes to limiting potential future climatic scenarios [6].

Quantifying the net climatic effect of forests is further complicated by the creation of biogenic volatile organic compounds in forests, which have an influence on both biogeochemical and biophysical processes. Secondary organic aerosols, which are highly reflective and cause physiological cooling, are regulated by BVOC and the oxidation products that come from them. Additionally, SOA serve as cloud condensation nuclei, boosting droplet concentrations and cloud albedo in the process. This results in extra biophysical cooling. On the other side, SOA may also result in latent heat release in deep convective cloud systems, strongly warming the atmosphere via radiative action. In addition, BVOC enhance the lifespan of methane and cause the creation of tropospheric ozone in the presence of nitrogen oxides through having an effect on the oxidative capacity of the atmosphere. Ozone and methane's persistence has a biogeochemical warming impact. Forest BVOC's overall impact, both locally and globally, is yet unknown. If indirect cloud impacts are taken into account, current data from modeling forest loss since 1850 implies that BVOC result in a slight net cooling.

In the tropics, where BVOC generation is greatest, the impact is maximum [7].

To inform policy choices that assist global climate mitigation, local adaptation, and biodiversity preservation, a better knowledge of the combined impacts of forest carbon and biophysical constraints on both local and global climate is required. The regional and chronological scale of interest greatly influences the relative significance of forest carbon storage and biophysical impacts on climate. The incremental effect of atmospheric CO_2 removed by trees developing in a specific landscape or watershed may not affect local surface or air temperature. Local temperature, however, is susceptible to biophysical changes in albedo, ET, and roughness. We can compare these affects in a practical way at regional and global sizes when the cumulative effects of forests on atmospheric CO_2 become evident in the temperature response. Model simulations of extensive deforestation or afforestation have mostly been used to estimate the relative influence of biophysical and biogeochemical processes on global or zonal climate. These studies often demonstrate that the effects of CO_2 on the earth's temperature outweigh those of forest cover and forest decline on a biophysical level by a factor of several times. However, only 10–90% of the global biophysical cooling is compensated by global warming from CO_2 release in models that show global or zonal deforestation outside of the tropics. Total deforestation in the tropics has a far greater global CO_2 impact than it does a biophysical one. All of these studies, with the exception of Davin and de Noblet-Ducoudré, have evaluated the net contribution of biophysical processes without separating out the various biophysical parts. Here, we provide a fresh examination of the warming effects of CO_2 on deforestation by 10° latitudinal steps. In order to understand the possible net effect of forest loss in a specific location on local and global climate, we then compare the CO_2 effect with the only published assessment of biophysical impacts by latitude.

All Forests Have Biophysical Effects That Help Local Climate

Ignoring biophysical influences on local climate means ignoring local self-interest, a potent incentive to achieve global climate objectives and enhance forest conservation. Because physical impacts in one place might cancel out effects in another, the biogeochemical influence of forests often outweighs the biophysical effect at the global level. Nevertheless, at the local scale, biophysical impacts may have a significant impact and be extremely enormous. Although it is commonly known that forests play a crucial role in sustaining habitat for biodiversity, recent extinction research has shown that forests also play a crucial part in preserving the climates needed to support biodiversity. Extinction is caused by changes in maximum temperature, not by changes in average temperature. In the tropics throughout the year and in the summer at higher latitudes, deforestation is linked to an increase in the maximum daily temperature. Naturally, deforestation raises daytime temperatures in tropical, mid-latitude, and boreal forests. Even at the mid- and high latitudes, the biophysical impacts of forests help to buffer local and regional temperature extremes, making very hot days far more frequent after destruction. 1/3 of the current rise in the intensity of the warmest days of the year at a particular place may be attributed to historical deforestation. Additionally, it has two to four times increased both the frequency and severity of hot, dry summers. Localized increases in intense heat owing to forest loss are on par with those brought on by a 0.5°C rise in global warming. The resilience of cities, agriculture, and conservation areas is increased by the local cooling that forests give during the planet's warmest seasons. The ability to adapt to a warmer world depends on forests.

Additionally, forests reduce the hazards brought on by excessive heat and drought. Trees are able to continue transpiring under drought circumstances and so disperse heat and release moisture into the environment because too deep roots, excellent water usage efficiency, and high surface roughness. Along with this indirect cooling, forest ET has the ability to affect cloud formation, improving albedo and perhaps increasing rainfall. With rising temperatures, trees produce more BVOCs and organic aerosols, which enhances direct or indirect albedo effects. Anomalous heat episodes in the mid-latitudes have been seen to be countered by this negative feedback on temperature.

Some forests have biophysical effects that help the global climate

Neglecting the biophysical impacts of certain woods on the planet's climate entails exaggerating some forest behaviors while underplaying others. For equal sized regions at various latitudes, the reaction to local forest change is not identical. Arora and Montenegro claim that the tropics experience three times more warming reductions per unit of forest cover than the boreal and northern temperate zones because of a quicker rate of carbon sequestration that is amplified by year-round biophysical cooling. Thus, taking into account biophysical factors greatly improves both the local and global climate benefits of tropical land-based mitigation programs [8].

Future Forest Climate Benefits are limited by Various Factors

The biophysical impact of forests is anticipated to vary in a number of ways as a result of climate change. Due to larger reductions in turbulent heat fluxes, deforestation in a future climate might warm the tropical surface by 25% more than deforestation in a current climate. Reduced snow cover in the temperate and boreal areas will result in less albedo impact and, hence, less biophysical cooling with high latitude deforestation in a warmer climate. Future rainfall patterns will have an impact on how the climate reacts to changes in forest cover in addition to changing the amount of snow cover since rainfall reduces the amount of moisture available for evaporative cooling. The local cooling impact of forests may be diminished if water usage efficiency increases as a result of rising atmospheric CO_2, which may also change the dynamics and moisture content of the atmosphere on a local to global scale. Future BVOC production might rise as a result of warming while also falling as a result of CO_2 suppression. The biophysical impact of future forests on climate is unknown due to the physiological and biological reactions of forests to warming, increasing atmospheric CO_2, and changing precipitation [9].

For carbon dioxide to continue to be removed from the atmosphere and for the physical processes mentioned above to continue producing local and global benefits, forests must remain. In many regions of the globe, shifting disturbance regimes might restrict the establishment and renewal of forests. Current and future dynamic global vegetation models predict an expanding terrestrial carbon sink. This sink is hypothesized to be caused by the elongation of the growing season in northern temperate and boreal regions as a result of climate change, as well as the effects of fertilization on plant growth caused by increased atmospheric CO_2 and N deposition. Increases in biomass accumulation are often seen in free-air carbon dioxide enrichment studies, although outcomes are very varied because of nutritional constraints and climate variables. Although the consequences of climate change on the frequency and severity of pest outbreaks are poorly understood, they are expected to have a major impact, especially when host ranges are thin. Increased stress on the tree hosts and direct impacts on insect populations brought on by warmer springs and winters are already increasing insect-related tree mortality in boreal forests.

Fire regimes are impacted by the climate. Fire regimes often accompany El Nio cycles in the tropics. However, when temperatures rise, fire and precipitation become less correlated because woods become more flammable even in years with average precipitation. There is a discernible temperature change signal in certain temperate and boreal forests, where fire frequency is also rising. Modeling exercises show that when temperatures rise and fire severity rises, this tendency is predicted to continue with increased damage to forests [10].

Continued deforestation might severely stress existing forests in addition to the changes brought on by global warming by warming and drying local and regional climates. A tipping point may occur in the tropics, which might lead to a switch to shorter, more savannah-like vegetation and change the effect of enormous, formerly wooded regions on the climate. Climate models take some of these processes into account while others do not. There is a lot of ambiguity due to the gaps. We nonetheless have a thorough grasp of the biophysical influences of forests on climate at local, regional, and global dimensions thanks to a mix of facts, models, and theory. This information may be used to develop forest-based climate mitigation and adaption strategies.

Forests' Potential for Mitigation: Moving Beyond the Biophysical/Carbon Divide

A different picture emerges if we concentrate on the capacity of forests to cool the world via both channels as opposed to contrasting the biophysical and biochemical effects of forests versus forest loss. According to our cautious estimate, woods up to 50°N provide enough to net global cooling to counteract heat brought on by their poor albedo via the combined impacts on CO_2, BVOC, roughness, and evapotranspiration. Benefits of global climate stabilization are probably felt north of 50°N, given the most anticipated future paths of forest change. Forests may warm the world for the 29% of the earth's land area that is located north of 50°N, but only if the impacts of total zonal deforestation are included together with all the strong land-ocean feedbacks caused by large-scale forest change in the boreal zone. Like forests elsewhere, woods above 50°N contribute to the stability of local climate by lowering surface temperatures throughout the warm season as well as during times of excessive heat or drought. They do, in fact, also lessen acute cold.

