INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE PAPER

Future Malone Institutions

A governing framework for creating additional institutions when necessary functions cannot be housed within existing bodies without compromising jurisdiction, legitimacy, or public identity

July 31, 2026

CORE GOVERNING RULE

A new Malone institution should be created only when a necessary and durable function cannot be assigned to an existing institution without materially compromising that institution's jurisdiction, legal integrity, operational effectiveness, legitimacy, or public identity.

This paper establishes the presumption, tests, approval standards, and separation requirements that should govern the creation of future Malone institutions. It is intended to prevent both institutional overcrowding and unnecessary organizational proliferation.

Executive Summary

The Malone Network is designed as a system of distinct institutions operating under a common ethical authority while retaining separate missions, jurisdictions, leadership structures, finances, and public identities. The Network should expand when a necessary function cannot be performed properly by an existing institution, but it should not create organizations merely to accommodate temporary projects, personalities, titles, or administrative convenience.

Every institution acquires legitimacy by remaining faithful to the function for which it was created. Malone Global University must remain credible as an educational institution. The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation must remain credible as a secular, board-directed grantmaker. The Church of Malone must remain identifiable as a religious and public-service institution. The Malone Political Party must remain identifiable as a political organization. Requiring one of these bodies to perform an incompatible function may weaken public trust, create legal conflicts, confuse accountability, and expose the entire Network to institutional capture.

Future institutions are therefore permissible, but their creation must satisfy an institutional necessity test. The proposed function must be necessary, durable, distinct, legally supportable, operationally substantial, and incapable of being performed adequately through an existing institution, department, program, subsidiary, contract, or interinstitutional agreement. A new body must also possess a clear mission, defined jurisdiction, independent accountability, sustainable resources, and a documented relationship to Malone Doctrine and the Malone Network.

1. Why Institutional Separation Matters

Institutional separation is not fragmentation. It is a method of preserving clarity, competence, and legitimacy across a coordinated system.

- **Jurisdictional integrity.** An institution must know which decisions it is authorized to make and which responsibilities belong elsewhere.
- **Legal integrity.** Charitable, educational, religious, political, commercial, and governmental functions may be governed by different legal requirements and restrictions.
- **Public legitimacy.** The public must be able to understand what an institution is, whom it serves, and what standards govern its conduct.

- **Operational competence.** Specialized functions require appropriate personnel, systems, capital, risk controls, and performance standards.
- **Financial accountability.** Separate funds, budgets, records, contracts, and audit trails reduce misuse and clarify responsibility.
- **Protection against capture.** No institution should gain control over the entire Network merely because it controls one source of money, education, worship, political organization, or communications.

SEPARATION PRINCIPLE

Shared doctrine and coordinated strategy do not require merged organizations. Cooperation should be achieved through charters, grants, contracts, memoranda of understanding, shared-service agreements, and defined delegations rather than through ambiguous control.

2. Presumption Against Unnecessary Proliferation

The Network should not create a new institution whenever a new project appears. Every additional body creates governance, compliance, financial, leadership, succession, and reputational obligations. The default response to a new need should be to determine whether it can be handled through an existing institution without altering that institution's fundamental identity.

Before creating a new institution, the Network should consider the following lower-complexity alternatives:

- an internal department, school, ministry, office, committee, or program;
- a time-limited project with a defined sponsor and termination date;
- a wholly owned subsidiary used for property, contracting, or another narrow support function;
- a grant to an independent qualified organization;
- a service contract with an outside specialist;
- an interinstitutional agreement assigning separate responsibilities to existing Malone bodies; or
- a pilot initiative designed to test whether the function is sufficiently durable to justify a permanent institution.

A new institution becomes appropriate only when these alternatives would leave the function inadequately governed, publicly confusing, legally compromised, or operationally subordinate to an incompatible mission.

3. Institutional Necessity Test

A proposal for a new Malone institution should satisfy all of the following tests. Failure on a material element creates a presumption that the function should remain a program, department, subsidiary, partnership, or proposal rather than become an independent institution.

#	Test	Required Finding
1	**Necessary Function**	The function addresses a material need that the Network has a legitimate reason to perform.
2	**Durability**	The need is recurring or long-term rather than temporary, ceremonial, or dependent upon one individual.
3	**Distinct Jurisdiction**	The function has a coherent domain of decisions and responsibilities that can be clearly separated from existing bodies.
4	**Incompatibility Test**	Assigning the function to an existing institution would compromise that institution's legal status, mission, legitimacy, neutrality, credibility, or public identity.
5	**Operational Substance**	The function requires dedicated leadership, personnel, assets, systems, partnerships, or risk controls.
6	**Independent Accountability**	The function can be measured, audited, reviewed, and disciplined through its own governing structure.
7	**Sustainable Capacity**	The institution has a credible source of capital, operating support, leadership succession, and administrative capacity.
8	**Network Compatibility**	The institution can cooperate with existing Malone bodies without absorbing their authority or duplicating their core roles.

