The Aletheia Vision

Principles and projects for practical independence and lasting public benefit

Cayle J. Warden

October 30 2026 • Version 1.3

Preface: What Sovereignty Means Here

The word sovereign has acquired some unfortunate associations. When I use it in Aletheia, I mean practical self-determination: having the knowledge, tools, choices, and resilience to direct one's life without unnecessary dependence on a company, platform, institution, or benefactor. Sovereignty is a capability to develop, not a special legal status to proclaim.

I am not describing the so-called "sovereign citizen" ideology. I reject claims that announcing oneself sovereign makes a person exempt from laws, courts, taxes, licensing, or ordinary public responsibilities. Calling driving a motor vehicle "traveling" does not make traffic laws disappear. I have no interest in roadside confrontations built around invented legal loopholes or supposedly magical phrases. That is not the independence I am talking about.

For me, sovereignty must coexist with the equal rights and safety of other people. It means meaningful control over the things we own, the ability to repair and understand the systems we depend on, control over our information, and viable alternatives when a provider or institution fails. It also means accepting responsibility for our actions. Laws and institutions may deserve criticism or reform, but changing them requires evidence, serious work, and a credible plan for what comes next—not pretending they do not exist.

Aletheia is not a claim to secede from society or stand above it. The goal is to participate in society on more informed, independent, and accountable terms. That is what I mean by sovereign throughout this document.

Introduction

I want to help build a world in which people have the knowledge, tools, material security, and freedom to direct their own lives. Aletheia is the name I give to the public philosophy behind that work. It connects truth in engineering, meaningful ownership, responsible reform, independent research, and institutions that can preserve useful work beyond the people who started it.

The practical approach begins with things I can build and improve: repair tools, software, technical documentation, service businesses, and tested solutions to real failures. Useful enterprises can support research. Research can produce capabilities that other people can use, understand, and improve. If those efforts become successful enough, their surplus can support education, environmental restoration, and infrastructure maintained for lasting public benefit.

The long-term mission is peace, independence, and a safe, freely lived future for my family and others. The projects are ways to pursue that mission. Their designs, order, and scale can change as evidence and circumstances change. The mission does not depend on any single device, company, facility, or extraordinary financial outcome.

This account describes both principles I hold now and institutions I would like to build. The movement has a manifesto and a developing body of work. Some projects have code or field observations; others remain designs, research questions, or distant aspirations. Proposed governance safeguards describe the standard I want institutions to meet. Their inclusion here does not mean they have already been adopted in binding organizational documents. The project register at the end makes these distinctions explicit.

1 The purpose of practical sovereignty

By sovereignty, I mean practical agency: the ability to understand the systems one relies on, make informed choices, maintain useful tools, protect personal information, and continue functioning when an outside provider changes its priorities. Someone who owns a device should have meaningful control over its useful life. A community should have options when a supplier, service, or institution fails it.

That does not require every person to become an engineer or every household to manufacture its own equipment. It requires access to independent technicians, understandable documentation, replaceable parts, interoperable systems, and alternatives that can actually be used. Shared expertise can increase independence when people can choose whom to trust and can take their knowledge or equipment elsewhere.

My experience in computing, automotive work, troubleshooting, and locksmithing has made this a concrete issue. A service restriction can prevent an otherwise competent person from doing a legitimate repair. A discontinued tool can strand functioning equipment. An inexpensive failed component can become an expensive replacement because the information needed to repair it is withheld. The cost is paid in money, wasted materials, lost time, and diminished choice.

Aletheia seeks to reduce those avoidable barriers. Its interest in truth is practical as well as philosophical. Accurate information lets people distinguish a real safety constraint from a commercial restriction, a repairable defect from an unavoidable failure, and a demonstrated result from an attractive claim. Knowledge becomes liberating when people can act on it.

The same reasoning reaches beyond technology. Financial insecurity can consume the room a family needs to recover. Lack of access to training or equipment can keep capable people from contributing. Weak infrastructure can make ordinary life precarious. A useful response should expand the person's options and capacity to act, with as little continuing dependence on a benefactor as possible.

I want the resulting social environment to actively discourage abuse, exploitation, and violence through clear norms, accountability, and safeguards. Freedom includes protection against coercion and predation. Institutions should help make peaceful life possible while leaving room for individual choices, disagreement, and different ways of living.

