

Socioplastics [2997] – LateralGovernance – Knowledge Production as Independent Political Act – Core Decalogue VI – Tome III – LAPIEZA-LAB – 2026

Socioplastics [2997] – LateralGovernance – Knowledge Production as Independent Political Act – Core Decalogue VI – Tome III – LAPIEZA-LAB – 2026 (Tome III, ExtensionLayer, Core Decalogue VI Spine; DOI Paper 07/10; Field: Political Theory / Sovereignty and Conflict; v1.0.0; 2026-04-26; CC BY-NC-SA 4.0; canonical TXT, machine-readable, auditable, diffable; PDF surrogate). LateralGovernance defines the political architecture of a corpus that regulates itself through horizontal protocols rather than vertical authority. Standards emerge from internal structure rather than external decree, and legitimacy derives from coherence, persistence, public evidence, and operational consequence rather than institutional delegation. In Socioplastics, governance is not granted from above but constructed across the lateral relations between nodes, operators, archives, identifiers, deposits, readers, and public interfaces. LateralGovernance names the political condition in which a corpus governs itself without depending on vertical authorisation. It does not reject institutions as such; it displaces their monopoly over legitimacy. The central claim is that knowledge can be regulated through architecture rather than decree. In conventional academic systems, authority descends vertically: institutions accredit authors, journals certify texts, departments define standards, committees distribute legitimacy, and recognition flows through hierarchical gates. Socioplastics reorganises this logic laterally. Here, authority is distributed across the structural relations that make the corpus durable and inspectable: a weak node loses force because it fails under cross-reference, redundancy, or incoherence; a strong node gains traction because it survives pressure, remains navigable, accumulates recurrence, and anchors later work. Governance therefore emerges from consequence rather than command. The corpus establishes its own standards through operators, cores, protocols, slugs, deposits, and public evidence. A term that drifts semantically weakens. A node without address loses retrieval. A layer without coherence remains unstable. A deposit without metadata loses authority. In each case, governance is enacted structurally rather than bureaucratically. This is the political architecture of epistemic sovereignty: standards are not announced as doctrine but embedded as conditions of survival. LateralGovernance therefore translates political theory into infrastructural design. From Illich it inherits the critique of institutional monopoly and the possibility of autonomous learning structures. From Ostrom it takes the governance of shared systems through distributed rules rather than central command. From Mouffe it takes the inevitability of conflict and the productive role of agonism in maintaining political vitality. From DeNardis it takes the proposition that governance is often embedded in technical architecture rather than visible law. Socioplastics synthesises these lines by proposing that a corpus can govern itself through structured consequence, distributed standards, and public inspectability. This is not informality. It is disciplined self-regulation. The relation between LateralGovernance and TopolexicalSovereignty is precise: TopolexicalSovereignty establishes the right of the corpus to name, define, and occupy its own conceptual territory; LateralGovernance establishes the political architecture through which that territory is maintained without vertical permission. One secures the lexical ground; the other governs the structural field above it. Together they define the sovereignty condition of Socioplastics as both linguistic and political, both territorial and infrastructural. LateralGovernance also defines a political right: the right to produce knowledge by building the infrastructure through which that knowledge can persist. This shifts sovereignty away from institutional permission and toward infrastructural capacity. The author does not ask for legitimacy as symbolic concession; the corpus builds the conditions under which legitimacy becomes difficult to refuse. The result is a post-institutional model of knowledge politics in which coherence, continuity, durability, and public evidence become the operative grounds of authority. Subfield Map: Agonistic Democracy – studies conflict, contestation, dissensus, and adversarial plurality as constitutive conditions of political life; Commons Theory – examines shared resources, collective stewardship, rule formation, maintenance, and distributed governance; Post-Institutional Theory – studies how legitimacy, organisation, and authority can emerge outside formal institutions without collapsing into informality; Decolonial Studies – examines epistemic hierarchy, colonial classification, extractive legitimacy, and the redistribution of knowledge authority; Urban Political Theory – studies power, territory, governance, citizenship, access, exclusion, and conflict in spatial form; Governance Studies – analyses how systems regulate themselves through protocols, standards, procedures, distributed rules, and infrastructural design; Critical Legal Geography – examines law as spatial arrangement, territorial force, procedural boundary, and uneven instrument of power; Bureaucracy Studies – studies forms, permits, delays, protocols, administration, and procedural systems as material political structures; Resistance Studies – examines refusal, tactical autonomy, dissensus, evasion, counter-institutions, and parallel organisation as political method; Cultural Sovereignty – studies the right to produce, preserve, circulate, and govern symbolic and epistemic forms outside external capture. Protocol order (2997): DEFINE internal standards through operators, metadata, protocols, and structural thresholds rather than declarative authority; ENFORCE those standards through consequence, allowing weak formulations to lose force and coherent structures to gain traction; DOCUMENT governance protocols publicly so the regulatory logic of the corpus remains inspectable and reproducible; DEFEND lateral autonomy by preserving infrastructural independence across deposits, identifiers, archives, and interfaces; EXPAND the corpus without delegating its standards upward, ensuring that growth increases sovereignty rather than dependency. References – Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. Harper & Row; Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press; Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. Verso; Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform Capitalism*. Polity Press; Lloveras, A. (2026). *Socioplastics [508] – Topolexical Sovereignty (v1.0.0)*. LAPIEZA-LAB, Madrid. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18682343> Citation: Lloveras, A. (2026). *Socioplastics [2997] – LateralGovernance: Knowledge Production as Independent Political Act (v1.0.0)*. LAPIEZA-LAB, Madrid. Slug: socioplastics-2997-lateralgovernance-knowledge-production-as-independent-political-act-2026. Interface: <https://antolloveras.blogspot.com> · ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9820-3319>. AUTHOR – Anto Lloveras · LAPIEZA-LAB, Madrid · 2026.