

# DOCTRINE INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

*Authority to state Doctrine, responsibility to explain it, and duty to apply it within  
defined operational jurisdiction*

---

**Institutional Governance Paper**

Malone Network

July 31, 2026

## Executive Summary

Malone Doctrine is the governing ethical authority of the Malone Network. Because the Doctrine governs multiple institutions with different legal forms, professional competencies, and public identities, the Network must distinguish three responsibilities that are closely related but never interchangeable: the authority to state what the Doctrine is, the responsibility to explain what it means, and the duty of each institution to apply it within its assigned jurisdiction.

The authority to state Doctrine determines which principles, rules, procedures, and interpretations possess canonical force. The responsibility to explain Doctrine makes that authority understandable through commentary, research, instruction, examples, and analysis. The institutional duty to implement Doctrine converts governing standards into policies and conduct appropriate to a particular institution. Confusing these functions permits scholars to legislate, officers to rewrite governing authority through practice, and institutions to impose their own jurisdictional priorities upon the entire Network.

**Governing principle: The authority to state Doctrine is not the same as the responsibility to explain it or the duty to implement it.**

| Function           | Primary question                   | Permitted output                                                                      | Controlling boundary                                                    |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| State Doctrine     | What governs?                      | Adopted axioms, principles, maxims, rules, procedures, and authorized interpretations | Requires formal doctrinal authority and adoption.                       |
| Explain Doctrine   | What does the governing text mean? | Commentary, teaching, research, examples, case studies, and interpretive guidance     | Must disclose status and may not silently amend the canonical text.     |
| Implement Doctrine | What must this institution do?     | Policies, decisions, programs, controls, standards, and operating procedures          | Applies only within the institution's lawful and assigned jurisdiction. |

## 1. Why the Distinction Is Necessary

A governing doctrine must be stable enough to preserve identity and flexible enough to guide action across changing circumstances. Stability requires controlled authority: readers must be able to identify which texts govern and who may amend them. Flexibility requires interpretation and implementation: institutions must explain abstract standards and convert them into practical decisions. The same body need not perform all three functions, and ordinarily should not.

Without functional separation, three recurring failures emerge:

- Interpretive capture occurs when an educator, commentator, department, or clergy body treats its preferred explanation as binding Doctrine without authorization.
- Operational capture occurs when a policy developed for one institution is presented as a Network-wide command even though it was designed for a limited mission or legal environment.
- Doctrinal stagnation occurs when fear of unauthorized amendment prevents institutions from explaining difficult language, testing applications, or developing lawful implementation methods.

The proper architecture resolves these risks by giving each responsibility a defined source of authority, a recognizable documentary form, a limited jurisdiction, and an escalation path when ambiguity or conflict remains.

## 2. The Authority to State Doctrine

To state Doctrine is to declare what possesses governing normative force. This authority is constitutional within the Malone Network. It does not arise from popularity, professional expertise, institutional size, financial contribution, public visibility, or repeated practice. It arises only from the authorized doctrinal process.

### 2.1 Canonical authority

A canonical doctrinal statement establishes, modifies, clarifies, or repeals a standard that binds Malone-aligned institutions according to its authority level and jurisdiction. Canonical materials must be identifiable by title, document class, status, version, effective date, and approving authority. A text that lacks these characteristics may be influential, but it should not be represented as adopted Doctrine.

### 2.2 Authority hierarchy

The adopted authority chain establishes an ordered relationship among doctrinal instruments:

| Rank | Authority level | Institutional function                                                   |
|------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Axioms          | Foundational propositions that establish the highest governing premises. |
| 2    | Principles      | General ethical standards derived from and constrained by the axioms.    |
| 3    | Maxims          | Condensed teaching rules that communicate recurring doctrinal judgments. |
| 4    | Rules           | Binding directives governing defined conduct or institutional decisions. |
| 5    | Procedures      | Authorized methods for performing duties required by higher authority.   |

|   |                                           |                                                                                           |
|---|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | Authorized commentary and interpretations | Formally adopted explanations resolving ambiguity or establishing controlled application. |
| 7 | Articles                                  | Structured doctrinal analyses applying higher authority to a defined problem.             |
| 8 | Implementation documents                  | Approved plans or instruments directing execution under the governing hierarchy.          |

When texts conflict, the higher-ranking authority controls. Lower instruments may clarify and operationalize higher authority, but they may not negate it. An implementation document cannot overrule a rule; an institutional article cannot overrule a principle; and no commentary may reverse an axiom under the guise of interpretation.

### 2.3 Who may state Doctrine

During the founding period, Joseph Malone serves as the originating doctrinal author and principal authority responsible for approving canonical status. Future constitutional arrangements may distribute or succeed this authority, but they must identify who may propose, review, adopt, amend, authenticate, and publish normative texts. Custodians, educators, officers, trustees, clergy, researchers, and political leaders do not acquire doctrinal authority merely because their roles require them to use the Doctrine.

