

## **Equilibrium regulating for the Multiplicity Rurality in Iran: Consistent Vision compatible to redefine the Rural Territories**

**Reza Khosrobeigi Bozchelouie\***

Assistant Professor of Geography and Rural planning, Hakim Sabzevari University, Iran.

**Jafar Javan**

Professor of Geography and Rural planning, University of Ferdowsi, Iran.

---

### **Extended Abstract**

---

#### **Introduction**

The management of the Iranian rural community has emerged from its diverse economic, social, cultural and natural structures. In addition, rural areas have been affected by external influences in recent years (urban-rural integrity and integration into the global economy) and are increasingly facing a different rural environment. There are two ways to control such diversified settlements. Or we should resort to reconciliation; what we have seen with regard to the centralized rural planning system in Iran, or whether new rural management practices, such as tackling the diversity of rural areas, should be taken into account without losing the importance of this diversity. Unfortunately, the differences created in rural areas by rural development management in the country-under the pretext of modern-day discourse-have been neglected, and the social and economic consequences of this trend are unrealistic and contradictory conceptions of disagreements and applying an alignment view has been for a variety of people in rural areas. Accordingly, executive management of development planning, including planning for rural development in Iran, is conducted only at the national and regional levels (provincial). There are no such plans at the local level. Because of the centralized planning decision making system in the country, regional planning is weak and inadequate, and development planning is practically limited nationally. In the sense that neither the plurality nor economic, social, cultural or natural diversity are considered and are not affected by the central planning of the overall reality of the country's villages. It is argued that when the rural territories are more than reasonable and the various mechanisms of each one are considered, executive management is in chaos. At the same time, if the rural management units are also geographically larger, it will focus. Therefore, the solution between the two should be designed, and this can be done in the area, and there is no extremes. Therefore, the research question is: How can the cultural and natural features of local areas, as a criterion for identifying rural areas, be combined with each other in a regional framework?

#### **Materials and Methods**

The main concern of this research is the definition of the village and its local area with the aim of solving the problem of centralization and revealing the internal and local potentialities in the rural areas, which forms the basis of the main rural development planning strategies in the third millennium, and as it does not seem to be a simple task. The basic theory used here is turning to the "Halfacree triple space" in the context of the concept of everyday rural life, which supports the criteria of the size of the territory and its land cover. The main realities of the villages, whether in our country or elsewhere, depend on the external flows of the global economy and the capitalist system, on the diversity of economic, social, cultural and natural differences in the complexity of space. Therefore, it is necessary to think about the various and complex aspects of space as a whole in the methodology of rural research. The present paper introduces the Halfacree Scheme (2006), which describes rural everyday life as a way of detecting these irregularities and as a basis for determining the scope of local communities. This conceptual framework allows diagnosis: The spatial manipulation of official representations (the goals of planners and government

---

\* Email: R.khosrobeigi@hsu.ac.ir

officials) in an interrelated environment; legal and informative processes that create tensions among different elements of rural space; and the everyday life of a village that is different in nature and irreconcilable. This is an entrenchment against the one-dimensional and objective criteria of rural development strategies, namely population density, agriculture and natural resources. In these circumstances, the change from the deviant criteria of the size of the territory and population density in the executive management of rural development programs in the country is required by the criteria of the size of the territory and land cover. It is claimed that the rural unit should, in the smallest (that is, the simplest), have a realm for the daily use of rural actors, on the one hand, and in the context of specialized planning and policy-making that identifies local networks and small groups-from the other side is determined to be good at defining the space and mapping according to the available data set. This situation is matching with the concept of rural ideals: a place for the most sense of the realm of societies. Land cover literature assumes that the rural unit should be able to take into account local differences and complexity in the landscape structure and knowledge of local land cover and distances. This concept is consistent with the village's ideals, "close to nature," and suggests that local management of rural prospects and cultural heritage can play a pivotal role in the future of rural development.

### **Discussion and Results**

In this research, it was agreed to use the "block" as a territorial unit and to determine the extent of the villages. Referring to the past literature of the village, we find that the block is the smallest possible unit of land, which could relieve us of the executive recommendations of the state - which are the only criterion for the differentiation of rural areas as a population density - and relate to the realities of everyday life of local residents. "Land use" was considered as a criterion for representing the variation and internal differences of the blocks. Land use is inevitably related to "land cover" that is visible on the ground. In addition, the "open land" indicator was seen appropriate as covering the surrounding land of residential densities and constructions to define the characteristics of the village. Identification of Rural Diversity and Differences is the final stage of a general determination for rural development planning, although it is not undermined by the principle of existing differences. Based on Johnson & Nielsen's point of view (2012), a simple operational approach to considering the diversity of the countryside, based on the length of the route, the time of travel, the perspective and counting of rural communities, should be from a point of departure to an urban area. Meanwhile, if there is no rural community, the degree of rurality is 1. If a rural community is attained, the degree of rurality is 2. If two rural communities are trained, the degree of rurality is 3 and up until the end. The discussion here is merely abstract, which assumes that there is a time gap between the more centers (villages) to reach a metropolis.

