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Abstract
Despite much time and attention by academia and policy to bring about cohesion between core and peripheral regions, still there are large disparities of wealth and outcomes. Recent literature suggests that part of the problem lies in the ways that core regions represent peripheries in discourse and practice (Willett and Lang, 2018; Willett 2016; Lang et al. 2015), meaning that peripheries need to find better ways to challenge negative core representations of place. This paper argues that a critical ontological perspective based on Deleuze and Guattari’s (2004) affective assemblages can help to understand this phenomenon better. The paper uses this framework to explore the periphery as a complex adaptive organism –or a periphery-assemblage. Local government is identified as an important structure, potentially enhancing and facilitating better adaptation to change. Using this perspective, and a research methodology that uses creative techniques to uncover the meanings underlying performed responses, the paper takes a case study of local government in Cornwall in the South West of the UK. Research was conducted between May and June 2016. It is claimed that one way for peripheries to challenge core representations more effectively would be to enhance communications within local government, which can better channel and develop information flows within peripheral regions.
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Introduction

The problem of uneven development, and the need to support the social and economic activity of peripheries is an enduring one. As an example of the difficulties in providing economic cohesion between rich and poor regions, EU structural funds, which support regional development investment, have been slow to make significant improvements towards reducing regional peripherality (Cataldo, 2017; Rodriguez-Pose and Fratesi 2004). Theoretical approaches towards understanding how to improve regional economies often look at structural issues. From this perspective, poorly performing regions need to develop clusters of innovation (see Bramwell et al., 2008); improve skills levels within the local economy (Lee et al. 2005); tackle poor communications and accessibility; encourage inward investment (Pike et al., 2006); endogenous growth (Rodriguez-Pose and Crescenzi 2008) and competitiveness (Herrschel 2010). Some of these approaches emphasise infrastructural development (Crescenzi et al. 2016) in terms of improving communications either by transport or digital technologies, or providing specific business support. Others, focus on policymakers developing human capital through aspects of community development to enhance social capital (Shortall 2004; Lee et al. 2005), and educational programmes to raise skills levels to better enable individuals to participate in the globalized economy.

Regional analyses that are based on critical theories that challenge orthodox, liberal perspectives, examine how cohesion between wealthy and struggling regions is problematized by the dynamics of contemporary neo-liberal capitalism, which pulls capital and resources towards a few dynamic poles, and away from spaces with lesser performing economies (Lang et al. 2015). Human and financial capital move from peripheries to the centre, as talent seeks better opportunities, and the rational decision is to invest limited resources where returns can be maximised. This has an important impact on how regions are produced through the beliefs and practices of local inhabitants (Soja 1996; Massey 2005; Thrift, 2008; Cresswell 1996; Hetherington 2008; Sibley 1995), and how persons from outside of the region imagine that space (Willett and Lang 2018; Willett 2016; Bürk et al. 2012; Kühn 2015; Kühn et al. 2017; Plüsschke-Altoff 2018; Pföser 2017)). Many of these are based on a post-colonial thought whereby powerful core regions dominate the ‘knowledges’ and ‘truths’ about weaker spaces, and in this way discursively produce, represent, and imagine an idea of space that reinforces the ‘inferiority’ of regions. (Fannon 2008; Said 2003).

Frequently, these studies take theories about otherness and combine them with the idea of internal colonialism (Hechter 1975), claiming that peripheries become ‘internal others’, discursively produced by core regions in ways that negatively impact the development of the periphery (Bürk et al. 2012; Willett and Lang 2018). For example, Eriksson (2008) discusses how peripheral, rural Norrland is discursively produced as an internal other, in ways that highlights its ‘traditional’, ‘rural’ and ‘backward’ characteristics and so reinforcing the ‘modern’ identities of the rest of Sweden. The periphery becomes the repository for the negative qualities that the broader whole seeks to reject (Jansson, 2003). More recently, these theories have often been used to examine post-socialist spaces in Europe (Bürk et al. 2012; Plüsschke-Altoff 2018; Pföser 2017). Bürk et al. (2012) call this type of narrative ‘stigmatising’; hindering attempts to project the dynamism and innovation that peripheral development initiatives have started to inject. And they alternatively introduce the notion that regional identities and their characteristics are always an act of power (Paasi 2003), and constructed in relation to other groups (Paasi 2013).

Similarly, the concepts of peripheralisation and how peripheries are imagined are constantly shifting. The notion of peripheralisation emphasizes on how peripheries are discursively constructed and how these discourses can impact their ability to develop economically (Kühn 2015; Willett and Lang 2018). Regional narratives, discourses, or identities might make a region appear more peripheral, or integrate it more into core discourses. Therefore, peripheralisation is a process that relies on

or integrate it more into core discourses. Therefore, peripheralisation is a process that relies on
knowledges constructed by core regions about the periphery (Fannon 2008; Said 2003). These knowledges are often adopted by peripheries despite their harmful consequences (Eriksson 2008; Johnsson 2003; Bürk et al. 2012), so the challenge for regional development is to find ways to support new knowledge that can counteract it (Willett and Lang 2018). Most of peripheralisation literature is devoted to understanding how peripheralising narratives are constructed, the mechanisms through which these are upheld (Bürk et al. 2012; Pfoser 2017; Pluschke-Altoff 2017; Horton 2008; Kühn, 2017), and its effects in the region and the people who live there (Meyer et al. 2016; Eriksson 2008; Jansson 2003; Willett 2016). How the narratives of peripheralization can be challenged and changed is nevertheless a subject that has not yet been explored.

