



Economic Effect Of Genetically Modified Crops Of India And Their Acceptance Globally

Preety Maimom¹, (Research Scholar)

Dr. Shrikant Sharma², (Research Supervisor)

^{1,2} Department of Biotechnology Vinayaka Missions Sikkim University, Gangtok, (Sikkim)

Abstract

Using laboratory testing, GM crops are created by transferring genes throughout organisms for certain features. These plants are referred to as agrobacterium tumefaciens, genetic engineering vegetation, or GMOs (Transgenic Organisms). Since India underwent the Agricultural Productivity in the 1970s, we are now self-sufficient in the food grain industry. Caused by climate change and mounting human impact, the condition has substantially altered in the twenty-first century. It will be difficult to end malnutrition and hunger worldwide by 2030, but it can be done via organic agriculture and the combined efforts of all partners. The universe is once again seeing a spike in hunger. The needs for food and nourishment cannot be met by current technology. The past ten years have seen a tremendous acceleration in the medical and technological advancement in these fields on a worldwide scale. The objective of this study is to clarify the idea of genetic engineering research with a view to economic effect of India and their acceptance globally. The widely used GTAP (Global Trade Analysis Project) modelling tool has been used to assess the impact of introducing GM crops into Indian agriculture. The components' actual income has improved only somewhat as a result of the significant drop in consumer prices.

Keywords: Genetically Modified Organisms, Global Trade Analysis Project, Economy, India.

Introduction

Genetic engineering (GE) is often cited as a technique that will be essential for meeting future dietary needs, energy, and transportation (Castle et al., 2008; Eckardt et al., 2009; Edgerton, 2009). The insertion of a few "insight" features into a very small variety of varieties has represented advances, but subsequent advancements risk being hampered by the more intricate hurdles to market for transgenic goods. A genetically modified (GM) crop is a plant used only for agriculture that has had one or more genes encoding for desired features injected into it via the advancing genetic manipulation Some alleles may come from entirely unconnected creatures as well as from flowers of the exact same or

another variety. The use of GM crops has grown quickly. In 2008, 9% of the world's acreage was being used to cultivate Gmo (James, 2008).

Microbial activity, insect repellent, weed killer compassion, started to improve nutritional profile, and other novel traits expressed in genetic modification have led to their widespread farming. According to the most recent data, 18 million gardeners in eight countries decided to plant Crop varieties on 181.5 thousand hectares in 2014, an increment of 3–4 percent over the previous year and 2013. (Lucht, 2015). Cultivar, corn, rapeseed, textiles, rapeseed oil, rice, peanut, pumpkin, melon, and jackfruit are among the Gmo which have already been commercialised in the past 20 years. However, due to their widespread agricultural production and role in the agricultural economies of many nations, rapeseed, corn, cloth, and safflower are of particular significance. The top manufacturers of Gm foods and goods are the United State, Argentina, and Canadian (James, 2010). Chile, Brazil, Chinese, and Asia seem to be the top emerging nations for mutant crop production (James, 2015). The cultivation of GM foods yields huge social and high ambient around the globe, although many landowners and citizens in various nations are sceptics of GMOs. Usually debates about mutant plants centre on their effects and results, whether they are on farming, human health on the climate, or economic growth. Among the top concerns for scientists and decision-makers throughout the globe seem to be the economic crisis and climate science. Because it is increasingly harder to maintain up with agricultural productivity only with level of increasing population, the food problem is escalating and scientists are searching for contemporary technologies to guarantee food sovereignty (Trivedi et al., 2016).

Despite these advantages, there is considerable resistance to the production and usage of Gm technology. Public resentments are especially prevalent in India (Lucht, 2015), but they have also spread to other nations and regions as a result of trade laws, news outlets, and political attempts by pro government organisations (e.g., Pinstруп-Andersen & Schioler, 2001, Miller & Conko, 2004, Herring, 2007, Paarlberg, 2008). Potential threats toward the environmental are now the main worries, however there are worries about negative social consequences (e.g., Altieri, 2001). For addition, some think that the conventional knowledge systems in poorer nations may be threatened by GM technology (Sharma, 2004).