2 Truth in engineering and meaningful ownership

The Aletheia manifesto places the ability to inspect, modify, and repair technology at the center of ownership. Its technical program calls for accessible schematics, documented communication protocols, component-level repair, owner-controlled firmware, and independent diagnostic access. A buyer should be able to keep useful hardware working after its original supplier stops supporting it.

The distinction that matters is between protection that serves the user and restriction that primarily preserves dependence. Encryption can protect private information. Authentication can protect a dangerous machine from unauthorized control. Those purposes deserve serious engineering. A restriction imposed solely to block legitimate maintenance or competing repair services deserves scrutiny and a workable alternative.

Local operation is a recurring design goal. Core functions should remain available when an internet connection fails or a vendor ends a cloud service. Optional remote services can be useful, but the owner should understand which functions depend on them and what will happen if that relationship ends. Recovery paths, exportable data, and safe manual control should be considered during design rather than after a failure.

Technical liberation therefore includes both disclosure and construction. Publishing an explanation is valuable; publishing a reproducible procedure, serviceable design, usable tool, or maintainable implementation gives that explanation practical force. The aim is to let people repair and adapt equipment with confidence instead of leaving them with a description of what has been denied to them.

Openness also creates obligations. Documentation should state what a tool does, its limitations, how it was tested, and which versions the results apply to. A hardware release needs enough information to reproduce and troubleshoot it. Software needs clear licensing and a realistic account of maintenance. A low purchase price means little if the device cannot be supported or repaired.

My preference is to publish most suitable STARS work openly. Commercial fabrication, support, training, and project-specific licensing can help finance that work. Dual licensing has been part of the planning, but the actual terms must be stated for each release. A general commitment to openness should never be mistaken for a license that has not been issued.

Privacy and responsible disclosure remain part of the same philosophy. People should control their own information; publication should not expose someone else's credentials, personal data, or confidential work. A security finding should be documented with a practical path to mitigation and appropriate coordination. The purpose is to improve people's control and safety, including the people affected by a disclosure.

Distributed discovery: an interconnected knowledge commons

Knowledge should not remain confined to its originator, discipline, institution, or a single gatekeeper. Aletheia aims to connect fields directly, rather than treating any one specialty or central authority as the necessary hub. A repair problem may suggest a solution from materials science; an environmental constraint may inform software, manufacturing, or public policy. The value lies not only in isolated facts but in reusable connections between them.

The movement should publish concise, usable knowledge nuggets: a clear question or spark, the concepts it connects, the proposed mechanism, relevant evidence and sources, competing explanations, known limitations, and a useful next test or application. A nugget may begin as an observation, a design, or a hypothesis. It should never be presented as a validated result until testing justifies that status. Failed tests and well-supported objections belong in the record, because they prevent others from repeating dead ends.

People should be free to examine, reproduce, criticize, improve, recombine, and independently extend ideas, with provenance, attribution, revision history, and appropriate licensing preserved. Aletheia is an invitation to collective discovery, not a demand that every author surrender private work or that security-sensitive information be published irresponsibly. The original contributor need not remain the permanent owner, gatekeeper, or maintainer of an idea for others to make useful progress.

The measure of this principle is not the number of ideas posted. It is the number that others can investigate, correct, put into practice, and build upon—and the measurable problems those developments help solve. The desired result is an open, distributed discovery network that can outgrow its founder.

3 Responsible reform begins with a replacement plan

One of my central principles is that an existing system should not be torn down until there is at least a concrete plan for what will replace it. A broken institution may still provide functions that people depend on. Removing its authority, funding, or technical infrastructure without understanding those functions can transfer the cost of reform onto people who already have the least protection.

A replacement plan does not require pretending that the present system is acceptable, or waiting for a perfect solution. It requires taking responsibility for continuity. What useful function must survive? Who depends on it? What will perform that function during the transition? What authority and resources will the replacement need? What will happen if it fails?

For a repair tool, the answer might be an independently tested alternative, documentation, and a recovery procedure. For an institution, the answer could require interim administration, preservation of records, funding for essential services, and a defined transfer of responsibility. The detail should match the consequences of failure.

There is a harder case when a system is fundamentally unjust and immediate removal could still cause greater harm. My preference is a short period of intense, serious debate. The purpose is to establish a defensible transition and reduce immediate harm. A temporary continuation needs explicit justification, limits, and scrutiny; open-ended discussion must not become a way to preserve the harm indefinitely.

