



Agricultural Produce and Minimum Support Price: Discourse On Agri-Marketing in India

Shoab Ansari¹, Dr. Mohd Firoz Ahamed², Dr. Saghir Ahmad Ansari³

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, Business & Management, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India.

² Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India.

³ Professor and Ex-Chairmen, Department of Agricultural Economics and Business Management, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Abstract

New agricultural policy passed recently in India has generated various questions and a range of curiosities about agricultural marketing, exchange and distribution. The issue is further graded as valuable in the context of an agriculture based economy like India. The discourses on agricultural marketing vary and classified in the domain of cultural, economic and constitutional discourses. The paper covers the emerging issues in agricultural marketing in context of newly adapted agricultural reforms acts passed by Indian parliament. It covers the economic attributes involved in agricultural marketing like supply-chain network, procurement, MSP, land holding capacity and corporatization of agriculture. Analysis of agricultural marketing in the light of contemporary agricultural and farming reform in the sector is the major objective of this work. It specially focuses on the Minimum Supporting Price (MSP) and its impact in agricultural marketing. Initially it started with the analysis of the nature of agricultural marketing in India that required incentive based contribution to farmers in the production, transportation and exchange of agricultural produce. The risk and vulnerability associated with agriculture as well as the larger need of food-stuff for larger populations. The arguments over the MSP awareness and its role as well as number of marginal, small and large scale farmers benefited by Minimum Supporting Price as well as the global capital involvement and potential fear of farmers associated with the farming are the important section of studies. In general the paper is based upon secondary sources. Census data, quantitative information from FCI and other government reports are utilized to analyze the economic discourse upon agriculture marketing issues in the context of Minimum supporting Price (MSP), Operational land holding size and Procurement.

Keywords- Procurement, Minimum support price (MSP), Agriculture, Marketing, Crops, Policy & Landholding

1. Introduction

Majority of the population that is about 68.84% in India is rural (Census 2011). About 56.6 % of main workers are involved in agricultural activities (Census 2011). Even, 70 % of rural population in India

occupies agricultural activities or agriculture related economic activities for their sustenance (Census 2011). In this respect, Agriculture is considered as an important and most dominant economic activity in India. Though, it contributes less 16.95% terms of total GDP share (Deepa T.M 2015). But in terms of the number of population employed in this sector it ranks first whereas in Indian economy, about half of the population is involved in this sector (Census 2011). Referred as a zone of disguised or hidden unemployment, Agriculture itself causes a great deal of attraction for various academic discourses (NSSO Reports). It provides the space for a genuine enquiry to observe the social, economic, cultural and political dimension of rural life,

However, for the economy, generally dependent upon agricultural and allied activities it is necessary to critically examine the marketing of the agricultural produce. How agricultural marketing shapes the livelihood of a large workforce associated with it? How farmers sell their items? What is the role of MSP in the agricultural marketing? There are many questions that require a sufficient academic engagement with the theme related to it.

The present paper deals with certain arguments and discourses related to agricultural produce and its marketing. These discourses are classified as economic, cultural and constitutional discourses. Largely agricultural marketing and the contemporary issues related to it is the main concern of the paper. Marketing of agricultural produce or marketability of agricultural produce has more significance that is the major source of farmers' income. It also affects the social and economic change of farmers' conditions¹(Bhalla 79).

In agricultural marketing, production of agricultural goods, food items or industrial-commercial crops and its exchanges into various hands is central. In Indian economy, agricultural produce has different ranges. Starting from food grains to modern agri-processing business it has enlarged its arena. Diversification in agricultural products relates with the diversification of crops and crop combination besides the enlarging the zone of farming technique. Creation of mixed farming, dairy, market gardening, pisci-culture, floriculture etc has caused the diverse agri-produce. Agricultural produce comes into the supply chain network with involvement of various actors.

2.0 Agricultural Marketing

Marketing of agricultural produce indicates the movement and exchange of agricultural produce from the producer to the consumers (Kohls, R.L. and Uhl, J.N. (1990)). In accordance with the experts of agricultural marketing agricultural marketing involved different stakeholders like collection, separation, grading standardizing, processing, transportation and selling to the consumers (Prof. Faruque 2018)². At each stage of agricultural marketing, agricultural produce comes into circulation and is controlled by the demand supply chain (Ericksen P. J.2008). However, agricultural marketing is also involved in a zone of uncertainty. In terms of its supply side where roles of input in crops production are varied and have to be rationalized in production (Hendrickson, J.R 2008). Role of physical, climatic, technological means are important as input involved in production (Goulet, D. 1977.). The transportation cost is another issue because of the fluctuation of process. Because, of the larger and everlasting demand of certain crops required into food, agricultural processing and commercial utilization.

