INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT AND RESOLUTION

Identifying, documenting, evaluating, and resolving disputes without allowing administrative competition to override Doctrine

Institutional Governance Paper

Malone Network

July 31, 2026

Executive Summary

Disagreement is not institutional failure. Unrecorded authority, unresolved jurisdiction, retaliatory competition, and the use of administrative leverage to defeat Doctrine are institutional failures.

The Malone Network contains separate institutions with distinct mandates, leadership structures, resources, legal identities, and public responsibilities. Their shared doctrinal alignment creates a common ethical framework, but it does not eliminate differences in judgment, evidence, timing, priorities, or institutional interest. Conflict is therefore foreseeable and must be governed rather than denied.

Core rule: No institution may use money, personnel, public visibility, access, urgency, or operational dependence to convert administrative influence into doctrinal authority.

Institutional conflict should be identified early, stated precisely, documented in a common record, evaluated against Doctrine and controlling institutional authority, and resolved by the body competent to decide the disputed question. Doctrinal questions must be referred to authorized doctrinal processes. Corporate, academic, charitable, political, religious, and operational questions remain within their respective jurisdictions unless a lawful cross-institution agreement provides otherwise.

The objective of resolution is not to produce artificial unanimity. It is to preserve Doctrine, restore lawful boundaries, assign responsibility, correct harm, and permit institutions to continue their missions without concealed domination or retaliatory obstruction.

1. Purpose and Governing Premise

This paper establishes a Network-wide framework for handling disagreements among Malone institutions. It applies when two or more institutions dispute authority, interpretation, resources, public representation, responsibility, or the effect of one institution's conduct on another.

The framework rests on five premises:

1. **Doctrine governs -** Administrative preference, institutional prestige, donor influence, political expediency, and operational convenience remain subordinate to authorized Malone Doctrine.
2. **Jurisdiction controls action -** The institution lawfully assigned a function decides and acts within that function, subject to Doctrine, law, and its governing instruments.
3. **Facts precede accusation -** Conflicts must be described through verifiable conduct, documents, decisions, and effects rather than motive attribution alone.
4. **Responsibility remains attributable -** The Network is not a shield behind which officers or institutions may conceal who decided, funded, directed, approved, or failed to act.
5. **Resolution must preserve institutional integrity -** A settlement that suppresses Doctrine, obscures authority, rewards coercion, or creates recurring dependency is not a valid resolution.

2. What Constitutes Institutional Conflict

An institutional conflict exists when the decisions, claims, conduct, or interests of one Malone institution materially interfere with another institution's mandate, authority, resources, public identity, legal obligations, or doctrinal alignment.

Conflict may arise from good-faith differences, poor communication, overlapping responsibilities, administrative error, resource scarcity, personal rivalry, or deliberate institutional capture. The process should not presume bad faith, but it must remain capable of identifying it.

Conflict class	Typical question	Primary risk
Doctrinal	What does Malone Doctrine authorize, require, prohibit, or rank as controlling?	An institution converts its own policy or interest into supposed Doctrine.
Jurisdictional	Which institution possesses authority to decide or perform the disputed function?	Overreach, duplication, shadow governance, or unlawful delegation.
Strategic	Which objective, sequence, or resource priority should govern a joint initiative?	Competition for priority replaces common long-term purpose.
Operational	Who controls execution, personnel, schedules, standards, or deliverables?	Confused command, unsafe work, delay, or incompatible procedures.
Financial	Who may fund, restrict, spend, audit, recover, or own the relevant assets?	Commingling, donor capture, private benefit, or disguised control.
Public identity	Which institution may speak, endorse, brand, or represent the activity?	Public confusion, authority laundering, or reputational transfer.
Information and records	Who owns, accesses, publishes, retains, or protects data and intellectual work?	Privacy breach, appropriation, retaliation, or loss of institutional memory.
Leadership and personnel	Which officer supervises, appoints, disciplines, or removes the persons involved?	Dual loyalty, informal command, factional capture, or retaliation.
Legal and compliance	Which legal duty, exemption, license, fiduciary obligation, or regulatory rule controls?	Liability, loss of status, unlawful conduct, or institutional contamination.

