

# Ecological Carry Out as of Price and Origins in Agricultural Contamination in Africa

Steve Mtenje,

Pre-FinalYearB.E(CS), DMI-St. John the Baptist University, Mangochi, Malawi

Email: [mtenjesteven@gmail.com](mailto:mtenjesteven@gmail.com),

Anandaraj Shunmugam,

Lecturer, School of ComputerScience & Information Technology,

DMI-St. John the Baptist University, Mangochi, Malawi

Email: [anandboyzz@gmail.com](mailto:anandboyzz@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT:

There have been pollution threats in many ways regarding to our Malawi, as well as worldwide causing damage to the natural resources and harming humans. But it's quite difficult to assess causes and damage usually they are complex. Agriculture pollution is normally diffused by the nature, arising at low levels but leading to significant cumulative impacts. Looking at agricultural pollution it is too significant reasons. Accurate assessments of problems and costs of pollution and the development of policies and technologies to reduce pollution, but, there are only a few meet the required partnership between specialists. Disciplines and institutions of people who produce or suffer the impact of the pollution. Likely, there are less countries in central Africa that does these technological assessment and policies for development.

## INTRODUCTION:

Many consequences rise with agricultural methodology and activity widespread in contamination of water, food and air. Countries are increasingly likely to suffer; these are by no means of restriction for the industrialized but to only focus to its economies. Although some agricultural pollutants damage agriculture itself, as when pesticides kill its naturally enemy of pests or the contaminate groundwater used for irrigation, mostly they affect other sectors of society. This means that agricultural performance, measured in terms of food or fibred production, is accorded a level of success that does not reflect the true internal and external costs. In practice the assessment of these effects and external costs is very complex, and we must be cautious for two reasons. First, agriculture is not to blame. Take nitrates for example: Drinking water, threaten the health of infants by indirectly inducing the blue-baby syndrome. However, they are just as likely to have been derived from human organic wastes as from fertilizers. Most likely that the famer does not perceive pollution as to affect their livelihoods, ignoring the costs and looking at a result. But with respect these costs are taken to be small if their only realized.

## **THE SOCIAL COSTS OF THE AGRICULTURAL POLLUTIONS:**

- Another case concerns pesticide residues in food that pesticides occur in foods. Sometimes in excess of recommended concentrations is known, yet to date there appears to be no evidence of harm arising from their consumption. Put together they represent very damaging cumulative stresses that could eventually threaten the whole base for agricultural production itself. Despite these cautions, there is still concrete evidence of disruption, degradation and contamination of water, food and air by agricultural pollution in industrialized and developing countries.
- Pesticides derived from disease vector programs as well as agriculture are also potential contaminants of water and food in developing countries. Another example is soil erosion which in some circumstances, can be as high from naturally vegetated as from cultivated land. Second, the level of uncertainty over the route from pollutant to consequence is still high in several cases. For instant the link between nitrates and cancer is still contentious although the carcinogenic Nitrous compounds can be synthesized in humans, it is still not known whether this results in cancer. At macro level the epidemiological evidence is also conflicting, and despite many studies no conclusions have yet been reached.

## **THREATS TO THE ENVIRONMENT:**

Although each pollution problem has its own peculiar underlying causes, there are a number of common themes that can be drawn out of the complexity. The relation to the trends of agricultural intensification, the costs of inputs and economic overuse, and the perceptions of people involved in production and consumption. The farmers may produce pollution and also by their activities reduce it, and the consumers may affect the market demand for products by their choices.

## **INTENSIFICATION OF AGRICULTURE:**

Crop residues incorporated in the soil or fed to livestock, and manures returned to the land could be absorbed and utilized. Wood and livestock fodder made from trees and shrubs, harbored natural enemies of pests, and the roots bound the soil against erosive forces. But looking at nowadays farming precautions has been diminished generating few external impacts and using few external resources. But much has changed over recent years. Farms in the countries and resource-rich areas of the developing countries have become more productive, so they have become larger and fewer in number, increasingly mechanized, less reliant on human labor. In most countries, these changes have been called a “Green Revolution” in which the single goal of increased productivity was achieved largely through the introduction of modern varieties of crops augmented by the use of fertilizers and pesticides. Intensification has also brought new practices that have in turn led to greater chemical use. In the irrigated lowlands, the varieties of rice that are directly sown require more herbicides because weed problems increase when rice is not transplanted.

Increased use of nitrogen has increased disease sheath blight, and staggered planting has increased the incidence of other pests. As it results to decreased crop rotations and increased use of pesticides on the new higher-yielding varieties.