Paying attention to all the ways that forests impact climate, including the biophysical aspects, is necessary to establish a fair and efficient global marketplace for market-based solutions to climate change. Future measures of forest climate impacts must take into account deforestation's implications beyond carbon dioxide emissions. Modelers have just lately started to take BVOC into account. This results in the development of SOA and subsequent cloud formation, which raises the albedo of intact forests. Thus, the biophysical cooling impact of deforestation is less when it is modeled since there is less of a change in albedo. Similar to this, taking into consideration how BVOC affects ozone and methane lessens the biogeochemical warming caused by deforestation. Deforestation also weakens the capacity of the soil to absorb carbon dioxide, particularly in the tropics. The loss of this sink is equal to around 13% of the present rate of rise in atmospheric CH_4, while being a negligible change in comparison to the atmospheric pool of CH_4. We already have the information necessary to start thinking about ways to roughly scale the CO_2 implications of changing forests according to latitude. Any such new, qualifying measure for the climate mitigation value of forests would be improved by finer resolution of latitude, background climate, and forest type.

CONCLUSION

The conventional idea of CO_2 mitigation, which ignores the local climate regulation services that forests offer, is just one aspect of the role that forests play in addressing climate change. At any latitude, the biophysical consequences of forest cover may make a substantial contribution to resolving local adaptation issues like severe heat and floods. At every latitude, woods provide carbon benefits that significantly reduce global warming. The biophysical impacts of forests, on the other hand, magnify the carbon benefits in the tropics, where forest carbon stocks and sequestration rates are greatest. This highlights the crucial relevance of maintaining, enhancing, and managing tropical forests. Maybe it's time to consider global climate mitigation in a broader sense. Deforestation's biophysical impacts must be taken into account in addition to its effects on atmospheric CO_2 if climate mitigation is to prevent global warming. We may also think about whether the focus on mitigation is too limited when it comes to the advantages woods provide for the climate. Although climate policies often distinguish between mitigation and adaptation, there is little doubt that forests have positive effects on both.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Xiao, “Satellite evidence for significant biophysical consequences of the ‘grain for Green’ Program on the loess plateau in China,” J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences, 2014, doi: 10.1002/2014JG002820.

[2] C. Richter, “Biophysical consequences of lipid peroxidation in membranes,” Chem. Phys. Lipids, 1987, doi: 10.1016/0009-3084(87)90049-1.

[3] M. Prem, S. Saavedra, and J. F. Vargas, “End-of-conflict deforestation: Evidence from Colombia’s peace agreement,” World Dev., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104852.

[4] J. Zhang, Y. H. Spitz, M. Steele, C. Ashjian, R. Campbell, and A. Schweiger, “Biophysical Consequences of a Relaxing Beaufort Gyre,” Geophys. Res. Lett., 2020, doi: 10.1029/2019GL085990.

[5] J. C. A. Baker and D. V. Spracklen, “Climate Benefits of Intact Amazon Forests and the Biophysical Consequences of Disturbance,” Front. For. Glob. Chang., 2019, doi: 10.3389/ffgc.2019.00047.

[6] N. Villalonga, M. David, J. Biejanska, R. Vicente, N. Comes, C. Valenzuela, and A. Felipe, “Immunomodulation of voltage-dependent K+ channels in macrophages: Molecular and biophysical consequences,” J. Gen. Physiol., 2010, doi: 10.1085/jgp.200910334.

[7] A. Renner, J. J. Cadillo-Benalcazar, L. Benini, and M. Giampietro, “Environmental pressure of the European agricultural system: Anticipating the biophysical consequences of internalization,” Ecosyst. Serv., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101195.

[8] “The Land-Water-Energy Nexus: Biophysical and Economic Consequences,” Water Intell. Online, 2017, doi: 10.2166/9781780409283.

[9] M. A. Moseng, J. C. Nix, and R. C. Page, “Biophysical Consequences of EVEN-PLUS Syndrome Mutations for the Function of Mortalin,” J. Phys. Chem. B, 2019, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcb.9b00071.

[10] N. G. Smith, D. Lombardozzi, A. Tawfik, G. Bonan, and J. S. Dukes, “Biophysical consequences of photosynthetic temperature acclimation for climate,” J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 2017, doi: 10.1002/2016MS000732.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Indian Sustainable Forest Management

Dr. Ranganatha Sudhakar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id-ranganatha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Since 2000, India has been testing out the criteria and indicators approach to sustainable forest management. The Bhopal-India process project has worked over the years to develop a functioning framework for achieving sustainability objectives that are appropriate to the national forestry circumstances. For the communities, forests provide a broad variety of ecological, economic, and socio-cultural advantages that improve their quality of life. However, the dynamics of managing forests in a developing nation are distinct since the various benefits of forests are quite apparent in a setting with many stakeholders. Effective institutionalization and capacity-building, together with community application and monitoring of criteria and indicators, may provide us the tools we need to assess our aims for sustainability. In order to achieve the sustainability of our forest resources, this article examines the use of criteria and an indicator strategy for sustainable forest management. It also provides an overview of the current situation in the nation.

KEYWORDS: Economic, Forest Management, Indian Sustainable, Sustainable Forest.

INTRODUCTION

The 1970s saw a rise in concern about the depletion and deterioration of natural resources, which led to the current intensive worldwide debate on sustainable development and management. A typical definition of sustainable development is development that satisfies current demands without jeopardizing the capacity of future generations to satiate their own needs. Since the UNCED Conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, also known as the Earth Summit, where international forest principles were first formulated by world leaders and the first global policy on sustainable forest management was adopted, sustainable forest management has been recognized as a crucial element of sustainable development. In order to fulfill the social, economic, ecological, cultural, and spiritual needs, as well as to maintain and improve biological variety, forest resources and lands should be managed sustainably [1].

There are several programs and procedures in place across the globe to organize efforts toward sustainable forest management. The criterion and indicators method has now evolved into a powerful instrument for assessing, tracking, and reporting the sustainability of forest resources. In particular, under Goal, to ensure environmental stability, which contains Target integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs, and reverse the loss of environmental resources, some indicators relating to changes in forest area have been added to the 48 indicators of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals. It is measured by indicators 25 (the percentage of land area covered by forests) and 26 (the percentage of surface area protected from development to preserve biological variety). Ecological, economic, and socio-cultural well-being are all included into sustainable forest management. It is described as "the process of managing permanent forest land to achieve one or more clearly specified objectives of forest management with regard to the production of a continuous flow of desirable forest products and services without undue reduction of its inherent values and future productivity and without undue undesirable effects on the physical and social environment" by the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) [2].

Sustainability is not a universal, outside of human conceptualization, idea. Instead, it is constantly framed inside choices about the spatiotemporal scale and the kind of system that is to be maintained4. The criteria and indicators method offers a framework to define the characteristics and objectives of socio-cultural, economic, and ecological factors related to sustainability and analyze progress towards them because of the abstract nature of sustainability. India being a diverse and ecologically rich country, places significant emphasis on sustainable forest management. The Indian government, along with various organizations and local communities, has implemented several measures to promote sustainable practices and protect the country's forests. Here are some key aspects of sustainable forest management in India:

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

a) **Forest Conservation Policies:** India has a comprehensive legal framework for forest conservation, including the Forest Conservation Act, Wildlife Protection Act, and the Environment (Protection) Act. These laws aim to regulate activities such as deforestation, encroachment, and illegal logging, while promoting sustainable forest management.
b) **National Forest Policy:** India's National Forest Policy provides guidelines for the sustainable management and conservation of forests. It emphasizes the need to maintain environmental stability, protect biodiversity, and ensure the livelihoods of forest-dependent communities.
c) **Joint Forest Management (JFM):** Joint Forest Management is a collaborative approach involving local communities and the forest department in the management and protection of forests. Under JFM, local communities are involved in decision-making, afforestation, protection against forest fires, and sustainable use of forest resources. This approach helps in empowering communities and conserving forests simultaneously.
d) **Afforestation and Reforestation:** The Indian government has initiated large-scale afforestation and reforestation programs to increase forest cover and restore degraded lands. Projects like the National Afforestation Programme (NAP) and the Green India Mission aim to enhance tree cover, improve forest quality, and enhance ecosystem services.
e) **Community Forest Rights:** The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, commonly known as the Forest Rights Act (FRA), recognizes and vests forest rights and occupation of forestland in forest-dwelling communities. This act aims to protect the rights of local communities over forests and encourage their participation in sustainable forest management.
f) **Biodiversity Conservation:** India has established a network of protected areas, including national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, and biosphere reserves, to conserve biodiversity and ecosystems. These protected areas play a crucial role in preserving wildlife habitats and promoting sustainable tourism.
g) **Sustainable Forest Products and Certification:** The Indian government promotes the sustainable harvesting and trade of forest products. Certification schemes like the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) are gaining recognition, ensuring that forest products meet international sustainability standards.
h) **Forest Fire Management:** Forest fire management is a critical aspect of sustainable forest management in India. The Forest Survey of India monitors forest fires using remote sensing technology, and timely action is taken to control and prevent fires.
i) **Research and Capacity Building:** The Indian government invests in research and capacity building to enhance knowledge and skills related to sustainable forest management. Research institutions, universities, and NGOs conduct studies on forest ecology, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable forest practices.
j) **International Collaborations:** India actively participates in international collaborations and initiatives related to sustainable forest management. It is a member of the United Nations Forum on Forests and has engaged in partnerships with other countries to share knowledge, technology, and best practices [3], [4].

