

Vertical Doctrinal Development

Vertical doctrinal development is the method of constructing a complete line of authority from a concrete problem to its highest governing axiom and then downward into rules, procedures, interpretation, and implementation. It ensures that each doctrinal provision has a clear source of authority and that each statement of authority can be translated into practical conduct.

The method is called vertical because it develops one issue through the full Malone Doctrine hierarchy rather than drafting many unrelated provisions at the same level.

A problem is not considered doctrinally complete merely because an essay has been written about it, a principle has been proposed, or a rule has been adopted. Completion requires the issue to be connected upward to foundational authority and downward to operational execution.

The full vertical structure is:

**Problem → Required Condition → Axiom → Principle → Maxim → Rule → Procedure →
Commentary → Article → Implementation**

The sequence may be drafted in a different order, but the completed authority chain must remain coherent.

Begin With a Specific Problem

Vertical development begins with a material condition requiring correction.

The problem may involve government oppression, institutional discrimination, social racism, political misalignment, strategic misdirection, misrepresentation, lack of organization, or another issue falling within the jurisdiction of Malone Doctrine.

The drafter identifies:

- what is happening;
- how the problem operates;
- who is harmed;
- what authority or dependency is involved;
- why the existing condition is unacceptable;
- what condition must replace it.

This prevents the Doctrine from becoming a collection of attractive but disconnected moral statements.

The problem supplies the practical necessity for the hierarchy.

Determine the Required Condition

Before drafting rules, the desired condition must be stated.

A doctrine cannot govern effectively if it knows only what it opposes. It must establish what should become true.

For example, if the problem is unreliable guidance, the required condition may be independent verification of material advice. If the problem is representative capture, the required condition may be accountable representation derived from an identifiable constituency. If the problem is fragmentation, the required condition may be durable organization capable of coordination and succession.

The required condition becomes the bridge between diagnosis and authority.

Derive the Axiom

The axiom expresses the highest foundational truth revealed by the problem.

An axiom must be broader than the original case. It should remain valid across different institutions, generations, leaders, and factual circumstances. It cannot merely restate the desired result for one dispute.

The drafter asks:

- What universal truth makes this condition wrong?
- What enduring duty or limit is involved?
- Would this proposition remain sound if applied to another group or institution?
- Can it govern cases beyond the one that produced it?
- Does it conflict with an existing axiom?

The axiom establishes why the Doctrine possesses authority to govern the issue.

A weak axiom is too narrow, temporary, partisan, or dependent upon one factual example. A sound axiom captures the durable moral structure beneath the problem.

Derive the Principle

The principle converts the axiom into an enduring normative standard.

Where the axiom states foundational truth, the principle states how persons and institutions ought to conduct themselves within the relevant domain.

A principle should be broad enough to govern many cases but specific enough to direct judgment.

For example:

Trust shall be proportionate to verified conduct and the consequences of error.

This principle can govern employment, education, politics, relationships, contracts, institutional reports, and leadership appointments. It translates a foundational duty of responsible judgment into a practical ethical standard.

Formulate the Maxim

The maxim compresses practical wisdom into memorable language.

A maxim is not merely a slogan. It is an instructional device derived from higher authority and intended to guide judgment in recurring situations.

Examples include:

Confirm and verify.

Identify, isolate, solve, document.

Actions speak louder than words.

The maxim helps members remember the controlling lesson without reproducing the entire doctrinal analysis. However, it remains subordinate to axioms and principles. Where a maxim is too broad for a particular case, the higher authority governs its interpretation.

Establish the Rule

The rule converts the principle into a required, prohibited, or conditionally authorized form of conduct.

A rule should identify:

- who is bound;
- what conduct is required or prohibited;
- under what conditions it applies;
- what exceptions exist;
- what authority enforces it;
- what consequence follows noncompliance.

The rule must not exceed the principle from which it is derived. It should implement higher authority rather than create a separate policy with no doctrinal foundation.

For example:

No material claim shall be relied upon solely because of friendship, credentials, authority, popularity, institutional status, political alignment, or declared goodwill when reasonable verification is available.