4. Conditions That Justify a Separate Institution

A separate institution is especially justified when one or more of the following conflicts would otherwise arise:

- **Legal conflict.** The proposed activity is restricted, regulated, or structurally incompatible with the legal status of the existing institution.
- **Mission conflict.** The activity would redirect the institution away from its core purpose or cause the public to misunderstand why it exists.
- **Neutrality conflict.** A secular, academic, charitable, or nonpartisan body would lose credibility by assuming a partisan, religious, commercial, or coercive role.
- **Fiduciary conflict.** The institution would be required to use restricted assets, donor funds, endowment resources, or public support for an unrelated purpose.
- **Audience conflict.** The new function serves a materially different constituency whose participation would be impaired by the identity of the existing institution.
- **Competency conflict.** The activity requires specialized leadership, licensing, expertise, facilities, or risk controls unavailable within the current body.
- **Accountability conflict.** Responsibility for outcomes would become unclear because several institutions or leaders could claim authority over the same function.
- **Reputational conflict.** Failure or controversy in the new function could unjustifiably damage an institution whose primary mission is unrelated.

5. Creation and Chartering Process

No future Malone institution should arise through informal usage, website branding, personal declaration, or the gradual accumulation of unreviewed activities. Institutional status should be conferred through a documented chartering process.

1. **Function Identification.** State the unmet need, intended beneficiaries, required capabilities, and consequences of leaving the function unperformed.
2. **Existing-Institution Review.** Document why the function cannot be assigned to an existing Malone institution, department, ministry, subsidiary, or program without material compromise.
3. **Pilot or Feasibility Phase.** Where practical, test the function on a limited basis to determine demand, cost, risk, public response, and operational requirements.
4. **Institutional Design Memorandum.** Prepare a formal proposal defining identity, mission, jurisdiction, authority, responsibilities, powers, limitations, legal form, financial model, and relationships.
5. **Doctrine and Network Review.** Confirm compatibility with Malone Doctrine and identify potential conflicts with existing institutional charters.
6. **Legal and Financial Formation.** Establish the appropriate legal entity, governing documents, board or leadership body, accounts, insurance, records, and compliance systems.
7. **Formal Chartering.** Issue an approved charter establishing the institution's authority and prohibiting expansion beyond its assigned jurisdiction without further authorization.
8. **Controlled Launch.** Begin with defined programs, measurable objectives, restricted commitments, and a scheduled institutional review.
9. **Post-Launch Evaluation.** Determine whether the institution should continue, expand, remain limited, merge, return to program status, or dissolve.

6. Required Elements of Every Institutional Charter

Every new institution should be defined using a common architecture so that its role can be compared with other Malone bodies and audited over time. At minimum, the charter should state:

- Identity - what the institution is and how it is publicly classified.
- Mission - the enduring public or institutional result it exists to produce.
- Purpose - why the institution is necessary within the Malone Network.
- Jurisdiction - the domain in which it may make decisions and act.
- Authority - the source and limits of its governing power.
- Responsibilities - the duties it must perform and outcomes it must pursue.
- Powers - the lawful tools and capacities it may use.
- Limitations - activities it is prohibited from undertaking.
- Relationship to Malone Doctrine - how it remains ethically governed.
- Relationship to the Malone Network - how it coordinates without merging.
- Organizational Structure - boards, officers, departments, affiliates, or chapters.
- Leadership - appointment, delegation, removal, succession, and continuity.
- Accountability - audits, reporting, review, discipline, and performance measurement.
- Current Programs - the initial activities authorized at launch.
- Related Institutions - dependencies, partnerships, grants, contracts, and boundaries.

7. Separation and Coordination Requirements

A future institution must be sufficiently separate to preserve accountability, but sufficiently coordinated to serve the larger Network. Unless a charter expressly provides otherwise, the following principles should apply:

- Separate legal identity when the function creates distinct legal, fiduciary, regulatory, or reputational exposure.
- Separate bank accounts, accounting records, budgets, contracts, assets, and liabilities.
- Distinct governing authority, even when some leaders serve in more than one institution.
- Conflict-of-interest disclosure and recusal for cross-institutional transactions.