This creates a demanding standard for reformers as well as incumbents. Criticism should identify what is failing and why. A proposed replacement should explain what it preserves, what it changes, who bears transition risks, and how its claims will be evaluated. When it is practical, limited pilots and parallel

operation can generate evidence before a wider change. Urgent protection may require action sooner, but the responsibility to plan for what follows remains.

The same principle applies to Aletheia's own work. If an open tool is offered as a substitute for a proprietary one, it needs evidence that it can perform the relevant job. If an independent institution is proposed as a better steward, its authority and resources need examination. Good intentions do not establish competence.

I expect the methods to remain adaptable. A design can be replaced, a project paused, a partnership changed, or a technical assumption abandoned without losing the mission. Responsible reform preserves the ability to correct course. Loyalty belongs to the purpose and the people affected, rather than to an implementation simply because I helped create it.

4 Institutions should earn trust through their operation

I am not opposed to institutions. Large projects require coordination, continuity, specialized knowledge, and ways to resolve disagreements. My objection is to dysfunctional implementations: organizations that conceal error, protect their own standing at the expense of their purpose, or accumulate authority that cannot be meaningfully challenged.

The institution I want has a defined mission, understandable powers, competent people, independent oversight, and a way to correct itself. Its value should be visible in the work it performs. Its continued existence should not become its overriding objective.

Within the scientific and technical decision bodies I have discussed, participation should follow demonstrable understanding. Relevant competence can come through formal education, practical experience, independent study, or some combination. Published standards should explain what a participant needs to understand. Passing those standards should automatically confer the corresponding eligibility, including voting eligibility, without an additional invitation from an inner circle.

That approach still leaves important design work. Standards must match the subject and remain open to challenge. A person qualified in one field does not automatically acquire authority in another. Assessment methods need review so that they do not quietly become barriers protecting an established group. These are proposed rules for competent institutional deliberation; a complete system of broader civic governance has not been settled here.

These competence-based voting rules concern decisions within specialized Aletheia scientific and technical bodies. They do not propose restricting anyone's voting rights in public elections.

Voting can settle what an organization will do. It cannot make a scientific proposition true. Evidence has to remain available for examination after a decision. Minority findings, explanations, and objections should be preserved and published rather than erased from the record. An objection may receive less attention at a given time, but future evidence should be able to bring it back into consideration.

This matters because apparent agreement can conceal uncertainty, and an unpopular observation can later prove important. The record should let a reader understand the majority's reasoning, the strongest objections, the evidence considered, and what would justify reconsideration. Institutional memory should preserve the reasoning behind decisions as well as the decisions themselves.

The same standard applies to expertise and leadership. Credentials can provide useful evidence of training. They should not substitute for results or prevent a capable outsider from demonstrating

understanding. Founding an organization, supplying its capital, or having an original idea should not exempt anyone from correction.

5 Accountability must have power to act

An institution cannot rely indefinitely on its founder's character. If the mission matters, its safeguards need to work when leaders are tired, mistaken, financially pressured, or personally invested in a decision. Oversight must be able to tell me that I am wrong and have consequences beyond offering advice I can ignore.

The institutional designs I have discussed include independent ethics oversight, external legal review, protected reporting, arbitration, auditable authority, and subsidiary accountability. These are intended safeguards, not a claim that every body, procedure, or legal power already exists. Their final implementation must specify who can act, what they can review, how conflicts are handled, and what remedies they can require.

Independence has to be practical. A reviewer should not have to protect a leader's reputation to keep a position. A person raising a concern should have a credible route outside the immediate chain of authority. A disputed decision needs a fair process and a record. Technical and financial claims should be open to qualified examination, with personal information protected where disclosure would cause harm.

Arbitration should provide a means to resolve a dispute without requiring the founder's personal favor. Its usefulness would depend on fair selection, clear authority, access to relevant evidence, and protection against conflicts of interest. The precise appointment, review, and appeal arrangements remain to be designed. Naming an independent body is only the beginning; its rules must let it act independently.

Research needs similar protections. Failed experiments and negative results should be publishable. A team should not have to produce a favorable conclusion to justify honest work. I have also considered bonuses or other recognition for people who continue difficult, worthwhile research. Such incentives would need to reward rigor and informative progress, while preserving the ability to stop an unproductive line. Persistence should remain responsive to evidence.