For Willett and Lang (2018), peripheries need to build the agency to create their own knowledges about their regions, independently of peripheralising core representations of place. They propose imagining the region as an assemblage (see Delueze and Guattari 2004), which they describe as a ‘dense network of deeply interconnected objects, symbols, meanings, institutions, nuances, and narratives which contribute to our knowledges about our worlds’ (Willett and Lang 2018: 261). Power comes from a multiplicity of sources within the system, enabling even those regions formerly characterised as ‘weak’ or ‘powerless’ to have the agency to shape their environments. This goes beyond the current body of scholarship that emphasises the powerlessness and victimhood of peripheries (Bürk et al. 2012; Pfoser 2017; Pluschke-Altoff 2017; Horton 2008; Kühn, 2017; Meyer et al. 2016; Eriksson 2008; Jansson 2003; Willett 2016). However, the mechanisms through which the periphery is able to challenge peripheralising processes is still under-explored. (Willett and Lang, 2018).

That is the theme of this article, to propose the concept of periphery-assemblage as a way to challenge peripheralising narratives and realize the power and agency latent within the peripheries. The article is organised in two major sections. Firstly, I explore the notion of the periphery as an evolutionary adaptive assemblage; here I use the concept of ‘affect’ as a language to focus on the deep interconnections between, and the ability of new knowledges to flow around the system, potentially challenging peripheralising narratives. Secondly, I identify community government as an important site for this transfer of knowledge. Using a case study of Cornwall in the UK, the study uses the concept of the periphery-assemblage to diagnose the blockages to communication within the periphery. Cornwall is a strong case study, as a peripheral region that is seeking to challenge the harmful effects of peripheralising narratives (Willett 2016). Finally, I suggest ways of improving communication techniques, enabling new narratives to be developed in the region.

The periphery as an evolutionary organism

Imagining economies as a complex evolutionary system is a well-established idea in understanding the interactions between people, regions, their environments, institutions, knowledges, and economies (Meekes et al. 2017; Boschma and Frenken 2011; Boschma 2015; Bristow and Healey 2014; Dawley et al. 2010). Kenneth Boulding (1981) provides a useful set of metaphors to understand the evolutionary economy, which compares the innovation and development of products and services of organisations and enterprises as similar to biological organisms. For Boulding, a crucial similarity is the requirement to obtain information about our environments in order to determine what place an organism is best suited to be – or in other words, what our particular evolutionary niche is, and how we can better adapt it to shifting environmental conditions.

Within the complex adaptive system of the evolutionary periphery, no single entity exists in isolation, and no element is more important than other. In common with flat ontological perspectives (Brassiere 2015), this means that human activity is merely a part of a bigger system that assigns equal weight to non-human and non-sentient activities (see also Bennett 2010). Whilst human activity might
appear to be more visible, many evolutionary economic geographers recognise that economic adaptation is a complex interaction between all human/non-human, biological/non-biological, sentient/non-sentient organisms in a globally connected system (Meekes et al. 2017; Boschma and Frenken 2011; Boschma 2015; Bristow and Healey 2014; Dawley et al. 2010). Successful adaptation is free from questions of morality. For some evolutionary economists, it refers to successfully adapting an enterprise or organism so it can grow optimally within a neoliberal economic system (Witt 2008). For others, it relates to the adaption of regions to be socially, environmentally, and economically resilient (Dawley et al. 2010). The role of economic development is to create the context or conditions for a region to flourish, rather than a particular desired end-goal (Meekes et al. 2017). Following the Darwinian principle, successful enterprises—or regions, are not necessarily those with the best or most technologically advanced knowledges, innovations, or ideas. Instead, success is about being the best adapted to a specific environment, in order to thrive.

Peripheral development can be viewed as an interaction between the activities of people, available technologies, and the economic structures and practices that already exist. Economies and communities grow incrementally, and successful developments are those that evolve in a complex interaction with all of the differing aspects of the social, political, and knowledge environment. From this perspective, peripheries do not have to rely on the support of dominant core regions, but are able to consider the processes through which they may better adapt to the changing social, political, ecological and economic environments. In this way, evolutionary theorising provides peripheries with the agency to make changes in their regions without being dependent on an oppressive core (See Willett and Lang 2018). Later in the paper, I will argue that this is where local government has the potential to facilitate interaction, communication, and thereby, adaptation.

