



Five Years from Now

What Aesthetic Computer Probably Becomes

@jeffrey · Aesthetic.Computer · ORCID 0009-0007-4460-4913

working draft — not for citation

Dansk · Español · 中文 · 日本語

March 2026 · 8fe6526fd

Index

1. Introduction	5
2. Ninety-Four Projects and Counting	7
2.1 The Drawing Software Lineage (2011–2020).	7
2.2 The Performance Turn (2016–2018).	8
2.3 Why History Matters for Projection	9
3. The Surplus Hardware Wave	10
3.1 From Prototype to Fleet (2026–2027)	10
3.2 The 50-Dollar Instrument (2027–2028)	12
4. Planetary Ensembles	14
4.1 notepat as Ensemble Instrument (2026–2027).	14
4.2 Beyond Music (2028–2031)	15
5. The Third Dimension	17
5.1 What Already Works	17

5.2 The GPU Question on Bare Metal (2026–2028)	18
5.3 3D as Creative Medium (2028–2031)	20
6. The Scholarly Turn	22
6.1 The Paper Mill (2026–2027)	22
6.2 Artist-Scholar Identity (2028–2031)	23
7. KidLisp’s Own Life	25
7.1 Language Community (2026–2028)	25
7.2 Language Evolution (2028–2031)	26
8. The Sustainability Question	27
8.1 The Funding Landscape (2026–2028)	27
8.2 The Solo-Author Risk (2028–2031)	28
9. The Convergence	30
10. What Could Change Everything	32
10.1 An Institutional Home	32
10.2 A Viral Moment	32
10.3 AI as Collaborator	33
10.4 What If He Stops	34

1. Introduction

Aesthetic.Computer is a mobile-first runtime and social network for creative computing, comprising 359 built-in interactive programs (“pieces”), a bare-metal Linux operating system that boots any x86_64 machine into a creative instrument, a minimal Lisp dialect for generative art, and a growing community of 2,812 registered users [@jeffrey, 2026a]. The project is authored and maintained primarily by a single developer, @jeffrey, with AI-assisted maintenance (“AestheticAnts”) handling routine upkeep.

As of March 2026, the project has produced 19 research papers across four languages, a bare-metal OS that boots in 7.3 seconds [@jeffrey, 2026f], a blockchain integration for minting generative artworks, and a 7,912-line musical instrument (notepat) that has become the system’s front door [@jeffrey, 2026e]. The codebase traces its lineage through 94 predecessor projects spanning more than a decade of tool-making.

This paper does not propose what Aesthetic.Computer *should* do. It attempts to read

what it *probably will* do, based on the momentum already visible in the code, the papers, the infrastructure decisions, and the philosophical commitments that have shaped the project to date.

2. Ninety-Four Projects and Counting

Any projection of Aesthetic.Computer's future must reckon with the depth of its past. The project is not a startup pivoting toward product-market fit. It is the 95th iteration of a single sustained inquiry: *what should a personal creative computing instrument be?*

2.1 The Drawing Software Lineage (2011–2020)

The archaeology paper [jeffrey, 2026b] traces Aesthetic.Computer through 94 predecessor projects spanning two GitHub accounts (50+ repositories), a 109 GB legacy server archive, and a Dropbox corpus. The trajectory begins with **thePRBAT** (Polygon Replicating Bitmap Authoring Tool, 2011), a Flash-based digital imaging tool built as a BFA thesis at Ringling College, and arrives at Aesthetic.Computer through a decade of drawing software variants: **JeffreyPaint** (2014, JavaScript + Unity), **Finger Quilt** (2016, iOS/Swift), **Dot** (2017, a plotting application that prefigures AC's plot

disk), and most importantly **No Paint** (2014–2020), which went through five incarnations—Rails, JavaScript shim, WebGL prototype, iOS/Cordova, Vercel site—before being absorbed into Aesthetic.Computer.

This is not a history of abandoned projects. It is a history of *restarts*: the same person, asking the same question, choosing to start over rather than accumulate features. The pattern is visible in Aesthetic.Computer itself: the piece model (single file, lifecycle functions, immediate-mode graphics) is a constraint-first design that *prevents* the feature accumulation that killed earlier iterations.

2.2 The Performance Turn (2016–2018)

Between 2016 and 2018, @jeffrey toured with Goodiepal & Pals across 65+ venues in Europe, building real-time performance tools: audience participation interfaces, music notation renderers, subtitle displays for live lectures. These tools—built fast, used once, thrown away—established a design principle that persists in Aesthetic.Computer: software as instrument,

not as product. The tools were played, not shipped.