Financial separation is another safeguard. Commercial assets, public-purpose funds, and personal generosity should have clear boundaries. A future public-benefit institution should be able to reject an expenditure proposed by its founder. If I wanted to help someone personally, I could use my own funds separately. The institution's independent decision should not become meaningless whenever the founder dislikes it.

Succession belongs in the design from the beginning. Records, responsibilities, technical knowledge, and review powers should survive leadership changes. Public-purpose assets need protections against diversion, and those protections need lawful ways to adapt when circumstances change. Durability requires both fidelity to purpose and the capacity to correct a mechanism that no longer serves it.

6 The relationship between Aletheia NPFS and STARS

Aletheia supplies the public philosophy: truth in engineering, practical ownership, open knowledge, responsible change, and lasting benefit. It is a movement and a developing program of publication and advocacy. A separate incorporated Aletheia organization is not assumed by this document.

NPFS LLC is the holding framework. Its role is ownership and stewardship of the business interests, rather than performing every activity itself. STARS, Sovereign Technical and Research Solutions, is the technical research and development arm: the place for devices, software, experimentation, and engineering work. The legal and administrative structures supporting that division of work continue to evolve.

Family service businesses, including Spotless Deep Cleaning and proposed locksmith operations, have their own customers, responsibilities, and commercial purposes. They can contribute to a more stable household and a stronger base for future work. They should not be treated as interchangeable with a research program or an unfunded philanthropic promise.

The hoped-for economic relationship is straightforward. Useful work earns revenue. A sustainable share can strengthen the household, maintain the enterprises, and fund research. Successful research and products may create further resources. Genuine surplus can then support educational access and larger public-benefit programs. Each step depends on actual performance and obligations that must be met.

I value mission control and would prefer arrangements that preserve the ability to choose what the work serves. That preference still requires honest economics. Open publication needs funding; equipment needs maintenance; people need compensation. Partnerships and specialist help can be valuable when their terms fit the mission.

Private enterprise, competition, and substantial financial success are compatible with this vision. Wealth is useful because of the capability and opportunity it can finance. Seeking broad public benefit does not require a commitment to identical outcomes, the abolition of markets, or a conventional political identity. Individual labels may describe parts of the philosophy, but none should replace an examination of the actual proposals.

7 The Sovereign Stack makes the philosophy tangible

The Sovereign Stack is the family of technical projects through which these ideas can become useful tools. The projects share interests in local control, independent diagnostics, transparent operation, interoperability, and equipment that remains serviceable. They are at different stages. A desired feature is not a demonstrated capability, and a collection of design files does not establish a finished product.

Automotive diagnostics and recorded evidence

Omni-Link is an open automotive diagnostic and service platform under design. Its intended role is to give independent technicians a flexible interface to vehicle systems and reduce dependence on restrictive or abandoned tools. Proposed support for particular protocols, manufacturer software, or service functions must be established individually through implementation and testing.

Eidolon is a related but distinct telemetry and logging project. Its purpose is to preserve information about what a vehicle or system actually did so that diagnosis can rely on a record. The architecture has explored embedded controllers and local recording. The current description is design work, rather than a claim that a complete, validated recorder is available.

Omni-Industrial and Omni-Process extend the same ambition toward industrial diagnostics, instrumentation, and process work. They remain proposed extensions. Equipment controlling real machinery would need application-specific validation and qualified review before operational use.

Repair tools and useful small software

The Truth is a proposed cable and connectivity analyzer, with USB and Ethernet use cases. It represents a common STARS objective: make the condition of an ordinary technical system directly observable with an understandable, serviceable tool. The design ambition should be separated from a tested specification or a shipping device.

Kinetic Torch is a more immediate software project. It is an Android flashlight utility built around a double-chop gesture, with a minimal-permission design and everyday reliability as its purpose. Evolving source code and active troubleshooting distinguish it from a concept alone. The reported failure to switch the torch off reliably remains an unresolved issue in the project record; it should not be described as a completed, dependable release.

Retrocomputing work, including a SIMM memory replacement or interposer concept, applies the repair philosophy to legacy equipment. Restoring local usefulness to older Nest devices is another planned example. Both concern extending the useful life of hardware whose original supply or support may no longer meet the owner's needs. Neither is presented here as a completed general solution.

