

# Geographical Global Rural Cultures and Cultures in Particular Geographical Realities: Some Particular Ideas for a Global Debate

Angel Paniagua\*

*Spanish Council for Scientific Research, CSIC, Madrid, Albasanz Street, 26-28, 28071, Spain*

**Abstract:** Scientific contributions to global culture are scarce from a rural geographic perspective. The vision of global rural culture is framed between global as a product of particular cultures or as particular cultures contributed to geographically global rural. Furthermore, the emergence of new politics of rural cultures associated with re- and territorialization processes and small tactics in place is analyzed. Finally, the bases are established for the joint and integrated study of the concept and approaches to global rural and global culture in different geographical scenarios in the global South and North.

**Keywords:** Rural culture, geography, place, global, space, post-modern.

## INTRODUCTION

We usually associate rural space with places or territories that have a scalar relationship from the locality to the global or planetary sphere. In contrast, there are few contributions that attempt to analyze or insert the global geographical as particular cultures or as particular cultures influenced the approach of a geographical global rural.

Culture is a multi-layered concept (Frank, *et al.* 2020). Rural culture is the spirit or genius of social groups, between pastoralism and modernity. These two large types are rural cultures with different approaches, but with infinite nuances. In other hand, Sack (1992: 87) suggests 'for culture can be thought of as the combination of perspectives and the forces of meaning and social relations in everyday life'. The popular culture and the culture of resistance 'with emphasize the role of social relations in the production and circulation of culture' (Sack, 1992: 87). There exists a fluid and permanent confrontation or dialectic of the old rural static culture and a dynamic modern rural culture. In the present, the utopian communities increased the micro cultural fragmentation.

Postmodernism and the cultural turn open a new era in rural geographical studies. Culture is spatial and heterogeneity, with a notable relevance of others of rural communities in the production and reformulation of culture. Furthermore, culture is open and fluid with informal circuits to return the old culture. But the consideration of cultural formulations brings together various axes of work, such as society-nature relations or the human-non-human relationship, studies on

personal experiences of space and especially the experiences of rural others, the symbolization of rural space, and studies on alternative populations or neo-nomadism. In short, it is a post-structuralist interpretation of space far removed from a functional rural space. Rural spaces and even place do not have a single meaning or measurement. That is, bringing together culture in the territory implies the deconstruction of rural space by interpreting popular discourses in academic texts. Consequently, spatial culture is very relevant, but it can have multiple meanings even in the same place. Thus, introducing culture into the interpretation of rural space affects the very delimitation of rural space, the social composition of said space and suggests a new conceptual and methodological frame of reference. The cultural approach to rural space admits the notable heterogeneity of the rural world and consequently it is not possible to admit final spaces; on the contrary, they are always spaces in permanent transformation based on difference. In this way, the equation of the rural with a sign or symbol implies that it can even be detached from all spatial reference (Paniagua and Hoggart, 2002).

In this way, there is a notable variety of approaches and perspectives on the cultural dimension of rural space and it is possible to admit, at the same time, that there are differentiated discourses from a scalar perspective. Thus locality and rurality could be associated from a cultural perspective to grant a certain interpretative materiality to rural culture. Rural localities condition representations and daily lives and this virtuality suggests a certain cultural typology of rurality associated with the place. But a strictly cultural vision of rural spaces may perhaps be very rigid and it is necessary to adopt more hybrid approaches that bring together different elements, recovering and integrating

\*Address correspondence to this author at the Spanish Council for Scientific Research, CSIC, Madrid, Albasanz Street, 26-28, 28071, Spain; E-mail: angel.paniagua@csic.es

rural (im) materiality (Paniagua, 2023). It is possible to argue that there are, at least, two more than binary circuits in rural cultures: (1) Global-essential and (2) micro-macro and intermediate levels.

In this context, it is possible to analyze and discuss the foundations of geographical rural cultures and a global rural culture. In definitive give new ideas or approaches about the particular rural culture and edge or conflictive rural cultures, linked with the possible ways from traditional rural culture to renovate rural cultures. But, and also, in parallel it is possible to argue the power and danger of excessive generalization of traditional values of the rural. Currently there are two main approaches in rural geographical culture (1) as scene or scenario or (2) rural culture as idea, ideal and ideology.

