
PROBLEMS OF LIVESTOCK FARMERS IN KOLAR DISTRICT

Dr.S.Jayalakshmi Priya

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Bangalore University Bangalore 560056. Karnataka.

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-7046-8735

Abstract

Livestock farming refers to domesticated animals raised in a rural setting to provide produce and labour and products for consumption such as meat milk fur leather eggs and wool. India is the worlds largest livestock owner having about 535.78 million. In India livestock has contributed 4.11% of the GDP In this study livestock farmers taken for sampling are breeders of cows, buffaloes, goats and sheep. The main place where the interview took place was the Kolar and Bangapet cattle jatre or cattle fair which takes place from morning 4:00 AM and goes on till the next day 7:00 AM. Many of these cattle rearing farmers were selected as samples from 20 villages of four talukas namely Kplar, Bangapet, Mulbagal and Srinivaspur.. The research problem pointed to agriculture becoming more mechanized resulting in more fertile grasslands coming under cultivation. Research methodology consisted of using both primary as well as secondary data. Primary data was collected by means of the questionnaire and interview method and secondary data was collected from previously published articles and government reports. Sampling design comprised of simple random sampling and percentage method was used to analyze the collected data. The findings showed that the lack of safe shelter which could save the livestock from snakes, raccoons and other wild animals was not there. Certain remedies were suggested. To conclude these livestock farmers were an unhappy lot and wanted their basic problems of water scarcity and lack of fodder to be addressed.

Keywords: fodder, livestock, mulch cows, grazing, Cattle fair.

1.Introduction

The families in the sampled villages of Kolar,Bangarpet,Malur andMulbagal had around 13 family members and their family income ranged from Rs.20,000 toRs.25,000per month.Their milk production was around 18 liters, that is nine in the morning and nine liters in the evening.Through sales of this milk they earned around Rs.55,000per month.Sale of cows took place in BangarpetDoddaSante(cattle fair or Jatre) where each cow, which was in good health, was a milch cow which and could give around 8 to 10 liters of milk per day fetched around ₹25,000.All the milk produced was sold to Karnataka milk federation KMF that is based in Tamaka KolarEach family had to spend around ₹1000 on providing water alone.Each family had to purchase 1000 litres of water per day to feed all the buffaloes cows goats& sheep besides alfalfa grass boosa and other cattlefeed .Most of the dung was used as a disinfectant outside their houses, in front of the houses and remaining was converted to gobber gas.Main drawback was there was no safety from wild animal attacks,snakes as the sheds were mostly left unmanned in the nights as most of the cowherds slept in their houses.Even the makeshift tents provided for the goats and the buffaloes was just fenced in. The buffaloes had a separate shed for themselves.The main family occupation in these sampled villages was cow rearing,buffalo rearing, goat and sheep rearing and herding.Every family had two members who solely looked took care of one cow.The major fodder for the cattle was busa and alfalfa grass and all the dried corn cobs.When asked about the government schemes they were not aware of any government schemes such as the Pashu Sanjeevni (Mobile Animal Surgery Vehicle) Kissan credit card National Livestock Mission Livestock insurance scheme under the AH & VS schemes.

Names of the sampled villages and the talukas.

Kolar	Chatrakodihalli
	Hanchala
	Shettyganahalli
Srinivaspur	Yadaruru
	Lakshmisagara
	Shygaturu
	Manjalanagara
	Kolathuru
	Agaram
Mulbagal	Yelduru
	Chintamakanahalli
	Mangalasagara
Bangarpet	Chdagatta
	Benagenahalli
	Sulikunte
	Murduvathi
	Vadigeri
	Madamangala

2.Review of Literature

(Steinfeld et al. 2006) Livestock systems occupy about 30 per cent of the planet's ice-free terrestrial surface area and are a significant global asset with a value of at least \$1.4 trillion. The livestock sector is increasingly organized in long market chains that employ at least 1.3 billion people globally and directly support the livelihoods of 600 million poor smallholder farmers in the developing world

(Thornton et al. 2006). Keeping livestock is an important risk reduction strategy for vulnerable communities, and livestock are important providers of nutrients and traction for growing crops in smallholder systems.

(Rosegrant et al. 2009). Livestock products contribute 17 per cent to kilocalorie consumption and 33 per cent to protein consumption globally, but there are large differences between rich and poor countries.

