

EDUCATION, POLITICS, AND CHARITY

*Complementary objectives without confused missions, legal identities,
audiences, or standards of conduct*

Institutional Governance Paper

Malone Network

July 31, 2026

Executive Summary

The Malone Network may pursue the same broad objective through education, political action, and charity, but those functions must remain assigned to institutions with different missions, legal identities, audiences, and standards of conduct.

Malone Global University develops knowledge, teaches, researches, publishes, and prepares people to exercise informed judgment. The Malone Political Party organizes political power, develops platforms, advocates policy, supports lawful electoral activity, and seeks authority through public political processes. The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation preserves and allocates charitable capital for qualified public-benefit purposes. These institutions may reinforce one another, but none may quietly absorb the authority or public identity of another.

Core rule: Education may inform political and charitable action; politics may advocate public solutions; charity may fund qualified public benefit. Cooperation is legitimate only when each institution remains identifiable, independently authorized, and accountable for its own part of the work.

Separation is not a barrier to coordination. It is the condition that makes coordination credible. Clear boundaries protect students from political coercion, donors from disguised campaign financing, beneficiaries from religious or partisan conditions, researchers from predetermined conclusions, and the public from uncertainty about who is speaking and under what authority.

1. The Foundational Principle

Education, politics, and charity address different dimensions of social change. Education develops understanding and capability. Politics converts public priorities into organized advocacy, legislation, administration, and electoral action. Charity directs private resources toward public needs that government, markets, families, or existing institutions do not adequately meet.

The same social problem may require all three capacities. A community with poor employment outcomes may need educational research, job training, policy reform, charitable grants, and direct services. The existence of a shared objective does not erase institutional distinctions. It instead requires a coordinated division of labor.

- 1. Doctrine aligns** - Malone Doctrine supplies the common ethical standard under which the institutions operate.
- 2. Charters assign** - Each institution receives authority from its own governing instruments, lawful status, and defined mission.
- 3. Operations remain attributable** - Every action, expenditure, publication, and public statement must be traceable to the institution that authorized it.
- 4. Cooperation does not transfer sovereignty** - Funding, research support, access, or shared personnel does not give one institution general control over another.

5. Public identity must remain intelligible - Students, voters, donors, beneficiaries, regulators, partners, and the public must be able to determine which institution they are dealing with.

2. Three Distinct Institutional Mandates

2.1 Malone Global University: education, research, and formation

Malone Global University is the educational and intellectual institution of the Network. Its proper work includes teaching, curriculum development, research, publishing, professional preparation, civic literacy, leadership development, and the preservation and transmission of organized knowledge.

- Primary audience: students, learners, researchers, instructors, professionals, and members of the public seeking knowledge.
- Primary authority: academic and educational jurisdiction over curricula, research standards, instruction, publications, and training programs.
- Primary standard of conduct: intellectual honesty, evidence discipline, accurate attribution, educational accessibility, and protection of learners from coercion.
- Prohibited substitution: the University may not present a Party platform as a neutral academic conclusion, operate as a campaign organization, or treat charitable funding as authority over scholarship.

2.2 The Malone Political Party: political organization and public power

The Malone Political Party is the Network institution responsible for political organization, public policy, advocacy, electoral participation, candidate development, legislative strategy, and the lawful acquisition and exercise of governmental authority.

- Primary audience: voters, supporters, volunteers, candidates, officeholders, public officials, coalition partners, and citizens participating in political processes.
- Primary authority: Party governance, platform development, political communications, electoral strategy, candidate and supporter organization, and policy advocacy.
- Primary standard of conduct: authorized representation, political transparency, lawful participation, public accountability, and clear distinction between fact, policy judgment, and persuasion.
- Prohibited substitution: the Party may not claim academic neutrality for partisan positions, use charitable assistance to secure political loyalty, or direct Foundation assets as though they were campaign resources.

2.3 The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation: stewardship and grantmaking

The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation is the secular, nonpartisan charitable-capital institution of the Network. Its central function is to receive, preserve, invest, and deploy charitable resources for qualified educational, community, cultural, humanitarian, and public-benefit purposes.

- Primary audience: donors, trustees, grantees, charitable partners, beneficiaries, and communities served by funded programs.
- Primary authority: fiduciary control over Foundation assets, grant priorities, eligibility, award conditions, monitoring, and charitable accountability.

- Primary standard of conduct: fiduciary care, impartial grant review, conflict controls, nonpartisanship, measurable public benefit, and protection against private inurement or institutional capture.
- Prohibited substitution: the Foundation may not purchase political allegiance, dictate academic conclusions, serve as a general treasury for related institutions, or treat affiliation as an automatic entitlement to funding.