### 2.4 What does not state Doctrine

| Material or action                   | Proper classification                          | Why it is not automatically Doctrine                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| University course or scholarly paper | Educational or research material               | Academic competence supports analysis but does not itself confer canonical authority.                               |
| Ethics Department policy brief       | Explanatory or advisory material               | It may interpret or recommend but remains non-normative unless formally adopted.                                    |
| Foundation grant condition           | Institutional funding requirement              | It binds the grant relationship, not the entire Network.                                                            |
| Church sermon or religious rule      | Ecclesiastical teaching or internal discipline | It governs religious participation within Church jurisdiction and cannot control secular institutions by assertion. |
| Party platform or campaign position  | Political policy                               | It directs political action but remains revisable and subordinate to Doctrine.                                      |
| Defense Department procedure         | Departmental operational rule                  | It governs a specialized function and does not expand the department's jurisdiction.                                |

|                     |                        |                                                                                         |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Longstanding custom | Institutional practice | Repetition may create precedent but cannot replace formal adoption or higher authority. |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### 3. The Responsibility to Explain Doctrine

Explanation makes Doctrine intelligible without changing its identity. It translates abstract principles into definitions, examples, historical context, comparisons, case studies, and practical guidance. Explanation is therefore indispensable, but it is also a high-risk function because persuasive commentary can be mistaken for binding authority.

#### 3.1 Principal explanatory institutions

The Ethics Department bears primary responsibility for doctrinal explanation, interpretive research, case analysis, the Malone Primer, policy briefs, and commentary concerning purpose and application. Malone Global University teaches the Doctrine through curricula, lectures, assessments, leadership formation, and disciplined academic inquiry. Other institutions may explain the Doctrine as necessary to their missions, but they must remain within their professional competence and disclose the status of their statements.

#### 3.2 Standards for responsible interpretation

- Textual fidelity: begin with the controlling language rather than the institution's desired outcome.
- Hierarchical consistency: read lower authority in a manner compatible with higher authority.
- Status disclosure: identify whether an explanation is adopted, authorized, proposed, academic, institutional, or personal.
- Jurisdictional competence: distinguish ethical interpretation from legal, financial, academic, religious, political, or operational judgment.
- Evidence discipline: separate documented fact, attributed claim, inference, analogy, and speculation.
- Conflict visibility: acknowledge genuine ambiguity or competing interpretations rather than manufacturing certainty.
- Revision control: preserve earlier interpretations and identify when a later authorized interpretation supersedes them.

#### 3.3 Explanation is not amendment

An interpretation becomes an unauthorized amendment when it adds a duty the text cannot reasonably support, removes an express limitation, reverses the hierarchy, or treats an institution-specific preference as a universal command. When an explanation would materially change rights, duties, jurisdiction, authority, or institutional identity, the matter should be referred for formal doctrinal adoption rather than resolved through commentary alone.

**Interpretation may disclose implications already contained in Doctrine. It may not**

**manufacture new governing authority and conceal the change as explanation.**

## 4. The Institutional Duty to Apply Doctrine

Every Malone institution has a duty to apply Doctrine within the mission and jurisdiction assigned to it. Implementation is the conversion of ethical authority into concrete institutional conduct. It includes policies, resource decisions, personnel standards, curricula, grant requirements, public positions, religious practices, security procedures, and administrative controls.

Implementation authority is real but limited. An institution may decide how to perform its own responsibilities, provided its decisions remain consistent with Doctrine, applicable law, its governing documents, and the legitimate authority of other institutions. It may not use implementation as a route to enlarge its jurisdiction or redefine the entire Network.

### 4.1 Jurisdictional implementation matrix

| Institution                        | Operational jurisdiction                                  | Examples of doctrinal implementation                                                          | Nondelegable boundary                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MGU Library                        | Canonical custody and publication                         | Metadata, authenticated texts, version history, archival preservation, authority indexing     | May preserve and authenticate; may not substantively rewrite Doctrine.                                       |
| Ethics Department                  | Interpretation and explanatory development                | Primer essays, policy briefs, case studies, problem frameworks, authorized commentary         | May explain and recommend; may not grant itself canonical authority.                                         |
| Malone Global University           | Education, research, publishing, and leadership formation | Curricula, courses, assessments, professional standards, institutional research               | May teach and test; may not convert scholarship into binding Doctrine without adoption.                      |
| Malone Charitable Trust Foundation | Charitable stewardship and grantmaking                    | Funding priorities, due diligence, grant conditions, impact standards, fiduciary controls     | May allocate charitable capital; may not purchase doctrinal, political, ecclesiastical, or academic control. |
| Church of Malone                   | Religious formation, fellowship, and public service       | Worship, ethical discipline, service ministries, volunteer public works, ecclesiastical rules | May govern voluntary religious participation; may not control secular Network bodies or compel belief.       |
| Malone Political Party             | Political organization, policy, and lawful public power   | Platforms, candidate standards, advocacy, legislative proposals, governmental programs        | May pursue political action; may not convert electoral expediency into Doctrine.                             |