(Delgado 2005). Livestock systems have both positive and negative effects on the natural resource base, public health, social equity and economic growth. Currently, livestock is one of the fastest growing agricultural subsectors in developing countries. Its share of agricultural GDP is already 33 per cent and is quickly increasing. This growth is driven by the rapidly increasing demand for livestock products, this demand being driven by population growth, urbanization and increasing incomes in developing countries .

3.Research Problem

KolarMulbagalBangarpet and Srinivaspur taluks of Kolar district had a teeming cattle and livestock population consisting of milch cows, bulls, buffaloes, goats and sheep. With Kolar being arid district lack of water and grazing land led to a difficult situation for the cattle rearers. Using forest areas to graze their cattle proved to be a risk due to wild animals attacks. Problem of vets existed and usually country medicines was given to these livestock often resulting in their demise. Lack of awareness of government schemes for farmers owning milch cows who could provide five or more litres of milk and sell it for their livelihood was also not known to almost of the sampled respondents. With all those livestock farmers left on their own save a few who sold milk to KMF in Tamaka Kolar what about the rest?

4.Objectives.

- 1.To study the main problems of livestock farmers in Kolar district.
- 2.To find out the main causes for the prevalence of these issues.
- 3.To suggest a few remedial measures to mitigate the main problems of these sampled farmers of Kolar district.

5.Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table-1-To study the main problems of livestock farmers in Kolar district.

Sl.no	Sampled taluks	No.of sampled respondents	Low income	Family numbering 13-15	Lack of veterinary doctors	Loss of grazing land	Severe competition to sell milk	High cost of milch cows
1	Kolar	50	20%	20%	20%	20%	10%	10%
2	Bangarpet	50	10%	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%
3	Srinivasapur	50	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%	10%
4	Mulbagal	50	20%	20%	10%	20%	20%	10%

Field Survey 2023 September.

Table Analysis

The biggest families were found in KolarSrinivasapur and Mulbagal and even these families were economically backward.while the other main problems such as not having access to veterinary doctors no lands to graze their cattle high competition to sell milk high cost of milch cows some of the other issues suffered by these livestock farmers.

Table -2- To find out the main causes for these problems.

Sl.no.	Sampled talukas	No.of sampled respondents	Severe competition has made prices of fresh milk less	No cash to procure fresh fodder	Lack of clean shelters and sheds	Loss of green fields to mechanized farming	Lack of timely medical help to sick and injured cattle
1	Kolar	50	20%	20%	30%	20%	10%
2	Bangarpet	50	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
3	Srinivasapur	50	20%	20%	20%	10%	30%
4	Mulbagal	50	20%	20%	30%	20%	10%

Field survey September 2023

Table Analysis

All the above mentioned problems could have been less had these livestock farmers made use of Kissan Credit card and town hospital veterinary doctor rather than give their own medical treatment. Using the milk cooperative societies to sell milk would have been given them better prices.with agricultural progressing in leaps and bounds with more use of mechanized farming techniques and expansion of agricultural lands grazing lands have dwindled making these livestock farmers to go to jungles in search of fodder putting them at risk.

6. Remedies or Suggestions.

- 1.Creation of greater awareness to procure loan schemes for purchase of milch cows with help

from the Karnataka government.

- 2.To build shelters for cattle and other livestock instead of leaving them in makeshift fencing instead of leaving them in makeshift fencing thus keeping them in unhygienic conditions.
- 3.Providing clean drinking water from tanks and ponds built solely for this purpose alone.
- 4.Timely medical aid should be made available easily by making the ambulance come to every village.

Limitations.

- 1.The main limitations between the sampled villages were manifold. The main problem was the vast distances covered to get authentic data.
- 2.Visiting the cattlesheds to get on the spot data was done during the evenings and early mornings as herding was a difficult proposition and travelling during late evenings proved to be a hazard.
- 3.Shortage of clean drinking water led to these cattle drinking from muddy ponds often contaminated usually leading to outbreak of diseases.

7.Conclusion.

With better drinking water availability, fodder grazing land and safe provision of night shelters Will go in a long way in nurturing a healthy livestock.

Fixing fair prices for fresh cow and buffalo milk by the milk cooperative societies in Kolar and KMF(Karnataka Milk Federation) Tamaka Kolar will usher a decent income to sustain big families of these livestock farmers. Giving on the spot medical help will save the life of many of these livestock. It goes to show the medical emergency preparedness of these farmers.