- Even with careful use of fertilizers and pesticides, the potential for pollution grows with increasing use. In high temperature regions that temperature hits 30-50 percent nitrogen that been applied in fertilizers is lost greater losses are seen in the tropics
- Pesticides too are lost to the environment, or remain in the crop as a residue. For pesticides this is particularly problematic because few are selective. Basically there is that kind of interference with biological processes to range of organisms. Studies has shown through their investigations that 20,000 chemicals for each pesticides been discovered. For some years ago the average was only 1800.
- Thus most new pesticides will be broad spectrum compounds acting on a range of different pest organisms, and inevitably affecting a wide range of non-target organisms, including humans. In future, much will depend upon the methods of crop fertilization and pest control that are adopted, and the picture may well change as fertilizer and pesticide usage increases.

### **COST OF THE INPUTS:**

Relative cost of most agricultural area be countries are those policies of subsidizing the production and sales, this mostly happens in countries that has little knowledge of effects of these subsidized agrochemicals. Looking at the power of this practice yes it encourages the food production but remember you not only encouraging the food production there is also a total cost of the subsidies can be very substantial by running into millions of dollars for some countries. However, some varieties of production turn to resist chemicals but these subsidies still encourage farmers greatly to relay of use of chemicals on their farms for different productions. Looking at so called threats to environment, the more the treatment the less likely to be the natural fight. To talk of brown plant hopper if treated with insecticides, actually suffered great damage. The more that farmers sprayed, the less likely it was that the natural enemies of pests would survive. The low cost of chemicals and cost of labor discourage traditional methods of pest control, which are usually more labor-and time-consuming.

### **PERCEPTIONS OF THE FARMER:**

Farmer are the major core, the views and beliefs of the important not only to productions also to the environmental care. Farmers are important, it is they after all who enact policies to reduce pollution. Sometimes farmers incorrectly perceive both the pest problem and the means of control available. Reducing these losses farmers have a tendency to overestimate both the worse possible losses and the effectiveness of pesticide.

- Let the farmer decide the best way of doing his job. Why to use chemicals, when as time to use chemicals, which kind of chemicals to use and where to apply the chemicals. Etc.

- The costs of decision-making by treating all decisions according to a standard operating procedure, for instance by spraying at pre-set times without regard for the level or likelihood of the attack.
- Check on the particular views about the pesticides themselves, rice farmers apply synthetic pesticides believing that pesticides are progressive and modern, and that powerful chemicals are a way of controlling one element of a hazardous environment. Some of these practices produces occasional droughts, flooding's as well as the pests.
- Technical studies tell how the beliefs do not accord with surveys conducted on farmers' fields, which suggest that at least half of sprayers do not benefit from increased yields. Generally, they believe that higher frequencies of treatment are associated with higher yields, and if they could afford it would apply according to a calendar schedule.

### **CUSTOMER PREFERENCES:**

Another major cause of overuse is the need to protect high value crops, such as fruit and vegetables, when the appearance of the product to the consumer is of considerable importance. Such cosmetic control is particularly prevalent in some industrialized countries. Markets permit buyers to select produce on the basis of appearance, and horticultural produce must sell itself or be left on the shelf. In many countries the number of certified organic farms is growing remarkably where farmers create requirements making it impossible to grow crops without using pesticides. As a whole public most farmer see achievements looking at prices and profits as well as Consumers are willing to pay the higher prices for organically-grown products that cost more to produce.

### **CHALLENGES FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT:**

In most cases its African countries that potentially have problem in agricultural productions. For instance, the central side of **Malawi** in Africa experience potential stresses and shocks arising from productive agricultural activity that threaten environmental sustainability. The central goal for development must be sustaining high levels of food production, ensuring that needs being the basic are met, and minimizing the damage and social costs producing the pollution. Conservation can take place everywherewithin natural resource base and ensure that its future use and exploitation would not be compromised. Conflicts of suggestions give evidence as a challenge increases food production has meant greater intensification, and by implication great changes in the natural and social environment.Reducing hedge maintenance costs and producing small gains in the area of cultivable land it is the result of the removal of hedgerows, woodlands and ponds has reduced the costs to the individual farmer by cutting of time machines need to turn in the now larger fields.

### **POPULATION CONTROL AND APPROCHES:**

These approaches could be integrated and technological encompassed by agroforestry, integrated pest management, integrated nutrient conservation, and soil and water conservation. Matching

these conflicting goals strategies it is possible to enhance yields and reduce environmental contamination.

Consequently, may fail to reach desired levels of adoption as to most farmers practice alley cropping of leguminous trees amongst cereal crops. Some programs fail to be economically viable to farmers despite proven scientific success.

