INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Cooperation, shared objectives, and clear boundaries across the Malone Network

Institutional Governance Paper

Malone Network

July 31, 2026

Executive Summary

The Malone Network operates through cooperation among distinct institutions, not through the informal blending of their powers. Each body contributes a specialized capability while retaining its own mission, jurisdiction, leadership, finances, records, public identity, and accountability structure.

Institutional relationships are therefore governed by two equal requirements: Malone institutions should support common objectives whenever coordination increases effectiveness, but no institution should assume another body's authority, obscure responsibility, or compromise the legal and public identity under which either institution operates.

Core rule: Institutions may cooperate extensively, but cooperation must remain documented, attributable, limited to authorized purposes, and reversible without destroying either institution's independence.

Proper cooperation allows the Network to combine education, research, charitable capital, religious service, political organization, administration, and other capabilities without recreating a single all-purpose body. Clear boundaries protect public trust, preserve competence, prevent capture, and make responsibility traceable when a project succeeds or fails.

1. Purpose of Institutional Relationships

The purpose of an institutional relationship is to combine complementary capabilities for a defined objective. A relationship is justified when one institution requires knowledge, funding, implementation capacity, access, facilities, personnel, or another lawful resource held by a different institution and when cooperation can occur without transferring powers that must remain separate.

- **Alignment -** Coordinate work around objectives consistent with Malone Doctrine and each participant's charter.
- **Specialization -** Permit each institution to contribute what it is specifically constituted and competent to provide.
- **Economy -** Reduce unnecessary duplication while preserving separate legal and fiduciary responsibility.
- **Accountability -** Identify who authorizes, funds, performs, supervises, communicates, and evaluates each part of the work.
- **Continuity -** Create repeatable arrangements that do not depend solely upon informal personal relationships.

2. Governing Principles

1. Doctrine aligns; charters assign - Malone Doctrine supplies the common ethical authority, while institutional charters and lawful governing documents determine which body may make a particular decision.

2. Cooperation does not merge identity - Participation in a joint objective does not create a new combined institution or erase the separate identity of any participant.

3. Authority follows responsibility - A body should not be held responsible for an outcome unless it possesses the authority, information, and resources necessary to perform its assigned role.

4. Resources do not purchase jurisdiction - A funder, donor, property owner, service provider, or research sponsor does not acquire authority beyond the terms of the documented relationship.

5. Information access is purpose-limited - Shared information may be used only for the authorized purpose and remains subject to confidentiality, privacy, security, retention, and attribution requirements.

6. Public statements require attribution - The public must be able to determine which institution is speaking, what authority it possesses, and whether a statement is joint, commissioned, advisory, or independent.

7. Conflicts are resolved by competent authority - Disputes must be referred to the governing bodies or offices authorized to decide the issue, rather than settled through informal pressure or unilateral action.

3. Authorized Forms of Cooperation

Malone institutions may cooperate through instruments proportionate to the duration, value, risk, and complexity of the relationship. Informal coordination may be sufficient for low-risk consultation, but material commitments should be reduced to writing.

Relationship form	Permissible use	Minimum control
Consultation	Exchange expertise or advice without transferring decision-making authority.	Written request, meeting record, or advisory memorandum.
Research commission	One institution asks the University or another qualified body to study a defined question.	Scope, evidence standards, publication rights, confidentiality, and ownership of work product.
Grant	The Foundation finances a qualifying charitable or educational purpose.	Grant agreement, restricted use, deliverables, reporting, audit, and return-of-funds provisions.
Contract or shared service	One body supplies administrative, technical, property, publishing, training, or professional services.	Price, service level, confidentiality, ownership, liability, and termination terms.
Memorandum of understanding	Two or more institutions coordinate a continuing objective without creating a new legal entity.	Roles, authority, resources, communications, data use, review, and exit provisions.
Joint initiative	Institutions combine distinct capabilities under one coordinated program.	Lead institution, workstreams, budget ownership, approval rights, public attribution, and evaluation.
Delegation	A governing body assigns a defined task to an officer, committee, or partner.	Express scope, duration, reporting, revocation, and reserved powers.
Referral	An institution directs a person or matter to the body with proper competence.	Accurate handoff, consent where needed, and no implied guarantee of acceptance.

4. Information Sharing

Information should move across the Network when it enables lawful coordination, prevents duplicated work, improves decisions, or protects institutional continuity. Information should not be shared merely because institutions are affiliated.

Information class	Examples	Sharing rule
Public	Published doctrine, public reports, websites, press materials, open research.	May be reused with accurate attribution and without implying endorsement.
Internal operational	Project plans, schedules, budgets, procedures, and staff coordination records.	Limited to personnel with a work-related need; redistribution requires authorization.
Confidential institutional	Board materials, legal advice, donor data, grant reviews, personnel matters, security details.	Need-to-know access, secure storage, defined retention, and disclosure controls.
Restricted personal data	Student, member, beneficiary, employee, volunteer, or applicant records.	Consent or lawful basis, minimum necessary use, privacy safeguards, and access logging.
Doctrinal and archival records	Canonical texts, drafts, provenance, authorized interpretations, and revision history.	Custody rules, version control, authenticity protection, and clear status labels.