8.References

1. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Livestock and Landscapes: Sustainability Pathways. Food and Agriculture Organizations of the United Nations. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/3/ar591e/ar591e.pdf> (accessed on 3 November 2021).
2. Thornton, P.K. Livestock production: Recent trends, future prospects. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 2010, 365, 2853–2867. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed][Green Version]
3. Rojas-Downing, M.M.; Nejadhashemi, A.P.; Harrigan, T.; Woznicki, S.A. Climate change and livestock: Impacts, adaptation, and mitigation. *Clim. Risk Manag.* 2017, 16, 145–163. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
4. Swanepoel, F.J.C.; Stroebel, A.; Moyo, S. The Role of Livestock in Developing Communities: Enhancing Multifunctionality. University of the Free State and CTA. 2010. Available online: <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/3003> (accessed on 9 August 2021).
5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change*; Cambridge University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2014. [Google Scholar]
6. Escarcha, J.; Lassa, J.; Zander, K. Livestock under climate change: A systematic review of impacts and adaptation. *Climate* 2018, 6, 54. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef][Green Version]
7. Gerber, P.J.; Steinfeld, H.; Henderson, B.; Mottet, A.; Opio, C.; Dijkman, J.; Falcucci, A.; Tempio, G. *Tackling Climate Change through Livestock: A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities*. 2013. Available online: <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20133417883> (accessed on 5 August 2021).
8. Collier, R.J.; Baumgard, L.H.; Zimelman, R.B.; Xiao, Y. Heat stress: Physiology of acclimation and adaptation. *Anim. Front.* 2019, 9, 12–19. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef][Green Version]
9. Ames, D. Thermal Environment Affects Production Efficiency of Livestock. *BioScience* 1980, 30, 457–460. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
10. Nardone, A.; Ronchi, B.; Lacetera, N.; Bernabucci, U. Climatic Effects on Productive Traits in Livestock. *Vet. Res. Commun.* 2006, 30, 75–81. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
11. Bianca, W. The significance of meteorology in animal production. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 1976, 20, 139–156. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]



12. Fregly, M.J. Adaptations: Some General Characteristics. In *Comprehensive Physiology*; American Cancer Society: Atlanta, GA, USA, 2011; pp. 3–15. Available online: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cphy.cp040101> (accessed on 1 September 2021).
13. Nardone, A.; Ronchi, B.; Lacetera, N.; Ranieri, M.S.; Bernabucci, U. Effects of climate changes on animal production and sustainability of livestock systems. *Livest. Sci.* 2010, 130, 57–69. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
14. Daramola, J.O.; Abioja, M.O.; Onagbesan, O.M. Heat Stress Impact on Livestock Production. In *Environmental Stress and Amelioration in Livestock Production*; Sejian, V., Naqvi, S.M.K., Ezeji, T., Lakritz, J., Lal, R., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012; pp. 53–73. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
15. Rashamol, V.P.; Sejian, V.; Bagath, M.; Krishnan, G.; Archana, P.R.; Bhatta, R. Physiological Adaptability of Livestock to Heat Stress: An Updated Review. *Periodikos.* 2018. Available online: <http://www.jabbnet.com/journal/jabbnet/article/doi/10.31893/2318-1265jabb.v6n3p62-71> (accessed on 20 July 2021).
16. Blokhuis HJ, Hopster H, Geverink NA, Korte SM and van Reenen CG 1998. Studies of stress in farm animals. *Comparative Haematology International*, 8, 94-101.
17. Blokhuis HJ, Jones RB, Geers R, Miele M and Veissier I. 2003. Measuring and monitoring animal welfare: transparency in the food product quality chain.
18. *Animal Welfare*, 12, 445-455. Buller H and Morris C 2002. Farm animal welfare aspects of the CAP, RSPCA, London. European Communities Proposal 2000.
19. Animal welfare and trade in agriculture. WTO Committee on Agriculture Special Session, G/AG/NG/W/19, 28 June 2000. European Commission 2005. Attitudes of consumers towards the welfare of farmed animals.
20. Special EU Barometer 229, 138 p. Faure, J.M., Bessei, W. & Jones, R.B. 2003. Direct selection for improvement of animal well-being. In: *Poultry Breeding and Biotechnology*.
21. Muir, W. & Aggrey, S. (Eds.). CAB International, pp. 221-245. Grandin T 1998 *Genetics and the Behavior*