|                                    |                                                                                   |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Defense Department and War College | Preparedness, security education, analysis, and specialized operational standards | Dossiers, situational awareness, rules of engagement, threat analysis, training | May protect and prepare; may not assume civil government, general police power, or unrestricted Network command. |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 4.2 Institutional policy and doctrinal status

An institutional policy may be mandatory within the issuing body even when it is not part of Malone Doctrine. This distinction is essential. A university academic-integrity rule, Foundation grant policy, Church membership standard, Party candidate rule, or Defense Department security protocol may bind those subject to the institution's authority. Its binding force arises from institutional jurisdiction, not from automatic elevation into the doctrinal hierarchy.

## 5. The Doctrine-to-Action Chain

A disciplined implementation process should preserve a visible chain from governing authority to measurable action:

- 1 Identify the governing authority:** Locate the controlling axiom, principle, maxim, rule, procedure, or authorized interpretation and confirm its current status.
- 2 Define the problem and jurisdiction:** State the factual problem, identify the institution responsible, and determine which other institutions possess relevant but separate authority.
- 3 Obtain competent interpretation:** Consult authorized commentary, subject-matter research, and qualified institutional analysis without treating advisory views as final authority.
- 4 Design the institutional response:** Develop a policy, program, decision, or control suited to the institution's legal form, mission, capabilities, and public identity.
- 5 Test for conflict and overreach:** Confirm that the response does not contradict higher Doctrine, invade another institution's jurisdiction, or create unlawful or misleading authority.
- 6 Authorize and execute:** Obtain approval through the institution's own governing process, assign responsibility, allocate resources, and implement the response.
- 7 Measure, record, and revise:** Evaluate outcomes, preserve the decision record, correct implementation failures, and refer doctrinal deficiencies for formal amendment when necessary.

## 6. Classification of Malone Materials

Every published Malone document should disclose its authority class. Clear classification prevents readers from treating all publications as equally binding and enables institutions to innovate without compromising canonical integrity.

| Class       | Purpose                                                     | Examples                                                                            | Authority effect                                                                          |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Normative   | States what governs                                         | Axioms, principles, maxims, rules, procedures, adopted interpretations              | Controls subordinate institutional action according to rank and jurisdiction.             |
| Explanatory | Explains purpose, meaning, context, or possible application | Primer essays, policy briefs, research, commentary, case studies                    | Informs judgment; becomes binding only through authorized adoption.                       |
| Educational | Teaches knowledge or develops competence                    | Courses, curricula, lectures, exercises, assessments, training manuals              | Binds educational participation where adopted by the University; does not amend Doctrine. |
| Operational | Directs institutional execution                             | Policies, plans, grant agreements, standards, protocols, administrative procedures  | Binds the issuing institution or defined program within its jurisdiction.                 |
| Historical  | Preserves development and provenance                        | Early drafts, superseded versions, ledgers, recorded evolutions, archived proposals | Documents history but does not govern current institutions unless expressly retained.     |

## 7. Controlled Interpretation Procedure

When the meaning or application of Doctrine is disputed, the following procedure should govern unless a more specific authorized process applies:

- Identify the precise text, authority level, version, effective date, and scope of the disputed provision.
- Determine whether the dispute concerns textual meaning, factual uncertainty, institutional competence, policy preference, or implementation feasibility.
- Review higher authority, definitions, cross-references, authorized commentary, and relevant institutional precedent.
- Obtain analysis from the institution possessing subject-matter competence while preserving the authority of the institution responsible for the final operational decision.
- Prefer interpretations that preserve the hierarchy, the stated purpose of the provision, institutional separation, and lawful execution.
- Escalate material ambiguity that changes rights, duties, powers, limitations, or jurisdiction to the authorized doctrinal authority.

- Record the resolution and classify it accurately as advisory, institutional, authorized interpretive, or normative.