Conceptualising the region as an evolutionary organism also has other benefits. It allows exploration of how to improve peripheral economies, paying attention to the dynamic interconnection of regions as economic spaces, and to redefine the meaning of ‘periphery’. Rather than being an economically poor area at the fringe of the global economy, here it is understood as a space that, for different reasons, has not successfully adapted to changing global economic and political conditions. This eliminates some of the well-documented negative connotations that exist alongside of the ascription ‘peripheral’ (see Eriksson 2008, Bürk et al 2012; Jansson 2003; Willett 2016). Evolutionary metaphors utilise the fluidity and mobility of regional identity to better (see Paasi 2013) challenge the peripheralising narratives that come from the dominant core regions (see Eriksson 2008, Bürk et al 2012; Meyer et al. 2017). The goal of successful development is to ensure that these changes help facilitate social and economic adaptation to local and global environments. To this purpose, the periphery assemblage needs to be sufficiently connected so that knowledge and information can flow throughout the system.

To explore this interconnectedness, I now turn to Giles Delueze and Felix Guattari’s (2004) affective assemblage to develop the concept of region as a periphery-assemblage. The affective assemblage describes how knowledge, ideas and power flow within an ideal evolutionary organism. It explores power as coming from a multiplicity of sources, capable of being harnessed by a range of actors, and not just by those who are traditionally imagined as ‘powerful’, such as peripheries (see Willett and Lang, 2018). Similarly, the assemblage is a way of imagining the complex interactions amongst and between all aspects of our lived experiences.

The region or periphery-assemblage, is made up of institutions, practices, ways of speaking about, economies, physical and conceptual structures, thoughts, and knowledges. In fact all that we encounter; know about the world; how it works; and our place in it; is a part of a mutating network of assembled and mobile ideas, concepts, structures, practices and institutions grouped in particular ways, at particular times, and around particular objects and ideas. For peripheral development, if change is
always going to happen (see Paasi 2013; Willett and Lang 2018; Bürk et al 2012), then the problem is to facilitate a change that can improve the adaptive capacity of the periphery-assemblage. In a study about how to challenge peripheralising narratives, this means that it is important to look at the institutions and organisations that act as conduits for information flows (Latour 2005). Later, I will argue that local government offers a way of connecting regional knowledges.

There are four concepts which can be used as tools for understanding these knowledge flows within the periphery-assemblage to better explore the connections within, between, inside and outside of our periphery-assemblage. Lines of articulation; affect; feedback loops; and spaces of possibility. Lines of articulation refer to the flows and connections that form between and within the periphery-assemblage, binding some (perhaps disparate) objects and ideas together. These lines of articulation might develop into a long-term flow or interconnection; they might fade away as quickly as they began; or alternatively they might remain, but offer only a tangential connection. The concept of affect is important for understanding why lines of articulation form. Affect is based on the post Epicurean philosophy of Spinoza, and literally refers to the capacity of some things, ideas, or practices to affect or impact others (Ahmed 2004; Bennett 2010). It transfers an impact to whatever surface it comes into contact with, attaching to and permanently changing almost anything (Anderson 2014). There is no mechanical relationship between the capacity of a phenomenon to create impact or affect (see Bennett 2010). Sometimes, a tiny occurrence will have a huge impact that ripples and amplifies throughout directly connected assemblages, whereas other much larger affective impacts might have minimal consequences (see also Connolly 2002).

The reason for this disproportionate impact is rooted in the phenomenology which Deleuze and Guattari take from Bergson (2004), rejecting a mechanistic perspective on power (Prigogine and Stengers, 1985; Smith and Jenks 2006). Here, because of particular histories, some affects ‘resonate’ (Connolly 2008), whilst others do not. Connolly shows us that it is entirely possible reshape the contexts, emphases, and practices within nearby assemblages, initiating self-perpetuating feedback loops between and within connected assemblages, embedding particular flows and interrelationships. In a research about how to challenge peripheralising narratives, this means that the ability to transfer knowledge and ideas around the periphery-assemblage provides greater opportunity not only for information to be shared, but also for new knowledges to develop. Affect helps to drive this process, as long as adequate information exchange structures are put in place. The cautionary note from Connolly (2008) is that emotionally charged affective responses can be fuelled by negative emotions such as anger and resentment, as well as positive ones like optimism and enthusiasm.

For the periphery-assemblage, lines of articulation, affect, and feedback loops provide a set of conceptual tools to visualise how knowledge and information move within the region. Lines of articulation facilitate visualization of new connections, and affect shows why some new ideas stick, and others do not. Feedback loops describe how some affects, innovations and ideas amplify and reverberate in the periphery, whilst others fail to. Crucially, they demonstrate how if new knowledges are to be created, they need to have well-functioning flows of information around the region. In turn, this facilitates better adaptation of the periphery to the contemporary external environment, and challenging peripheralising knowledges, narratives, and processes. This provides the opportunity to abandon old practices, structured patterns of behaviour, and path dependencies that inhibit adaptation to emerging niches. However it is important to recognise that these are only spaces where change might occur, given the right information and inputs, but there is no guarantee that they will. It is crucial that all people and organisations are able to contribute to, find out about, and act on emerging knowledges within the periphery-assemblage, if peripheralising knowledges are to be challenged.