- Written grants, contracts, licenses, leases, or service agreements for transfers of money, property, personnel, intellectual property, or services.
- Clear public branding so that audiences can identify which institution is speaking or acting.
- No automatic authority flowing from one institution to another merely because they share a founder, doctrine, name, officer, donor, or strategic objective.
- Shared services permitted only when documented, fairly allocated, and incapable of compromising institutional independence.
- Data and records shared only for an authorized purpose and under appropriate privacy, security, and retention standards.
- Disputes resolved by the governing instruments and authority hierarchy of the Malone Network rather than by informal personal influence.

8. Relationship to Malone Doctrine

Malone Doctrine governs the ethical alignment of all Malone institutions, but it does not erase their functional distinctions. A future institution must remain subordinate to the Doctrine while exercising independent judgment within its assigned jurisdiction.

The Doctrine should determine the institution's ethical boundaries, duties, standards of truth, stewardship obligations, and conditions of alignment. The institution's charter should determine its operational authority. Where institutional policy conflicts with Malone Doctrine, the higher doctrinal authority controls. Where two institutions disagree over an operational matter, the relevant charters, contracts, and delegated jurisdictions should determine responsibility.

NETWORK FORMULA

One Doctrine may govern many institutions. Each institution must possess one principal identity, one defined jurisdiction, and one accountable chain of authority.

9. Existing Separation as Precedent

The current Malone architecture demonstrates why separate institutions may be necessary:

- **Malone Global University** must preserve academic and educational legitimacy. It should not become the partisan campaign organization, religious congregation, or unrestricted grant treasury of the Network.
- **The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation** must preserve secular, board-directed charitable stewardship. It should not become a church, political party, school administration, or general operating command.
- **The Church of Malone** must preserve its religious, fellowship, and public-service identity. It should not control Foundation assets, academic standards, or partisan political operations.
- **The Malone Political Party** must preserve political accountability and public clarity. It should not use the Foundation, University, or Church as concealed instruments of partisan finance or campaign control.

10. Potential Categories of Future Institutions

The framework does not pre-authorize any particular institution. It identifies categories that may eventually require separate treatment if the necessity test is satisfied. Examples may include:

- an economic-development or investment institution that conducts commercial activity unsuitable for a charity, school, church, or political party;
- a media, publishing, or public-communications institution requiring editorial independence and specialized liability controls;
- a diplomatic, cultural-exchange, or international-relations institution serving nonacademic and nonpartisan external relationships;
- a disaster-response or emergency-services institution requiring rapid deployment, specialized training, and operational command;

- a health, housing, food-production, technology, infrastructure, or community-development institution requiring regulated professional operations;
- an archives, standards, accreditation, or institutional-audit body whose credibility depends upon independence from the organizations it evaluates; or
- a commercial holding, property, licensing, or shared-services entity created to isolate assets and support multiple institutions without controlling their missions.

These examples are illustrative only. A category should not become an institution until its purpose, legal status, public identity, capital requirements, and relationship to existing bodies are formally established.

11. Review, Dormancy, Merger, and Dissolution

Creation does not guarantee perpetual operation. Every future institution should be reviewed to determine whether it continues to perform a necessary and distinct function.

- **Continuation.** The institution remains necessary, effective, compliant, and properly resourced.
- **Correction.** The mission remains valid, but leadership, programs, controls, or public identity require reform.
- **Dormancy.** The institution retains its charter and assets but suspends operations because present capacity or need is insufficient.
- **Return to program status.** The function no longer requires an independent institution and can be housed safely within another body.
- **Merger.** Two institutions have become substantially duplicative and can combine without sacrificing legal or public clarity.
- **Dissolution.** The function is obsolete, unlawful, persistently ineffective, financially unsustainable, or incompatible with Malone Doctrine.

Conclusion

The Malone Network should remain capable of institutional growth without becoming administratively chaotic or functionally confused. New institutions are justified when separation protects the mission and legitimacy of both the proposed body and the institutions that already exist.

The controlling question is not whether a new organization would be interesting, prestigious, or convenient. The controlling question is whether a necessary and durable function can be performed responsibly within the present architecture. When the answer is no, institutional creation becomes a method of protecting jurisdiction, preserving public trust, assigning accountability, and allowing the Network to expand without compromising its existing bodies.

Create no institution without necessity. Assign no function where it corrupts identity. Coordinate all institutions without collapsing their jurisdictions.