The Goodiepal influence runs deeper than collaboration. The goodiepal paper [@jeffrey, 2026c] identifies five threads that carry through to Aesthetic.Computer: instrument-first design, community organized through affinity rather than institution, works designed to resist digital reproduction, and radical pedagogy through direct engagement rather than curriculum.

2.3 Why History Matters for Projection

The 94-project history constrains our projection in two ways. First, it makes sudden pivots unlikely. @jeffrey has been circling the same problems—personal tools, creative instruments, constraint-based design—for 15 years. The next 5 years will almost certainly stay within this orbit. Second, it makes abandonment unlikely for the reasons people usually abandon projects (boredom, loss of interest, attraction to something shinier). The risk is not distraction; it is exhaustion. We return to this in §10.4.

3. The Surplus Hardware Wave

The single largest force acting on Aesthetic.Computer’s future is external: in October 2025, Microsoft ended support for Windows 10, rendering an estimated 240 million PCs obsolete by institutional standards [United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), 2024]. These machines are not broken. They are ThinkPads, EliteBooks, and Latitudes with 8–16 GB RAM, 1080p screens, WiFi, and 6–10 hour batteries. They cost \$30–80 on the surplus market. They are the raw material for everything that follows.

3.1 From Prototype to Fleet (2026–2027)

AC Native OS already boots on surplus hardware [@jeffrey, 2026f]. The gap between “boots on two ThinkPads in @jeffrey’s apartment” and “boots on 30 machines in a classroom” is not primarily technical. It is operational: WiFi credential management, per-device identity provisioning, hardware compatibility testing across dozens of laptop models, and a flashing workflow that a

non-technical person can execute.

The likely near-term work is mundane but critical:

- **Per-user WiFi storage:** moving hardcoded SSIDs out of JavaScript pieces into persistent per-device config files that survive OTA updates
- **Hardware compatibility matrix:** systematic testing across ThinkPad X1/T/L series, HP EliteBook 800 series, Dell Latitude 5000/7000 series
- **One-command flashing:** a USB image builder that takes a handle, colors, and WiFi credentials and produces a bootable drive
- **A/B kernel slots:** dual-partition boot with automatic rollback if the new kernel fails health checks

These are not glamorous features. They are the difference between an art project and an infrastructure project. The trajectory of the codebase—OTA updates already working, build names already generated, device identity already inscribed in the boot partition—suggests that

@jeffrey understands this distinction and is moving toward the infrastructure side.

3.2 The 50-Dollar Instrument (2027–2028)

If the operational work lands, the economic argument becomes very loud: a complete creative computing instrument—personalized, self-updating, requiring zero IT infrastructure—for the price of a surplus laptop and a USB drive. No Chromebook enrollment. No Apple ID. No subscription.

The OLPC project [Kraemer et al., 2009] demonstrated that hardware-first approaches to computing access fail on cost and logistics. The Raspberry Pi addressed cost (\$35) but requires \$150 in accessories. Aesthetic.Computer’s proposition is different: the hardware already exists, already has a screen, keyboard, battery, and WiFi, and is being discarded by the millions. The software is 89 MB.

The likely outcome by 2028 is not mass adoption but *proof points*: a handful of classrooms, community centers, or workshop contexts where

fleets of 10–30 surplus machines run AC Native OS and the results are documented. These proof points become the evidence base for grant applications, institutional partnerships, and the sustainability arguments described in §8.

4. Planetary Ensembles

The PLOrk paper [Jeffrey, 2026h] makes an argument that the existing codebase already supports: laptop orchestras have been musically legitimate since Princeton’s PLOrk proved the concept in 2006 [Trueman et al., 2006], but the model is trapped in universities at \$1,500+ per seat. AC Native OS on surplus hardware reduces the cost to \$50/seat. The question is whether anyone will play.

4.1 notepat as Ensemble Instrument (2026–2027)

notepat is already a polyphonic keyboard instrument with 32-voice synthesis, room reverb, and wave-type selection [Jeffrey, 2026e]. It runs on bare metal at 192 kHz. The missing ingredient for ensemble performance is not audio quality but *coordination*: synchronized tempo, shared harmonic space, and a conductor interface.

The likely development path:

- **UDP ensemble sync**: extending the existing dual-channel networking (WebSocket + UDP)

to synchronize beat clocks across devices on a local network

- **Conductor piece:** a new piece that displays the ensemble state and allows a conductor to set tempo, key, and dynamics
- **Spatialization:** using the physical positions of surplus laptops as distributed speakers—the ensemble *is* the sound system, following Turino’s participatory music model [Turino, 2008]

This thread has obvious conference appeal. A live demonstration of 10 surplus ThinkPads playing a coordinated musical piece—each showing the player’s handle in rainbow text, each contributing a voice to a distributed sound field—is the kind of demo that wins Ars Electronica mentions and NIME submissions.

