

*Commentary***Political and environmental conditions for agricultural policies**

Amy Janzwood*

Department of Political Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Received: 20-May-2022, Manuscript No. AJPS-22-65118; Editor assigned: 24-May-2022, PreQC No: AJPS-22-65118 (PQ); Reviewed: 10-Jun-2022, QC No: AJPS-22-65118; Revised: 16-Jun-2022, Manuscript No: AJPS-22-65118 (R). Published: 24-Jun-2022

DESCRIPTION

The significance of place-based strategies based on understanding of local conditions the restricting constraints of inadequately place-based policies are illustrated with a study of maize policy and their impact and draw attention to the flaws in present top-down strategies for production promotion, value chain integration, and sector protection, which fail to incorporate regional expertise the importance of combining soil, climate, water conditions, production capacity, and local agricultural methods information and recommend a more knowledge and place-based strategy that includes a multidimensional approach, adaptable agricultural management and open decentralized governance structures that involve region-specific agricultural, economic, political, and environmental information. The term “disingenuous natures” is used to characterize the intersecting knowledge frameworks, management practices, and material conditions that allow authoritative knowledge about human-environment interactions to take hold and persistent. These circumstances are deceptive in that they are simultaneously artifactual and generative of social-ecological reifications, knowledge distortions, and information deficiencies, yet they maintain authority and legitimacy in decision-making settings. Those attempting to address the present post-truth wave lack a coherent framework for understanding the process by which post-truth emerges and dishonest personalities emerge. The role of demographic and socioeconomic variables in catalyzing pro-environmental behavior is a point of contention. Environmental scepticism is often attributed to a number of variables, including a person’s level of faith in social institutions, their religious and political ideologies, and conflicting priorities. Through what we term “green distributive politics,” green capitalism is developed, legitimized, and negotiated among marginalized rural people. Green distribution is a term that refers to value transfers between state, capital, and civil-society actors in order to support environmental conservation and green development. As they transfer value to excluded communities and strive to legitimate new socioeconomic arrangements, state and capital actors deploy various modes of distribution,

including as markets, reciprocity, redistribution, and sharing. Green distributive politics refers to efforts to establish consent through distributive programmes that grow citizen-subjects with environmental obligations while also allowing for longer-term disputed sociopolitical relations with rural people.

Green marketization models are inadequately sensitive to the sociopolitical processes and different distributive forms deployed by state and capital actors to build permission for green capitalist projects, according to capitalist environmentalisms. It also develops a conceptual framework for green political distribution. Decentralized natural resource governance has been followed by intensifying conflicts over resource claims based on social identities. Dominant groups have used ethnic, gender, and generational status to justify exclusive resource control by claiming who is a responsible resource user and who is a despoiler. The importance of “environmental subjects” under decentralized resource regimes has been stressed in the literature on environmentality. Despite this, far too frequently critical scholarship on environmental beliefs and practices has defined power in terms of dominance and resistance, ignoring the ways in which individuals’ dissatisfactions with environmental subject positions involves a wide range of power relationships. External network links and Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) have combined impacts on innovation performance. It also looks into how environmental dynamic influences the interaction between network ties, and innovation performance. We propose that business ties impact innovation performance through EO, whereas political ties influence innovation performance through business ties, based on the dynamic capability viewpoint of EO and the contingency view of network links. Furthermore, we believe that in more dynamic situations, the indirect impacts of business links and political ties on innovation performance are larger. Discrepancies in public support for farmer autonomy and external responsibility should be recognized by policymakers and interest groups, and these differences are likely anchored in environmental worldviews. There is a need for combined ecological and social studies that evaluate the possibility of area agricultural producers adopting conservation techniques voluntarily and estimate the efficacy of prospective accountability measures.

*Corresponding author. Amy Janzwood, E-mail: amyjanz@ubc.ca