

# Problem-Driven Doctrinal Engineering

Problem-driven doctrinal engineering is the method by which Malone Doctrine converts concrete human and institutional problems into permanent systems of ethical authority, practical guidance, and organized response. It begins with conditions that require correction rather than with abstract philosophy detached from experience.

The method asks:

**What is wrong, how does it operate, what harm does it cause, what condition must replace it, and what governing authority is required to preserve that correction?**

The purpose is not merely to describe injustice, express values, or produce persuasive essays. It is to construct a complete doctrinal pathway from lived reality to institutional action.

The working sequence is:

**Problem → Mechanism → Harm → Required Condition → Response → Implementation  
→ Rule → Principle → Axiom → Testing → Revision → Adoption**

Each stage performs a separate function.

## Begin With the Problem

A doctrinal project begins by identifying a consequential problem that affects individuals, families, communities, institutions, government, or economic life.

The problem must be defined precisely enough to distinguish it from related conditions. "Racism," "poverty," "corruption," or "disorganization" may be valid broad concerns, but they are not yet sufficiently developed for direct institutional response. The drafter must determine what is occurring, who is affected, what authority is involved, and why the condition deserves doctrinal treatment.

The seven strategic problem containers provide the current organizing framework:

1. government oppression;
2. institutional discrimination;
3. social racism;
4. political misalignment;
5. misdirection and arrested development;
6. misrepresentation;
7. lack of organization.

These containers prevent Doctrine from becoming a collection of unrelated opinions. Each specific issue is placed within a larger structural problem.

## Identify the Mechanism

A condition cannot be corrected reliably until its operative mechanism is understood.

The mechanism is the process through which the problem produces or sustains harm. It may involve law, administrative discretion, institutional dependency, cultural pressure, political loyalty, false information, resource control, weak leadership, or organizational fragmentation.

The mechanism explains why the problem persists.

This stage separates root causes from symptoms. Public conflict may be a symptom. Lack of enforceable standards may be the mechanism. Individual failure may be visible. Administrative attrition may be the mechanism. Political disappointment may be recurring. Unconditional loyalty may be the mechanism.

Doctrinal engineering must govern the mechanism, not merely react to its most visible result.

## Define the Harm

The drafter must identify the actual injury created by the mechanism.

Harm may include:

- loss of life or safety;
- denial of rights;
- educational exclusion;
- economic dependency;
- damage to reputation;
- political weakness;
- family instability;
- developmental delay;
- institutional fragmentation;
- loss of time, opportunity, or accumulated knowledge.

Defining harm establishes the moral and strategic importance of the problem. It also prevents exaggerated responses to minor conditions and inadequate responses to serious ones.

## State the Required Condition

Doctrine should not stop at condemnation. It must define what should become true.

The required condition is the positive state that would correct or materially reduce the problem. It may require equal treatment, verified information, organized representation, transparent administration, independent capacity, accountable leadership, stable family conduct, or coordinated institutional power.

The required condition provides the bridge between diagnosis and solution.

Without it, a response may oppose the existing condition without knowing what system should replace it.

## Design the Response

The response identifies what individuals and institutions must do.

Individual responses may include discipline, record preservation, verification, boundary-setting, skill acquisition, financial preparation, lawful self-defense, or strategic withdrawal.

Institutional responses may include education, political organization, legal support, charitable intervention, alternative systems, trusted communication, professional networks, documentation, and enforcement.

The response should allocate responsibility according to capacity. Individuals should not be assigned structural problems they cannot solve alone. Institutions should not excuse nonperformance by reducing every failure to personal responsibility.

Problem-driven doctrinal engineering distinguishes personal duty from institutional duty while requiring both.

## Convert the Response Into Implementation

A principle without execution remains aspiration. The response must therefore be translated into sequence, authority, resources, jurisdiction, and measurement.

Implementation asks:

- Who acts?
- Under what authority?
- In what order?
- With what resources?
- According to which procedure?
- What records must be created?
- What result indicates success?
- What conditions require correction or withdrawal?

This stage reveals whether the proposed solution is operational or merely rhetorical.

## Derive the Authority Hierarchy

Once a response is sufficiently developed, its governing content is converted into the Malone Doctrine hierarchy:

1. **axioms** establish foundational authority;
2. **principles** define enduring normative standards;
3. **maxims** preserve practical wisdom;
4. **rules** establish required or prohibited conduct;

5. **procedures** direct execution;
6. **authorized commentary** governs interpretation;
7. **articles** organize application and analysis;
8. **implementation documents** guide real-world performance.

The hierarchy should not be drafted as disconnected layers. Each lower provision must derive from and remain consistent with the higher authority above it.

A rule should implement a principle.

A principle should express an axiom.

A procedure should execute a rule.

Commentary should interpret rather than replace authority.

## Drafting Order Is Not Authority Order

Problem-driven doctrinal engineering does not require the drafter to begin with an axiom simply because axioms occupy the highest level of authority.

In practice, drafting may begin with a case, problem statement, proposed solution, rule, or implementation procedure. The broader principle and axiom may become clear only after the concrete issue has been examined.

Drafting moves upward and downward until the full hierarchy is coherent.

The method is therefore cyclical rather than strictly linear.

## Test and Revise

No doctrinal provision should be adopted merely because it sounds morally correct.

It must be tested against:

- realistic cases;
- foreseeable abuse;
- conflicts with existing Doctrine;
- individual and institutional capacity;
- unintended consequences;
- exceptions and edge conditions;
- implementation costs;
- succession requirements;
- standards of measurement.

Testing may reveal that a rule is too broad, a principle is too vague, an axiom is not truly universal, or a procedure cannot be executed.

Revision is not a failure of authority. It is part of the engineering process that produces reliable authority.

## Adopt and Preserve

A provision becomes authoritative only after it has been reconciled, approved, classified, versioned, and placed within the appropriate regulatory schedule or doctrinal document.

The final record should preserve:

- the adopted language;
- authority level;
- effective date;
- responsible office;
- interpretation;
- revision history;
- related procedures;
- implementation guidance;
- explanatory Primer material.

This allows future leaders to know what governs, why it exists, and how it should be applied.

The governing principle is:

**Doctrine shall be derived from consequential problems, developed through tested solutions, and converted into a coherent hierarchy of authority capable of guiding individual conduct and institutional action.**

Problem-driven doctrinal engineering prevents Malone Doctrine from becoming abstract, ornamental, or disconnected from community needs. It begins with what must be corrected, identifies how the condition operates, designs a practical response, and preserves the resulting wisdom as inheritable authority.

The method converts experience into doctrine, doctrine into implementation, and implementation into accumulated institutional power.