- **Purpose limitation** - Receiving information does not authorize unrelated use, republication, fundraising, campaigning, discipline, or commercial exploitation.

- **Source integrity** - Reports should preserve authorship, date, version, evidence status, and the distinction between official records and preliminary work.
- **Correction duty** - Material errors discovered through information sharing should be returned to the source institution for review and correction.
- **Access termination** - Access should end when the relationship, assignment, or lawful purpose ends, subject to required archival retention.

5. Common Objectives and Joint Initiatives

Common objectives may include educational access, community renewal, leadership development, food security, public safety, cultural advancement, institutional continuity, research, civic competence, economic development, and implementation of Malone Doctrine. A shared objective does not make every institution equally responsible for every method used to pursue it.

Lead-institution rule: Every joint initiative must identify one lead institution and assign each supporting institution a defined workstream. The lead coordinates the project; it does not absorb the jurisdiction of its partners.

A joint initiative should specify:

- **Objective** - the public or institutional result sought
- **Lead institution** - the body responsible for overall coordination and final operational reporting
- **Contributions** - the research, funding, personnel, facilities, services, access, or implementation capacity supplied by each participant
- **Reserved decisions** - matters that remain exclusively with each participant's board, officers, or competent authority
- **Budget ownership** - which institution receives, holds, disburses, and reports each category of funds
- **Public identity** - the names, marks, spokespeople, disclaimers, and attribution used in external communications
- **Measures of success** - common outcome measures and institution-specific performance duties
- **Review and exit** - how the arrangement is evaluated, amended, suspended, or terminated

6. Funding, Grants, and Resource Support

Financial support is one form of institutional cooperation, not a transfer of sovereignty. The source, legal character, restrictions, and intended use of funds must remain identifiable throughout the relationship.

- **Foundation grants** - The Malone Charitable Trust Foundation may support qualified educational, charitable, cultural, public-welfare, or community programs. Its board retains independent fiduciary judgment and grant oversight.
- **Contracts and fees** - Institutions may pay fair-value compensation for lawful services. Payments must be recorded as contractual consideration rather than disguised grants or informal transfers.
- **Restricted funds** - A recipient must segregate and use restricted funds only for the approved purpose and return or redirect unused funds according to the governing agreement.
- **Shared assets** - Facilities, equipment, technology, intellectual property, and personnel may be shared under documented terms that identify ownership, maintenance, risk, access, and termination rights.
- **No implied control** - Funding does not entitle a donor or affiliated institution to control doctrine, academic findings, ecclesiastical decisions, political positions, or another board's fiduciary judgment.

7. Public Communications and Operating Identity

Clear public identity is a governance control. Every communication should allow a reasonable reader to determine which institution issued it, whose authority it represents, and which institution is responsible for the underlying activity.

- **Separate names and marks** - Use the correct legal or operating name, website, letterhead, accounts, and visual identity for the institution responsible.
- **Authorized spokespeople** - Only designated representatives may issue official statements or bind an institution publicly.
- **Joint attribution** - Joint work should identify the lead, funder, research provider, implementation partner, and any limited role of supporting institutions.
- **No endorsement by implication** - A grant, contract, venue, citation, shared officer, or common doctrine does not by itself imply endorsement of every position held by another institution.
- **Status accuracy** - Proposed, developing, pilot, active, suspended, and completed initiatives must be described accurately.
- **Corrections** - The institution that issued a materially inaccurate statement remains responsible for correction, even when the error arose from information supplied by a partner.

8. Boundaries of Authority and Responsibility

Institutional boundaries are preserved by identifying both permissible support and prohibited substitution. The following matrix summarizes the principal relationships among the Network's current institutions.

Institution	Primary responsibility	Permissible cooperation	Boundary
Malone Doctrine	Supplies the shared ethical and governing standard.	May be taught, interpreted, applied, and preserved through authorized institutions.	Does not become an informal excuse for one institution to seize another institution's operational authority.
Malone Global University	Education, research, publishing, training, archives, and knowledge infrastructure.	May research for, train, advise, and publish materials used by other institutions.	Does not conduct partisan campaigns, control Foundation assets, or exercise ecclesiastical authority.
Malone Charitable Trust Foundation	Secular stewardship and allocation of charitable capital.	May grant funds to qualified Malone and external institutions and monitor restricted use.	Does not control doctrine, academic conclusions, church governance, or Party operations.
Church of Malone	Religious formation, fellowship, volunteer service, and qualifying public works.	May provide organized service capacity and receive grants for lawful charitable work.	Does not govern the Foundation, compel political loyalty, or claim governmental or academic authority.
Malone Political Party	Political organization, policy, elections, representation, and governmental reform.	May commission research, train personnel, and cooperate on lawful nonpartisan civic objectives.	Does not use charitable, educational, or church assets as partisan financing or command those institutions.
Future institutions	Specialized functions not responsibly housed in existing bodies.	May enter the same documented relationships once chartered and recognized.	Do not acquire Network-wide authority merely because they fill a necessary gap.