In industrial sectors the fluctuation of demand and supply may have an impact on the larger population. Some agricultural produce is perishable and required for procurement and reservation for its future utilization, So Infrastructure In this respect is also required and developed by agencies at government and private level. The role of public sector government undertaking is important in this respect.

¹ Performance of Indian Agriculture: A District wise Study Hardcover – 1 May 1979
by G. S. Bhalla (Author), Y.K. Alagh (Author)

² Factors influence farmers in Agricultural Marketing in India (Prof. Faruque 2018)

Though modern farming practices have also seen private and corporate involvement In production, exchange and consumption of agri produce, the food processing industries and agricultural based Examine activities has enhanced the dimension of agri marketing. The Backward and Forward Linkages of Agricultural Produce have causes for the Dynamism Involved in Agricultural Marketing (Acharya S S 2011).

2.1 Importance of Agricultural Marketing

Historically, agricultural marketing is considered as the first and most fundamental activities of settled civilization (Ahamed, M.F 2019). Generally, it was more self-sufficient and involved only as the exchange of agricultural produce to consumers directly through Cash or on barter basis (IndiaAgroNet.com)³. However, contemporary trade occupies a series of exchanges of agriculture produce involving various stakeholders till it reaches to consumers point. There are three processes in modern agri-marketing : Accessible, preparation for consumption & distribution. Agricultural produce mainly directly entered the market or started for true bags or processed by farmers' local merchants (Khan,N, Khan.M.M 2012).

However contemporary agricultural marketing in India denotes that the major form products are sold (63%) to private money lenders (whose it indebted) on the other hand weakly market is another significant space where farmers sell their Produce. Specially local and marginal farmers (which constitute 73%) of all farmers category neighboring weakly market occupy another space where farmer sell their goods Mandy (market place) is another space of buyers-seller Interaction (Jagdish N.Sheth 1997) .Mandi occupy is the 3rd historical place where farmer has least role in selling good.

3.0 Economic Discourses on Agriculture Marketing

The question of landholding is very important in terms of agricultural production and agri-marketing. Landholding determines the scale of agricultural production, its volume and nature of cropping pattern. Though, the volume of agricultural produce, composition of crops as food crops or commercial crops as well as the market value of the crops matters in the larger process of agri-marketing. The Marginal farmers constitute larger no. of farmers (68.45%) in India which has the land less than 1 hectare (agricultural Census 2015-2016). Larger farmers constitute only 0.57 %. (Agricultural Census, 2015-2016). This huge no. of marginal and small farmers is generally located in the most populous states of India. Among all the marginal farmers, Uttar Pradesh has the largest share of marginal farmers that is 19.05 % (agricultural census 2015-16). However, the marketing return of these farmers is lesser and out migration is highly recorded from rural India that indicates the rural distress and unfavorable farming returns (Census 2011).

TABLE 1.0

Number of Operational Holdings by Size Group- 2015-16

State/UT	Marginal	Small	Semi-Medium	Medium	Large	All holding
Assam	1.86	1.9	2.11	1.42	0.45	18.73
Bihar	14.93	3.65	2.95	1.46	0.36	11.20
Haryana	00.80	1.21	1.98	3.45	4.93	1.11
Punjab	00.15	0.80	2.62	5.48	6.88	0.74
Uttar Pradesh	19.05	11.65	9.38	6.77	2.73	16.26
West Bengal	05.98	3.76	1.82	0.31	0.07	18.60
All India	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source : Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare (Agriculture Census 2015-16, Phase-I)

³ IndiaAgroNet.com(Agricultural news)