1. The integrated approaches require a greater range of scientific knowledge and understanding if all the apparently conflicting goals are to be met.
2. Integrated approaches require detailed local ecological and socio-economic information on livelihood systems-who better to provide this than local people themselves.

The plans recommended holding the practice of irrigation in the fields for a set period after application, and the recycling of irrigation water. These practices were rapidly adopted and are in practices in number of areas, as a result, concentrations in drinking water rapidly fell. There is nevertheless some evidence of success.

## **REFERENCES:**

1. Pollution Control for Agriculture 2nd Edition BY Loehr Published in 1984.
2. Roy, Amit. 2014. "Adoption of Innovative Technologies, Presented on behalf of IFDC at the World Congress on Conservation Agriculture, Manitoba, Canada, June 25.
3. The Effects of Fertilizer Applications on Runoff Loss of Phosphorus, Wang, W., T. Liang, L. Wang, Y. Liu, Y. Wang, and C. Zhang. 2013.
4. Fertilizer nitrogen recovery efficiencies in crop production systems and consideration of the residual effect of nitrogen, Vitousek, P., Chen, D., Leip, A., Cai, Z. and Zhu, Z. 2014.
5. Angelo, Mary Jane, Jason J. Czarnecki, and William S. Eubanks, II. 2013. Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Law.
6. Turrall, H., with X. Mateo-Sagasta, and J. Burke. 2012, Water Pollution from Agriculture.
7. Goldman, L. 2004. "Childhood Pesticide Poisoning: Information for Advocacy and Action.
8. David J. R. Angell, Justyn D. Comer, Matthew L. N. Wilkinson (eds.) - Sustaining Earth\_ Response to the Environmental Threat (1990, Palgrave Macmillan UK)
9. Ippolito, A., M. Kattwinkel, J. J. Rasmussen, R. B. Schäfer, R. Fornaroli, and M. Liess. 2015. "Modeling Global Distribution of Agricultural Insecticides in Surface Waters.
10. Pimentel, D. 2005. "Environmental and Economic Costs of the Application of Pesticides.
11. Sánchez-Bayo, F., P. J. van den Brink, and R. M. Mann. 2012. Ecological Impacts of Toxic Chemicals.
12. Asman, W. A. H., M. A. Sutton, and J. K. Schjørring. "Ammonia: Emission, Atmospheric Transport and Deposition.
13. Bruinsma, J. 2002. World Agriculture: Towards 2015/2030: Summary Report. Rome: FAO.
14. Edwards, C. A. 1993. "The Impact of Pesticides on the Environment.

15. Pimentel, D., R. Zuniga, and D. Morrison. 2005. "Update on the Environmental and Economic Costs.
16. WHO (World Health Organization). 1990. Public Health Impact of Pesticides Used in Agriculture. Geneva.
17. Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S.E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E.M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S.R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C.A. and Folke, C. 2015. "Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet.
18. Asche, F. 2008. "Farming the Sea." *Marine Resource Economics* 23: 527–547. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/docs/aquaculture\\_docs/marine\\_perspectives\\_farming\\_the\\_sea.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/docs/aquaculture_docs/marine_perspectives_farming_the_sea.pdf).
19. Edwards, P. 2015. "Aquaculture Environment Interactions: Past, Present and Likely Future Trends." *Aquaculture* 447: 2–14. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2015.02.001.
20. 2016. "Regional Study on Agricultural Pollution in East Asia, Overview of Agricultural Pollution in the Philippines."
21. Tan, Z., C. Komar, and W. J. Enright. 2006. "Health Management Practices for Cage Aquaculture in Asia - A Key Component for Sustainability." In *The 2nd International Symposium, Cage Aquaculture in Asia*, 3-8 July.
22. FAO website. "Aquaculture". <http://www.fao.org/fishery/aquaculture/en>.
23. Xie, B., J. Qin, H. Yang, X. Wang, Y.-H. Wang, and T.-Y. Li. 2013. "Organic Aquaculture in China: A Review from a Global Perspective." *Aquaculture* 414: 243–253.
24. Zaks, D. P., N. Winchester, C. J. Kucharik, C.C. Barford, S. Paltsev, and J.M. Reilly. 2011. Contribution of Anaerobic Digesters to Emissions Mitigation and Electricity Generation under U.S. Climate Policy. *Environmental science & technology*.
25. Zhou, J.-B., J.-G. Xi, Z.-J. Chen, and S.-X. Li. 2006. "Leaching and Transformation of Nitrogen Fertilizers in Soil after Application of N with Irrigation: A Soil Column Method." *Pedosphere* 16 (2): 245–252.