

Comparative study on China's Agricultural and Rural Development Policy Transformation and International Experience under the Background of Rural Revitalization

Yuxian Yu*

Zhongkai University of Agriculture and Engineering, Guangzhou, Guangdong, 510225, China.

Email: 1329078187@qq.com

*corresponding author

Keywords: Rural revitalization; Rural development support policies; International experience; Comparative

Abstract: Accelerating the pace of China's agricultural and rural development support policy transformation is a major measure to realize the rural revitalization strategy. To this end, based on the discussion of the international evaluation methods of agricultural support policies, this article compares the effects and structure of China's agricultural and rural support policies with those of the United States, the European Union, Japan, and the developing countries Russia, Indonesia, Vietnam, etc. National Agriculture supported PSE, GSSE, and CSE for analysis, and comparison. It is believed that although China's agricultural support policy started late, PSE and% PSE have grown rapidly. Compared with some developed countries, support needs to be increased.

1.Introduction

The implementation of the strategy of revitalizing the countryside with socialism with Chinese characteristics is a major strategic decision made by the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China in accordance with the current situation of agricultural and rural development in China. It is an important part of building a well-off society in China. Always grasp. The formulation of supporting policies for agricultural and rural development is an important measure to achieve rural rejuvenation [1]. For this reason, since China's accession to the WTO, it has directly subsidized agriculture and established a policy support framework mainly based on price support, so that China's grain output has maintained a steady growth state for many years and farmers' economic income has also increased. But at the same time, we must clearly see that the situation facing China's agricultural development is also very serious: domestic land costs and labor costs have risen sharply, food prices have been inverted, and there have been "three highs" (high production, high imports, high inventory) Strange; internationally, the United States submitted a request for consultation to the WTO on the grounds that China's support policy for agricultural products exceeded its commitments at the time of accession to the WTO. Facing such a grim situation, as a worker engaged in agricultural work, it is responsibility of the author to conduct in-depth research on China's agricultural and rural development support policies in the new situation, and to conduct in-depth analysis of agricultural support policies in developed and developing countries for reference.

2.Overview of International Evaluation Methods for Agricultural Support Policies

The international organization that evaluates agricultural support policies is the OECD. This article uses the OECD evaluation index system for the evaluation of agricultural support policies in various countries. It not only covers the agricultural support policies of each country, but also reflects the agricultural support level and support structure status of each country [2]. The OECD indicator system (2015 edition) divides the total agricultural support evaluation (TotalSupportEstimate, TSE) into three categories: one is ConsumerSupportEstimate, CSE

(Consumer Support Evaluation); the second is ProducerSupportEstimate, PSE (Producer Support Evaluation); the third is GeneralServicesSupportEstimate , GSSE (General Service Support Evaluation). The purpose of designing OECD agricultural support evaluation indicators internationally is to facilitate the evaluation and monitoring of agricultural support policies in various countries, and to facilitate agricultural negotiations and dialogue between countries.

3.Comparison of China's Agricultural and Rural Development Support Policy Transition with Developed Countries

The transformation of China's agricultural and rural development support policy can be compared with the representative United States, European Union, and Japan in developed countries, which can be carried out in three aspects.

3.1.Comparison of the effects of agricultural and rural support policies.

3.2.In terms of producer support evaluation, from the perspective of % PSE from 2002 to 2015, China is far lower than Japan and the European Union, and slightly higher than the United States, as shown in Table 1. Second, from the perspective of the development of the trend, the % PSE of the United States and the European Union and Japan fell sharply in 2015 compared to 2002. Only China's% PSE rose year after year, and surpassed the US and EU in 2014, with a cumulative increase of 177.86%. The main reason is that the state has implemented a series of agricultural and rural support policies, such as the abolition of agricultural tax, animal husbandry tax, slaughter tax, etc., and a number of subsidy policies [3].

Table 1: China, the United States, the European Union and Japan 2002-2015 PSE comparison table (Money value% PSE transferred by consumers and taxpayers to producers in China, US, Europe, and Japan)

Countries	%PSE	Remark
China	12.32%	Ranked third
America	11.04%	Ranked fourth
Europe	24.63%	Ranked second
Japan	51.78%	Ranked first

3.3.Structural comparison of agricultural and rural support policies. In order to develop their own agricultural production, each country will make corresponding adjustments to its agricultural support policy structure according to its actual situation [4]. This article selects China, the United States, the European Union, and Japan for their agricultural support structures from 2002 to 2005 and 2012 to 2015 for comparison. The results are: the proportion of PSE in EU, Japan, and China from 2002 to 2005 have increased to in varying degrees, proving that these countries are using agricultural support policies to adjust their structure, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparison of agricultural support structures in China, the United States, the European Union, and Japan from 2002 to 2005 and 2012 to 2015

Countries	2002——2005 Year			2012——2015 Year			Ranked
	PSE	GSSE	CSE	PSE	GSSE	CSE	
China	22.5 %	29.9%	Little increase	6.1%	44.7%	with PSE as it priority	
USA						with PSE as it priority	
Europe			Little increase			with PSE as it priority	
Japan			Little increase			with PSE as it priority	

3.4.Comparison of agricultural and rural support policies. Use the OECD agricultural support indicator system to compare the effects and structure of agricultural and rural support policies in the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China: First, China 's TSE (total agricultural support) ranks first in the four countries, in terms of % PSE and PSE. It is constantly growing, but

compared with Japan, where China's agricultural production conditions are basically similar, China's PSE is still low, and it is necessary to further strengthen agricultural and rural support policies; second, from the perspective of the structure of agricultural support The proportion of CSE and PSE has increased rapidly. Within GSSE, public reserve expenditures have fallen significantly, and the proportions of innovation and agricultural knowledge have increased significantly [5].