## 8. Standards for Institutional Implementation

A legitimate implementation must satisfy more than formal consistency with a doctrinal phrase. It should also demonstrate institutional competence, lawful authority, operational feasibility, proportionality, accountability, and measurable benefit.

| Standard        | Required question                                                                                                          |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Authority       | What governing text and institutional instrument authorize this action?                                                    |
| Jurisdiction    | Why is this institution, rather than another Malone body, responsible for the action?                                      |
| Legality        | Does the action comply with applicable law, fiduciary duties, professional standards, and contractual obligations?         |
| Mission fit     | Does the action advance the institution's assigned purpose without altering its public identity?                           |
| Proportionality | Is the action no broader, more coercive, or more expensive than the legitimate objective requires?                         |
| Capability      | Does the institution possess the personnel, knowledge, resources, and controls needed to perform the function competently? |
| Accountability  | Who approves, executes, audits, measures, corrects, and reports the action?                                                |
| Outcome         | What observable result will demonstrate that the implementation served the governing principle?                            |

## 9. Conflicts, Escalation, and Resolution

Conflict may arise when institutions interpret the same provision differently, when a Network objective requires cooperation across jurisdictions, or when an implementation appears to contradict Doctrine. The existence of disagreement does not authorize unilateral expansion of power.

The dispute should first be resolved at the lowest competent level. Institutions should identify the controlling authority, exchange relevant information, distinguish doctrinal disagreement from operational preference, and seek a response that preserves each body's lawful responsibilities. Where no reconciliation is possible, the matter should be escalated according to the nature of the dispute:

| Type of dispute           | Primary forum                                  | Possible result                                                |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Meaning of canonical text | Authorized doctrinal or interpretive authority | Clarification, authorized interpretation, or formal amendment. |

|                                  |                                                                  |                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Institutional jurisdiction       | Network governance and affected governing bodies                 | Boundary determination, delegation, cooperative agreement, or creation of a new institution. |
| Operational method               | Responsible institution's governing authority                    | Policy selection, revision, suspension, or replacement.                                      |
| Legal or fiduciary compliance    | Institutional board, counsel, compliance authority, or regulator | Legal correction, recusal, restricted action, or termination.                                |
| Factual or technical uncertainty | Qualified research, academic, or professional body               | Further investigation, provisional policy, or evidence threshold.                            |

## 10. Accountability and Safeguards

The distinction among stating, explaining, and implementing Doctrine must be enforceable through institutional controls. Otherwise, titles and document labels will not prevent capture.

- Canonical registry: maintain a public and internal index of current normative instruments, authority levels, versions, and effective dates.
- Status labeling: place document type and authority status on title pages, metadata, indexes, and citations.
- Separation of approval: require doctrinal adoption, institutional policy approval, and publication custody to be performed through distinguishable processes.
- Conflict disclosure: identify financial, political, religious, academic, or personal interests that may influence interpretation or implementation.
- Written delegation: define the power, purpose, duration, limits, reporting obligations, and revocation terms of delegated authority.
- Audit trail: preserve proposals, reviews, decisions, dissent, adoption records, implementation reports, and revisions.
- Corrective authority: permit institutions to suspend unlawful or failed implementation without pretending that operational failure invalidates the Doctrine itself.
- Capture protection: prevent funders, clergy, politicians, academics, security officers, administrators, or successors from converting specialized leverage into general doctrinal control.

## 11. Public Communication Standard

Every Malone institution should identify the source and status of claims made in the Doctrine's name. Public communications should use formulations that preserve the distinction among authority, explanation, and implementation.

| Preferred formulation            | Proper use                                        |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| "Malone Doctrine establishes..." | Use only for current adopted normative authority. |

|                                                        |                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| "An authorized interpretation provides..."             | Use when a formally adopted explanation controls ambiguity or application.       |
| "The Ethics Department explains..."                    | Use for explanatory analysis, with the document's status identified.             |
| "Malone Global University teaches or finds..."         | Use for curricula, scholarship, research, and educational standards.             |
| "The Foundation requires as a condition of funding..." | Use for grant-specific or institutional requirements, not Network-wide doctrine. |
| "The Church teaches its members..."                    | Use for religious doctrine or voluntary ecclesiastical standards.                |
| "The Malone Political Party proposes..."               | Use for platforms, advocacy, legislation, and governmental policy.               |
| "This institution implements Doctrine by..."           | Use when describing a jurisdiction-bound operational response.                   |

## Conclusion

Malone Doctrine can govern a diverse institutional network only when authority, interpretation, and implementation remain visibly distinct. The authority to state Doctrine protects continuity and constitutional identity. The responsibility to explain Doctrine makes it teachable and responsive to complex circumstances. The duty to apply Doctrine enables each institution to convert governing principles into competent action within its own jurisdiction.

These functions should cooperate but should never collapse into one another. An explanation must not become an amendment by stealth. An institutional policy must not become a universal command by repetition. A custodian must not become the author merely by possessing the archive. A funder, educator, church, political party, department, or successor must not use specialized authority to capture the whole system.

**One governing Doctrine. Controlled interpretation. Jurisdiction-bound implementation. Documented accountability.**