4.2 Beyond Music (2028–2031)

The ensemble model generalizes beyond music. A network of surplus machines running coordinated pieces could be:

- A **distributed drawing wall:** each screen

shows a section of a larger canvas, participants draw locally, and the network composites the result

- A **collaborative KidLisp environment**: students write generative programs that feed into a shared visual space
- A **performance score**: the machines execute a graphic score [Jeffrey, 2026g], each interpreting the same notation through different pieces

The infrastructure for all of these already exists: WebSocket relay, UDP broadcast, per-device identity, and a piece model that supports any combination of graphics, audio, and input. What's missing is the *choreography*—the pieces themselves and the social forms around them.

5. The Third Dimension

Aesthetic.Computer is widely perceived as a 2D system. The immediate-mode graphics API—`wipe`, `ink`, `line`, `box`—and the pixel-art aesthetic of most pieces reinforce this impression. But the infrastructure tells a different story. A full software 3D rasterizer already exists, a multiplayer FPS already ships, and the architectural choices made in the bare-metal OS position 3D as the next major expressive frontier.

5.1 What Already Works

The bare-metal OS includes `graph3d.c`, a 600-line CPU software rasterizer with perspective projection, frustum clipping (Sutherland-Hodgman against 6 clip planes), depth buffering, per-vertex color interpolation, and texture mapping with perspective-correct barycentric coordinates. The JavaScript API exposes this through a `Form` constructor: pieces create meshes with vertex positions, colors, and texture coordinates, then render them with `ink(r,g,b).form(mesh)`.

Two production pieces demonstrate the system.

`fps.mjs` provides a first-person camera with pointer lock, WASD movement, textured ground planes, and rotating cubes. `1v1.mjs` extends this into a multiplayer FPS with hitscan weapons, bot AI (patrol/chase/flee states), kill tracking, and the dual-channel networking pattern (WebSocket for reliable game events, UDP for low-latency position sync). The browser path uses Three.js (r0.182) with WebGL rendering and includes VR/XR session support [Sutherland, 1968].

The system thus has two parallel 3D paths: a software rasterizer on bare metal (CPU-only, no GPU) and a hardware-accelerated path in the browser (WebGL/Three.js, with WebGPU infrastructure in place). The API surface is identical from the piece author's perspective.

5.2 The GPU Question on Bare Metal (2026–2028)

The software rasterizer is elegant but fundamentally limited. Every surplus ThinkPad and Elite-Book in the target fleet has an Intel integrated GPU capable of OpenGL 4.x or Vulkan 1.x, sitting idle. The kernel's DRM subsystem al-

ready manages the display via KMS modesetting; extending it to expose a render node for GPU-accelerated rasterization is a known engineering path (EGL on DRM, or Vulkan via `/dev/dri/renderD128`).

The likely trajectory is cautious. @jeffrey's design instinct favors software control over hardware delegation—the entire bare-metal OS philosophy is “know every instruction between power-on and pixel.” GPU drivers introduce opacity: firmware blobs, driver bugs, vendor-specific behavior. The software rasterizer's virtue is that it is *legible*: the pipeline from vertex to pixel is 600 lines of C that a student can read.

The probable compromise: GPU acceleration as an opt-in path for pieces that need it, with the software rasterizer remaining the default and the reference implementation. This mirrors the browser architecture, where WebGPU exists alongside the 2D canvas but doesn't replace it.

5.3 3D as Creative Medium (2028–2031)

The more interesting question is not technical but expressive. What does 3D mean in a system designed around constraint, immediacy, and single-file pieces?

The predecessor projects offer a clue. @jeffrey's work has always been about *painting*: No Paint, JeffreyPaint, thePRBAT, the Radical Digital Painting lecture tour. The 3D infrastructure is not building toward a game engine or a CAD tool. It is building toward *spatial painting*—the ability to place marks, colors, and forms in three-dimensional space with the same immediacy that `ink(255,0,0).line(0,0,100,100)` provides in two dimensions.

The pieces that will matter are not the ones that look like Unity demos. They are the ones where 3D is used the way @jeffrey uses 2D: as raw material for instruments, for performances, for things that are played rather than consumed. A 3D notepad where notes have spatial position and the room reverb is literal—sound emanating from forms distributed in virtual space. A 3D KidLisp

where (`box 0 0 0 50 50 50`) places a cube the way (`rect 0 0 50 50`) places a rectangle. A fleet of surplus laptops each rendering a different camera angle of the same distributed 3D scene.