Affective assemblages help this study in a number of ways. First, they improve on the existing body of peripheralisation research (Bürk et al 2012; Jansson 2003; Erickson 2008; Willett 2016) by
providing a deep analysis of the levels of interconnections, interrelationships, and networks between people, things, institutions and infrastructure. This contributes to the recognition that peripheral identities and economies are shifting, fluid, and mobile (Paasi 2013; Willett and Lang 2018). Second, they offer an examination of the ways and means by which these interconnections circulate information throughout the region, what these information flows incorporate, and how it facilitates adaptation to social, political, and economic niches (see for example, Latour 2005). Thirdly, in emphasising the importance of interconnectivity it offers suggestions for challenging peripheralising narratives, by considering the extent to which all aspects of the periphery are embedded within the knowledges and flows within the region-assemblage (Willett and Lang 2018; Thrift 2008; Connolly 2002). Such embedding would mean that people can be involved in the changes that are taking place as part of development processes; can feedback impacts, concerns, and opportunities to improve investment efficacy; and contribute to a vibrant and dynamic civil society and social capital. In the next section, I will claim that a well-functioning local democracy can provide this kind of amplificatory space.

Local Government and the Periphery-Assemblage

In the context of this article, local government refers to formalised institutions that operate on a local, or community basis. Recent research has shown (particularly with regard to investment in infrastructure), that local governments that respond to the needs of the community are crucial to the success of development projects because they are less subject to competing individual interests, and better able to take a holistic vision on what is good for the community (Crescenzi et al., 2016; Collins, J. Neal and Z. Neal 2014). Derived from the former, local government then provides a connective and communicative role in the periphery-assemblage, since its vision of the collective good allows creating spaces of possibility to facilitate regional adaptation. In practice, the quality of local government is also important for attracting human capital; people who can contribute positively towards local social and economic adaptation (Ketterer and Rodriguez-Pose 2015); and improving quality of life and social capital which impacts positively on the locality (Shortall 2004; Casey and Christ 2005; Evans and Synnett 2007; Lee et al. 2005). On an individual level, political participation in local or community government improves life satisfaction (Chan, Ou, and Reynolds 2014; Kelly 2013) and health outcomes (Boullanne and Brailey 2013). Consequently, the social capital enabled by local government offers the potential for collecting together many different assemblages within the periphery, incorporating individuals, community groups, businesses, and interest organisations. It also provides a space for sharing information.

In terms of the periphery and for peripheralisation processes, there are a number of questions to be considered here. A local government with high level of citizen participation and engagement can act as a conduit, facilitating flows of information between differing parts of the periphery-assemblage. It can collect, collate, and disseminate knowledges about the local environment and provide what Boulding (1981) might call ‘multi-parental’ responses to community problems and decision making. What Boulding means by this is related to what he refers as ‘genes’, which are inputted into problem-solving. Echoing Delueze and Guattari, a wide and diverse gene-pool of ideas is essential to create knowledges which are sustainable in the long term. A too narrow pool restricts diversity, fails to challenge bad ideas, and reproduces unhelpful path-dependencies, problems or flaws (Connolly 2005). This inhibits the ability of the region-organism to adapt successfully to changes in its environmental conditions. Consequently, having some kind of space through which to channel and filter communication and structural decision making is vital for a peripheral development that is better adapted to its social, economic and political environment (see Meekes et al. 2017). In this respect, it is not surprising that Crescenzi, Cataldo and Rodriguez-Pose (2016) find that infrastructural investment is more effective in regions with strong local government.
An additional effect of interconnections and interactions formulated and fostered by local
governments, is that they can help individuals and groups to make contacts and connections. This
opens up new lines of articulation and spaces of possibility that contributes to the regional social
capital (Shortall 2004; Casey and Christ 2005; Evans and Synnett 2007; Lee et al. 2005) and adaptation
to emerging niches. In sum, the attributes of a good local government and its close connections and
overlays with other assemblages within the region can amplify positive affects and interactions,
creating ripples and feedback loops throughout the periphery-assemblage, making their own spaces of
possibility, and enabling new mutations and adaptations to occur. A strong local government is in this
respect crucial for the community’s ability to effectively update and realise its potential.

Case study and methodology

This article takes the case study of Parish Councils in Cornwall, South West of the UK.
Research for it was conducted in the summer of 2016. Using Cloke and Edwards (1986) definition of
peripherality, Cornwall is a remote rural region, which has had low economic performance for many
decades (Willett, 2013). Since 1999, the region has been a recipient of the highest levels of European
Union Structural Funding, designed to flatten the inequalities between peripheral and core regions
(Willett, 2013). The ascription of peripherality is one that local people accept due to the
underperforming economy and poor infrastructure connecting Cornwall to core areas in the southeast
of the UK (Willett, 2016). Indeed, it has been very important for gaining additional investment (Willett,
2013).