Material and method

Study design

The conceptual framework within which the research will be conducted is known as the research design. It provides the framework for data collection, measurement, and analysis. After collecting the data, data will investigate and conduct a descriptive research.

Data collection

The following are secondary data sources from within the organisation:

- Documentation on the organization's health and safety procedures
- Statements of mission and vision formulation
- Magazines including Financial Statements Publications
- Executive Summary of Sales Report Customer Relationship Management Software
- Information collected from secondary sources in other locations:
- Government documents
- Publications
- Business journals
- Libraries/Internet

On the other hand, the reliability of information produced using secondary data gathering methods cannot be validated.

Database analysis

GM crop adoption in Indian agriculture was already assessed using the well-known GTAP (Global Trade Analysis Project) experiences. The prominent GEMPACK tool is used to execute this same analysis. GTAP concept is a dynamic, estimated partial equilibrium simulation among many industries and regions. GTAP model (Version 7) has been amended to include the labelling expenses spent by the industry, which utilises the commodity as an intermediate input (Corong et al., 2017).

Result and Discussion

Impact on associated industries:

Organizations that are integrally related to the production of GM textiles, millet, legumes, and millet would be impacted by their acceptance. Improvement in production and a commensurate drop in the best deals and discounts of products that use terrain better efficiently than others have been caused by a reduction in cost of lands various food crops, including wheat, sugar, and others. The industries that include dairy, milk, and Dairy is gaining because it can use cheaper intermediate inputs like soybean, maize, and rice. Table 1 provides evidence of the change in magnitudes.

Table 1 Impact of using genetically modified (GM) cotton, maize, soybeans, and rice (in percent change) affect the other areas of the economy.

Sector	Supply Price	Output	Consumer Demand	Export(fob)	Import(cif)
Grains Crops	-0.44	0.29	0.22	1.94	-0.82
Processed food	0.02	0.15	0.17	-0.09	0.2
Meat and Livestock	-0.45	0.47	0.34	2.88	-0.69
Milk and Dairy	0	0.24	0.24	-0.04	0.25
Veg oil and fat	-0.62	1.37	1.06	3.54	-0.87
Processed Rice	-0.99	0.4	0.25	3.4	-2.26
Extraction	0.06	-0.16	0.21	-0.56	0.02
Manufacturing	0.16	-0.09	0.18	-1.11	0.49
Services	0.23	0.09	0.24	-0.76	0.43

Trade's impact on other nations

When only India adopts GM crops, it is evident from Table 2 that the main rice-exporting South-east Asian nations would see a negative impact on their trade balance. India is gaining market share from nations that are a part of our other Asian countries. India's low-cost goods have a negative impact on China, other Asian nations, and the USA.

Table 2: The effect on trade balance of the other countries when only India is adopting the GM crops (in million USD)

Countries	Rice	Cotton	Textile	Maize	Soybean
USA	-9.81	-23.39	-40.12	-3.72	-9.16
Argentina	-0.04	-0.01	-0.18	-0.24	-1.53
Brazil	-0.09	-3.32	-1.95	-0.29	-6.21
South Africa	-0.01	-0.83	-3.14	-0.1	-0.03
China	-1.39	0.15	-98.97	-0.33	0.91
Canada	-0.18	-0.18	-3.64	-0.07	-3.36
Rest of Latin American Countries	-2.00	-0.90	-14	0.15	-1.96
Oceania	-0.5	-6.68	-3.55	-0.33	-0.7
Other Asia	-16.11	-0.22	-79.22	2.99	9.55
SSA -	-0.55	-17.22	-0.8	0.08	-0.82

Adoption of GM rice, cotton, maize, and soybean in India and all other nations outside the EU with a 10% productivity shock and a 50% adoption rate

Prior to considering the results, GM crops are produced in other nations in addition to India (Table 3). Compared to other nations Indian exports of rice and other products to the global market have decreased since the country began using GM crops. Nevertheless, the textile industry, even though the trade balance in this industry has somewhat improved, India still dominates.