TABLE 1.1

Number and area of operational by size groups

Category of Holdings	Number of Holdings		Area		Average Size of Holdings	
	2010-11	2015-16	2010-11	2015-16	2010-11	2015-16(P)
Marginal (Less than 1 hectare)	(67.1)	(68.45)	(22.5)	(24.03)	1.42	1.40
Small (1.0 to 2.0 hectares)	(17.9)	(17.62)	(22.1)	(22.91)	2.71	2.69
Semi-Medium (2.0 to 4.0 hectares)	(10.0)	(9.55)	(23.6)	(23.84)	5.76	5.72
Medium (4.0 to 10.0 hectares)	(4.2)	(3.80)	(21.2)	(20.16)	17.38	17.07
Large (10.0 hectares and above)	(0.7)	(0.57)	(10.6)	(9.07)	1.15	1.08
All Holding	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)		

Source : Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare (Agriculture Census 2015-16, Phase-I)

*-Excluding Jharkhand

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentage share out of total holdings/area

The agricultural land holding in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar is less and generally belong to the marginal and small farmers group hence they occupy the intensive subsistence farming (Agriculture Census 2015-16) in comparison to extensive large scale farming of Punjab and Haryana. However the farm production is efficient and productive may be considered as high in the popular states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar in terms of crop diversification and combination. But food crops like wheat and paddy are mostly grown. In terms of paddy and Wheat Punjab-Haryana belt is more sound for food grains production but less diversified. The market availability and government procurement covered a large number for the food grains of Haryana and Punjab where 100 % coverage of MSP is recorded. So, larger land holding capacity of Punjab and Haryana farmers has the positive sides in market return (Table 1.1).

However, land fragmentation in India may have impacts in all classes of farming size where marginal lands have increased from the occupied area and the size of land holdings. The same is true for small land size holding and occupied areas. But Large land size holding has slightly decreased in terms of land holding (Table 1.1). The slight decreased changes in terms of land holding and land occupying area from 2010-11 agricultural census year to 2015-16 census year has not much influence in the nature of agree-produce. Though, the marketing of agri-produce and rapid involvement of private actors and growth of agro-processing industries has been observed in terms of forward linkages of agri-produce of multiple packaged goods and its market coverage for consumers of local market (Irmén A. and Thisse J.F. (1998))

3.1 Cultural Discourses on Agricultural Marketing

Cultural discourses on agricultural marketing are one of the important and key segments of agricultural marketing in India (Robert A. Gross , 1982,Shafi 1984). Indian agriculture is deeply rooted in the culture,

customs and traditions of farmers' social milieu.⁴ (Singh, J., Dillon.S.S 1984) The cropping pattern, crop combination, crop preferences are associated with the festivals, rural cultural ethos, farming experiences and social customs⁵ (Gupta, D 2005). Even farm lands and its lease entities are also associated with the cultural informal practices. However, marketing of agricultural produce in the surrounding vicinity of rural areas are governed with these cultural norms such as local agricultural fair, exchange of agri-produce to the other farmers and local non farming actors like, Pujari, pandit, agricultural workers and other social dependents. However, with introduction to the recently enacted bill they will be influenced by the modernization effect and distribution to these products will be under question. Recent acts regarding the agricultural marketing in India have also caused the deformation of cultural roles in the sector. The introduction of private actors would concern the maximization of profits with rapid exchange of agricultural goods and services and the cultural elements of agri-marketing will be destroyed⁶. The market will demand efficient production agri-materials on the demand of capitalists hence the crop preferences of farmers choice may be devalued. Farmers may come at the mercy of the market rather than the obedient of cultural ethos (Mathur, B.P 2019). Even, the cultural aspect of farmers' social relations among themselves will be destructed and sense of competitiveness may replace the cooperative feelings and cohesive characters of rural societies.

3.2 Marketing Issues

Non farming diversification is less in India (Haque, T 1985). Though, the production of costs of different crops such as Paddy, wheat and Maize was in Uttar Pradesh was 58429/hectares of land. This huge cost was not balanced in view of output. Hence farmers are under stress and indebted as in the year 2016. Their farm production is changing from crops to vegetables. This agricultural community belongs to those regions of India where population size is more and land is scarce generally Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and other parts of North India. In this region the cropping patterns are still traditional and require much institutional and infrastructural reform. In other words we can say that state incentives for production, exchange and distribution are required before going to market reform. Rapid growth of population, family fragmentation, social disintegration and urbanization effect has caused the land size reduction and modification of large land holding towards small and marginal farmers. It has also resulted in land deteriorations.