9. Coordination Without Centralized Overreach

The Network may establish councils, secretariats, working groups, registries, shared-service offices, or future coordinating institutions. These bodies exist to facilitate communication and continuity, not to become an unchartered government over every Malone institution.

- **Express delegation** - A coordinating body exercises only powers assigned in writing by competent institutions or governing authority.
- **No implied supremacy** - Scheduling meetings, maintaining records, managing shared systems, or coordinating strategy does not confer doctrinal, fiduciary, academic, ecclesiastical, or political supremacy.
- **Reserved powers** - Boards and authorized leaders retain decisions that law, charter, or fiduciary duty requires them to make independently.
- **Reviewability** - Coordination decisions should be documented, appealable to the proper authority, and periodically reviewed for scope creep.

- **Service orientation** - Administrative bodies should reduce friction, preserve records, and improve execution rather than multiply approvals or obscure responsibility.

10. Conflict Resolution and Escalation

Disagreements are inevitable when institutions share objectives but operate under different duties. Conflict should be resolved through jurisdictional analysis rather than personal influence or public confrontation.

1. **Identify the disputed decision** - State precisely what action, resource, record, authority, or responsibility is contested.
2. **Identify the competent institution** - Determine which charter, governing instrument, law, agreement, or doctrinal authority assigns the decision.
3. **Separate ethical from operational questions** - Doctrine may govern the ethical boundary while an institutional board or officer retains the lawful operational decision.
4. **Review the governing agreement** - Apply the grant, contract, memorandum, delegation, policy, or project charter controlling the relationship.
5. **Seek direct institutional resolution** - Authorized representatives should attempt a documented resolution before escalation.
6. **Escalate to governing bodies** - Unresolved matters should be referred to the relevant boards, executives, doctrinal authority, or other competent forum.
7. **Protect continuity** - Pending resolution, preserve funds, records, rights, and essential services without creating irreversible facts.
8. **Document the outcome** - Record the decision, rationale, corrective actions, and any required amendments to prevent recurrence.

11. Accountability for Cooperative Work

Cooperation does not dilute accountability. Each institution remains responsible for the acts it authorizes, the funds it controls, the information it discloses, the personnel it supervises, and the representations it makes.

- **Authorization record** - Maintain evidence showing who approved the relationship and under what authority.
- **Responsibility map** - Assign ownership of each deliverable, risk, decision, budget, record, and communication channel.
- **Performance reporting** - Measure both the common objective and each institution's assigned contribution.
- **Audit and access rights** - Provide proportionate rights to inspect records, verify restricted uses, and evaluate performance without opening unrelated institutional records.
- **Incident reporting** - Report legal, financial, ethical, security, safety, or reputational incidents promptly to affected institutions.
- **Corrective action** - Suspend, revise, terminate, recover funds, revoke access, or discipline authorized personnel when the arrangement is misused.
- **Closeout** - At completion, reconcile funds and property, transfer required records, revoke unnecessary access, and publish accurate final status.

12. Emergency and Exceptional Cooperation

Urgency may require accelerated cooperation, but emergency conditions do not permanently erase institutional boundaries. Temporary authority must be defined narrowly, recorded, and reviewed after the immediate necessity passes.

- **Minimum necessary action** - Use only the authority and information required to address the emergency.
- **Time limitation** - Emergency delegations should expire automatically unless renewed through ordinary authority.
- **Financial traceability** - Emergency expenditures and transfers must remain attributable to the correct institution and purpose.

- **Post-action review** - Evaluate legality, effectiveness, rights impacts, financial use, public communications, and lessons learned.
- **No precedent by silence** - A temporary emergency practice does not become permanent policy without formal adoption.

13. Relationship Approval Test

Before entering or renewing an institutional relationship, decision-makers should be able to answer each of the following questions affirmatively:

- Does the relationship advance an objective authorized for every participating institution?
- Is each institution contributing a capability within its legitimate jurisdiction?
- Are authority, funding, deliverables, records, communications, and liabilities assigned clearly?
- Can the public identify which institution is responsible for each material act or statement?
- Are confidential and personal data limited to a defined, lawful purpose?
- Can each institution withdraw without losing control of its core identity, governance, or essential assets?
- Are conflicts of interest, related-party transactions, and private-benefit risks controlled?
- Does the arrangement preserve independent fiduciary, academic, ecclesiastical, political, and doctrinal judgment where required?
- Are performance measures and termination rights proportionate to the relationship?
- Would the arrangement remain defensible if reviewed by members, beneficiaries, donors, regulators, partners, or the public?

Conclusion

The Malone Network gains strength from coordinated specialization. Its institutions should exchange knowledge, finance worthy work, train personnel, organize service, advance policy, preserve records, and pursue common objectives together. They should do so through relationships that make authority clearer rather than less visible.

The governing standard is neither institutional isolation nor unrestricted centralization. It is disciplined cooperation: shared doctrine, distinct jurisdictions, documented commitments, accurate public identity, traceable responsibility, and accountability to the authority appropriate to each function.

Final principle: The Network should act as one coordinated system without pretending to be one undifferentiated institution.