3. Duty to Identify and Disclose Conflict

Leaders have a duty to identify conflict before it becomes institutional damage. Silence is not neutrality when an officer knows that authority is disputed, resources are being misused, or one institution is being represented as another.

A conflict should be disclosed when any of the following occurs:

- Two institutions issue incompatible instructions concerning the same project, person, asset, or public statement.
- An institution claims power that another institution believes is reserved to its jurisdiction.
- Funding, access, employment, grants, facilities, or public support are threatened to force agreement.
- A policy, platform, sermon, course, interpretation, grant condition, or administrative rule is presented as Malone Doctrine without proper authority.
- The legal duties of one institution conflict with the requested action of another.
- Shared personnel receive inconsistent supervision or face retaliation for complying with one institution's lawful rules.
- A joint initiative lacks a clear lead institution, authorization record, cost allocation, or accountability owner.
- Public communications make it unclear which institution acted, who approved the action, or which audience is being addressed.

Early disclosure should be treated as a governance safeguard rather than an act of disloyalty. Retaliation against good-faith disclosure is itself a separate institutional violation.

4. The Institutional Conflict Record

Material conflicts should be placed into a written conflict record. The record creates a shared factual baseline, prevents revisionist accounts, and allows decision-makers to distinguish doctrinal questions from administrative disagreements.

Required element	Content
Conflict identifier	A unique title, date opened, participating institutions, and responsible record custodian.
Question presented	A concise statement of the decision, authority, action, or interpretation in dispute.
Relevant facts	Verified events, documents, statements, transactions, deadlines, and known operational effects.
Institutional positions	Each institution's requested outcome, claimed authority, governing instruments, and supporting reasons.
Doctrinal references	Canonical provisions alleged to govern, including status, authority level, and exact relationship to the dispute.
Jurisdiction map	Which institution controls which function, asset, personnel, decision, record, or public representation.
Risks and urgency	Potential legal, financial, safety, reputational, doctrinal, or continuity consequences.
Interim measures	Temporary restrictions, preservation orders, pauses, access controls, or communication rules.
Evidence log	Documents received, witnesses consulted, disputed facts, missing information, and reliability assessments.
Decision and remedies	The final determination, authority relied upon, corrective steps, deadlines, owners, and review date.

5. Immediate Stabilization

Some conflicts require temporary measures before final resolution. Interim action should prevent irreversible harm without deciding more than necessary.

- Preserve relevant records, communications, financial data, versions, and access logs.
- Pause disputed transfers, publications, appointments, dismissals, expenditures, or public representations when delay is less harmful than continuation.
- Maintain essential services and beneficiary protections wherever possible.
- Prohibit retaliation, destruction of records, unilateral rebranding, and unauthorized public statements about the dispute.
- Separate conflicted personnel from investigative or decision-making roles when impartiality is reasonably questioned.
- Set a defined review period so temporary controls do not become permanent shadow governance.

Interim authority is protective, not acquisitive. No institution may use a temporary emergency to seize permanent jurisdiction.

6. Standards for Evaluation

A conflict must be evaluated through an ordered set of authorities and considerations. The loudest institution, largest budget, most visible leader, or most urgent operational demand does not automatically control.

