



GREEN REVOLUTION AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Laxman Vasant Nalawade¹ & Dr. Arvind Vaman Dalavi²

¹M.A. B.Ed. Research Scholar, P.A.H.S. University Solapur

Campus.

Email- laxmannalwade1985@gmail.com

²M.A., Ph.D. Assistant Professor & Research Guide, Bharat Mahavidyalaya, Jeur.

Tal. - Karmala Dist. - Solapur. Email- Arvind.dalavi@gmail.com



Abstract :

Since the middle of the last century, several perspectives have addressed rural development from different viewpoints and productive aspects have prevailed. Vista that changes factors desire productive aspects have prevailed. Four general approaches rural, aspects productions that a great extent. That encompass these perspectives: the Technological, Sociological, generals a group is perspectives: The Technocratic, Sociological, Socio-Technocratic, and Political approaches. This paper aims Sociological, Socio-Technological and Political. The articular to put forward Food Sovereignty and its focus on the rights reflation to search outdoor sovereignty food, centered of rural inhabitants as a perspective of the political approach a population rural, therefore perspective to rural development. Despite the fact that food sovereignty Politics in the rural area. The integrates important topics such as the need of the food integrate aspects importance of rural inhabitants by society, it is necessary to identity through to increase the efficiency of agricultural processes. So the productivity of the crops was increased and could help developing rural areas to face their growing population's needs. Its consummatoms postulates necessities.

Key Words: agricultural policy, food policy, household income.

Introduction:

It started around 1960s and helped in increasing food production in the country.

The green revolution's primary aim was to introduce high-yielding varieties (HYVs) of cereals to alleviate poverty and malnutrition.

Objective of Green Revolution:

- 1) Short Term: The main short aim behind this revolution is to address India's hunger crisis during the second Five Year Plan.
- 2) Long Term: The long term goal of this revolution is to do modernization of agricultural practice in rural areas. This will lead to modernization of rural development, industrial development; infrastructure, raw material etc.
- 3) Employment: Another main objective after this revolution is to provide employment to both agricultural and industrial workers.

- 4) Scientific Studies: Another objective is to produce strong plants which could withstand extreme climates and diseases.

Method of Green Revolution:

The term 'direct transfer' is used to discriminate between methods of plant transformation that rely on the use of indirect methods and those that do not direct methods. Direct gene transfer method all rely on the delivery of large amounts of 'naked' DNA whilst the plant cell is transiently permeabilised. One of the major disadvantages of the direct gene transfer methods is that they tend to lead to higher frequency of transgene rearrangement. Other, less reproductive method, such as laser mediated uptake of DNA, microinjection, ultrasound and inplanta exogenous application, have mainly been used for the analysis of transient gene expression.

Data Base:

- 1) The green revolution had led to a significant increase in production. The biggest beneficiary of the revolution of was wheat grain. The production in the first phase of the scheme was 55 million tons.
- 2) Only in agricultural production not limited to, this revolution also increased per acre product.
- 3) To meet the demand of growing population and for emergencies that production was enough to stock it.
- 4) Tertiary industries like transport, irrigation, food processing, marketing etc. provided employment opportunities for workers due to green revolution.
- 5) Farmers in rural area benefited greatly from the Green Revolution, prospering and increasing their incomes.

Impact of Green Revolution in Rural Area: Average Yield per Hectare of Crops during 1950-51 to 1999-2000 (Yield per hectare in kgs)

Years	Rice	Wheat	Pulses
1950-51	668	663	441
1960-61	1.013	851	539
1970-71	1.123	1.307	524
1980-81	1.336	1.630	433
1990-91	1.740	2.281	578
1992-93	1.744	2.327	573
1995-96	1.855	2.493	552
1999-2000	1.968	2.778	635

There were three basic elements:

Expanding farming areas – Post-independence, India needed to expand its cultivable land to meet the rising demand.

Double-cropping on the existing farm land – Since India had only one rainy season every year, farmers in the country practiced one crop season per year. However, the Green Revolution introduced huge irrigation projects to make water available for another crop. Hence, farmlands now had two crop seasons per year.

Using better seeds – The Indian Council for Agricultural Research, which the British had established in 1929, was reorganized in 1963 and 1975. The Council developed new strains of high yield variety seeds, mainly wheat and rice and also millet and corn.