3.3 "MSP" Related Issues

Even the awareness about MSP Minimum Supporting Price is very less among the farming community. It has been observed that local institutions and nearby markets seem to be more attractive places for agricultural marketing. In general a major crop produce is irrationally sold to the local money lenders over all MSP has not much active role for agricultural produce to the small and marginal farmers. However, crops like paddy and wheat are the dominant crops under the MSP zone. These crops provide the larger MSP helps even In the area of marginal farmers such as west Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. So, for the crops like wheat and paddy which has more awareness In view of MSP among farmers has larger say In the populous states of India. Though, Punjab and Haryana have more benefits.

⁴ Baisakhi, Holi, Bihu festivals are associated with agricultural activities and marketing

⁵ Batai System, traditional and informal contract farming system in India

⁶ Market-oriented farming: An overview

TABLE 1.3

Top rice producing state

State	Average production per year (Million Tonne)	% of state's produced under MSP
West Bengal	14-15	Less than 1
Uttar Pradesh	12-13	20-23
Punjab	10-11	100

Source of FCI 2017-18

In this respect, FCI data indicates that Rice production is about 14-15 Million Tonne in West Bengal but Procurement by the Government agencies was only less than 1 %. Uttar Pradesh produces about 12-13 million to rice per year and the state procured only 20-23 % rice. However, production of rice from Punjab is about 10-11 million tones and state procurement is 100 percent. In this respect we can say that Punjab is highly beneficial with the state procurement. (FCI 2017-18). Food grain production is more at the North-Western Part of India most importantly Punjab. Punjab is one of the largest producers of wheat in 2020 it produced about 127 LMT. Because of the larger land holding capacity of Farmers of Punjab it produces more but is dominated by Mono-crops. Madhya Pradesh a has also shared more in terms of food grain which is 129 LMT in the year 2020. However, marginal farmers contribute less in terms of food grains production but their cropping pattern is diversified. From small land holdings they tried to produce valuable crops more demanded in the market values.

The uneven agricultural development and variation among farm producers in India characterizes the marketing disparity in the Agricultural market. MSP is the key factor in the agricultural marketing in the area of Punjab and Haryana. MSP influences the life and activities of not only the farmers in Punjab and Haryana but it also impacts the associated lives like local traders, artisan, and shopkeepers are dependent over it. Each year Punjab and Haryana get more than 80,000 Crore of rupees through MSP. ⁷In India, The major irony is that about 6 % farmers are fully covered with the MSP and among them 84 % are recorded in the state of Punjab and Haryana. The possible fear of eradication of MSP causes insecurity among the farmers of this region.

The changes in the Essential Commodity (Amendments) Act where agricultural produce

The total procurement of farm produce by state agencies has even not been recorded and still it has less possibility. There is no doubt that openness of the agricultural market may expand the arena of the agricultural market and will lead to the economic diversification and competitiveness and bargaining powers to the producers and other stakeholders. However, the political economy and institutional reform would be the precondition of new changes. The rural Non Farming sector is the area where a potential for larger economic growth is located. The statistical data

The potential fear of farmers is also located in the process of corporate sectors in the agri-marketing. The power of “global capital”, the financial resource bases of corporate may cause the people land relationship. Culturally farmers are attached to their land and land is the status symbol to them. If rapid extraction of land resources will be their then mode of relations to the land and farmers will change and ultimately leads to the degradation. Making farming as a market drive economic activities may lead to the see story. In accordance with the government, it will bring positive change to the farmers where farming will be economically more remunerative. However, farmers claim that interaction with private players will damage the farmers.

There seems to be no doubt that market economy provides the more control of market forces specially the laws of demand and supply factions In economic order. The pathetic condition of farmers especially marginal and small farmers will be potentially more affected because of the

⁷ Article Published on editorial page of The Hindu on December, 19th, 2020

Introduction of capital forces in economic relations. There is a possibility of complete surrender against the capital forces by the farmers in the background of competition. Even the traditional labor involved in the farming activities would be affected with respect to newly emerged conditions.

