

interfering in the functioning of the agricultural markets will bring enormous changes in the rural society and economy. Such as, it would open up the Indian agriculture to the dictates of the world market. Moreover, the demand of the developed countries has risen for tropical crops and fruits, which means a diversion of land away from foodgrain production. This would further mean the country will become food-import dependent. So, when world food prices fall, the farmers' debts will increase. Then many farmers will be forced migrate to cities in search of jobs, swelling the number of unemployed (Siddiqui, 2012a; 2017c).

However, neoclassical economists argue that to improve efficiency, the demise of the agriculture sector and in particular small farmers is seen as necessary for economic progress. However, this is fundamentally incorrect in the present era of global climate change, where sustainable agriculture is central to a new sustainable development paradigm. The neoclassical economists' belief regarding the one-size-fits-all approach to measuring and understanding complex investment environment issues is very problematic, especially when based on the interests and priorities of particular institutions and powers.

We must then move into a new realm of creative thinking, collective democratic policy-making, respect for local and indigenous people's knowledge and experiences, and involving them in long-term planning to develop ecologically friendly and sustainable agriculture. This is the only way to deal with the challenges that agriculture, economy, ecology and society currently face in developing countries.

The neoclassical economists' solution to the contemporary environmental crisis is more market not less market. For this solution, there is a need to change the market-led economic policy



A number of researchers have found that industrial agriculture is the biggest single contributor to a loss of biodiversity.

to address the contemporary agricultural crisis. They see in monetary terms, and the loss of nature is very difficult to monetise. They favour using market prices for all these irreplaceable commodities. The contemporary corporate-led food regime, from the concentration of power in food chains to genetically modified seeds is consolidating global markets in the name of market freedoms and efficiency.

A number of researchers have found that industrial agriculture is the biggest single contributor to a loss of biodiversity, and is profoundly shaped by contemporary capitalism, not least because only a handful of "commodity" species are deemed to have any value,

and because, in the sole pursuit of profit and growth, "externalities" such as pollution and species loss are ignored. Agro-exporting systems leave rural populations increasingly deprived of land, and in developing countries, create an increasingly food dependent large population. The neoliberal policy of market deregulation across the world has intensified the marginalization of the small farmers in the developing countries. It has been found that the adverse impact of climate change is disproportionately felt by the poorest people in developing countries, who are contributing to it the least. Identifying these inequalities matters because inequality is endemic to capitalism (Siddiqui, 2019a).

However, neoclassical economists argue that to improve efficiency, the demise of the agriculture sector and in particular small farmers is seen as necessary for economic progress. However, this is fundamentally incorrect in the present era of global climate change, where sustainable agriculture is central to a new sustainable development paradigm. The neoclassical economists' belief regarding the one-size-fits-all