Privacy research and responsible safety work

DTMB, the RF Privacy Bench project, explores Bluetooth and Wi-Fi privacy questions through embedded devices and observation. Board configuration, source versions, build results, logs, and captures are necessary to establish what was actually tested. Current consolidated evidence has not been verified. Desired privacy effects must remain hypotheses until measurements support them; discussion of an experiment is not proof of protection against tracking.

The field work concerning certain Von Duprin exit-device combinations provides a different kind of example. A failure was reported from actual doors, and a low-cost mitigation was developed and described. The relevant lesson is to connect observation, reproducibility, remedy, and disclosure. Field reports and a proposed retrofit do not amount to independent certification or universal approval. A shareable account can explain the safety purpose without distributing unnecessary exploitation detail.

A public technical commons

The longer-term aim is a body of designs, repair knowledge, test procedures, and affordable tools that others can use and improve. A future workshop, makerspace, or training program could turn that documentation into access to equipment and instruction. Such a facility remains an aspiration.

User-controlled computing is part of the general philosophy, while private systems remain outside the public technical portfolio. Openness is a deliberate publication choice. It does not authorize disclosure of confidential designs, personal infrastructure, or someone else's information.

8 Philanthropy should create lasting room to act

The public-benefit ambitions follow the same purpose as the technical work: reduce avoidable dependence and improve the conditions from which people can build a life. Their scale depends on resources actually earned and available. The initiatives described here are research directions and long-term aspirations, not funded commitments or operating institutions.

Water resilience and ecological stewardship

Warden Water Works is the long-horizon water and environmental vision. It includes water treatment and reclamation, drought resilience, aquifer recharge where appropriate, and restoration of healthy watershed function. Related engineering ideas include mobile distillation, atmospheric water generation, desalination concepts, and reuse of available heat.

These are research and infrastructure directions. Their usefulness depends on location, energy requirements, water quality, ecological effects, and long-term operation. A concept that moves or treats water still has to demonstrate a benefit in the place where it would be used. Professional hydrology, environmental assessment, and collaboration with affected communities would shape real implementation.

One long-term possibility is eventual public stewardship with protections against sale, privatization, or diversion from the intended benefit. The legal mechanisms and maintenance funding remain to be established. The underlying ambition is durable water security and ecological recovery.

Sea Warden and public knowledge of the ocean

Sea Warden is the proposed autonomous ocean-floor mapping fleet. Its purpose is to expand useful knowledge of the seafloor and make that knowledge a public benefit. The initial aspiration reached millimeter-scale detail; later discussions explored three-to-five-centimeter targets and the usefulness of a one-meter outcome. A fleet of roughly 500 units with 40 to 70 percent uptime has been considered as a planning scenario.

Those numbers are aspirations and assumptions, not demonstrated specifications or a deployment plan. Coverage, resolution, positional accuracy, sensor choice, endurance, maintenance, and cost would have to be evaluated together. A high-resolution image is not automatically equally accurate three-dimensional terrain. Any future performance claim needs a defined measurement and evidence from the actual survey system.

Ocean Cleaning, also explored under the Sea Citadel name, is a separate speculative marine plastics-recovery concept. Mapping and cleanup could share interests, but they have different purposes and validation requirements. Neither fleet is represented as built, funded, or operational.

9 Resilient infrastructure and the Sovereign Citadel

The Sovereign Citadel is a long-range concept for a resilient place to live, work, preserve knowledge, and carry out research. It brings together habitation, workshops, water, energy, food production, communications, and local control. Subterranean construction and integrated environmental systems have been explored as possible approaches.

Its place in the vision is continuity and peace. I want my family to be able to live safely and freely, with infrastructure that reduces dependence on fragile arrangements. The physical design serves that purpose. It can change if a different approach provides a better way to achieve it.

The Citadel remains conceptual and unconstructed. Excavation, geology, groundwater, seismic behavior, ventilation, emergency access, and long-term maintenance would require professional engineering. A proposed layout does not establish safety or self-sufficiency. The project is also distinct from the marine Sea Citadel concept and from Warden Water Works.