This rule gives operational meaning to the principle governing trust.

Create the Procedure

The procedure explains how the rule is carried out.

A rule may require verification. The procedure identifies what must be checked, who performs the review, what records are preserved, when secondary approval is required, and how unresolved uncertainty is handled.

Procedures should establish:

- sequence;
- assigned responsibility;
- required records;
- decision points;
- escalation standards;
- review requirements;
- completion criteria.

Without procedure, a rule may remain authoritative but inconsistently applied.

Procedures must remain subordinate to rules. Administrative convenience cannot lawfully alter the duty established by higher authority.

Supply Authorized Commentary

Authorized commentary establishes the approved interpretation of the provision.

It may define terms, resolve ambiguity, identify the relationship among provisions, explain exceptions, and clarify how authority applies to difficult cases. Commentary is especially important where a concise rule could be interpreted in conflicting ways.

Commentary does not replace the governing provision. It explains how the provision is to be understood.

Where commentary conflicts with a rule, principle, or axiom, the higher authority controls.

Develop the Article

The article provides the fuller doctrinal treatment of the issue.

It may include:

- the principle;
- definitions;
- diagnostic analysis;

- governing rule;
- ethical requirement;
- threat analysis;
- conditions for failure;
- system response;
- measures of success;
- cross-references.

The article connects the authority hierarchy to the problem that produced it. It allows the reader to see the complete doctrinal architecture without confusing explanatory development with the rank of the provisions contained within it.

An article is a container. Its individual provisions retain their assigned authority levels.

Produce Implementation Documents

Implementation documents convert the completed doctrine into institutional practice.

These may include:

- manuals;
- training materials;
- forms;
- checklists;
- reporting systems;
- referral procedures;
- program designs;
- evaluation standards;
- local operating plans;
- compliance controls.

Implementation belongs to actual institutions. Malone Doctrine supplies the governing standards, but the relevant Malone institution carries out the work under its own charter, jurisdiction, officers, and resources.

This preserves the distinction between doctrinal authority and institutional execution.

Drafting May Move Upward or Downward

Vertical doctrinal development does not require writing the axiom first.

A real case may first reveal a needed procedure. The procedure may expose the need for a rule. The rule may reveal a principle. The principle may reveal an axiom. Testing the axiom may then require the rule and procedure to be revised.

Development therefore moves in both directions:

Concrete experience moves upward toward authority; authority moves downward toward conduct.

This movement continues until the hierarchy is internally consistent.

Test the Vertical Chain

A completed doctrinal column must be tested as a whole.

The drafter should ask:

- Does the axiom genuinely support the principle?
- Does the principle justify the maxim and rule?
- Does the rule remain within the principle's limits?
- Does the procedure execute the rule accurately?
- Does the commentary interpret rather than alter?
- Does the article preserve the distinctions among authority levels?
- Can an institution actually implement the system?
- Does the solution correct the original problem?

A defect at one level may require revisions throughout the column.

A weak axiom can destabilize everything beneath it. An overbroad rule may contradict its principle. An impractical procedure may reveal that the rule was not sufficiently developed. Vertical testing prevents these layers from drifting apart.

Horizontal Reconciliation

Vertical development must eventually be reconciled horizontally with the rest of Malone Doctrine.

A provision governing trust may intersect with provisions concerning truth, justice, leadership, institutional authority, political conduct, or economic responsibility. The new doctrinal column must therefore be compared with existing columns to identify duplication, conflict, gaps, and unintended interaction.

Vertical development produces depth. Horizontal reconciliation produces unity.

Both are required for a coherent governing system.

Governing Principle

The governing principle is:

Every material doctrinal response shall be connected upward to foundational authority and downward to practical execution through a coherent and testable hierarchy.

Vertical doctrinal development prevents Malone Doctrine from becoming a disconnected inventory of axioms, principles, maxims, rules, and procedures. It develops each consequential problem as a complete authority structure.

The method converts a lived problem into a permanent doctrinal column: grounded in experience, governed by principle, preserved through authority, and completed through institutional action.