1. **Applicable law -** Identify legal duties, prohibitions, fiduciary standards, regulatory conditions, contracts, and protected rights that cannot be waived through internal preference.
2. **Authorized Malone Doctrine -** Determine whether canonical Doctrine directly governs, establishes a controlling principle, or requires an authorized interpretation.
3. **Governing instruments -** Apply charters, declarations, bylaws, board resolutions, policies, delegations, grant agreements, and other controlling institutional records.
4. **Assigned jurisdiction -** Determine which institution owns the disputed function and what authority has or has not been delegated.
5. **Reliable evidence -** Separate documented facts, attributed claims, testimony, inference, and speculation. Material uncertainty must be stated rather than concealed.
6. **Mission and public identity -** Assess whether the proposed outcome preserves the institution's legitimate purpose, audience, neutrality, and credibility.
7. **Proportionality and least intrusion -** Choose a remedy sufficient to correct the conflict without unnecessarily occupying another institution's jurisdiction.
8. **Network continuity -** Consider long-term dependencies, precedent, succession, public confidence, and the risk of recurring conflict.

7. Resolution Sequence

Resolution should occur at the lowest competent level capable of producing a lawful, documented, and durable result. Escalation is warranted when authority is contested, harm is material, or the first level lacks independence.

Stage	Forum	Principal task	Escalation trigger
1	Direct consultation	Clarify facts, roles, authority, and requested cure between designated representatives.	No agreement, disputed authority, material harm, or missed deadline.
2	Institutional leadership review	Each institution's competent executive, committee, or board states its formal position.	Conflicting final positions, cross-institution impact, or leadership conflict.
3	Joint resolution panel	A temporary, balanced panel consolidates the record, narrows issues, and recommends remedies.	Doctrinal question, legal uncertainty, noncompliance, or rejection of recommendation.
4	Specialist referral	Authorized doctrinal authority, counsel, auditor, academic reviewer, or other expert decides the issue within competence.	Remaining mixed questions or need for institutional implementation.
5	Final institutional action	Each competent governing body adopts, rejects, or implements the determination within its jurisdiction.	Noncompliance, new evidence, material procedural defect, or appeal right.
6	Accountability and follow-up	Verify cure, restore boundaries, correct records, assess harm, and prevent recurrence.	Failure to cure, retaliation, repeated breach, or systemic design defect.

8. The Joint Resolution Panel

A joint resolution panel is not a permanent central government for the Network. It is a limited dispute forum created by the affected institutions or by an authorized Network governance instrument.

A properly constituted panel should:

- Include balanced representation and at least one member independent of the immediate operational dispute.
- Disclose conflicts of interest, institutional affiliations, and prior involvement.
- Receive the same core record from all parties and permit written responses.
- Separate issues by competence rather than attempting to decide every question itself.
- State whether its result is advisory, binding by prior agreement, or subject to governing-body adoption.
- Issue findings, authority analysis, recommendations, dissenting views when material, and implementation deadlines.
- Dissolve when its assigned matter is complete unless separately authorized for monitoring.

Panel members may not enlarge their own institution's jurisdiction through the dispute process. Participation in resolution does not create permanent supervisory authority.

9. Doctrinal Questions and Administrative Competition

The most serious institutional conflicts arise when an administrative preference is presented as a doctrinal command. This converts ordinary competition for resources, prestige, access, or control into a false claim of higher authority.

A doctrinal question exists only when resolution requires determining what authorized Malone Doctrine states, means, ranks, requires, permits, or prohibits. The following are not automatically doctrinal questions:

- Which institution receives a particular budget allocation or grant.
- Which leader receives public credit or controls a meeting agenda.
- Which operational method is faster, cheaper, or more convenient.
- Which institution hosts a website, event, archive, facility, or staff position.
- Which political position, curriculum design, charitable priority, or ministry practice is preferred when Doctrine allows more than one lawful choice.

No institution may issue a binding doctrinal interpretation merely because it must make an operational decision. It may adopt a provisional application within its jurisdiction, clearly labeled as such, while referring the doctrinal question to the authorized interpretive process.

Doctrine may resolve administrative conflict; administrative conflict may not manufacture Doctrine.