These initiatives and policies reflect India's commitment to sustainable forest management, aiming to balance environmental conservation, livelihoods, and economic development. However, challenges such as illegal logging, encroachment, and climate change impacts persist, requiring ongoing efforts to ensure the long-term sustainability of India's forests

DISCUSSION

Sustainable forest management is a crucial aspect of environmental conservation and socio-economic development in India. This abstract provides an overview of India's efforts in promoting sustainable forest management, highlighting key practices, policies, and challenges. India has established a comprehensive legal framework, including the Forest Conservation Act, Wildlife Protection Act, and Environment (Protection) Act, to regulate and protect forests. The National Forest Policy provides guidelines for sustainable forest management, emphasizing environmental stability, biodiversity conservation, and community livelihoods [5].

Joint Forest Management (JFM) initiatives have empowered local communities, involving them in decision-making, afforestation, and protection against forest fires. Afforestation and reforestation programs, such as the National Afforestation Programme and Green India Mission, focus on increasing forest cover and restoring degraded lands. Recognition of community forest rights under the Forest Rights Act has further empowered forest-dependent communities, ensuring their participation in sustainable forest management. Protected areas, including national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, and biosphere reserves, play a vital role in conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services. India promotes sustainable harvesting and trade of forest products through certification schemes like the Forest Stewardship Council and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification. Forest fire management, research, and capacity building initiatives are integral to sustainable forest management practices in India. While India has made commendable progress in sustainable forest management, challenges such as illegal logging, encroachment, and climate change impacts persist. Ongoing efforts are necessary to strengthen law enforcement, raise awareness, and foster international collaborations to address these challenges effectively [6], [7]. India's commitment to sustainable forest management demonstrates a balance between environmental conservation and socio-economic development. However, continuous vigilance and adaptive strategies are essential to ensure the long-term sustainability of India's forests in the face of evolving environmental and socio-economic contexts [8].

Manage Forests Sustainably

The lives of millions of forest dwellers and other impoverished people who live close to the woods have been challenged in recent decades by increased strain on the nation's natural resources. Any country's and its inhabitants' success has depended on its access to forest resources. They are a crucial natural resource that, in addition to serving other vital purposes like protecting biodiversity, storing carbon globally, and serving as a repository for potential future values, offers several advantages to mankind. Forest resources are used by both the wealthy and the poor, either directly or indirectly, and forestry is considered in many developing nations, notably India as a way to reduce rural poverty and achieve sustainable development. In India the demand on the country's remaining forest resources is enormous. We barely make up 2.5% of the earth's landmass and 1.85% of its forest cover, yet we are home to 17% of the world's people and 18% of its livestock9. In this context, it is essential to protect the forests and manage them responsibly in order to guarantee the people who rely on the woods have a stable way of life and to protect our biological variety.

There is a tendency toward only accepting those forest products that come from sustainably managed forests as a consequence of rising public awareness and several international treaties and conventions. It has become a system based on the market to encourage sustainable forest management. With regard to positioning forest products at a premium price and enforcing improved forest management practices, certification and eco-labelling are such innovative approaches. Using criteria and indicators, manage forests sustainably A paradigm change is taking place in the forestry industry, moving away from sustained wood supply and toward sustainable forest management, which takes into account environmental, economic, and social factors. Ever since the forests were maintained using current scientific principles, the concept of sustained yield has regarded as the main emphasis of forest management. It is a recognized standard in forest management and the foundation of contemporary organized forestry.

To successfully handle these concerns on a regional and worldwide scale, as well as to provide the technological foundation for policy choices, scientific knowledge is required everywhere in the globe. Numerous worldwide projects, including as criteria and indicators, life cycle assessments, cost-benefit analyses, knowledge-based systems, and environmental impact assessments, have the ability to define and evaluate sustainable forest management. The criterion and indicator technique has received widespread acceptance, and much effort has been made to improve it and put it to use in real-world situations. It has evolved into a strong instrument for assessing, monitoring, and reporting the sustainability of forest resources through time. Currently, over 160 nations take part in nine regional and global processes of sustainable forest management that use the criterion and indicator method and are tailored to different forestry situations. Most of these processes are part of an international effort. The criteria and indicators method offers a tool for determining the extent and direction of change in specific forestry circumstances, and thus gives forest managers and other actor's crucial information for making decisions linked to forests. It is a crucial foundation for helping nations gather, archive, and share the trustworthy, science-based forest data they need to monitor and evaluate the state of their forests.

The fundamental components and a set of requirements or procedures by which sustainable forest management may be judged are defined and characterized by criteria. The criteria and indicators provide a solid foundation for defining sustainability in the context of specific nations as well as a way to recognize, track, and analyze regional and worldwide trends. These are tools that allow for the evaluation and reporting of progress toward sustainable forest management. According to Castaneda, criteria are the range of forest values to be addressed as well as the fundamental components or guiding principles of forest management that may be used to gauge the sustainability of forests. One or more indicators may be used to characterize each criteria, which each corresponds to a crucial aspect of sustainability [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

By including the communities in the application and monitoring of the sustainability by criteria and indicators method, it is possible to improve the sustainability of people-oriented management projects like shared forest management. We must attend to the institutionalization and capacity-building requirements of the communities in order for them to apply and monitor the criteria and indicators. The indicators and criteria provide a chance to track and evaluate the condition of sustainable forest management. Forest managers are given a strong yet simple tool by the method. To execute and analyze the framework in order to make choices on sustainable forestry, however, ultimately belongs to the forest managers, as it does with other monitoring and assessment frameworks. In addition to gauging forest sustainability at the national level, the criteria and indicators method also considers effective monitoring. To ensure that forests can sustainably meet the diverse demands of humans, close international collaboration in the field of forest research and allied fields is necessary. Although such collaboration made it feasible for regional efforts for criteria and indicators to evolve in the first place, we may need to improve them to ensure our sustainability objectives.

REFERENCES

[1] R. P. Chaudhary and C. K. Subedi, "Chure-tarai madhesh landscape, Nepal from biodiversity research perspective," Plant Archives. 2019.

[2] R. K. Maikhuri, S. Nautiyal, K. S. Rao, K. Chandrasekhar, R. Gavali, and K. G. Saxena, "Analysis and resolution of protected area-people conflicts in Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve, India" Environ. Conserv., 2000, doi: 10.1017/S0376892900000060.

[3] S. Dutta and M. K. HOSSAIN, "Bringing back the Chakaria Sundarbans mangrove forest of South-east Bangladesh through sustainable management approach," Asian J. For., 2020, doi: 10.13057/asianjfor/r040204.

[4] D. Datta and D. Chatterjee, "Assessment of community-based initiatives in sustainable management of Indian dry deciduous forests," Int. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol., 2012, doi: 10.1080/13504509.2011.606549.

[5] K. Singh, R. K. Maikhuri, K. S. Rao, and K. G. Saxena, "Characterizing land-use diversity in village landscapes for sustainable mountain development: A case study from Indian Himalaya," Environmentalist, 2008, doi: 10.1007/s10669-008-9164-6.

[6] A. Ishtiaque, S. W. Myint, and C. Wang, "Examining the ecosystem health and sustainability of the world's largest mangrove forest using multi-temporal MODIS products," Sci. Total Environ., 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.200.

[7] R. K. Singh, S. M. Hussain, T. Riba, A. Singh, E. Padung, O. Rallen, Y. J. Lego, and A. K. Bhardwaj, "Classification and management of community forests in Indian Eastern Himalayas: implications on ecosystem services, conservation and livelihoods," Ecol. Process., 2018, doi: 10.1186/s13717-018-0137-5.

[8] S. Thakur, V. S. Negi, R. Pathak, R. Dhyani, K. Durgapal, and R. S. Rawal, "Indicator based integrated vulnerability assessment of community forests in Indian west Himalaya," For. Ecol. Manage., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2019.117674.

[9] R. Mathew, A. Gantait, and A. Swamy, G, "Community Based Conservation for Sustainable Forest Management – Probing the Indian Projections and Selected International Paradigms," Tour. Theory Pract., 2017.