TABLE 1.4

Procurement of Agricultural Produces and Payment of MSP to Farmer

*As on 09-09-2020

Wheat		Paddy	
Rabi Season(RMS)	Marketing Quantity Produce (in LMT)	Kharif Season(KMS)	Marketing Quantity Produce (in LMT)
2017-18	36.09	2017-18	7.75
2018-19	42.59	2018-19	6.74
2019-20	40.37	2019-20	7.36
2020-21	38.60		

(Source;Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution)

TABLE 1.5

State-wise; total quantum of wheat and paddy procured by the FCI since March 2019 is as follows

(Fig. in LMT)

State	Wheat		Paddy	
	RMS 2019-20	RMS 2020-21	KMS 2018-19	KMS 2019-20*
Haryana	11.33	6.69	0.00	0.05
Punjab	15.72	14.20	0.00	2.24
Uttar Pradesh	1.09	1.34	0.01	0.95
West Bengal	0.00	0.00	0.46	0.76

The government scheme of MSP can be viewed in terms performance of procurement of agricultural produce by respective procurement agencies table 1.5 denote the process end of crops In terms of wheat and paddy that is highly bought by government agencies (FCI) as rabies kharif seasons table 1.5 indicate that in year 2019-2020 Haryana rank on 11.33% procure by FCI compare with 6.69% in the year 2020-21. Punjab occupied the place in terms of government procurement of wheat as well as rice in which wheat contributed 15.72% (2019-20) and 14.20% (2020-21) respectively; though for the paddy crops Haryana as well as Punjab didn't record. Procurement in kharif seasons in the year 2018-19.but next year in 2019-20 both the state Haryana & Punjab has recorded the procurement of paddy as 0.05% (Haryana) and 2.24% Punjab. This data clearly indicates that for paddy crops procurement Haryana has less significance compared with Uttar Pradesh and west Bengal from where 0.95% and 0.76% of paddy was procured in the year 2019-20 respectively. Though, procurement of paddy was less from these two states in the year 2018-19 which was 0.01 (Uttar Pradesh) and 0.46 (west Bengal). However, for wheat procurement, West Bengal is less significant where nothing has been procured. Though, it indicates the less production of wheat crops from the agricultural land of west Bengal. Though, Uttar Pradesh wheat was procured as 1.34% (2019-20) and 1.00% in 2018-19 the data explained the regional inequality in terms of agricultural procurement of selected crops of wheat & paddy in India

TABLE 1.6

The total number of farmers availed the Minimum Support Price (MSP) from Paddy and Wheat is as follows-

As on 09.09.2020

STATES	Paddy			wheat			
	KMS 2017-18	KMS 2018-19	KMS 2019-20*	RMS 2017-18	RMS 2018-19	RMS 2019-20	RMS 2020-21
Haryana	681984	830792	1891622	690448	883783	902937	780963
Punjab	1142621	1143713	1125238	843446	897905	830528	1049982
Uttar Pradesh	492913	684013	706549	800646	1070044	749858	663810
West Bengal	350181	733357	805186	0	0	0	0

This information was given in a written reply by the Union Minister of State for Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Shri Danve Raosaheb Dadarao in Rajya Sabha today.

APS/SG/MS

(Release ID: 1656291) Visitor Counter: 712

However, the number of farmers who were benefitted from paddy and wheat crops under MSP varied. Haryana and Punjab have important ranking in terms of farmers under MSP coverage (Table 1.6). Even Haryana and Punjab is not the traditional producers of paddy crops and FCI has not procured the paddy from Haryana (Table 1.5) but Haryana has procured the paddy in the decentralized procurement agencies as well as state agencies (ibid 1.4) in the in kharif season (2019-2020). The farmers benefitted by the MSP are higher in higher as 18911622 that shows the rapid increase in paddy production and its procurement in the year 2019-2020. Even for Rabi Marketing System as for wheat is concerned, the data of table 1.6 indicates that Haryana and Punjab are leading under MSP coverage. From the year 2018-2019 the MSP coverage to farmers in the state of Haryana has decreased in the year 2020-21. The decreasing tendencies of wheat coverage further reveal for the state of Uttar Pradesh where the MSP covered the 1070044 farmers in the year 2018-2019 but no. of farmers under wheat MSP has decreased as 663870 (Table 1.6). Though, West Bengal farmers have not been protected by MSP system for wheat crops because wheat is not procured by FCI in west Bengal either in 2019-20 or 2020-21. The less coverage of MSP is recorded in the state of Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal in compare to farmers benefitted by MSP from the Haryana and Punjab even for paddy also where Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal are the traditional producers.

4.0 Constitutional Discourse-

The legal bases of agricultural marketing in India have also been involved in constitutional discussion also. As a federal political structure Indian constitution provides the division of power among various powers in terms of central government, provinces and local governments. Various issues are distributed in respective lists that give jurisdiction to the central and state powers to frame the laws with respect to the items mentioned, in their respective lists (schedule V11 of Indian constitutions).