The convergence with ensembles (§4) is where 3D becomes genuinely new. Synchronized 3D scenes across networked surplus machines—each screen a window into a shared virtual space, each player’s input affecting the scene for all participants—is a form that neither game engines nor creative coding tools have explored at the \$50/seat price point. The networking is already proven (`1v1.mjs`). The hardware is already available (§3). The missing piece is the artistic vision for what a distributed spatial instrument should feel like, and that is precisely the kind of question @jeffrey has spent 94 projects learning how to answer.

6. The Scholarly Turn

Between March 3 and March 20, 2026, @jefrey produced 19 research papers in four languages. This is not normal behavior for a solo developer. It signals a deliberate turn toward scholarly legitimacy—an attempt to build what the RESEARCH-DIRECTION.md file calls a “research moat” around the project.

6.1 The Paper Mill (2026–2027)

The paper infrastructure is already industrial: a custom L^AT_EX template with AC fonts, automated PDF building via a server (“the oven”), a cards format for single-sheet printouts, and a translation pipeline producing Danish, Spanish, and Chinese editions of every paper. The 40+ readings library provides the citation base. The pipeline is designed to produce, not to prototype.

The near-term trajectory is submission: ACM C&C Demos (April 16), ICCS Short Papers (April 24), JOSS software papers (rolling). If any of these land, the project gains a scholarly foothold that most creative coding tools never

achieve. Processing [Reas and Fry, 2007] and Scratch [Resnick et al., 2009] built their academic legitimacy over years; @jeffrey is attempting to compress that timeline by producing volume and targeting multiple venues simultaneously.

6.2 Artist-Scholar Identity (2028–2031)

The CalArts paper argues that an art school is an operating system—that the structures of proximity, critique, and disciplinary contamination that characterize institutions like CalArts can be ported into software. If @jeffrey continues to publish at this rate, the papers themselves become a body of work: not documentation of a software project, but a sustained argument about what creative computing is and who it is for.

The likely 5-year outcome is one of two scenarios:

1. **The moat holds:** 6–10 papers are published across peer-reviewed venues, @jeffrey is invited to speak at conferences, and *Aesthetic.Computer* enters the canon alongside Processing, Scratch, and Sonic Pi [Aaron, 2016] as a recognized creative computing envi-

ronment. The papers create a feedback loop: scholarly attention brings users, users create pieces, pieces generate new papers.

2. **The moat doesn't hold:** submissions are rejected, the solo-author pattern raises reviewer eyebrows, and the paper infrastructure goes dormant. The code survives; the scholarly identity does not. This is the more common outcome for artist-programmers.

The honest bet is somewhere between: a few publications land, enough to establish credibility in niche venues (NIME, xCoAx, ICLC), but the mainstream HCI and PL conferences remain out of reach without collaborators and user studies.

7. KidLisp's Own Life

KidLisp is a 118-function Lisp dialect for generative art [Jeffrey, 2026d]. It is sandboxed (no file I/O, no networking), runs in the browser, and has already accumulated 16,779 stored programs and a blockchain minting integration via Tezos. The language is small enough to fit on an index card.

7.1 Language Community (2026–2028)

The Tezos “keeps” system—where KidLisp programs are minted as on-chain artworks for 2.5 XTZ—creates an economic incentive to write KidLisp. The keeps contract (v11) is live, the minting UI exists at keeps.kidlisp.com, and 5 tokens have already been minted and migrated. If the generative art market remains active, this thread sustains itself.

The more interesting possibility is pedagogical. KidLisp’s constraints—no state mutation, no side effects beyond drawing, 118 functions, runs in a browser—make it a candidate for teaching environments. A KidLisp curriculum built

around the cards format (single-sheet programs that students can hold in their hands) aligns with Papert’s constructionism [Papert, 1980] and the project’s existing infrastructure.

7.2 Language Evolution (2028–2031)

KidLisp will face pressure to grow. Users will want state, animation, interactivity, sound. The design question is whether the language absorbs these features (becoming a general-purpose creative language) or remains deliberately minimal (a “haiku language” for static generative art, with JavaScript handling everything else).

The project’s history suggests the latter. @jeffrey’s design instinct, visible across 94 predecessor projects, favors sharp constraints over feature accumulation. The piece model itself—single file, lifecycle functions, immediate-mode graphics [@jeffrey, 2026g]—is a constraint-first design. KidLisp will probably stay small. The interesting growth will be in what people make with it, not what the language adds.