3. Functional Separation Matrix

The following matrix identifies the primary contribution of each institution and the boundary that preserves its legitimacy.

Institution	Primary function	Legitimate contribution	Boundary that must remain
Malone Global University	Educate and research	Knowledge, curriculum, training, evaluation, public learning	Must not become a campaign office, grant allocator, or compulsory ideological gatekeeper
Malone Political Party	Organize political action	Platforms, advocacy, candidates, legislation, government reform	Must not disguise persuasion as neutral scholarship or charity
Malone Charitable Trust Foundation	Fund public benefit	Grants, endowment stewardship, charitable partnerships, impact oversight	Must not finance partisan campaigns, purchase loyalty, or control recipient doctrine

4. Why the Functions Should Not Be Collapsed

A single institution attempting to educate, campaign, distribute charity, control doctrine, and administer public works would accumulate incompatible duties. The result would not be efficiency. It would be confused authority, weakened credibility, and an organization that cannot clearly explain which standard governs a particular decision.

- 1. Mission distortion** - Political urgency may pressure educators to simplify evidence, while fundraising pressure may redirect charitable priorities toward publicity rather than need.
- 2. Audience coercion** - Students may feel pressured to support a party; beneficiaries may feel compelled to adopt political or religious positions; donors may believe gifts finance one purpose when they support another.
- 3. Legal and fiduciary confusion** - Different entities operate under different duties, restrictions, reporting obligations, and decision standards. Blending funds and authority makes compliance and accountability difficult to establish.
- 4. Loss of public trust** - The public cannot evaluate an institution fairly when educational, partisan, and charitable messages are issued under one indistinguishable identity.
- 5. Evidence corruption** - Research loses credibility when conclusions are predetermined by campaign needs or grantmaking preferences rather than evidence.

- 6. Capture risk** - A donor, political faction, academic department, religious body, or charismatic officer could gain leverage over the entire Network through control of one combined institution.
- 7. Untraceable failure** - When authority is blended, each unit can blame another for poor outcomes. Separation identifies who approved, funded, performed, supervised, and evaluated the work.
- 8. Succession instability** - A multi-purpose body may depend excessively on one founder or executive because no durable division of powers exists for future leadership.

5. Legitimate Areas of Cooperation

The institutions may coordinate extensively when each contributes a capability within its own jurisdiction. Cooperation should be designed around a defined objective, not around an informal belief that all Malone institutions are interchangeable.

- **Research support** - The University may study a public problem and publish findings that the Party, Foundation, Church, or other institutions may use. Research conclusions remain attributable to the University and subject to its evidence standards.
- **Policy development** - The Party may use public research to formulate a platform, legislative proposal, or administrative plan. The resulting policy belongs to the Party even when informed by University work.
- **Educational grants** - The Foundation may fund qualified University programs, scholarships, public courses, or research projects through written grant agreements. Funding does not purchase academic conclusions.
- **Community grants** - The Foundation may fund qualified public works or direct-service programs implemented by the Church of Malone, independent charities, public agencies, or other eligible bodies. The implementing organization remains accountable for delivery.
- **Civic education** - The University may teach how government, elections, public finance, and law function without endorsing candidates or requiring Party participation.
- **Public consultation** - The Party may invite researchers, educators, charities, and community institutions to provide testimony or advice while retaining responsibility for political decisions.
- **Evaluation** - The University or an independent evaluator may assess whether a charitable or political program achieved defined outcomes, provided the evaluation is not controlled to guarantee a favorable result.

A common objective does not create common authority. Each institution must make its own approvals, use its own budget, issue its own communications, and accept responsibility for its own deliverables.

6. Division of Labor Across a Shared Initiative

A coordinated initiative should divide responsibilities across the full lifecycle of the work. The following model is illustrative rather than mandatory.