Industrial ambitions occupy a related but separate part of the vision. Local manufacturing, material recovery, process instrumentation, and useful reuse of heat or water could provide jobs, production capacity, and revenue for research and public benefit. The attraction is to make valuable capability available closer to the people who need it.

Those systems have to stand on measured performance. An appealing diagram connecting one process's waste to another's input does not prove that the quantities, timing, quality, costs, or environmental effects will work. Some earlier industrial concepts may be changed or rejected if their emissions, economics, or maintenance burden conflict with the mission. No factory, integrated recovery system, or novel energy capability is implied to exist because it appears in a concept portfolio.

The same openness to revision applies to frontier research. Unusual ideas can be explored through defined questions and controlled experiments. A surprising hypothesis earns the opportunity to be tested, with the result recorded honestly. Confidence, novelty, and persistence do not substitute for evidence.

10 A stable mission with a flexible path

The portfolio is larger than the resources available to advance it all at once. A credible path starts by strengthening the foundation: household stability, useful paid work, clear records, reliable repositories, and a small number of projects that can reach meaningful completion. A modest working tool is a real contribution even when the larger vision remains distant.

The next stage would be repeatable technical work: tested prototypes, maintainable software, reproducible documentation, and products or services that people actually use. A stronger laboratory and selective manufacturing could follow when there is enough demand, skill, and financial capacity. Educational access can grow alongside the work where it can be sustained.

Larger industrial and environmental efforts would begin with bounded feasibility studies and pilots. Expansion should follow evidence of benefit and the ability to operate and maintain what has been built. Partnerships should add competence and capacity while keeping responsibility and decision rights understandable.

Major infrastructure and long-term public-benefit institutions belong to the exceptional-success horizon. They require real capital, durable administration, and safeguards that work independently of the founder. They should not be financed in the narrative by treating hoped-for future wealth as present resources.

This progression is conditional rather than a fixed calendar. A useful opportunity may change the order. A failed test may end a project. A resource constraint may require a smaller implementation. I want to preserve that flexibility without losing the overarching purpose.

Progress should be assessed through things that can be shown: a reproducible build, a fault corrected, a reliable release, knowledge someone else can use, a viable operation, a person trained, or an environmental result independently measured. A larger list of ideas does not automatically mean greater progress. Recording a failure can also advance the work by preventing the same mistake from consuming more time and resources.

The long-term measure is whether people have more freedom and a more secure life. An organization that grows while demanding endless sacrifice from everyone involved would need to examine whether it is still serving that purpose. The desired future includes room to live peacefully, rather than permanent emergency or an obligation to produce without end.

11 Participation, verification, and collaboration

Aletheia does not require agreement with every long-range proposal. The work can begin wherever a person or group can identify a real problem and improve the available tools, knowledge, or options. Independent technicians can document repair barriers and safe remedies. Engineers and researchers can test claims and designs. Educators, businesses, and communities can identify where accessible skills and equipment would make a measurable difference.

Participation should begin with bounded work: a defined problem, a responsible maintainer, testable criteria, and a record of what succeeds or fails. Technical publications should identify versions, licenses, known limits, and how a result was obtained. Findings involving safety or security require appropriate review and responsible disclosure rather than publication for publicity alone.

The project register is a dated snapshot, not a catalog of completed products. Public references should link to materials a reader can actually inspect: source repositories, documentation, build logs, test reports, or technical advisories. A public planning document is evidence of documentation, not evidence of successful operation. Where no source is linked, this edition makes no public verification claim.

I welcome scrutiny of Aletheia's assumptions, economics, designs, and safeguards. An objection supported by evidence should remain part of the record, even when it challenges my own approach. Meaningful participation should not depend on personal loyalty, credentials alone, or agreement with an entire worldview.

The best next contribution is often small and concrete: reproduce a result, fix a defect, make instructions clearer, test an alternative, teach a useful skill, or establish a dependable way to maintain a tool. Public opportunities and contact channels will be identified as they are ready; this statement does not imply a formal membership system or an operating public workshop.

I want the eventual legacy to be people with more options, tools that remain useful, knowledge that can be recovered and improved, healthier environments, and institutions able to serve their purpose without my constant direction. The scale may change. The responsibility to build something useful, truthful, and correctable remains.