### **POLITICS OF RURAL CULTURES**

The politics of rural cultures are usually based on various elements that interact with each other in the place: resistance, contestation and representation and on a renewed spatiality in the rural justice approach (Soja, 2010). The new spatial culture and significance associated with small habitat tactics to regional, national and global expressions of rural space. Scalar rural cultures imply the uneven development of particular cultures at global scales, with particular relevance of meso and intermediate spatial levels. There is currently a renewed value of particular (micro) cultures as strategies of resistance with respect to a neoliberal globalization of rural space and a normative vision of their cultures.

Knieling and Othengrafen (2009) suggest the existence of cultural differences in planning systems, associated with the cultural turn since 1990s. But global change spaces needs to integrate in nations and regions territories and even in localities. The cultural turn emphasizes the value of cultural diversity in the context of postmodernism. Culture is a pluralistic, fragmentary, dynamic and reflective. The cultural varieties as principle suggest a notable role of culture in the spatial integration. Culture and space are associated in the new planning cultures. The work with landscape biographies suggests infinite cultures, in a way from meta narratives to localized narratives. Culture is spatial and is the product of the indissolubility of culture, geo-politics and socio-economy.

There is a de-spatialization of the normative culture in the face of a territorial culture, within the framework

of the creation of a new territorial rural culture. In this framework, a renewed concept or materialist approach of rural culture emerges as things established in rural space in the face of a new rural consciousness based on creativity, associated with a cultural restructuring from below, from the rural areas themselves with a notable variation in popular rural visions of cultural spaces.

In this context, new regional cultures emerge in a global rural world. The new cultural rural politics based on identity of de-territorialization, resistance and limits of opportunity of rural cultures, cultural politics as resistance and rural cultures as spectacle and resistance.

In this way it is necessary to rethink rural space as particular/global cultural subject. Transforming communities by investing in cultural rural heritage suggest an identity in the era of spatial de-territorialization, or de-territorialization of identities (Mitchell, 2000). Global heritage and development and global heritage as an idea of particular heritage is culture and materiality. Rural heritage is both as an element in social inclusion and exclusion. Heritage and rural environment suggest landscape biographies and cultural biographies linked with a conception of heritage and identity, and heritage values. But, it is also possible to consider the rural heritage and cultures under conflict linked with diversity of experiences and values associated with (im) material heritage, including the consideration of indigenous peoples.

### **GLOBAL CULTURE(S) AND GLOBAL RURAL**

Mainly associated with the narratives of global cultures and differentiated rural traditional landscape. In this context is possible a rural global culture in the South and in the North, with different rural identities and the variable and even infinite existence of vulnerable rural villages and communities. Rural planning cultures view the culture as quality of life of new comers in rural areas. (New) global culture impact on local communities through cultural activities and renovate traditional rural cultural life, with a new division: Locals and volunteers. Culture provides qualities of life and community in geographically local rural areas. In this sense the new cultural policies are associated with cultural consumption and the vision of culture as hybrid element where cultural activities benefit new comers. The global villages in modern rural societies 'is part of the general modern tendency to thin out cultural and homogenize modern places' (Sack,

1992: 96). In other hand, Sack suggests with a notable application to rural areas: 'Other features of modern culture also alter the image and meaning of place' (Sack, 1992: 101). This characteristic creates contexts of place and infinite changes in the relationship self/others in a rural community. The relativity of inauthenticity to authenticity in negotiated terms of place: 'that places are inauthentic has its roots in our reactions to particular aspects of the tensions of commodities' (Sack, 1992: 170). The authenticity is a relative evaluation of modern life and (rural) place (Sack, 1992: 172).

In the core of European rural culture or in other words in the old global North rural culture is associated with pastoralism and the Romanization and modernists, associated with transformation and development of rural areas. A new status associated with country homes and country residence. MacFarlane (1987) point out two key elements: (1) the relevance of culture through 'peasantness' and the peasant civilization and a mode of peasant society myth of community and patriarchal society: the ideal type of peasant. (2) Intimate anti-urbanism and love of nature of the English country houses: 'nature powerfully influenced the development of an interest in the countryside and little community' (MacFarlane, 1987: 95). In the new global North, the cultural ideals are associated with North American traditions and origins: productive agriculture and landscape and harmonious small towns. In this context emerges a remarkable vision of culture as multifunctional countryside, where individualism reconsidered growth and individual property.