10. Authority of the Principal Institutions

Institution or authority	Competence in conflict	What it may not do
Authorized doctrinal authority	State, clarify, rank, or revise canonical Doctrine through the proper process.	Administer another institution's daily operations merely because Doctrine applies.
Malone Global University	Resolve academic, curricular, research, publication, and educational-administration issues.	Convert scholarship or teaching commentary into canonical Doctrine or Party policy.
Malone Political Party	Resolve platform, campaign, organizing, policy advocacy, and political leadership questions.	Use political leverage to command charitable, religious, or academic decisions.
Malone Charitable Trust Foundation	Resolve grant, investment, fiduciary, donor-restriction, and charitable compliance questions.	Purchase doctrinal, academic, ecclesiastical, or political control through funding.
Church of Malone	Resolve worship, membership, religious teaching, clergy, ministry, and internal ecclesiastical matters.	Impose religious authority on secular Network institutions or charitable beneficiaries.
Administrative bodies	Resolve records, facilities, technology, contracts, scheduling, and assigned support functions.	Treat control of infrastructure or access as superior governing authority.
Malone Network coordination	Maintain shared records, convene authorized review, identify cross-institution effects, and monitor agreed remedies.	Act as an undeclared parent corporation or substitute governing board.

11. Available Remedies

Remedies should correspond to the type, seriousness, duration, and consequences of the conflict. Resolution may require more than a declaration of which party was correct.

- Clarification of Doctrine, charter authority, delegated power, or institutional role.
- Correction, withdrawal, retraction, relabeling, or republication of an inaccurate statement or document.
- Return, suspension, reallocation, or restriction of funds, data, property, credentials, or access.
- Revision of a joint agreement, grant condition, reporting line, approval sequence, or public-communication protocol.
- Recusal, removal from the matter, reassignment, discipline, or termination of an officer, contractor, representative, or committee role through the competent institution.
- Restitution, reimbursement, restoration of records, or other cure for measurable harm.
- Independent audit, legal review, doctrinal review, academic review, or compliance monitoring.
- Separation or discontinuation of a joint project when cooperation can no longer preserve lawful boundaries.
- Creation of a new institution when a recurring necessary function cannot be housed in an existing body without compromising jurisdiction, legitimacy, or public identity.

12. Appeals and Reconsideration

An appeal is not an opportunity to restart administrative competition. It should be limited to defined grounds:

1. **Lack of authority -** The deciding body acted outside its competence or imposed a remedy beyond its jurisdiction.
2. **Material procedural defect -** A party lacked notice, access to the core record, opportunity to respond, or an impartial decision-maker.
3. **New material evidence -** Evidence unavailable through reasonable diligence would likely change the result.
4. **Doctrinal inconsistency -** The decision conflicts with controlling Doctrine or relies on an unauthorized doctrinal statement.
5. **Legal or fiduciary error -** The decision requires conduct prohibited by law, governing instrument, contract, or fiduciary duty.

Reconsideration should have a deadline and should not automatically suspend protective measures. The reviewing body must state whether it affirms, modifies, vacates, or remands the decision and identify the authority for doing so.

13. Documentation, Transparency, and Confidentiality

Conflict records should be sufficiently complete to preserve institutional memory and demonstrate accountable resolution. Transparency does not require unrestricted publication of sensitive information.

- Maintain the question presented, material evidence, institutional positions, decision, authority, remedies, deadlines, and closure record.
- Protect personnel records, donor information, student records, privileged legal advice, security information, and confidential beneficiary data.
- Publish a summary when public statements, public funds, donor trust, community harm, or institutional legitimacy require correction or explanation.
- Identify which findings are established, disputed, inferred, confidential, or unresolved.
- Preserve superseded decisions and corrections so later readers can reconstruct institutional development.
- Restrict access based on role and purpose rather than institutional status alone.

14. Compliance, Accountability, and Closure

A conflict is not resolved when a decision is issued. It is resolved when the required cure has occurred, institutional boundaries are restored, affected records are corrected, and recurring causes have been addressed.