[10] P. Mondal, S. S. McDermid, and A. Qadir, "A reporting framework for Sustainable Development Goal 15: Multi-scale monitoring of forest degradation using MODIS, Landsat and Sentinel data," Remote Sens. Environ., 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2019.111592.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

The Forest Sector and the Sustainable Development Goals

Mr. Naveen Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email-Id-naveenkumarj@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: All political and social actors must exert tremendous effort if these aims are to be met in the next years. Although the forest industry was included in the initial definitions of sustainable development, it is still unclear what role forestry may play in accomplishing the Sustainable Development Goals. As a result, the direct good and negative consequences of forestry on sustainability are examined, and it is spoken about how sustainable forest management might help achieve other Sustainable Development Goals in addition to SDG 15. This research shows that forestry has a dual function, meaning it may have both positive and negative effects on sustainability. Therefore, it is advised to employ integrated evaluation techniques to determine if a particular policy or strategy including forests is promoting sustainable development. The use of qualitative frameworks like the Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development is suggested in addition to quantitative integrated evaluations. It is also recommended that second-order sustainability performance for the forest sector be operationalized in future studies.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation.

INTRODUCTION

From the standpoint of sustainable development, forestry is especially intriguing since it was the subject of an early description of the concept that was published in the 18th century, and because it still has a significant role to play in the transition to a sustainable society. The release of the Sustainable Development Goals significantly increased the global discussion on sustainable development. Additionally, all levels of governmental and private players must take action to address the serious issue of climate change. Consequently, this article has two objectives: first, it will assess the positive and negative impacts of the forestry industry on sustainable development. Second, the connection between the forest sector and the SDGs will be examined. To do this, a review of the relevant literature on the subjects was conducted, and then the relationships between the SDGs and forest management were examined. Several of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals are significantly advanced by the forest sector. Here are some significant SDGs and how they relate to the forest sector [1], [2]:

SDG 15: Life on Land: This target focuses on preserving biodiversity, managing forests sustainably, preventing desertification, and rebuilding damaged lands. By encouraging sustainable forest management techniques, preserving biodiversity, preserving ecosystems, and restoring forest landscapes, the forest sector helps to achieve SDG 15.

SDG 13: Climate Action: By serving as carbon sinks and lowering greenhouse gas emissions, forests are essential for addressing climate change. By storing carbon dioxide and limiting the effects of climate change, sustainable forest management techniques such as afforestation, reforestation, and decreasing deforestation help to achieve SDG 13.

No Poverty: SDG 1 the forest sector has the ability to reduce poverty, especially in rural areas where reliant on trees for subsistence. Practices for managing forests sustainably, such as community-based forest management, may help alleviate poverty in communities who rely on forests and promote sustainable livelihoods.

Responsible Production and Consumption (SDG 12): The forest sector is directly related to ethical patterns of production and consumption. Sustainable forest management guarantees that forest products are harvested ethically, reduces waste, supports sustainable value chains, and promotes the use of goods made of sustainably managed forests.

Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG) 11: Through a variety of ecological services offered by forests, such as clean air, water control, and recreational places, urban areas profit from the forest sector. By strengthening green infrastructure, increasing urban biodiversity, and building sustainable

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

and livable cities, urban forestry efforts support SDG 11 [3].

SDG 2: Zero Hunger: Forests have the capacity to improve agricultural resilience and food security. Agroforestry systems, which combine trees with agricultural methods to produce food sustainably, may improve soil fertility, offer shade, diversify sources of income, and promote SDG 2.

SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth: By creating job opportunities in a variety of forestry-related industries, including forest management, wood production, ecotourism, and non-timber forest products, and the forest sector helps to achieve this goal. Sustainable forest management procedures provide respectable employment and advance SDG 8. Forests are essential for managing water resources, according to SDG 6 on clean water and sanitation. As natural filters, forested watersheds control water flows, reduce erosion, and preserve water quality. Watershed protection is a result of sustainable forest management techniques, which supports SDG 6.

SDG 14: Life Below Water: Forests and the ecosystems they support are important for the preservation of freshwater and coastal habitats. By lowering sedimentation, enhancing water quality, and preserving marine species, forest conservation and restoration initiatives help to achieve SDG 14.

Partnerships towards the Goals, SDG 17: To accomplish sustainable forest management goals, the forest sector needs cooperation from stakeholders in the public, commercial, and civic sectors. In order to share information, create capacity, and mobilize resources to help the forest sector and achieve the SDGs, partnerships and international collaboration are essential. The Forest Sector can substantially contribute to several SDGs, promoting a more sustainable and inclusive future, through combining sustainable forest management practices, policies, and collaborations [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Environmental Sustainability and the Forest Sector In the original concept of sustainable development, forestry was included, and medieval authors had previously emphasized the value of long-term forest management. Although the timber industry is not new to discussing sustainability issues, these issues go beyond the idea of sustainability. Since there is no universally accepted definition of "forest sector" for this debate, it is vital to define it before going into more depth on these subjects. ISIC classifies the forest sector, which includes forestry, logging, and associated service activities, as sector A, whereas processing is included as a part of manufacturing. The EU's NACE categorization makes a similar difference between forestry, logging, and associated services and the further processing of wood and forest-made goods. Although it makes sense to make a distinction between primary production, manufacturing, and services, doing so does not take into account the links between these three macro-economic sectors and is thus less helpful for analyzing the sustainability consequences of forest-related activities.

Since all economic activities that primarily rely on the production of products and services from forests should be included in the sector definition, the FAO definition is utilized for this work. This would include industries that rely on the generation of wood fiber. Additionally, it would include activities like the commercial production and processing of non-wood forest products and the use of forest resources for sustenance. Even business operations connected to the provision of forest services might be included. The discussion of the sustainability effects created by the sector and the assignment of these impacts from forestry to the SDGs will be done separately from the examination of sustainability impacts caused by the forest sector. Sustainability Effects of the Forest Sector, the sustainability effects of both forest management as a whole and of business operations that rely on the production of wood fiber are taken into account using the FAO definition of forestry.

As a result, it is necessary to assess the sustainability consequences of various activities such as the production of timber, industrial round wood, wood fuel, charcoal, or wood-based panels, pulp and paper, or wooden furniture. Given how often woods are utilized for leisure, tourism must also be taken into account. The three components of the forest sector have an effect on sustainability. Usually, these effects are divided into three categories: economic, environmental, and social effects. Economic sustainability relates to a company's competitiveness or, in the case of non-profit organizations, its economic viability. In order to measure the effects of economic sustainability, it is necessary to take into account issues like management of innovation and technology, cooperation, knowledge management, organizational procedures, and reporting. The use of both renewable and non-renewable resources, emissions into the air, water, or soil, the quantity of waste and hazardous waste, the utilization of ecosystems, effects on biodiversity, and the environmental influence of the product throughout its life cycle are all examples of environmental sustainability impacts.

The social dimension of sustainable development, which includes organizational governance, human rights, labor practices, fair operating practices, consumer issues, and community involvement, is defined by the ISO 26000 standard on "social responsibility" as the set of seven core topics that must be taken into account by any organization looking to improve its sustainability performance. From the standpoint of social sustainability, the contribution of indigenous people to forestry is very important. The link between the forest sector, certain sustainability concerns, and the FSSD sustainability principles is shown in Table 1. Every action taken by the forest industry must be evaluated to see whether it complies with the FSSD sustainability guidelines. Table 1 may be used to determine trade-offs between other sustainability factors as well. Such trade-offs are probable, particularly when contrasting economic aims with environmental or social ones. An intensively managed forest is one example, which uses equipment effectively to optimize wood production while minimizing emissions, but this generally comes at the expense of ecosystem integrity and biodiversity, as well as poorer monoculture resilience. There is also a trade-off between intense forest management and indigenous people's rights, or the use of smaller farmer-owned woods as a source of income for families. However, there may be trade-offs within one aspect of sustainability: utilizing more biomass derived from forests that have been extensively managed to replace non-renewable resources may come at the expense of biodiversity. The link between elements of sustainable forest management vary across regional and temporal scales, as shown by Vierikko *et al.* in their investigation of forest management practice in Finland [6]–[8]. In contrast to communities where forestry plays a major economic role, socially engaged communities with a more varied economic structure engage in less intense competition with ecological components of forests. This highlights the difficulty of assessing sustainability effects at various sizes [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

It is necessary to identify and evaluate these trade-offs and their associated implications in a thorough manner, and methodologies like the FSSD or particular techniques like life cycle assessment or life cycle sustainability assessment must be employed for this. The specification of the system boundaries is crucial in the implementation of these approaches since they may be used to evaluate immediate effects across a lifespan. However, they are less useful for evaluating trade-offs between effects on other SDGs and forestry itself. Processes within the forest industry and with other sectors locally and internationally need to be linked much more strongly and effectively. An option is to use systematic integrated evaluations; however they take a macro-level approach and need the quantification of all impacts. This may be difficult, particularly when it comes to evaluating the tactics and actions of various forest actors. A broader sustainability perspective is required to recognize and assess tradeoffs. Second-order sustainability performance also takes into account a system's effects on the whole system, in addition to the direct effects of the system under analysis.