Local government in Britain is a somewhat confusing and hierarchical patchwork that has
developed incrementally over many centuries (Kieth-Lucas 1980). Broadly, at the top of the tier are
Principal Authorities (which might be based on a city, large conurbation, county – or even a part of it
county). Principal Authorities that have not become Unitary Authorities have a layer of District
Councils immediately below them. The level of government closest to ordinary people is that of Parish
Councils, which exist at a small city, town or village level. This means that they are the most
accessible to individuals and organisations. In this structure, historically Parish Councils have had very
little executive power or responsibility, and mainly provide a level of local administration for central
government policy. However, local government reforms in the UK under the so-called Localism
agenda of 2011, mean that they will have more to administer in coming years (Buser 2013; The
Localism Act 2011. McIntyre and Halsall (2011:270) call this ‘devolving responsibility from
Whitehall to Town Halls’. Under the new agenda, many Parishes have accepted responsibility for
services as diverse as local green spaces, car parks, public toilets and libraries. All Parish Councils
positions are voluntary roles, although a paid clerk supports them. For small Councils, the clerk only
works a few hours a week, whilst larger Councils might employ several office staff and other
personnel.

It has been claimed here that for peripheries to challenge peripheralising narratives more
effectively they need to have a space whereby knowledge and information can be able to flow more
freely throughout the periphery-assemblage, and so facilitate the development and propagation of new
knowledges. As the smallest level of government, community councils (Parish Councils in the UK),
provide such a space. However, in practice, there are many structural issues that Parishes need to
address. A primary problem is that of representative democracy. In common with all layers of British
government, membership to the Council is subjected to popular vote, with councillors holding office
for a period of four years, after which they can seek re-election. However, in the May 2015 elections
only 20% of Councils contested their vacancies (NALC 2015). This suggests that currently Parish
Councils are far from being assemblage-hubs of action, interaction, and new ideas. Often it is very
difficult to get candidates for council seats, and sitting councillors will rely on their personal and
professional networks to gain candidates. Consequently, councillors are restricted to particular sections of the community, limiting the ‘gene’ pool (Boulding, 1981) of available ideas and the ability of ideas and information to form affective resonances with a broader population (Connolly 2008). Moreover, and perhaps reflecting a failure to capture the public imagination, turnout at local elections can typically be very low. This indicates some kind of structural breakdown with respect to the ability of Parish Councils to act as a conduit and communicative space for a diversity of ideas and information flows within the community or periphery-assemblage, and also to create and update the spaces of possibility that can contribute to a more successful economic development.

The case study aims to understand more about this structural breakdown in the Parish Councils. The model of the peripheral assemblage is used to diagnose what should be done in order to improve this important site of possibility. Empirical research was focused on generating discursive data about how participants understand Parish Councils, exploring the lack of participation, and how this contributes to blockages in information flows within the periphery-assemblage. Therefore it was important to gather data about what people really feel, and not about what they say that they feel. To do so, data was gathered using a methodological approach informed by phenomenology and symbolic interactionism (Mead 1934; Blumer 1969; Goffman 1959). Mead discusses attitudes and perceptions as a series of linked actions and responses that people make at a subconscious level. We might imagine this as a set of ‘performances’, whereby individuals adopt a specific language or action when faced with particular, familiar situations (Goffman 1959). To look beyond performed statements and explore the meanings that lay beneath, a conversational approach was used to provide the space for individuals to discuss their perceptions with an otherwise unattainable level of depth (Flick 2004). To ensure that the conversations went to a deeper level than in conventional conversational methods, research introduced an element of chance, which could challenge path dependencies of participants ‘performance’ (Goffman 1959; Mead 1934). The aim was to gather data to also explore the range of materialities that connect the periphery-assemblage in the analysis phase.

Research was conducted in three stages. Firstly, to explore popular perceptions of Parish Councils. In order to generate a breadth of interviews that would provide a diverse range of positions but with limited resources, this phase was conducted at the Royal Cornwall Show (RCS). On a Saturday, the RCS attracts a wide cross-section of individuals from across Cornish civil society. The object of this research was not to provide representative data, but to understand the topic better, and a broad cross-section helped exploration of a range of views (Charmaz 2006). For this phase, methods derived from theatre and performative research were employed, enabling imaginative conversations that challenged path dependent narrative performances, while also removing barriers to participation (See Heras and Tabera 2014; Orlu-Gul et al. 2014). The idea was, drawing on Goffman (1959), to break down the structured expectations of questions and responses, providing a new space for individuals to look a little deeper into what they really think. The method used was to stop show-goers on a random basis and ask them to draw a picture of what they thought a Parish Councillor looks like. This provided a playful hook as a means of starting a conversation about people’s perceptions of the Parish level of government, and to encourage participants to move beyond more standardised responses and provide more nuanced and reflective responses. Full ethical approval was provided through my research institution, and potential participants were fully informed of the nature and purpose of the research, before being asked if they would like to participate and draw the picture. In practice, most participants chose not to draw but only to talk about how they perceived the Council, and many told anecdotes about their own experiences with their local Parishes. The offer to draw, however, captured their imagination. All participants completed a consent form. 27 people were spoken to, individually or in pairs, across seventeen separate interviews. Detailed notes were taken of the conversations, so the data gathered in this primary stage consisted of notes and sometimes drawings.
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The second phase took the insights of phase one to inform more in-depth interviews. Interviews were conducted with a Parish Council in Cornwall, which has been very proactive at engaging with government reforms, but which is facing a recruitment crisis of candidates for the next election (May 2017). A one-to-one interview was conducted with the Chair of the Parish Council to understand the changes that have taken place in recent years, how the Council and the community have responded to these changes, and the challenges and opportunities this has opened up. Finally, a focus group was held with five individuals who currently are reliable volunteers on Council matters, but do not wish to become elected representatives. The purpose was to understand why people who currently volunteered in the community, were not interested in formalising this. Whilst the first phase often collected conversations from people who were not actively involved in their communities, the focus group worked with people who intimately understood what being a Councillor involved.