Every final resolution should identify:

- The officer or body responsible for each corrective action.
- Deadlines, evidence of completion, and the reviewer who verifies compliance.

- Consequences for refusal, delay, retaliation, or repeated breach.
- Necessary changes to policy, delegation, training, contracts, record systems, or institutional design.
- A closure date and any later monitoring period.

Where an institution rejects a nonbinding recommendation, it should state its reasons and accept responsibility for the resulting consequences within its jurisdiction. Where a decision is binding by law, governing instrument, or prior agreement, refusal becomes a compliance matter rather than a continuing policy debate.

15. Principal Failure Modes

1. **Doctrinal pretext -** A leader cites general values to avoid the actual authorized text, hierarchy, or interpretive process.
2. **Resource coercion -** Funding, payroll, facilities, technology, records, or access are withheld to force institutional submission.
3. **Forum shopping -** A party repeatedly seeks a more favorable decision-maker after losing before a competent authority.
4. **Shadow adjudication -** Private conversations or unofficial councils produce outcomes that are later presented as formal decisions.
5. **Collective blame -** Responsibility is assigned vaguely to the Network rather than to the officer or institution that acted.
6. **Premature publicity -** A party uses public pressure before internal facts, authority, and remedies have been evaluated.
7. **Retaliatory administration -** Personnel, grants, access, endorsements, or opportunities are manipulated against a party that raised a good-faith concern.
8. **Permanent emergency -** Temporary protective measures become a continuing transfer of power without review or authorization.
9. **False consensus -** Dissent is suppressed to create the appearance of unity while the underlying jurisdictional defect remains.

Institutional unity is not the absence of recorded disagreement. It is the capacity to resolve disagreement without abandoning Doctrine, jurisdiction, evidence, or accountability.

16. Institutional Conflict Resolution Test

Before closing a dispute, the responsible bodies should be able to answer each question affirmatively:

1. **Identification -** Has the exact conflict been stated without collapsing separate doctrinal, legal, jurisdictional, and operational questions?
2. **Record -** Are the material facts, evidence, authorities, positions, and uncertainties documented?
3. **Competence -** Did each question go to the institution or authority authorized to decide it?

4. Independence - Were conflicts of interest, retaliation risks, and resource leverage controlled?

5. Doctrine - Was authorized Doctrine applied rather than manufactured, selectively quoted, or displaced by administrative preference?

6. Jurisdiction - Does the outcome preserve the separate mandate and public identity of each institution?

7. Remedy - Does the resolution correct harm, assign responsibility, and prevent recurrence rather than merely end discussion?

8. Accountability - Are owners, deadlines, verification methods, and consequences documented?

9. Continuity - Can the institutions continue their lawful missions without concealed dependency, domination, or unresolved ambiguity?

Conclusion

The Malone Network requires a conflict system strong enough to preserve both common Doctrine and separate institutional authority.

Shared ethical alignment does not eliminate institutional interest, human disagreement, resource competition, legal constraint, or differences in professional judgment. A mature Network does not respond by denying conflict or by placing every institution under one administrative command. It creates a disciplined process that identifies the question, preserves the record, applies the correct authority, protects the parties, and assigns a remedy to the body competent to carry it out.

Doctrine remains superior to administrative competition. Jurisdiction remains superior to informal influence. Evidence remains superior to accusation. Written authority remains superior to assumption. Accountability remains attached to the institution and officer that acted.

When conflict is handled through these principles, disagreement becomes a source of institutional clarification rather than fragmentation. Boundaries become more precise, authority becomes more credible, errors become correctable, and cooperation can resume without requiring any institution to surrender its mission, legitimacy, or lawful identity.

The final objective is not compulsory agreement. It is governed resolution: a durable settlement in which Doctrine is preserved, jurisdiction is restored, responsibility is visible, and the Malone Network remains capable of coordinated action without becoming an undifferentiated organization.