REFERENCES

[1] R. J. Baumgartner, "Sustainable development goals and the forest sector-A complex relationship," Forests, 2019, doi: 10.3390/f10020152.

[2] S. Linser and M. Lier, "The contribution of sustainable development goals and forest-related indicators to national bioeconomy progress monitoring," Sustain., 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12072898.

[3] F. X. Aguilar and Y. Wen, "Socio-economic and ecological impacts of China's forest sector policies," Forest Policy and Economics. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.forpol.2021.102454.

[4] E. Loučanová, H. Paluš, K. Báliková, M. Dzian, N. Slašťanová, and J. Šálka, "Stakeholders' perceptions of the innovation trends in the slovak forestry and forest-based sectors," J. Bus. Econ. Manag., 2020, doi: 10.3846/jbem.2020.13503.

[5] P. A. Minang, L. A. Duguma, F. Bernard, D. Foundjem-Tita, and Z. Tchoundjeu, "Evolution of community forestry in Cameroon: An innovation ecosystems perspective," Ecol. Soc., 2019, doi: 10.5751/ES-10573-240101.

[6] J. Timko et al., "A policy nexus approach to forests and the SDGs: tradeoffs and synergies," Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.cosust.2018.06.004.

[7] N. Talpă, A. F. Hălălișan, and B. Popa, "Analysis of state forest institutions in the Republic of Moldova, using a causative model," Forests, 2021, doi: 10.3390/f12010105.

[8] D. Mutta, L. Mahamane, C. Wekesa, G. Kowero, and A. Roos, "Sustainable business models for informal charcoal producers in Kenya," Sustain., 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13063475.

[9] M. A. H. B. Bhuiyan and M. A. Darda, "Tourism for sustainable development goals (SDGs)

achievement in Bangladesh," Bangladesh J. Public Adm., 2021, doi: 10.36609/bjpa.v29i2.224.

[10] C. Ofoegbu and C. I. Speranza, "Discourses on Sustainable Forest Management and Their Integration into Climate Policies in South Africa," Int. For. Rev., 2021, doi: 10.1505/146554821832952762.

ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Effects of Policy Reforms on African Agriculture's Sustainable Intensification

Mr. Naveen Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email-Id-naveenkumarj@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: African agriculture plays a crucial role in food security, poverty reduction, and sustainable development. This abstract examines the effects of policy reforms on the sustainable intensification of agriculture in Africa, focusing on the potential for increased productivity, resilience, and environmental sustainability. Historically, African agriculture has faced numerous challenges, including low productivity, limited access to inputs and credit, inadequate infrastructure, and inconsistent policy support. Policy reforms aimed at addressing these challenges have been implemented across the continent, with a focus on promoting sustainable agricultural practices, improving market access, and enhancing rural livelihoods. Sustainable intensification of agriculture involves increasing agricultural productivity while minimizing adverse environmental impacts. Policy reforms can play a pivotal role in creating an enabling environment for sustainable intensification by incentivizing the adoption of environmentally friendly practices, improving access to inputs and technologies, and supporting farmers' capacity building. Evidence suggests that well-designed policy reforms can have positive impacts on African agriculture's sustainable intensification. Reforms that prioritize agricultural research and development, extension services, and farmer education have shown potential for improving productivity, enhancing crop diversification, and promoting climate resilience.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Technologies, Deforestation, Environment, Farmers, Land Degradation.

INTRODUCTION

African farmers increase crop output on their current farmland, expand production into vulnerable regions with high biodiversity levels, or do both in response to rising food demand brought on by population and wealth development. This chapter's main takeaway is that African farmers and policy-makers must adopt "sustainable agricultural intensification" in order to meet rising food demand without further harming the environment. To maintain and protect soil fertility while achieving production targets, money is needed. The word "capital" in this sense refers to both organic and inorganic fertilizers as well as land enhancements including irrigation, erosion control, and fertility management [1].

Many farmers in Africa do not choose this route. They are either increasing their output on more vulnerable regions or intensifying in an unsustainable way, which involves mining their soils and depleting the resource base. This is often brought on by ineffective regulations that lessen farmers' incentives and ability to seek SAI. Without concurrent public investments in institutional development or physical infrastructure, which might have encouraged smallholders to intensify in a profitable and sustainable way, economic liberalization measures have reduced government support for agriculture, increasing input prices and market risk. African governments and donors should fund institutions and infrastructure while striking a balance between extensive government participation and a lack of popular support.

In reality, capital-led intensification is often needed to satisfy the SAI criterion. This suggests that farmers must apply significant quantities of inputs that increase soil fertility, such as fertilizer (both organic and inorganic), and quasi-fixed capital land improvements, such as infrastructure for water and land conservation. Of fact, capital-led intensification may also be labor-intensive as farmers require labor to build and maintain the latter. In contrast, when farmers employ insufficient amounts of these capital inputs, intensification is capital-deficient. Soil mining and degradation are caused by an inadequate application of organic matter, inorganic fertilizer, and land improvements, as well as by the intensity of land use that prevails over the majority of Africa's semi-arid and hillside tropics. Farmers that choose this route often make no new capital investments and only increase labor. This enables them to harvest, weed, and produce more intensely, among other things.

It won't be possible to achieve sustainable intensification using solely organic materials in the majority of Africa. Due to rising population pressure, manure, a crucial component of the majority of low-input systems, is in limited supply in nations like Rwanda, Malawi, and Zimbabwe. To replace inorganic fertilizer, a substantial volume of manure is required. Compost, mulch, and manure utilization might provide a significant scaling-up issue. Individual farmers may undoubtedly use these soil improvement techniques. But in most places, cattle numbers would need to increase to unsustainable levels if all farmers adopted these methods. The most effective method for converting N or P from biomass into soil nutrients is not brown manure. Furthermore, the majority of ruminants cannot tolerate the poisonous secondary chemicals found in many natural species. Composting or mulching using local shrub/bush trimmings may reduce the amount of fodder available. It would be quite amusing if efforts to switch to organic fertilizing led to the destruction of native plants as a result of excessive green manure collection [2]!

Because perennial plants accumulate organic waste deposits and hold it, while also preventing water and wind erosion, they may contribute to SAI. Perennials don't replace other fertility investments; instead, they mainly complement them. Perennials may increase the profitability of using additional inputs, as Clay *et al.* found in Rwanda. Costly perennials are possible. They often have substantial sunk costs, require many years to create, and frequently have uncertain markets. The likelihood that the poor would invest in perennials is expected to be lowest if they have greater discount rates and are more risk-averse.

The Theoretical Foundation

The incentives and limitations that farmers must contend with heavily influence the agricultural technology and factor intensities they choose. Market conditions and pricing are affected by changes in policy. Actions made by farmers are impacted by this, and those actions in turn affect the environment. The displays four sets of variables along with their connections. The first set of policy factors affects the farm communities' motivations and readiness to act while being external to them. These include structural changes, such as adjustments to the global economy, urbanization, and infrastructure; policy reforms at the macro and sectoral levels; and initiatives that combine aspects of and yet are only applicable temporarily to a particular region.

The second group of factors, which includes the incentives that farmers face and the ability of farm families and communities to respond to shifting incentives, are influenced by these variables. Access to public infrastructure, private money, and collectively held capital all influence capacity. Due to their motivations and capabilities, farmers pick certain technologies that utilize land more or less intensively, and they distribute their labor, land, and money among a variety of on- and off-farm activities. In turn, the actions made by the farmers have an impact on the environment, both on and off the farm. The relationship between farm-level intensification's shape and its economic and environmental sustainability may be understood by looking at labor productivity. Almost all smallholder families in Africa get the bulk of their income from labor, and because putting more land into production requires a lot of labor, patterns of labor usage have an impact on environmental sustainability.

Farmers evaluate the best method to use the labor they have available before deciding whether to expand their farmed land, including whether to clear forest. These evaluations include factors including profitability, risk, transaction costs, etc. Since the productivity of labor is a function of soil quality, which is itself an increasing function of the quasi-fixed capital investment and inorganic fertilizer application we highlight, the farmer's choice of intensification route has a significant impact on this choice. Non-agricultural wage rates, production and input prices, risk exposure, and transaction costs are all influenced by market factors and policy changes. They therefore have a big impact on how smallholders divide up their labor. The sustainability of the succeeding agricultural boom is strongly impacted by this. The rewards offered by the many alternatives accessible to households influence how much labor they give and how they spend their time. Farmers are unlikely to remove more forest as long as the returns to on- and off-farm labor are both high in comparison to land-clearing labor. The main factor influencing how labor production is distributed across various activities in smallholder families is. Households must devote their labor to the endeavors that will provide the best returns in order to maximize their utility or profits. Households should devote labor to cultivating existing land until its productivity is comparable to that of clearing and cultivating new areas, assuming for the time that they do not have access to off-farm labor markets [3].