In the new global South the colonial and postcolonial ideas and traditions are relevant (Frank, *et al.* 2020). Bottom up local rural cultures and rural distinguished cultures in global South culture oscillate between modernity and urbanization. In the global South rural cultures is an element of resistance were urbanized in support meso and national levels of modernization is a relevant approach and ideal. The case of China suggests cultural specificities in rural change (Frank, *et al.* 2020), in this country the local cultures are an element of commodification in the process of rural transformation. Commodification of rural cultural values is a key element in the dynamics of change and restructuring of rural cultures and the new role of native local planning based on the experiences in place. In countries like India the cultures are associated with new agricultural programs and the social justice in post-colonial era and rural-urban linkages and more recently the top-down to bottom-up

approach. But in the postcolonial era at the present rural culture is embedded in social stratification (Frank, *et al.*, 2020) and the cultural memory of social stratification is historical and the new approach bottom up has multiple stories in regional and local rural areas.

Rural phase of Latin American culture suggests different cultural situations: 'Latin American cultures and that their mere presence is important in distinguishing this culture from others' (Davidson, 1947: 249). The material aspect (eg. architecture), is a rural phase of culture, with elements that distinguish these rural cultures from others and suggests Latin American cultural situations. At the present culture and natural heritage is a key element and strategy for rural regeneration in Latin-American. As Escobar (2010) states, in the space of Latin America there are notable tensions and contradictions, where 'the long-term histories and trajectories that underlie the cultural and political at play' (...) where 'idea of a single, universal modernity and towards a more plural set of modernity's (...) moving beyond the dominance of one set of modernities (Euro modernities), or not, remains to be seen' (Escobar, 2010: 3).

The idea of ethnicity as a cultural element in the global South moves towards an idea of multiple ethnicities even within the same nation, where there is also a mixture of black and white ethnicities as an overcoming of binary arguments. This suggests that rural space transits between the concepts of citizenship, community and collectivity, included in a renewed concept of postcolonial nation, which conditions access to land and the cultural rights of the individual. There are also complex ethnic alliances and the emergence of new ethnic kits, and a recognition of ethnicity based on double games: indigenous against culture of others. Ethnicity linked to the context and the situation of the land market unchanged since the colonial stage is combined with a new mobile cultural identity of a global and de-territorialized nature.

## CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

The cultural perspective of rural areas also has notable limitations, especially due to the difficulties in using research results by socio-economic agents or public administrations themselves. In short, it has little operability outside the academic circuits and establishes the weakness to carry out large overall interpretations based on detailed studies with analytical approaches established in relation to the place. The politics of global cultures imply an uneven development

of particular cultures both in large geographical areas and in more localized places, in the form of scalar new cultural planning. In particular rural places, the biographies of heritage gain notable relevance as a key element of rural transformations. For geographical areas the approach of cultural rural globalism has different roots. In the old global north it oscillates between notions of pastoralist associated with romantic ideas of the countryside and modernization linked with processes of rural development. In the new global North the culture is anchored in the North American ideal of productive agriculture and humanized and harmonious small towns. In the new global South the ideas and traditions of the colonial and post-colonial countryside are very relevant, ultimately associated with planned cultures process of bottom-up cultures as element of rural restructuring and transformations.

## REFERENCES

- Davidson, W. 1947. Rural Latin American Cultures. *Social Forces* 25(3), 249-252.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/25.3.249>
- Escobar, A. 2010. Latin America at a crossroads. *Cultural Studies*, 24: 1, 1-65.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380903424208>
- Frank, KZ *et al.* 2020. Comparative rural planning cultures. *Planning Theory & Culture*, 21(5), 769-795.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2020.1853438>
- Knieling, J., Othengrafen, F. 2009. Planning cultures in Europe. Deciding cultural phenomena in urban and regional planning. Farnham, Ashgate.
- MacFarlane, A. 1987. The culture of capitalism. London, Basil Blackwell.
- Mitchell, D. 2000. Cultural geography. A critical introduction. London, Blackwell.
- Paniagua, A. 2023. Conceptualizing new materialism in geographical studies of the rural realm. *Land*, 12, 225.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/land12010225>
- Paniagua, A., Hoggart, K. 2002. Lo rural, ¿hechos, discursos o representaciones? Una perspectiva geográfica de un debate clásico. *Información Comercial Española, ICE: Revista de Economía*, 803, 61-72
- Sack, R.D. 1992. Place, modernity, and the consumer's world. A relational framework for geographical analysis. London, The Johns Hopkins Univ Press.
- Soja, E.W. 2010. Seeking spatial justice. Minneapolis, Univ. Minnesota Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816666676.001.0001>

---

Received on 02-01-2024

Accepted on 14-01-2024

Published on 09-02-2024

<https://doi.org/10.6000/2817-2310.2024.03.06>

© 2024 Angel Paniagua; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open-access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.