Stage	University	Political Party	Foundation / charity
Problem definition	Research conditions, history, causes, affected populations, and evidence limits	Identify public concerns, constituencies, governing constraints, and political priorities	Identify unmet needs, charitable eligibility, funding gaps, and beneficiary impact
Solution design	Develop instructional, technical, or evaluative models	Choose policy position, advocacy strategy, legislation, or administrative reform	Select grant strategy, eligible recipients, conditions, and measures of charitable benefit
Authorization	Approve academic work through University authority	Approve platform or campaign activity through Party authority	Approve grants and expenditures through Foundation fiduciary processes
Implementation	Teach, publish, train, or conduct research	Organize, advocate, campaign, negotiate, legislate, or administer when lawfully empowered	Fund qualified work; grantees or service institutions deliver approved programs
Evaluation	Measure learning, evidence quality, or program outcomes	Evaluate political feasibility, public support, and governmental performance	Monitor grant use, beneficiary outcomes, compliance, and continued funding value
Communication	State educational or research conclusions with academic attribution	State political positions as Party positions	State charitable awards, purposes, and impact without partisan endorsement

7. Funding and Resource Boundaries

Money is one of the most powerful sources of institutional confusion. Every transfer of funds, property, personnel time, or services should state the source, recipient, purpose, restrictions, ownership, reporting requirements, and termination conditions.

- 1. Separate accounts and records** - Each institution maintains its own finances, books, approvals, contracts, and audit trail.
- 2. Purpose-limited grants** - Foundation funds may be used only for the approved charitable purpose and may not be redirected to partisan activity, private benefit, or unrelated operations.
- 3. No automatic entitlement** - Affiliation with the Malone Network does not guarantee a grant, contract, endorsement, facility, employee, or shared resource.
- 4. No jurisdiction by funding** - A grantor may enforce the grant agreement but does not thereby acquire general academic, political, religious, or administrative control over the recipient.
- 5. Fair-value transactions** - Where institutions purchase services from one another, terms should be documented, reasonable, and reviewed for conflicts of interest.
- 6. Restricted use of shared assets** - A facility, website, database, mailing list, or brand may be shared only under written rules identifying ownership, access, security, permitted use, and revocation.

8. Information, Research, and Data Sharing

Information can support coordination without erasing institutional boundaries. The controlling principle is purpose limitation: information should be shared only to the extent necessary for an authorized objective and under standards appropriate to the data involved.

- **Research independence** - A funder or political user may define a question, but it should not suppress inconvenient findings or require predetermined conclusions.
- **Attribution** - Reports should identify the authoring institution, sponsor, methodology, limitations, and whether conclusions are academic, advisory, political, or operational.
- **Privacy** - Student, donor, supporter, beneficiary, member, and employee data should not be transferred among institutions merely because they share Malone affiliation.
- **Consent and authority** - Mailing lists, case files, educational records, grant records, and political supporter data may be used only under applicable authorization and stated purposes.
- **Security and retention** - Shared information should be protected, retained, corrected, and destroyed under documented standards.
- **No compelled viewpoint profiling** - Educational or charitable participation should not be used to infer political loyalty or pressure participants into Party affiliation.

9. Personnel, Leadership, and Dual Roles

The same individual may lawfully serve more than one Malone institution, especially during the founding period. Dual service does not merge the offices. The individual must act under the authority, duties, records, and standards of the institution whose function is being performed at that moment.

- 1. Role identification** - Public statements, correspondence, approvals, and contracts should identify the office and institution represented.
- 2. Separate decisions** - A person serving on two governing bodies must not treat approval by one body as approval by the other.
- 3. Conflict disclosure** - Financial, professional, familial, political, or institutional conflicts should be disclosed and managed through recusal or independent review.
- 4. No transfer of confidential information** - Access obtained through one office may not be used for another institution without authorization.
- 5. No retaliation across institutions** - A student, employee, volunteer, donor, grantee, beneficiary, or member should not face adverse treatment in one institution for declining participation in another.
- 6. Succession readiness** - Each institution should develop leaders competent in its own mission so the Network does not depend permanently on individuals holding multiple roles.

10. Public Identity and Communications

Institutional identity is a governance control. Names, logos, webpages, email domains, letterhead, donation forms, enrollment materials, campaign communications, and public statements should make the responsible institution apparent.

- University communications should identify educational purpose and distinguish research findings from institutional or Party advocacy.
- Party communications should identify political sponsorship and should not imply that a course, scholarly paper, Foundation grant, or Church ministry constitutes an endorsement.
- Foundation communications should identify charitable purpose and avoid language suggesting that grants are political rewards or instruments of doctrinal control.
- Joint projects should use a written attribution statement describing each participant, its role, and the limits of the relationship.
- Cross-links among websites should describe affiliation accurately without suggesting merger, common finances, or automatic authority.
- Public-facing corrections should be issued by the institution responsible for the original statement or action.

11. Distinct Standards of Conduct

Shared ethics do not eliminate role-specific standards. The same act may be acceptable for one institution and improper for another because each serves a different audience and exercises a different kind of authority.