These schedules for marginal labor productivity are determined by several variables. They go higher in reaction to rising crop prices as well as an increase in the usage of supplementary inputs like inorganic fertilizers and land-improvement techniques that preserve water or land. As a plot's soil quality declines due to continual cultivation, they go downward. Due to a fall in labor productivity on existing plots after a few plantings, this leads to the customary cycle of shifting cultivation, in which forest destruction occurs. Due to families' preference for domestic consumption, the slope of the two schedules increases when agricultural goods become non-tradable. As welfare increases and real-income effects encourage substitution into leisure, the overall amount of labor given declines. The little information on African agriculture implies that family labor supply is inelastic UN terms of both income and wages. This suggests that in most situations, the trade-off between work and leisure will be dominated by changes in the relative returns to labor across various uses. Agricultural intensification and intensification may both be induced by technological advancements and investments in quasi-fixed capital that boost labor productivity in both already-existing and newly opened areas. However, based on our educated hypothesis, quasi-fixed capital expenditures often only encourage intensification since they are often particular to already-cultivated regions. They could be distinct from agricultural production technologies in this regard.

Farmers would often not embrace labor-using technology if off-farm work pays more than farm labor and/or helps to lower overall income risk. Similar to this, labor freed from agricultural output on current lands would often not be reallocated to putting new land under the plough if off-farm activity pays more than farm work at the margin. The same can be true if there is little correlation between on-farm revenue and non-agricultural income. With their revenue stream being extremely unpredictable, farmers would find it desirable to diversify their labor allocation across industries. Any labor that is not used in agriculture output on current plots will be absorbed by the off-farm market if the market pay rate consistently surpasses the marginal productivity of forest-clearing labor.

It makes no difference whether technological development reduces labor costs or increases labor-intensiveness in manufacturing. Of course, if real wages decline or crop prices rise both of which often happened after liberalization measures in Africa farmers may commit more labor to their current plots, expand their planted area, and spend less time engaging in leisure activities and/or off-farm pursuits. Destroying marketing boards that charged producer food prices, for example, has no effect on output prices and does little to encourage intensification or deter farmers from extending their agricultural lands. Instead, one must induce investment in quasi-fixed components, the use of agricultural inputs on already cleared land, or some other comparable action to change the MRPL curve more than the MRPL* curve. As a result, rural non-farm labor markets, seasonal financing, and input markets may all be crucial in halting deforestation [4].

African farmers place a high value on non-farm income. According to Reardon's analysis of 28 field surveys conducted in Africa, non-farm income accounted for 45% of total income on average. Non-farm activities, however, may have both positive and negative effects on intensification. On the one hand, non-farm activities compete with farming for labor and resources if they pay more than agricultural activities and/or serve to lower income risk. This means that farmers may pick labor-saving agricultural technology instead of labor-intensive ones if they can afford to do so, even in the face of farm labor surpluses. In a case study on the adoption of hybrid maize in Botswana, Low demonstrates how farmers consciously choose labor-saving technology to free up labor for profitable non-farm activities. In cases when labor-intensive conservation measures are required, the desire to participate in off-farm activities to diversify revenue sources might jeopardize sustainability plans. Non-farm activities may also, in certain cases, serve as a release valve from the burden of labor and land. Similar to homes, farms do not immediately employ labor freed up to plow more land. On the other hand, for many African rural families, non-farm income often serves as a major source of income. Non-farm income increases families' ability to invest in quasi-fixed agricultural capital due to the fragility of rural finance institutions. An empirical issue is whether household non-farm income will be invested in capital-led intensification. Both the local labor market's features and the viability of other investment options will play a role.

However, there is a lot of evidence to suggest that non-farm income is not distributed fairly across families. The households with the lowest incomes have the least access to non-farm employment. The poorest families are compelled to rely on agriculture because they have minimal access to non-farm income and cannot afford agricultural inputs. This often denotes the removal of further wooded areas or soil mining. Therefore, people who are least able to fund investments on their own also have the least access to non-farm alternatives. Growing farm productivity creates a disproportionately high demand for non-agricultural products and services, which leads to an expansion of rural non-farm activity. As a result, the cost of off-farm labor increases. This impact has been shown by Ahmed and Hossain in Bangladesh's rice-growing regions during the Green Revolution. We hypothesize that comparable outcomes take occur in African environments when agriculture output rises. The multiplier effects in general equilibrium thus likely protect the forests, wetlands, and ranges from becoming victim to higher agricultural output, provided that the fundamental rural market infrastructure is in place. Increased agricultural productivity historically and globally results in less employment in agriculture as sectors with greater income elasticity of demand absorb more labor.

African SAI Policy Reforms and Incentives

The elimination of fertilizer, seed, and loan subsidies, as well as the removal of marketing subsidies for agricultural outputs, have been the primary macroeconomic and sectoral policy reforms in Africa during the last 15 years. Too often, policymakers tend to make assumptions about the consequences of changes in output and input prices without really evaluating those hypotheses. Analysts of public policy often assert that "liberalization will increase farm profitability." The 'ceteris paribus' presumptions often obscure the nuanced ways in which policies really influence current price distributions, transaction costs, and farmer behavior. We argue that the significant shifts in macro- and sectoral policy brought on by structural adjustment have had unclear and sometimes unsatisfactory results, leading to a range of repercussions on intensification patterns at the farm level [5].

Macroeconomic Policy Changes

Analytically, the consequences of macro reforms on the incentives available to farmers are uncertain. Devaluation of the exchange rate, for instance, may increase input costs more or less than it boosts output prices for "intensification crops" like rice, maize, or cotton. The degree to which trade-related earnings are taxed away by governments rather than distributed to farmers, the size of the margins in private commerce, and the tradability of the inputs and products all play a role in this. Governments may also take steps to compensate farmers or consumers for price increases brought on by devaluations. For instance, after the devaluation of the CFA franc in 1994, the governments of Mali and Senegal decreased tariffs on rice and fertilizer, respectively. Devaluation may increase producer pricing risk and marketing expenses, as it did in Madagascar.

Market liberalization's impacts might sometimes be unclear. By fostering competition, liberalization may lower trade margins, create new output markets, and lower farm-gate input costs, all of which would increase farmers' profitability. However, market liberalization may also turn domestic markets into enclaves, drive up the price of imported inputs and transportation, and heighten price risk. Evidence from a variety of rural African community's shows that market liberalization favors market concentration and raises entry barriers in certain sectors, which tends to result in more volatile pricing levels. It also demonstrates that devaluations have conflicting impacts on input use and farm profitability. The little data reveals that although liberalization has raised both predicted prices and price variability, state involvement decreased the mean and variance of agricultural commodity prices. Even in cases when liberalization boosts average medium-term output prices, price volatility might harm agricultural investment because it deters investments in quasi-fixed capital. Price instability also hinders the inter- and intra-arm spread of technologies that increase yield, which delays the adoption of new technologies.

Reforms to Sectoral Policies

The majority of sectoral pricing strategies have clear impacts on output or input prices when they are not supported by macroeconomic stability measures. However, the results are questionable when governments employ these measures in the context of macroeconomic stability. Sectoral policies may even be intended to balance out macroeconomic changes. The most recent wave of policy changes, however, has a tendency to prioritize macroeconomic policy above sectoral policy. Governments have a tendency to restrict their sectoral interventions in order to achieve fiscal balance, border parity pricing, and similar goals. Nevertheless, sectoral interventions may have significant, underappreciated 'crowding-in' effects that promote private investment in sustainable technology. Now, let's look at a few particular sectoral policies [6].

Seed/Fertilizer Regulations

The world's lowest fertilizer consumption, which has decreased over the last 15 years, is found in Africa. Given that governments no longer provide loan subsidies, fertilizer subsidies, and seed subsidies, this is not unexpected. In Africa, both the price of fertilizer and seeds as well as the effective interest rate for buying inputs has increased significantly. Evidence from case studies suggests a link between the drop in fertilizer usage and the growing costs of inputs and financial services. In addition, there is mounting evidence that private seed and fertilizer merchants have not reacted as favorably as they could have to the opening up of input markets brought about by the dissolution of fertilizer parastatals. African fertilizer markets are beset by a risky, seasonal demand, high transportation costs, undeveloped financial services markets, and cash-strapped farmers. The majority of African countries' domestic fertilizer production is inefficient due to economies of scale. As a result, changes in macroeconomic, trade, and exchange-rate policy as well as unstable global fertilizer prices affect local fertilizer pricing. While domestic fertilizer production and fertilizer subsidies have typically failed in Africa, it is also apparent that private markets in rural Africa cannot now provide fertilizer supply. This implies that government will inevitably have a role in the short to medium term. Public investment in improving commercial marketing infrastructure seems potential given the high costs of timely fertilizer delivery to farmers and the limited supply of fertilizer to most farmers.