An open path toward the Right to Repair community

Aletheia has a natural area of common purpose with Right to Repair advocates, including the FULU Foundation and the broader independent-repair community associated with Louis Rossmann. Their work on genuine device ownership, repair documentation, vendor lock-in, and legally protected repair strongly overlaps with Aletheia’s commitment to technical independence. This is a proposed direction for future cooperation, not a statement of present partnership, endorsement, sponsorship, or membership.

A credible approach begins with useful, verifiable contributions: carefully documented repair cases, reproducible component-level findings, responsibly disclosed failures, local-first alternatives for abandoned equipment, and clear evidence of how owners are denied functionality or choice. Where appropriate, such work can inform public repair guides, consumer-rights documentation, technical demonstrations, or existing repair-bounty efforts. Any work involving digital locks, safety-critical devices, personal data, or intellectual-property restrictions must be reviewed before public release.

Collaboration should be invitation-based and practical. Publish a bounded problem, the evidence, the attempted remedy, its limits, and what help would advance it. Contribute to existing community infrastructure before requesting attention or affiliation. Seek common projects while preserving each

organization’s independent mission. No one person or institution should become the required hub through which Aletheia ideas must pass.

Project and institution status register

Status date October 30 2026. Current work describes documented activity, not a claim that every item is receiving simultaneous attention. Code, designs, field reports, and operating systems represent different levels of maturity. The descriptions below do not certify technical performance or legal adoption.

Public references in this register identify inspectable materials, not independent certification of a working product. No public link is assumed where evidence has not been verified.

Initiative	Intended role	Status, boundary, and public evidence
Aletheia	Public philosophy and technical liberation	Manifesto and developing program exist. Full institutional implementation remains prospective.
NPFS LLC	Holding and stewardship framework	Existing entity. Future governance arrangements remain subject to implementation.
STARS	Technical research and creation	R&D identity and portfolio with mixed maturity. Formal structures continue to evolve.
Kinetic Torch	Gesture flashlight utility	Evolving project and troubleshooting; reported off-gesture issue remains unresolved. Public project documentation; Android source and verified release not yet published in this repository.
Exit-device safety work	Document a field failure and mitigation	Founder-reported observations and proposed remedy. Independent certification is not asserted.
Omni-Link	Independent vehicle diagnostics	Architecture and design work. Protocol and service capabilities require verification.
Eidolon	Telemetry and local recording	Architecture and design work. Complete validated deployment is not established.
The Truth	Cable and connectivity analysis	Proposed device and design work. Finished product performance is not established.
DTMB	RF privacy experiments	Design and bench work discussed. Current consolidated build and measurement evidence remains unverified.
Omni-Industrial and Omni-Process	Industrial diagnostics and process tools	Proposed extensions. Operational safety and capability are unvalidated.
Legacy hardware and Nest work	Extend useful equipment life	Concepts and planned work. General working replacements are not established.
Workshop and education access	Shared tools and instruction	Desired facility or program. An operating public venue is not asserted.
Industrial recovery systems	Production and resource reuse	Exploratory concepts. Feasibility and net benefit remain open.

Initiative	Intended role	Status, boundary, and public evidence
Warden Water Works	Water resilience and ecological recovery	Long-range infrastructure vision with research concepts. No regional deployment is asserted.
Sea Warden	Public-benefit ocean-floor mapping	Aspirational fleet and performance scenarios. No demonstrated fleet capability.
Ocean Cleaning and Sea Citadel	Marine plastics recovery	Separate speculative research concept. Feasibility is unproven.
Sovereign Citadel	Resilient living and research environment	Long-range engineering concept. Unconstructed.
Institutional safeguards	Competence and independent correction	Stated principles and proposed mechanisms. Adoption and enforceability require specific instruments.

Reference basis

The Aletheia Manifesto A Framework for Technical Sovereignty, dated April 20 2026, establishes the movement's technical ownership and transparency principles. Warden Vision Statement, dated October 25 2026, records the wider organizational, technical, and philanthropic vision. The replacement-first principle, participation rules, preservation of minority evidence, flexible mission planning, and Sea Warden aspirations incorporate subsequent or separately stated clarifications by Cayle J. Warden through October 29 2026. The principle of distributed discovery and the proposed Right to Repair collaboration path were added October 30 2026. Proposed partnerships are not confirmed affiliations.

This document expresses the vision and its intended standards. Project-specific source code, test records, adopted governance instruments, and funded plans remain the appropriate evidence for claims about implementation.