“Agriculture” in general is included in the state list of V11 schedule (item 14 of state list, article 246 of Indian constitution). Even markets and fairs are also included in the same list as item 28 of Indian constitution. However, the power to regulate the trade activities comes under the domain of the central government which is mentioned as the 42nd item of the central list of viith schedule of India constitution (ibid) as inter-state trade and commerce. In terms of constitutional discourse developed over agricultural

marketing in India, it seems that laws related to agricultural produce marketing come under the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures. Though the central government can make laws for encouragement, incentivize, persuade and cajole the provincial government (⁸Damodaran Harish 2020). The debate over the new policies adopted by the central government in India as agricultural produce and livestock contract farming and services (promotion and facilitation act, 2018, **the first**, and perhaps the most far-reaching and controversial, is called the farmers' produce trade and commerce (promotion and facilitation) bill, 2020. **The second** is the essential commodities (amendment) bill, 2020. **The third** ordinance, the farmers (empowerment and protection) agreement on price assurance and farm services, Bill.2020.

However, the discourse on central legislation produced much debate because of the other provisions within the constitutional framework. There is no doubt that the constitution empowers the centre to legislate on the issue of "trade and commerce" in all food stuff, cattle fodder, raw cotton and jute. It includes the inter-state and intra state marketing regulations. This provision is clearly mentioned in the concurrent list of vii th schedule of Indian constitution. Which provides the authority of state as well as centre can make laws over the issue mentioned as the 26th item of the concurrent list. Another provision that enlarges the powers of the central government is that in case of conflicts between centre and state government, the laws made by the central government shall prevail over those of the states. In this respect, the arguments made by the scholars seem to be diverse, In terms of "agriculture", it has the broader connotations that involve not only the cultivation of soil, harvesting and raising the crops but also incorporates rearing of animals, selling of agricultural and farming produce. If already existing state regulations like APMC Act (2018) Comes into conflict with central acts then APMC Act will be overshadowed. The discourse generated in this respect is cooperative federalism and autonomy of state governments. The various agro climatic regions and agro-ecological regions suited with the variety of crops may have the different requirements. Respective provinces located in these agro climatic regions will have the specific programs and policies related to agricultural productions, exchange, procurement and marketing, the food stuff, crop combinations, cropping pattern and land size holdings are also different. The respective states make the policies on the principled position of pragmatism. Hence, autonomy of states with regard to local agricultural marketing is the important concerns of many states in India.

Conclusion

- Agriculture Marketing has wide connotation that not only linked with economy but culture and legal frame work produce the discourses on their own.
- Farmers are more vulnerable community so they must be compensated and must not be relied only on market forces.
- Agricultural policies and newly adapted laws by Indian parliament in 2020 must be rationalized and it would be in form of development of non-farming economics diversification in rural India.
- Rural resource mobilization and rural employment generation can be produced by organized agricultural marketing in India and will reduce the pressure of disguise work force on farm land.
- Incentives to the farmers and awareness over MSP is much required because of the lesser number of farmers benefitted from MSP coverage.
- MSP coverage must be trickle down from the farmers of Punjab and Haryana to other states of India.
- Procurement of agri-produce can be replace when the grain or agricultural produce would be exchange among the local consumers through local market system
- More concentration should be there upon marginal and small farmers as their numbers are enlarging. They must be included in the rural policy coverage
- Instead of reform at the cost of rural lives it must be rational suitable agricultural policies.

⁸ Article Published on editorial page of Indian Express on December, 29th, 2020

There is no doubt that a free market would lead to the improvement of farmers' lives but some it will raise the other question about environmental sustainability and over- extraction of natural resource economy. The government is expected to base the rural market environment condition for the farmer, at what level. the MSP. The question will still be there, and through planned .but this protection for the Punjab and Haryana farmer. is can't be over through. Without day, even the private trade is before the law into force.