Table 3: The sectoral impact (in percent change form) on India when all other nations, except the EU embracing all of the GM crops

Sector	Export(fob)	Import(cif)	Trade Balance (Million USD)
Rice	32.76	-11.98	32.16
Cotton	11.98	-4.76	39.78
Textile	3.87	-1.09	467.45
Maize	-2.98	-0.09	-5.36
Soybean	-0.12	-2.76	-5.87

Intermediate inputs used in GM rice and industries associated to it would cost more to label by 10%.

This situation investigates the impact of the obligatory labelling law for genetically modified foods that India has implemented. GM food must be labelled appropriately, and imported GM foods must specify their nation of origin's status of approval. A research on the Philippines found that the required labelling increases manufacturing costs by 11–12% (Gruere and Rao, 2007). To account for the labelling expense for locally produced GM rice and maize, the GTAP model has been updated appropriately. Table 4 lists the sectoral consequences of this labelling legislation.

Table 4: Sectoral impacts of the labelling regulation in India (as a percent change).

Sector	Output	Export(fob)	Import(cif)	Trade Balance (Million USD)
Rice	0.88	42.06	-35.18	52.99
Dairy and Milk	0.01	1.8	-0.55	1.8
Processed Rice	-0.17	-2.79	1.49	-17.86

inclination change in favour of domestically sourced maize and industries associated to it with GM rice subject to labelling regulations India is the only nation not to have adopted GM crops.

This is to examine customer perceptions of GM crops. Its most significant product for Indian consumption is rice. Because to the great nutrient content and little herbicide use

in Genetically engineered crops, Deodhar et al(2008) .'s study of the Indian customer's knowledge, judgment, and readiness to price with GM food revealed that customers are willing to spend money of 19.5% for agricultural crops and 16.12% for cooking oil. The current GTAP approach is changed to accommodate the aforementioned problem using the Voss and Herman (2001) model. Seeing considering that no other nation has adopted GM rice, Bangladesh has been the only one to do so, therefore GM rice must be labelled. It is evident from Table 4 those favourable preferences shift in favour of GM maize would produce a rise in market demands, which again will raise the price of availability. A marked increase in the trade balance will arise from a decrease in rice imports and an increase in exports if customers in India begin to favour non-GM rice less (see Table 5).

Table 5: Sectoral consequences of a +25% change in preference for GM rice in India

Sector	Supply price	Output	Consumer Demand	Export(fob)	Import(cif)	Trade Balance
Rice	3.69	26.23	25.98	-28.86	20.56	-31.98
Dairy and Milk	0.52	-0.15	-0.6	-6.90	2.76	-6.34
Processed Rice	2.69	-0.77	-0.68	-10.02	6.98	-80.76

Table 4.13: Sectoral consequences of a -25% change in preference for GM rice in India

Sector	Supply price	Output	Consumer Demand	Export(fob)	Import(cif)	Trade Balance
Rice	-17.90	-19.63	-23.65	123	-82.57	139.87
Dairy and Milk	-2.67	0.66	0.56	7.87	-3.56	9.56
Processed Rice	-1.67	0.19	0.10	5.78	-3.85	454.11

With a favourable preference change favoring GM grains, there seems to be a huge market including both farmland to fulfil the growing consumer requirement. Thus, the cost of land increases. But as a result of excessive product prices, cereal prices increase, somewhat lowering the revenue of workers in the food industry. In the event of a taste change away from Gm foods, the reverse happens. The need for many of the economic elements is significantly reduced when output decreases and buyer behavior declines. Nonetheless, the components' actual income has improved only somewhat as a result of the significant drop in consumer prices. The knowledgeable pay inequality has grown because manual work is more valuable in this area than manual workers.