In 1978-79, India produced a record grain output of 131 million tons. This catapulted India as one of the world's biggest agricultural producers.

From the time India gained independence in 1947 to 1979, farmlands recorded an improvement of 30% in their yield per unit land.

Another benefit of the Green Revolution was the increase in employment opportunities. Agricultural workers were in demand and so were industrial workers due to the creation of facilities like factories and hydroelectric power stations.

Over the years, there has been some criticism due to the extensive use of pesticides and fertilizers. Also, extensive irrigation projects have eventually led to soil degradation. Further, heavy dependence on a few major crops has reduced the biodiversity of farmers.

Conclusion:

- 1) The global crisis has led to a radical change in paradigm when defining priorities and public policies for rural development in the poorest countries. Virtually all the organizations working in agriculture, food and development aid are currently heavily engaged in these deliberations, notably in the African context, where strong population growth is threatening natural resources weakened by drought.
- 2) The major strategic priorities defined by these recent initiatives for agricultural research and rural development consider that an increase in agricultural production is needed, but they have dismissed the models based on technological progress, intensification and 'blind' growth that guided the 'green revolution'. These new priorities are intended to sustainably improve production, whilst remaining sympathetic to the human population and the environment. Consequently, the core objective for all rural development players in the African dry lands, particularly for research, is to organize, manage and support innovation systems that improve rural living conditions without damaging the environment.
- 3) Improving the capacity of rural populations in poor countries to design innovations collectively and control their development has become a vital need on an African scale, and also a global scale. This great challenge will necessarily involve developing novel approaches and new technical learning and communication tools that will introduce new technologies, as well as local know-how, whilst respecting the cultural context.
- 4) This renewed vision of the role of research for development grants a core role to 'stakeholders', to 'competencies', to 'dialogue', and to the 'sharing' of knowledge and information. It is in this objective of accompanying stakeholders and developing competencies that research is awaited. The new face of research for development and food security presupposes that it will implement Tran's disciplinary approaches combining the technical sciences with social and human sciences. Research should take a much greater part than it has so far in strengthening the competencies of all stakeholders in the rural world, seeking to increase their empowerment and ability to act. Our contribution to that objective stands out through an interchange of views involving recent, or ongoing, experiences in the field, presented and discussed by the people involved in those experiences, be they from the world of research, development, farmer organizations or civil society.
- 5) As the global food, financial and environmental crisis takes hold – or maybe owing to it – we would seem to be moving towards a model arguing in favour of 'true human development', which, as Edgar Morin highlighted in *Less set saviors necessities a education due future*, will involve joint development of individual autonomy, community participation and the feeling of belonging to the human race (Morin, 2000).

Reference:-

- 1) Altieri, M. and V. Toledo. 2011. The agro ecological revolution in Latin America: rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants. *J. Peasant Stud.* 38, 587-612. Doi: 10.1080/03066150.2011.582947
- 2) Bebbington, A. 1999. Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Develop.* 27, 2021-2044. Doi: 10.1016/S0305-750X (99)00104-7