Profitability requires both the existence of an efficient market and a favorable ratio of output to input prices. The only farmers who will spend money on inorganic fertilizers, animal traction, organic matter, and soil conservation are those that participate in successful commercial agriculture. It makes no difference in this respect whether they are big or tiny, growing food crops or other kinds of crops. For instance, in Burkina Faso, farmers use 13 times as much manure on income crops like cotton and maize as they do on the primary subsistence grains, sorghum and millet. Where there are lucrative cash crops, Zimbabwean farmers mostly employ fertilizers and better tillage techniques. Farmers in Rwanda and Tanzania's highland tropics limit the use of fertilizer and soil preservation techniques to commercial crops. Environmentally responsible agricultural intensification is facilitated by project-level interventions and policy changes that make viable sustainable crops and technologies.

Policy for Financial Services

Financial services for rural areas were often provided in conjunction with the purchasing of agricultural products and the distribution of fertilizer and seed by parastatals. In addition to raising input prices for small farmers in many places, the elimination of public input and output distribution networks sometimes increased effective interest rates for rural borrowers or completely removed their access to seasonal lending. In the absence of state rural financing programs, many private merchants have found it challenging to enter or expand into new markets, unless they have access to their own consumer loans. The establishment of functional credit schemes was made possible by government parastatals by connecting the input and output markets. Private operators may not be able to achieve it under the current institutional and legal framework. The government's capacity to connect credit and production markets has positive general equilibrium consequences that, in retrospect, seem to have at least partially offset the negative partial equilibrium impacts of state monopoly or monopsony [7].

Smallholders increasingly depend on cash crops and non-farm incomes to fund capital accumulation and stabilize consumption as a result of decreased rural lending volumes. However, with the termination of government credit programs, access to alternative finance has often become extremely concentrated since the largest farmers make the most money off-farm and from cash crops. Because of this, only bigger operators and the most commercial smallholders can afford to adopt SAI, leaving the majority of semi-subsistence smallholders with the option of increasing production, engaging in unsustainable intensification, or giving up on agriculture. We know little about how the decline of public financial services has impacted the usage of fertilizer and seed, but even less is known about how it has influenced the creation of physical capital, such as purchases of postharvest machinery, small-scale irrigation systems, and animal traction equipment. Increases in the effective interest rate should, in principle, deter such investment, but few experts have looked into the matter. In a vast portion of Africa, imports dominate the market for tangible capital goods including tractors, ploughs, irrigation pumps, and tractor components. Therefore, price increases should result from currency devaluations. Investments in irrigation, transportation, and land protection will cost more as a result. Although there haven't been any research on the price elasticity of investments in African farms, it is quite probable that a combination of banking sector contraction, contractionary monetary policy, and currency devaluation has discouraged investment in quasi-fixed agricultural capital.

Promoting capital-led SAI relies heavily on stimulating rural financing. While certain quasi-fixed capital investments, like bunding and terracing, involve a significant amount of labor, they often also call for a complementary commitment of bought inputs, such fertilizer and equipment. State-directed rural loan programs were often inefficient and unsustainable financially. Smallholders in Africa who are particularly credit-constrained. Despite this, there is a compelling argument for the state to cover the start-up and training expenses for self-sufficient rural financial institutions that can mobilize local funds and circulate them as loans within and among communities.

Agrarian Law

The key components of land policy during the last ten years have been land titling plans, the gazetteing of public spaces, and a very little amount of land redistribution. Intensification and long-term investment in land improvements would be encouraged by the former, which has a tendency to raise land values. As smaller farmers replace bigger farmers, the latter should raise the marginal value product of land usage by boosting the labor-to-land ratio. In sub-Saharan Africa, the effect of land tenure on investment and technology adoption is murky. The influence of land tenure systems is obscured, according to Migot-Adholla *et al.*, by a number of other structural issues such rural health, education, and infrastructure.

For people who live in ecologically sensitive locations, the surge in activity in the previous 10 years regarding the gazetting of lands for protected areas has increased tenure instability. Farmers have less motivation to engage in conservation measures necessary for SAI if they are less certain than previously that the state won't take their property for parks and reserves. The sad irony is that by endangering present landowners' ability to govern the environment, environmental conservation efforts may actually lead to environmental deterioration [8].

Public or non-governmental organization initiatives, which are effectively mini-packages of policies that touch smaller populations on a temporary basis, have grown at the same time that governments are dismantling its financial services and input parastatals. These packages essentially replicate a portion of the pre-structural adjustment programs, such as extension services, subsidized "microfinance" services, subsidized equipment, inputs, and marketing services. These initiatives are often promoted as "demonstration projects" in contexts where dissemination may one day succeed. Examples of good contract farming programs include the Sasakawa Global 2000 initiatives in Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, and Tanzania. On participating farms, several of these initiatives have dramatically enhanced yields, but only by overcoming the structural barriers that often prevent the use of SAI techniques. The programs have made sure that farmers have access to timely financial services and the right supplies, as well as a market for their produce. The outcomes, however, often do not carry over or continue after the plan has ended. The plans themselves may not be financially viable on a big scale. These initiatives show that smallholder farmers in Africa are capable of producing more ecologically sound and higher-yielding crops. Additionally, they imply how ineffective rural factor and product markets stifle both the incentives for sustainable intensification and the capacity of governments and donors to successfully change those incentives via macro- or sector-level policy. While sectoral and macroeconomic changes may be required to provide a stable macroeconomic environment, they have often failed to address the structural issues at the root of unsustainable intensification and intensification.

Governments, donors, and farmers made investments and implemented policies in the situations in this subsection to address the issues with risk, high transaction and input costs, and poor profitability that afflict African agriculture. Demand drove the accomplishments in that rising product demand made agriculture viable and decreased market-related risk. In each instance, a lucrative intensification that prevents degradation reduces the need to expand farming into the remaining wetlands, woods, and bushlands. The Mali government improved irrigation infrastructure in the 1980s and 1990s to make it simpler for farmers to take advantage of new incentives for rice and onion production. At the same time, it ceased being in charge of planning farm production, selling farm outputs, and maintaining that infrastructure. Private merchants were able to improve their flexibility in responding to new incentives as a result of this opening. The required incentives were made available by the CFA franc's depreciation in 1994. It raised net returns to production and made the rice and onions grown by Office du Niger farmers considerably more competitive in Mali and across West Africa. Double cropping was made possible by the increased incentives and upgraded irrigation infrastructure. As a result, agricultural revenue and the effectiveness of the government's infrastructure expenditures both greatly rose. Additionally, it helped farmers maintain the infrastructure and gave them money to buy fertilizer and field equipment, allowing them to intensify.

Rwandan Bananas

Rising earnings and the development of rural communities led to a demand for processed goods like banana wine, which in turn led to an increase in the demand for bananas. As a consequence, during the last 20 years, both banana output and area have increased significantly. Compared to other land uses, bananas provide better returns. This has provided farmers a reason to intensify, combined with high and growing population pressure that has restricted their access to land. Although it takes time for bananas to become established, food crops may be cultivated around immature bananas, making the gestation period more tolerable for the poor than it is for some other perennials. Additionally, bananas stop erosion, a significant problem in Rwanda [9].

In these two nations, cotton producers were guaranteed profitability and decreased risk thanks to subsidies for fertilizer and seeds, finance, and guaranteed output markets. These are managed by vertically integrated, public-private hybrid businesses connected to the world cotton market. Programs for animal traction equipment assisted farmers in purchasing equipment. In Mali and Burkina Faso in the 1970s and 1980s, this approach caused a tremendous increase in the area cultivated with cotton. In response to these advantageous incentives, farmers expanded their cotton fields and intensified their cotton farming. When additional places with high-quality land became available, they tended to initially increase output there before intensifying once more high-quality land became unavailable. They often enhanced in places with sufficient soils by applying comparatively high rates of fertilizer, organic matter, and animal traction to both cotton and the rotation crop, maize. Farmers improved maize productivity by buying inputs using the money they made from cotton. African post-liberalization agriculture often lacks the components necessary for a successful SAI. Public and private agricultural capital, inexpensive inputs, low-risk output markets, easily available financial services, and an off-farm labor market to absorb labor from low-productivity farms are all in short supply. Reforms may encourage unsustainable intensification or intensification in the absence of such circumstances. For many African smallholders who grow grains, roots, and tubers for domestic markets, there is strong evidence to suggest that the removal of price stabilization plans and subsidies for input distribution, marketing, and rural credit left a void that was not later filled by the private sector. Induced deterioration of the environment, as shown in the succinct case studies that follow, occurs either via intensification or through intensification with insufficient capital, which results in soil nutrient mining.