The detailed notes, drawings and transcriptions were coded for themes and regularities (refined as the analysis progressed), and drew lines of connection between the various aspects of the research (see Yin 2003; Charmaz 2006; Strauss and Corbin 2008). Codes were constructed according to the key issues expressed by participants regarding engagement with Parish Councils, and these codes were used to better understand the operation of the assemblage.

Findings and Analysis

There are two defining characteristics of how people experienced the local Council-assemblage. First, people found it to be too heavily structured around specific and particular patterns of behaviour that limited people’s capacity to engage with town and Parish Councils. Second, people felt that the tools of communication used were ineffective for engaging with the general public, and lacked the capacity to facilitate and develop interactive affective feedback-loops between the Council as a body, and the individuals and groups that made up the wider community and periphery-assemblages. In this section, I show that a breakdown of information flows, affective impacts, lines of flight, and feedback loops has led to path-dependent knowledges, narratives and structures, which are difficult to challenge. Consequently, decisions are made using a limited range of knowledges, and emergent spaces of possibility do not arise. It will be shown how this deepens rather than challenges peripheralising knowledges, narratives, and processes by failing to allow new ideas to move around the periphery-assemblage.

The formalised structures of representative democracy are important processes to ensure openness, inclusivity and transparency; and they can also act as conduits that make it easier for people who are familiar within these assemblages to navigate the complex systems of local government (see also Moir and Leyshon 2013). However in the focus groups people felt more comfortable and familiar with the looser structures, fluidity and informality, of the participatory democracy of local campaign groups (See also Guertz and Van De Wijdeven, 2010). A community activist in her mid 30’s described: ‘paperwork and things are one of the major reasons why I wouldn’t want to be on a Parish Council. I'm not a pen pusher. I don’t work like that’. This means that people found reasons not to get involved in local politics, or once involved (particularly working people), were unable to make the required number of meetings annually, and so had to stop being Councillors. For example, a woman in her 40’s related her husband’s experience as a Parish Councillor for three years: ‘He had to go to a meeting every six weeks or so. Everyone else was retired, and then he had to be away a lot because of his job, and ended up missing a lot of meetings. I think it was three in a row, so he had to step down’. As a consequence, Town and Parish Council assemblages were made up of a limited demographic, which carries important implications for the capacity to make multi-parental decisions (Boulding 1981) and create emergent spaces of possibility for innovation to happen (Deleuze and Guattari 2004; Connolly 2008). Instead, people experienced the assemblage as if its boundaries were being policed...
and divergent ideas vigorously discouraged, rather than allowed to remain fluid and flexible. In some respects, this is to be expected given the poor levels of democratic engagement between local people and Parish Councils (Willett and Cruxon 2018; NALC 2015). Low levels of political participation mean that it is easier for particular knowledges to become rooted. Sometimes this can have disastrous consequences. In another example, a former Councillor (female, in her late 30’s) felt that she had to go home after disagreements about turning a children’s play area into a car park. Another (female, mid 30’s) participant chose not to stand for the Council as she believed that she would clash with the different opinions of the strong characters already part of the Council: ‘There are a lot of people in this community that won’t always back you and I don’t feel like I’m in the right age bracket that fits the people that you need to back you sometimes. That isn’t a majority, but there is a very, very small minority who you get in every community, who will niggle and pick with what you are doing’. This, she felt, would add too much unpleasantness to her life in the village.

In the local government assemblage, only particular persons, groups and organisations are being incorporated into the network, which instead of being fluid, dynamic and mobile, has become static and rigid. This was articulated by a man in his 50’s who stated that the ‘Parish Council are a closed group and they ‘shun the non-believers [those who do not agree with council decisions] as it were’. A separate male in his 50’s stated that ‘there are some forward-looking Councils, but the vast majority are backwards-looking’. As a consequence, power starts to become unilinear rather than multiple, focussing on a small rather than multi-parental set of ideas (Boulding 1981; Prigogine and Stengers 1983). This problematises the capacity of the Council and its communities, to communicate adequately within the periphery-assemblage, or outside, with the broader environment. As a result anti-peripheralisation processes, perceptions, and narratives are compromised by eluding new ideas that arise from within, damaging the capacity of the periphery to innovate and adapt to change and mutating niche. Instead, the bad feeling created then developed its own set of negative feedback loops and affective responses (Ahmed 2004; Connolly 2008).