Institution	Decision standard	Core duty	Principal risk
University	Evidence, pedagogy, educational value, and intellectual integrity	Teach accurately and develop capable judgment	Indoctrination, politicized research, or misuse of learners
Political Party	Political judgment, public mandate, feasibility, coalition, and lawful strategy	Represent positions openly and organize public power responsibly	Manipulation, unauthorized representation, or disguised partisanship
Foundation	Charitable purpose, fiduciary prudence, eligibility, need, impact, and compliance	Protect charitable assets and allocate them for public benefit	Private benefit, favoritism, political financing, or donor capture

12. Applied Coordination Examples

12.1 Civic literacy initiative

The University develops a nonpartisan course explaining local government, budgeting, voting, administrative procedure, and citizen rights and duties. The Foundation may fund qualified public access to the course. The Party may separately encourage civic participation or use publicly available material in political education. The University does not endorse Party candidates, and enrollment is not conditioned on Party involvement.

12.2 Neighborhood renewal initiative

The University studies neighborhood conditions and develops training materials. The Foundation funds eligible cleanup, food access, youth, or community-hub programs. The Church of Malone or another qualified service organization may implement public works. The Party may advocate improved municipal

services or related policy. Each body communicates its own role and maintains separate funds, approvals, and records.

12.3 Workforce development and economic mobility

The University provides literacy, language, credential, or employment training. The Foundation funds scholarships, equipment, or qualified partner programs. The Party develops policy concerning workforce systems, licensing, transportation, or economic opportunity. Educational admission, charitable assistance, and political support remain independent decisions.

12.4 Policy research requested by the Party

The Party may commission or request research from the University under a documented agreement. The research should disclose sponsorship, preserve methodological independence, and permit publication of material limitations. The Party remains free to accept, reject, or adapt recommendations as political judgment, but it may not misstate the research as proof of conclusions the study did not reach.

13. Governance Controls for Joint Work

Before a joint initiative begins, participating institutions should adopt a written instrument appropriate to the scale and risk of the project. This may be a memorandum of understanding, grant agreement, services agreement, data-sharing agreement, joint public statement, or coordinated project charter.

- Objective - What public or institutional result is being pursued?
- Authority - Which governing body or officer authorizes each participant?
- Roles - Who researches, teaches, funds, implements, supervises, communicates, and evaluates?
- Resources - Which institution owns the money, property, systems, records, and intellectual work?
- Standards - Which academic, political, charitable, legal, ethical, privacy, or security standards apply?
- Attribution - How will the public identify each institution and understand the relationship?
- Conflicts - How will disagreements, conflicts of interest, or nonperformance be reviewed?
- Termination - How may a participant withdraw, and what happens to funds, data, property, and unfinished obligations?
- Evaluation - What evidence will determine whether the initiative should continue, change, or end?

14. Institutional Boundary Test

A proposed arrangement should not proceed until the participating institutions can answer the following questions clearly:

- 1. Identity** - Can every affected person tell which institution is acting?
- 2. Authority** - Does that institution possess the chartered and lawful power to perform the proposed function?
- 3. Mission** - Does the activity advance the institution's own mission rather than merely benefit an affiliate?
- 4. Audience** - Are students, voters, donors, members, beneficiaries, and the public being addressed under the correct relationship?

- 5. Funding** - Are funds legally eligible, separately recorded, purpose-limited, and free of improper conditions?
- 6. Conduct** - Which institutional standard governs the decision, and can compliance be demonstrated?
- 7. Accountability** - Who is responsible if the action fails, causes harm, misuses resources, or misleads the public?
- 8. Independence** - Can each institution leave the arrangement without losing its legal identity, core mission, records, or capacity to govern itself?

Conclusion

Education, politics, and charity can pursue complementary objectives because each addresses a different requirement of durable social change. Education develops knowledge and capability. Politics organizes public will and governmental action. Charity directs private resources toward public benefit. Their cooperation becomes strongest when their identities remain clear.

The Malone Network should therefore reject both institutional isolation and institutional collapse. Isolation wastes complementary capacity. Collapse destroys jurisdiction, credibility, and accountability. The governing objective is coordinated specialization: common ethical alignment, distinct legal and operating identities, documented cooperation, and responsibility assigned to the institution competent and authorized to carry it.

Under this architecture, no student must become a partisan to learn, no beneficiary must surrender conscience to receive aid, no donor may purchase doctrine, no political institution may disguise advocacy as neutral scholarship, and no educational or charitable body may quietly exercise powers assigned to the Party. The result is a Network capable of coordinated action without becoming one undifferentiated organization.