Conclusion

All of the prospective GM crops examined showed an increase in production as a result of India's adoption of GM technology, which also caused supply prices to drop. Although smaller than the growth in production, domestic demand has also grown. This resulted

in a decrease in imports and an increase in exports, resulting in a positive trade balance. The breakdown of welfare reveals that the productivity shock is the main cause of it. In terms of the other economic sectors, more intensively used commodities like wheat, sugar, and other food crops have seen increasing production and lower supply prices. Other industries, Commodities that use either millet, beans, or rice as raw material, also including animal - based foods, yoghurt and cream, vegetable oil including saturated cholesterol, including treated rice, have however benefitted.

References

- Altieri MA. 2001. Genetic Engineering in Agriculture: The Myths, Environmental Risks and Alternatives. Oakland, CA: Food First
- Carpenter, J. E. (2013). The socio-economic impacts of currently commercialised genetically engineered crops. *International Journal of Biotechnology*, 12(4), 249-268.
- Carpenter, J. E. (2013). The socio-economic impacts of currently commercialised genetically engineered crops. *International Journal of Biotechnology*, 12(4), 249-268.
- Castle LA, Wu G, McElroy D. 2008. Agricultural input traits: past, present and future. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 17, 105–112.
- Corong EL, Hertel TW, McDougall R, Tsigas ME, Van Der Mensbrugge D. 2017. The standard GTAP model, version 7. *Journal of Global Economic Analysis*. 22;2(1):1-19.
- Deodhar ., Y. S., and S. Ganesh and W.S. Chern (2008) Emerging Markets for GM foods: An Indian perspective on consumer understanding and willingness to pay. *International Journal of Biotechnology*. 2008. Vol 10(6): 570-587.
- Eckardt, N.A., Cominelli, E., Galbiati, M. and Tonelli, C. (2009) The future of science: food and water for life. *Plant Cell*, 21, 368–372.
- Edgerton, M.D. (2009) Increasing crop productivity to meet global needs for feed, food, and fuel. *Plant Physiol.* 149, 7–13.
- Gruere., G. and S.R. Rao (2007). A Review of International Labeling Policies of Genetically Modified Food to Evaluate India's Proposed Rule. *AgBioforum*, Vol 10(1): 51-64.
- Herring RJ. 2007. The genomics revolution and development studies: science, poverty and politics. *J. Dev. Stud.* 43:1–30
- James C. 2008. Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2008. ISAAA Briefs 39. Ithaca, NY: Int. Serv. Acquis. Agri-Biotech Appl.
- James C. 2010. Global status of commercialized biotech and gm crops: 2010. International Service for the acquisition of agribiotech applications. Ithaca, NY: ISAAA.
- James C. 2015. Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2014. ISAAA brief. p. 49.
- Lucht JM. 2015. Public acceptance of plant biotechnology and GM crops. *Viruses*. 7(8):4254–4281.

- Miller HI, Conko G. 2004. *The Frankenfood Myth—How Protest and Politics Threaten the Biotech Revolution*. Westport, CT: Praeger
- Nielsen CP, Anderson K. 2001. Global market effects of alternative market responses to genetically modified organisms. *Weltwirtsch. Arch.* 137:320–46
- Nielsen, C.P., and K. Anderson 2001. GMOs, trade policy, and welfare in rich and poor countries. In *Quantifying the Impact of Technical Barriers to Trade*. Ed. J. Maskus, and J. Wilson. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Paarlberg RL. 2008. *Starved for Science: How Biotechnology is Being Kept Out of Africa*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Smallholder farmers in the Makhathini Flats, Republic of South Africa. *Outlook Agric.* 32:123–28
- Pinstrup-Andersen P, Schioler E. 2001. *Seeds of Contention: World Hunger and the Global Controversy over GM Crops*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- Sharma D. 2004. *GM Food and Hunger: A View from the South*. New Delhi: Forum Biotechnol. Food Secur.
- Trivedi M, Singh R, Shukla M, Tiwari RK. 2016. GMO and food security. In: Omkar, editor. *Ecofriendly pest management for food security*. USA: Academic Press. p. 703–726.