Part of the problem here relates to the difficulties that Councils have in getting new Councillors. If the lack of interest leads to fewer volunteers, existing Councillors then must use their networks to try filling vacancies. This immediately restricts the multi-parental (Boulding 1981) nature of idea generation, compromising adaptability by inhibiting the development of new lines of flight and spaces of possibility (Deleuze and Guattari 2004). In contrast, the inability to introduce new information fosters the maintenance of path dependencies that might no longer have a beneficial function in the successful adaptation of the region-assemblage (Bedau and Humphries 2008; Smith and Jenks 2006). What the above participants seem to be describing, is a situation whereby path dependencies or older knowledges are upheld and aggressively policed because of a lack of diversity within the Councils. This lack of diversity over ideas means that it is difficult to challenge peripheralising narratives (Willett and Lang 2018; Willett 2016; Lang 2015; Erickson 2008; Bürk et al 2012), as there is a preference towards pre-existing (albeit harmful) ideas.

Most participants recognised the need to incorporate a broader demographic into the Council, but felt uncertain how to do this. This meant that practices, principles and structures emerged creating feedback loops that favoured affective responses towards, and communication within and between the dominant demographic. The result was that Council monocultures are replicated, further excluding different groups within the region-assemblage from participating by reproducing affective resonances that reinforce existing structures. A woman in her early 20’s articulated these communicative issues by stating that ‘we get a Parish booklet through the door, but I think it always goes straight into the bin. A Parish Facebook would be good though. I’d definitely read that as it would be right up in front of me’. Here, attempts at communication were not in themselves affectively adapted to how younger people accessed information about their worlds. This meant that rather than opening conduits of information
flows and creating feedback loops (Connolly 2002; Latour 2005), it blocked communications to significant sectors of the community.

Sometimes, the issues were about languages. In the RCS part of the research several people related stories about how they or their children/friends’ children had tried to engage with the Council to improve play facilities. Usually, they used the available narrative locally of wanting to develop a skate park within existing play area grounds. Unfortunately, the experiences of the young people were that the Council had been slow, ineffective, or at times, obstructive, rather than open to suggestions for positive change. In this case, councillors had failed to recognise that regardless of the merits or otherwise of skate-parks, these young people had been trying to find ways of engaging in, and becoming an active part of, the peripheral community-assemblage. For instance, a woman in her early 40’s related the story of a boat-builder in her community, who had tried to work with the Council to improve play facilities: ‘He has put a lot of personal effort in, with the children to get a skate park built. But it’s getting nowhere, despite ALL the effort… The Parish Council have all the power to make changes, but they don’t use that power.’ In not comprehending that this was a communicative invitation with the potential of creating affective spaces of possibility (Deleuze and Guattari 2004; Smith and Jenks 2006; Connolly 2008), this potentiality gets lost and generates affective responses built on resentment.

Moreover, at other times, the lack of capacity for effective communication created a series of negative affective impacts, which developed resentment and hostility amongst some members of the community towards Councillors. The Council had installed some kayak racks, which had the potential to be of significant practical use, and facilitator of much affective good-will. However, focus group participants felt that they had not known about the facility until it was too late to rent a space. The community activist quoted earlier talked about this saying ‘for instance, we locally have had a kayak rack down at the harbour. That was terribly advertised, for which I missed out on a kayak space and I’m gutted… and I’m like, if I had known about that properly, where was that advertised?’ This was interpreted to mean that members of the Council benefitted more than other locals, creating hostilities and blockages to communication, threatening the operation of the assemblage through divisions and narratives that undermine the relationship between communication and trust. Thus, communication difficulties within the assemblage has generated an affective situation of antagonism which dissipates collective activity potentially harms flows of information (See Ahmed 2004; Bennett 2010; Anderson 2014).

Evidence of this affective hostility was found amongst the range of participants who discussed how difficult it was for the Councils and communities to hold conversations about a range of topics. Although Councils have a statutory duty to disseminate the minutes of meetings, these tend to be done via notice-boards, websites, and/or community newsletters. However little or no attempt is made to amend the format into something more easy to read for persons unfamiliar or uncomfortable with the formalisation of Council processes. Equally, few Councils use social media tools as a means of engaging with other locals in ways that are more familiar to (particularly younger) demographics. This creates something of a chicken-and-egg’ problem, whereby the circulation of knowledges happens only within particular parts of the Council-assemblage, threatening its capacity to keep the disparate aspects of the assemblage collected together. In turn, this reproduces mono-linear power structures and harms the ability of the community to either utilise or convey accurate information to other parts of the periphery-assemblage, or to acknowledge emerging perceptions that challenge stigmatising (Bürk et al 2012) narratives. As a consequence, few emergent spaces are facilitated (Bedau and Humphries 2008; Boulding 1981; Deleuze and Guattari 2004), which means that there is little innovation or dynamism happening in the governance of communities, and therefore fewer possibilities for new lines of flight or lines of articulation (Deleuze and Guattari 2004; Connolly 2002).
This case study demonstrates the potential damage that poor communicative practices within local government can have for the ways that information flows through and reverberates around the periphery-assemblage. Local government can have an enabling impact on peripheral development (Crescenzi et al., 2016; Collins, J. Neal and Z. Neal 2014). However, in this case the information flows, affective impacts, lines of flight and feedback loops have broken down, inhibiting the ability of the periphery to create dynamic spaces of possibility, and therefore challenge peripheralisation. The result is that potentially harmful or outdated path-dependencies, narratives and structures fail to be challenged, replaced or improved through the incorporation of new ideas (Bedau and Humphries 2008; Smith and Jenks 2006). It can create feedback loops of negative affects which inhibit successful flows of information, rather than positive amplificatory affects which can facilitate successful adaptation to national and global social, political, and economic shifts (Connolly 2008; Latour 2005). Local governance can provide a unique assemblage-space to collect, make decisions, and disseminate. However it, too, should be able to adapt to the shifting environments and niche within which it is embedded.