### **Conclusions**

The main thing behind the presented model in this study is that balance cannot be created unless the point that there has been no true solution. The theoretical solution is, in a pluralistic order (daily life), let the demands freely grown and competed with each other until the balance of forces reaches the equilibrium point. As we can see, in the course of recent socioeconomic transformations, rural-urban integration, urbanization flows, integration into the global economy-regional equilibrium, and somewhat rural areas, found their place in communication with the city center, respectively (Rurality Rating). This point cannot be temporary, because the balance of force proportions is changing. So the existing order undergoes turbulence and constant perturbation. In this order, those who are most despised and want to overthrow the existing order are those who are the weakest of all (remote and marginal villages). Such a mechanism cannot be created, but it is the organic growth of society (diverse land coverings due to different local capacities). Here, the domains of socioeconomic activity are distinguished from each other (the block), in such a way that rural communities do not have to identify themselves with one and can maintain their independence in the distance between these domains. The survival of such a structure depends on any kind of extremism: i.e. tolerance, in which the individual respects

another, and opposes the expansion of conflicts that make compromise impossible. In general, rural areas should be required to live together in accordance with the criteria (executive management limits), in order to these criteria to be implemented and, in other words, be balanced.

**Keywords:** Everyday lives, block, land cover, open land, grading, rurality.

## References

- 1- Arzeni, A., Esposti, R., & Sotte, F. (2002). *European Policy Experiences with Rural Development*, Associazione—Alessandro Bartola “, European Association of Agricultural Economists, Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk Kiel KG. ISBN 3-8175-0363-6.
- 2- Barkin, David. 2001. La nueva ruralidad y la globalización." *La nueva ruralidad en América Latina*. 2: 21–40.
- 3- Brezzi, M., Dijkstra, L., & Ruiz, V. (2011). *OECD extended regional typology: The economic performance of remote rural regions* (No. 2011/6). OECD Publishing.
- 4- Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay. *Power, action, and belief: A new sociology of knowledge*, 32, 196-223.
- 5- Cloke, P. (2006). Conceptualizing rurality. *Handbook of rural studies*, 18-28.
- 6- Colocousis, C. R., & Duncan, C. M. (2007). *Handbook of Rural Studies*, edited by Paul Cloke, Terry Marsden, and Patrick H. Mooney. *Journal of Regional Science*, 47(5), 999-1001.
- 7- Cruickshank, J. A. (2009). A play for rurality—Modernization versus local autonomy. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(1), PP. 98-107.
- 8- Dijkstra, L., & Poelman, H. (2008). Remote rural regions: How proximity to a city influences the performance of rural regions. EU.
- 9- Dinis, A. (2006). Marketing and innovation: Useful tools for competitiveness in rural and peripheral areas. *European Planning Studies*, 14(1), 9-22.
- 10- Duenckmann, F. (2010). The village in the mind: applying Q-methodology to re-constructing constructions of rurality. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(3), PP. 284-295.
- 11- Featherstone, D., & Painter, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Spatial politics: essays for Doreen Massey*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 12- Halfacree, K. (2006). Rural space: constructing a three-fold architecture. *Handbook of rural studies*, 44-62.
- 13- Halfacree, K. (2007). Trial by space for a ‘radical rural’: Introducing alternative localities, representations and lives. *Journal of rural studies*, 23(2), 125-141.
- 14- Halfacree, K. H. (1993). Locality and social representation: space, discourse and alternative definitions of the rural. *Journal of rural studies*, 9(1), 23-37.
- 15- Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to capital*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 16- Heley, J., & Jones, L. (2012). Relational rurals: some thoughts on relating things and theory in rural studies. *Journal of rural studies*, 28(3), 208-217.
- 17- Higgs, G., & White, S. (2000). Alternatives to census-based indicators of social disadvantage in rural communities. *Progress in Planning*, 53(1), 1-81.
- 18- Hillyard, S. (2007). *The sociology of rural life*. Berg.
- 19- Holloway, L., & Kneafsey, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Geographies of rural cultures and societies*. Ashgate.
- 20- Johansen, P. H., & Nielsen, N. C. (2012). Bridging between the regional degree and the community approaches to rurality—A suggestion for a definition of rurality for everyday use. *Land Use Policy*, 29(4), 781-788.
- 21- Jonard, F., Lambotte, M., Bamps, C., Dusart, J., & Terres, J. M. (2007). Review and improvements of existing delimitations of rural areas in Europe. *JRC Scientific and Technical Reports*, European Commission, Joint Research Center, Institute for Environment and Sustainability. EUR, 22921.
- 22- Jones, A. (2003). ‘Power in place’: viticultural spatialities of globalization and community empowerment in the Languedoc. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(3), 367-382.
- 23- Jones, L., Mann, R., & Heley, J. (2013). Doing space relationally: exploring the meaningful geographies of local government in Wales. *Geoforum*, 45, 190-200.
- 24- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (Vol. 142). Blackwell: Oxford.