- 3) Borras Jr., S. 2009. Agrarian change and peasant studies: changes, continuities and challenges-an introduction. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 5-31. Doi: 10.1080/03066150902820297
- 4) Brass, T. 2002. Latin American peasants - new paradigms for old? *J. Peasant Stud.* 29, 1-40. Doi: 10.1080/03066150412331311019c
- 5) Bryceson, D. and C. Kay. 2000. *Disappearing peasantries: rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America.* Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- 6) Chambers, R. 1983. *Rural development: putting the last first.* Prenotice Hall, Harlow, UK.
- 7) Chambers, R. and G. Conway. 1992. *Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century.* Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK.
- 8) Declaration of Nyeleni. 2007. Declaration of Nyeleni. *Chain React.* 100, 16. In: <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=081408433041096;res=IELHSS>; consulted: May, 2016.
- 9) Desmarais, A. 2002. Peasants speak - The via Campesina: consolidating an international peasant and farm movement. *J. Peasant Stud* 29, 91-124. Doi: 10.1080/714003943
- 10) Ellis, F. and S. Biggs. 2001. Evolving themes in rural development 1950s-2000s. *Develop. Policy Rev.* 19, 448. Doi: 10.1111/1467-7679.00143
- 11) FAO. 2003. *Trade reforms and food security: Conceptualizing the linkages.* Rome.
- 12) Garcia, A. 1972. *Atraso y dependencia en America Latina.* Editorial El Anteo, Buenos Aires. Doi: 10.1080/03085147.2014.898824
- 13) Han, C. 2014. The economic fallacy and forms of integration under and after socialism. *Econ. Soc.* 43, 626-649. Doi: 10.1080/03085147.2014.898824
- 14) Hetherington, K. 2009. The strategic incoherence of development: marketing expertise in the world development report. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 653-661. Doi: 10.1080/03066150903143053
- 15) Kay, C. 2005. *Enfoques sobre el Desarrollo Rural en America Latina y Europa desde mediados del siglo veinte.* Institute of Social Studies de La Haya. The Hague, the Netherlands.
- 16) Kay, C. 2009. Development strategies and rural development: exploring synergies, eradicating poverty. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 103-137. Doi: 10.1080/03066150902820339
- 17) Martinez-Alier, J. 2011. The EROI of agriculture and its use by the Via Campesina. *J. Peasant Stud.* 38, 145-160. Doi: 10.1080/03066150.2010.538582
- 18) Martinez, N., Z. Menacho, and F. Pachon. 2014. Food loss in a hungry world, a problem? *Agron. Colomb.* 32, 283-293. Doi: 10.15446/agron.colomb.v32n2.43470
- 19) Max-Neef, M., A. Elizalde, and M. Hopenhayn. 1994. *Desarrollo a escala humana: conceptos, aplicaciones y reflexiones.* Vol. 66. Icaria Editorial, Barcelona, Spain.
- 20) Molina, J. 2010. Keys for rural territorial development. *Agron. Colomb.* 28, 421-427.
- 21) Ortega, M. and M. Rivera. 2010. Indicadores internacionales de Soberanía Alimentaria: nuevas herramientas para una nueva agricultura. *Rev. Iberoam. Econ. Ecol.* 14, 53-77.
- 22) Oyo, C. 2009. The World Development Report 2008: inconsistencies, silences, and the myth of "win-win" scenarios. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 593-601. Doi: 10.1080/03066150903142949
- 23) Pachón, F. 2011. *Desarrollo rural: superando al desarrollo Agrícola.* Colección Techné. Editorial Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- 24) Pachón, F.A. 2013. Food sovereignty and rural development: beyond food security. *Agron. Colomb.* 31, 362-377.
- 25) Parrado, A. and J. Molina. 2014. *Mercados campesinos: modelo de acceso a mercados y seguridad alimentaria en la región central de Colombia.* Oxfam; Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- 26) Patel, R. 2009. Food sovereignty. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 663-706. Doi: 10.1080/03066150903143079
- 27) Polanyi, K. 1977. *The livelihood of man.* Academic Press, New York, NY.
- 28) Polo, J. 2013. Karl Polanyi y la "hybrids" economists de la Modernidad. *Logos: An. Semin. Metafisi.* 46, 261-285. Doi: 10.5209/rev_ASEM.2013.v46.42873

-
- 30) Ramirez, C. 2014. Critical reflections on the New Reality and the rural territorial development approaches in Latin America. *Agron. Colomb.* 32, 122-129. Doi: 10.15446/agron.colomb.v32n1.41218
 - 31) Schejtman, A. and J. Berdegúe. 2003. Desarrollo territorial rural.
 - 32) RIMISP, Santiago. Scoones, I. 2009. Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36, 171-196. Doi: 10.1080/03066150902820503
 - 33) Silva, R. 2010. Multifuncionalidad agraria y territorio: algunas reflexiones y propuestas de análisis. *EURE (Santiago)* 36, 5-33. Doi: 10.4067/S0250-71612010000300001
 - 34) Van der Ploeg, J.D., Y. Jingzhong, and S. Schneider. 2012. Rural development through the construction of new, nested, markets: comparative perspectives from China, Brazil and the European Union. *J. Peasant Stud.* 39, 133-173. Doi: 10.1080/03066150.2011.652619