4. Comparison of China's Agricultural and Rural Development Support Policy Transition with Developing Countries

China's agricultural and rural development support policy transition is compared with developing countries. This article chooses to compare with Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, Turkey, Israel and other countries. It can be carried out from three aspects.

4.1 Agricultural and Rural Support Policies The comparison of PSE between China and relevant developing countries from 2010 to 2016 is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of PSE indicator values of agricultural support between China and relevant developing countries in 2010-2016

Countries	Agricultural Support PSE Situation
China	700 Over 100 million Euros, average annual growth rate 15% .
Indonesia	130 More than 100 million euros, with an annual growth rate of 10% .
Russia	80 Above 100 million euros, the overall change is not significant.
Kazakhstan	2010—2015 Year, The average annual growth rate is about 14%, which was negative in 2016.
Ukraine	2013-2016 was negative.
Vietnam	2014-2016 was negative.

4.2 Agricultural and Rural Support Policies CSE comparison between China and relevant developing countries from 2010 to 2016, see Table 4 for details.

Table 4: Comparison table of CSE indicator values of agricultural support between China and relevant developing countries in 2010-2016

Countries	CSE in Agricultural Support
China	The CSE is lower than the OECD value. In 2015 and 2016, the CSE was about 1.2 times that of the OECD.
Indonesia	Shows a downward trend, the decline rate is 13%.
Russia	The changes are unstable, showing an increasing trend from 2010 to 2013, and then a downward trend.
Turkey	Same as Russia.
Ukraine	2010 was negative, with an average annual growth of 1.5 billion euros from 2011 to 2016, a growth rate of 23%.
Israel	Higher growth.
Kazakhstan	Higher growth.

4.3 Agricultural and Rural Support Policies The comparison of GSSE between China and relevant developing countries from 2010 to 2016 is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Comparison table between China and relevant developing countries in 2010-2016 agricultural support GSSE index

Countries	Agricultural Support GSSE Situation
China	150More than 100 million euros, an annual growth rate of about 11%, accounting for more than 50% of the OECD.
Turkey	The change is small, with an average of more than 2 billion euros.
Russia	The highest in 2013, showing a downward trend from 2013 to 2016.
Indonesia	The fastest growth rate was 44%.
Philippine	Shows a growth trend, exceeding 1 billion euros since 2013, with an average annual growth rate of 12%.
Israel	The lowest among countries, with an average of 100 million euros.
Ukraine	Increase first and then decrease.
Kazakhstan	Increase first and then decrease.

5.Conclusions, References and Suggestions

This article uses the international OECD agricultural support indicator system to measure and compare the effects and structure of agricultural support policies between China and developed countries, mainly the United States, the European Union, and Japan, and China and developing countries, mainly Russia, Indonesia, and Vietnam. The experience is as follows:

5.1.Conclusion. Through a comparative analysis of the level and structure of agricultural support effects in countries with different levels of development, they have one thing in common: that any country with better agricultural development must be a country with a more reasonable agricultural support structure.

5.2.References and recommendations. China's agricultural support policy started relatively late, but PSE and% PSE have grown rapidly, which has played a significant role in the rapid development of agricultural production in China. However, compared with some developed countries, China's% PSE value has not been able to meet the needs of agricultural development, and more support is needed.

Acknowledgements

The project Out-reaching, International Exchanges and Training Foundation Development for Agriculture in Guangdong Province (project No. 156015) was supported by Guangdong Provincial Strategy for Revitalizing Rural Areas 2019 (category: agriculture industry development—projects organized and implemented at provincial level) (grant No. 73, [2019])

References

- [1] Mo Zhongning. Implementing Rural Revitalization Strategy to Promote Modernization of Agriculture and Rural Areas [J]. Guihai Lunong, 2018 (2).
- [2] Zheng Zhibing, ZHENGZhi-bing. International Experience and Enlightenment of Public Finance Agricultural Expenditure Policy [J]. Journal of Xi'an University of Finance and Economics, 2008, 21 (1): 64-68.
- [3] Du Zhixiong [1], Xiao Weidong [2]. The Actual State and Policy Support of Family Farm Development: Observing International Experiences [J]. Reform, 2014 (6): 39-51.

- [4] Chen Hanping. On International Experiences of Agricultural Modernization [J]. Journal of Henan Business College, 2015 (3): 21-25.
- [5] Zhang Lili, Li Jing. Fiscal Policies for Developing Modern Agriculture in Major Countries and Their References [J]. China Foreign Investment, 2011 (24): 45-46.