- 25- Liepins, R. (2000). Exploring rurality through community': discourses, practices and spaces shaping Australian and New Zealand rural communities'. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16(3), 325-341.
- 26- López-i-Gelats, F., Tàbara, J. D., & Bartolomé, J. (2009). The rural in dispute: Discourses of rurality in the Pyrenees. *Geoforum*, 40(4), PP.602-612.
- 27- Lowe, P., Marsden, T., Murdoch, J., & Ward, N. (2005). *The differentiated countryside*. Routledge.
- 28- Lowe, P., Murdoch, J., Marsden, T., Munton, R., & Flynn, A. (1993). Regulating the new rural spaces: the uneven development of land. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 9(3), 205-222.
- 29- Marsden, T. (1998). New rural territories: regulating the differentiated rural spaces. *Journal of rural studies*, 14(1), 107-117.
- 30- Massey, D., Research Group, H. G., Bond, S., & Featherstone, D. (2009). The possibilities of a politics of place beyond place? A conversation with Doreen Massey. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 125(3-4), 401-420.
- 31- Meijering, L., van Hoven, B., & Huigen, P. (2007). Constructing ruralities: The case of the Hobbitstee, Netherlands. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 23(3), PP. 357-366.
- 32- Murdoch, J. (1997). Inhuman/nonhuman/human: actor-network theory and the prospects for a nondualistic and symmetrical perspective on nature and society. *Environment and Planning D*, 15, 731-756.
- 33- Murdoch, J., & Pratt, A. C. (1993). Rural studies: modernism, postmodernism and the 'post-rural'. *Journal of rural studies*, 9(4), 411-427.
- 34- Neal, S. (2013). Transition culture: politics, localities and ruralities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, 60-69.
- 35- Nielsen, N. C., & Johansen, P. H. (2009, August). A functional approach to classifying rurality at parish level in Denmark: combining Corine Land Cover data and administrative boundaries. In *The XXIII European Society For Rural Sociology Congress*.
- 36- Nugin, R. (2014). "I think that they should go. Let them see something. The context of rural youth's out-migration in post-socialist Estonia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, PP. 51-64.
- 37- Paniagua, A. (2014). Rurality, identity and morality in remote rural areas in northern Spain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 35, 49-58.
- 38- Paquette, S., & Domon, G. (2003). Changing ruralities, changing landscapes: exploring social recomposition using a multi-scale approach. *Journal of rural studies*, 19(4), 425-444.
- 39- Rousseau, N. (1995). What is rurality?. Occasional paper (Royal College of General Practitioners), (71), 1.
- 40- Smith, B. J., & Parvin, D. W. (1973). Defining and measuring rurality. *Southern Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 5(1), 109-113.
- 41- Terluin, I. J. (2003). Differences in economic development in rural regions of advanced countries: an overview and critical analysis of theories. *Journal of rural studies*, 19(3), 327-344.
- 42- Van Eupen, M., Metzger, M. J., Pérez-Soba, M., Verburg, P. H., Van Doorn, A., & Bunce, R. G. H. (2012). A rural typology for strategic European policies. *Land Use Policy*, 29(3), 473-482.
- 43- Vard, T., Willems, E., Lemmens, T., & Peters, R. (2005). Use of the CORINE land cover to identify the rural character of communes and regions at EU level. *Trends of some agri-environmental indicators of the European Union*, EUR, 21669.
- 44- Waldorf, B. (2007). Measuring rurality. *Context*, 8(1), 5-8.
- 45- Wilson, G. A., & Burton, R. J. (2015). 'Neo-productivist' agriculture: Spatio-temporal versus structuralist perspectives. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 38, 52-64.
- 46- Woods, M. (2009). Rural geography: blurring boundaries and making connections. *Progress in Human Geography*.
- 47- Young, I. M. (1986). The ideal of community and the politics of difference. *Social theory and practice*, 1-26.