Intensification of rice in Madagascar

Madagascar's economy is dominated on the rice industry. The 1980s saw higher and more volatile rice prices as a result of market liberalization, currency depreciation, and decreasing governmental support for agricultural financing. Fertilizer usage also decreased. This encouraged Malagasy rice producers the majority of whom are net rice consumers who are food insecure—to enhance production by increasing the area under cultivation by cutting down on fallow times and expanding into vulnerable forest borders. They had few options since they lacked new manufacturing technology and had limited access to contemporary inputs. Deforestation seems to have picked up after deregulation from the 0.8% annual rate determined by aerial photos for the 1973–1985 period. A significant percentage of the forest loss seems to have been caused by smaller, less productive rice growers who resided in relatively densely populated regions and families with higher levels of food insecurity. These were the farmers who were specifically negatively impacted by the reform initiatives [10].

Cameroonian Cocoa Industry Disinvestment

Deforestation in the southern Cameroon rain forest seems to be a result of policy shocks. Early in the 1990s, the state's price stability and cocoa marketing programs were dismantled, which caused relative crop prices to change drastically in favor of plantains and cocoyams over cocoa. Due to decreased government investment in rural infrastructure and higher transportation costs brought on by the CFA franc depreciation, this was followed by an aggravation of transportation and marketing bottlenecks. As a result, producer prices for export goods like cocoa and fruit decreased and were more unpredictable, while the cost of importing food into the southern forest margins rose and became more volatile. In response, farmers switched their labor from perennial systems for growing cocoa to annual systems utilized in the region for growing cocoyams, plantains, maize, and groundnuts. This happened mostly as a result of the lack of new technology for these crops and inefficient input distribution methods in the southern

IFERP connecting engineers...developing research
ISSN (Online) 2456 -1304
International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 9, Issue 5S, March 2022

Cameroonian forest areas. It was thus not possible to boost cocoyam or plantain production via sustainable intensification.

Deforestation is only one effect of the policy-induced growth of annual crop production in low-productivity soils. Additionally, it has replaced the formerly prevalent agroforestry systems, centered on the production of cocoa and fruit, with considerably less effective systems that conserve biodiversity and sequester carbon. It will need a strong, renewed focus on greater labor and land productivity as well as better interregional food marketing to persuade farmers to switch from rotating annual crops to sustainable intense perennial agroforests in the southern Cameroonian rain-forest margins.

Zambian and Zimbabwean Corn

Interesting instances may be found in the maize subsectors of Zambia and Zimbabwe, where pre reform policies in the early 1980s encouraged smallholder adoption of hybrid maize varieties and fertilizers practices crucial to SAI in both nations' most vulnerable regions. The governmental expenditures required by depot supply and subsidies for seed, fertilizer, and banking services, however, were beyond of reach for neither Zambia nor Zimbabwe. As a consequence, by the start of the 1990s, they had eliminated these services. In both nations, the usage of fertilizer has decreased, which has resulted in both soil nutrient mining and, in areas where farmers are close to forest borders, intensification by forest removal. By raising the relative profitability of vast agriculture based on labor-intensive clearing, declining real wages in rural labor markets also operate against sustainable intensification. Private smallholder marketplaces for inputs and commodities are now gradually returning. However, it is yet too early to say whether this will be widely adopted and prosperous enough to encourage a return to SAI.

This chapter's main thesis is that policy changes have had mixed results for SAI in Africa, which is roughly described as making sufficient use of organic matter, inorganic fertilizer, and agricultural capital such irrigation systems, irrigation structures, and equipment. SAI is undoubtedly difficult in a continent with so limited money. Currently, it seems that the majority of African smallholders are not making sustainable decisions, which is why the crises of rural poverty, falling per capita agricultural production, and environmental degradation are intertwined. Nevertheless, making the right supplementary investments may break the cycle. The majority of required technologies are already in use. Giving African smallholders the ability and incentives to choose sustainable growth strategies is the key. Many policy changes have neglected to consider the overall impact on smallholder production incentives in favor of macro-level changes, failing to adequately take into account the structural flaws in rural markets.

On the incentives and capabilities of African farmers to make the investments required for SAI, recent legislative changes have had a mixed impact. The SAI success stories are found in areas where required farm-level capital investments have been made in the past or are currently being made via initiatives, where markets are close by and have a functional infrastructure. Farmers benefit from incentives and have the ability to pursue SAI if governmental or NGO interventions have remediated structural flaws in factor or product markets or developed an agricultural capital foundation. Unfortunately, a large portion of Africa's poorest smallholders reside in rural places with inadequate infrastructure, banking institutions, or access to public services. They also deal with unstable and subpar trading conditions. The capital-led route to SAI remains unreachable in their everyday fight against hunger and poverty, often creating a vicious cycle of poverty and environmental destruction. Liberalization often leads to the destruction of ecologically sensitive regions with significant biodiversity in these contexts.

How to change the deteriorating circumstances for smallholder farmers growing grains, tubers, and roots for local markets is a critical problem. Policies to encourage the private investment required for SAI are essential components. In much of Africa, zealous governmental involvement in marketing systems turned out to be financially unsustainable failures. But all too often, economic reform programs have thrown away the parastatal baby along with the essential state support services for private investment and marketing. A country-specific approach will be required for choosing the best public investments in institutions and physical infrastructure. While there is always a chance that intensification may result in some loss of forest cover, failing to intensify responsibly would almost certainly lead to new challenges to vulnerable edges.

CONCLUSION

In addition, regulatory frameworks and land-use planning play a critical role in mitigating the loss of natural vegetation. Strengthening and enforcing laws against illegal land conversion, implementing zoning regulations, and promoting protected areas can help safeguard vulnerable ecosystems from further degradation. Engaging stakeholders across the soybean supply chain is crucial for promoting sustainable practices. Collaboration among farmers, agribusiness companies, governments, and civil society organizations can drive the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies, promote responsible sourcing, and support certification programs that prioritize sustainability criteria. Furthermore, consumer awareness and demand for sustainably produced soybeans can incentivize producers to adopt practices that protect natural vegetation. Supporting initiatives that promote responsible soybean production and traceability can provide market access and premiums for sustainably grown soybeans. In conclusion, the expansion of soybean cultivation driven by technological advancements has had adverse effects on natural vegetation. However, through sustainable land-use practices, regulatory frameworks, stakeholder engagement, and consumer demand for responsible sourcing, it is possible to mitigate the negative environmental impacts of soybean production. By promoting sustainable soybean technology and supporting efforts to preserve natural vegetation, the global soybean industry can contribute to a more environmentally and socially responsible agricultural system.

REFERENCES

[1] W. Naudé, "Entrepreneurship and the Reallocation of African Farmers: Delivered as the Simon Brand Memorial Lecture, Agricultural Economics Society of South Africa, Khaya Ibhubesi, Vredefort Dome, South Africa, 30 September 2015," Agrekon, 2016, doi: 10.1080/03031853.2016.1160507.

[2] R. R. B. Leakey, T. Mabhaudhi, and A. Gurib-Fakim, "African lives matter: Wild food plants matter for livelihoods, justice, and the environment—a policy brief for agricultural reform and new crops," Sustain., 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13137252.

[3] M. Altman, T. G. B. Hart, and P. T. Jacobs, "Agrekon : Agricultural Economics Research , Policy and Practice in Southern Africa," Agrekon, 2010.

[4] W. Naudé, "Entrepreneurship and the Reallocation of African Farmers," Agrekon, 2016, doi: 10.1080/03031853.2016.1160507.

[5] B. J. McCabe-Sellers, S. Bowman, J. E. Stuff, C. M. Champagne, P. M. Simpson, and M. L. Bogle, "Assessment of the diet quality of US adults in the Lower Mississippi Delta," Am. J. Clin. Nutr., 2007, doi: 10.1093/ajcn/86.3.697.

[6] B. L. Kaptymer, J. Abdulkerim Ute, and M. Negeso Hule, "Climate Smart Agriculture and Its Implementation Challenges in Africa," Curr. J. Appl. Sci. Technol., 2019, doi: 10.9734/cjast/2019/v38i430371.

[7] D. W. Olivier, "Urban Agriculture in Cape Town: Building Sustainable Livelihoods," in World Sustainability Series, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-63007-6_8.

[8] K. Mua, "Sustainable Growth and Social Development Through Agribusiness Industry," SSRN Electron. J., 2016, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2796348.

[9] M.-S. B.J., B. S., S. J.E., C. C.M., S. P.M., and B. M.L., "Assessment of the diet quality of US adults in the Lower Mississippi Delta," Am. J. Clin. Nutr., 2007.

[10] S. Zorya, N. Morgan, L. D. Rios, and R. Hodges, "Missing food: the case of postharvest grain losses in sub-Saharan Africa," World Bank, 2011.