Conclusion

In this study, I have made three interconnected arguments. First, I claim that effective and inclusive local government is a crucial space to challenge peripheralisation processes and facilitate adaptation to structural environmental changes (Crescenzi et al., 2016; Collins, J. Neal and Z. Neal 2014). Second, poor communication can generate peripheralisation processes within the periphery-assemblage. Local Councils provide a space of possibility (Connolly 2008; Deleuze and Guattari 2004) to actualise the power within the peripheral regions (Author forthcoming; Paasi 2013; Willett 2016). The case study demonstrates the extent to which poor communication can harm the function of the region as a periphery-organism. Finally, the major claim is that viewing peripheral regions as affective assemblages can help to identify the processes of peripheralisation that need to be challenged in order to successfully adapt to the contemporary environment (Bürk et al 2012; Lang et al 2015; Willett and Lang, 2018; Eriksson 2008). These processes include linkages, reverberations and feedback loops that can be better developed in order to evolve to changing socio-economic niche (Boulding 1981; Connolly 2008; Bergson 2004; Smith and Jenks 2008). In part, this can help to understand more fully the impacts that particular investments and opportunities from traditional approaches to peripheral development are having, and to identify better, through a better understanding of the periphery-assemblage, how these affects can be amplified. The improved circulation of knowledges amongst all of the differing demographics of the peripheral-assemblage would have the effect of being better able to incorporate and include diverse sections of the populace into debate and dialogue about what is happening in the locality. Further, improved knowledges and communication can better challenge peripheralising narratives.

The example of local government in the case study, showed that people are fundamentally disconnected from strategic decision making, investment, and development within the locality. This has happened through a range of factors, including modes of communication and unfamiliar formalised processes and structures. In contrast to informal political groups within the community, Parish Councils have many layers of coded knowledges about how the like to be interacted with, and how they function. This caused the participants to feel alienated, and hence, the general population are badly placed to know about emerging adaptations, innovation, plans, opportunities and ideas (Bedau and Humphries 2008; Smith and Jenks 2006; Boulding 1981) which can challenge stigmatising and peripheralising perceptions about the region, and narratives of place (Eriksson 2008; Janssen 2003; Willett 2016; Bürk et al 2012; Lang et al 2015). As a result, affective resentments and outdated knowledges and perceptions allow peripheralising narratives to remain in circulation. This is not to
blame peripheries for their situation. On the contrary, national government has an important role in helping to create the structures within which peripheral local governments can actualise their agency.

In the UK, the Localism reforms (MacIntyre and Halsall 2011; Buser 2013; The Localism Act 2011) provide some of the structure in order to do this, but much work is still required to transform the ways that various aspects of local government are communicated. Part of the problem lies in how representative local government works and is perceived (Moir and Leyshon 2013; Guertz and Van De Wijdeven 2010). It is necessary to make it more inclusive, discursive, and relevant to ordinary people; as well as to disseminate power throughout the periphery. The potential benefits to such a course of action extend beyond merely challenging negative perceptions (Eriksson 2008; Janssen 2003; Willett 2016; Lang et al 2015; Bürk et al 2012), and may include building, maximising or amplifying capabilities and capacities. This carries the additional advantages of providing tangible evidence to contradict peripheralising stereotypes, and would improve social capital, knowledge and skills, amplifying the capacity of traditional development approaches to make a difference. In working with the connectivity and capacity of people and communities within the periphery, there are clear spaces of potentiality for enhancing the agency of people to challenge the peripheralising narratives that can be so damaging to long term regional development (Willett and Lang, 2018; Bürk et al, 2012; Eriksson 2008).

Finally, understanding the region as an affective assemblage allows to better observing the processes through which ideas and investments impact the regional economy. Unveiling the interconnections and feedback loops through which apparently disparate phenomena interconnect, and which can be used to both observe, but also to maximise the effectiveness of large and small developments. It offers an ontological perspective whereby even small things can have a great impact. This provides a sense of agency both to individuals within peripheral regions, and to the peripheral region itself in order to better challenge its physical and discursive peripherality.
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