Bibliography

- [1] Acharya, S.S. and N.L. Agarwal (2011), Agricultural Marketing in India, *Oxford & IBH publishing Company Pvt Ltd., Fifth edition.*
- [2] Ahamed, M.F (2019), INDIGINOUS GROUP : A STUDY THROUGH SPATIAL PERSPECTIVE, *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research: www.jetir.org*
- [3]. Census, (2011) "Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner". *India Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India*
- [4]. Deepa T (2015) Abhyudaya, Role and Importance of Primary Sector "Revolutions in Primary Sectors" Volume-3 Issue-4 October-December-2015 Pages-8 www.uni-mysore.ac.in
- [5]. (2020) "Directorate of Economics and Statistics" Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture Farmers Welfare Government of India
- [6]. (2020) "Directorate of Economics and Statistics" Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture Farmers Welfare (Agricultural Census 2015-16) GOI
- [7] Ericksen P. J.2008 *Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change research Global Environmental Change* 18 (1), 234245. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.09.002
- [8]. Goulet, D. (1977). *The uncertain promise: Value conflict in technology transfer.* New York: IDOC.
- [9]. Gupta, D (2005); Whither the Indian Village: Culture and Agriculture in 'Rural' India, *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol. 40, No. 8 (Feb. 19-25, 2005), pp. 751-758 (8 pages)
- [10]. G. S. Bhalla, Y.K. Alagh (1979) "Performance of Indian Agriculture": A Districtwise Study Hardcover – 1
- [11]. Haque, T(1992) "Economics of Agriculture in Backward Regions", Project Report, NIRD, Hyderabad
- [12]. Haque, T (1985): "Regional Trends and Patterns of Diversification of the Rural Economy in India" *Indian Journal of Agricultural. Economics*, Vol XL, No. 3, July-Sept, pp. 291-297
- [13]. Hendrickson, J.R(2008) J.R. Hendrickson, J.D. Hanson, D.L. Tanaka, G.F. Sassenrath Principles of integrated agricultural systems: *introduction to processes and definition Renew. Agric. Food Syst.*, 23 (4) (2008), pp. 265-271.
- [14]. Irmen A. and Thisse J.F. (1998): Competition in multi characteristics spaces: *Hotelling was almost right Journal of Economic Theory*, 78,1, p.76-102.
- [15]. Jagdish N.Sheth (1997): "Buyer-Seller Interaction: A Conceptual Framework"
- [16]. Kohls, R.L. and Uhl, J.N. (1990) *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 6th edition, New York, *Macmillan Publishing Company* pp. 18–21
- [17]. Khan, N, Khan.M.M (2012) *Marketing Revolution in Rural India: Emerging Trends and Strategies; Journal of Business Administration and Education*, Vol 1, No 1

- [18]. NSSO, (2019) “*Labor and Employment statistics*”; Ministry of Statistical and Programme Implementation, Government of India.
- [19]. Prof. Faruque (2018) Factors influence farmers in Agricultural Marketing in India, *M Jeyaramya et al. International Journal of Recent Research Aspects* ISSN: 2349-7688, Special Issue: Conscientious Computing Technologies,, pp. 565-568
- [20]. Randhawa Sundaram, Randawa,N.S & Sundaram, K.V (1990), “Small farmers Development in Asia and the Pacific : Some lessons for strategy formulations and Planning”, *FAO Economic and Social development*; Paper No. 87, FAO/UN, Rome,
- [21]. Robert A. Gross, (1982); Culture and Cultivation: Agriculture and Society in Thoreau's Concord *The Journal of American History* Vol. 69, No. 1 (Jun., 1982), pp. 42-61 (20 pages)
- [22]. Shafi M (1984) Agricultural productivity and regional imbalances : a study of Uttar Pradesh “*Agricultural economics aspect*” Uttar Pradesh. New Delhi : Concept,
- [23]. Singh, J.,Dillon.S.S (1984), Agricultural Geography, *Tata McGraw-Hill*, 412 pages
- [24]. Varadharajan, D. 2019 AI, Robotics, And the Future of Precision Agriculture. Available online: <https://www.cbinsights.com/research/ai-robotics-agriculture-tech-startups-future/>.
- [25]. V M Rao Hanumappa 99 Rao, V.M & Hanumappa, H.G (1999) : “Marginalization Process in Agriculture – Indicators, Outlook and Policy Implications”, *Economics and Political Weekly*, 34(52), December 25-31, PP (A133 – A138)
- [26]. Winter, 1972 Harry L. Davis and Alvin J. Silk, ‘! Interaction and Influence Process in Personal Selling,’ *Sloan Management Review*, 13, 54-56.