8. The Sustainability Question

Every thread described above depends on a single person continuing to work. Aesthetic.Computer has no venture funding, no institutional backing, and no employees beyond @jeffrey. The AestheticAnts maintenance system automates routine tasks, but architectural decisions, paper writing, hardware testing, and community cultivation require human attention.

8.1 The Funding Landscape (2026–2028)

The project has identified funding sources: Creative Capital (\$50,000 project grants), Prix Ars Electronica (€10,000), Gary Marsden Travel Awards, and GitHub Sponsors. The paper mill is partly a grant-writing strategy: a project with 19 papers, conference demos, and a documented user base is a stronger applicant than one with only code.

The Tezos keeps provide a small revenue stream. Prints (20 ordered as of March 2026) provide another. Neither is sufficient to sustain full-time development.

The honest projection: by 2028, the project either secures a grant or institutional affiliation (a residency, a teaching position, a research fellowship) or it slows to maintenance-mode development. This is not a failure scenario—many important creative tools are maintained part-time by their creators for decades. But the ambitious threads (planetary ensembles, surplus hardware fleets, scholarly moat) require full-time attention.

8.2 The Solo-Author Risk (2028–2031)

Illich’s “tools for conviviality” [Illich, 1973] argues that good tools should be operable without specialized expertise. Aesthetic.Computer aspires to this for its users, but the project itself is not convivial in Illich’s sense: it requires @jeffrey’s expertise to maintain. The bus factor is one.

The mitigation is already partially in place: the codebase is open source, the architecture is documented in 19 papers, the piece API is designed for single-file simplicity, and the AestheticAnts system handles routine maintenance autonomously. But the difference between “the

code is open” and “someone else can lead the project” is vast.

The likely 5-year trajectory: @jeffrey remains the sole architect. A small community of piece authors contributes content (265 published pieces and growing). One or two contributors submit pull requests for specific features. The project does not achieve the “thousand contributors” model of Processing or p5.js, but it doesn’t need to—its value proposition is not breadth but depth: a single vision, rigorously maintained, that takes creative computing to places committee-designed tools cannot go.

9. The Convergence

The seven threads described above are not parallel tracks. They converge.

The 94-project history (§2) establishes the trajectory that makes the other threads legible. Surplus hardware (§3) provides the material base for planetary ensembles (§4). The 3D infrastructure (§5) extends the ensemble model into spatial performance. The papers (§6) document and legitimize all of it. KidLisp (§7) provides a safe entry point for new users who arrive through any of these channels. Sustainability (§8) determines whether the convergence happens at all—and §10.4 examines what happens if it doesn't.

The most likely 5-year scenario is this: by 2031, Aesthetic.Computer is a recognized but niche creative computing environment with:

- **5,000–10,000 registered users**, up from 2,812, driven by notepat virality, conference demos, and classroom deployments
- **A bare-metal OS** deployed on 100–500 surplus machines across 5–15 sites (schools, community centers, artist residencies, workshops)

- **3–5 published papers** in peer-reviewed venues, establishing a minimal scholarly footprint
- **50,000+ KidLisp programs**, with a small but active generative art community minting keeps on Tezos
- **Ensemble performances** at 2–3 festivals or conferences, using fleets of surplus laptops as distributed instruments
- **A single maintainer** still writing most of the code, with AI-assisted maintenance handling an increasing share of routine work

This is not the most ambitious outcome, nor the most conservative. It is the outcome consistent with a project that has made specific, deliberate choices about what it cares about—depth over breadth, instruments over IDEs, maintenance over disruption—and that has the infrastructure to follow through on those choices at the pace a solo developer can sustain.

10. What Could Change Everything

Projections based on momentum are reliable precisely because they ignore discontinuities. Four wildcards could alter the trajectory entirely:

10.1 An Institutional Home

If @jeffrey takes a teaching position at an art school or research university, Aesthetic.Computer gains something it currently lacks: students. A cohort of 15–30 students using Aesthetic.Computer as their primary creative computing environment for a semester would produce more pieces, more bug reports, more use cases, and more scholarship than a decade of solo development. The CalArts paper’s argument—that art school is an operating system—works in reverse: the operating system could become a school.

10.2 A Viral Moment

notepat was posted to Hacker News and received attention. A second viral moment—a TikTok of a classroom full of surplus laptops playing music

together, a tweet thread about the \$50 creative instrument, a conference demo that gets filmed and shared—could bring thousands of users in a week. The infrastructure (URL-addressable pieces, instant registration, social features) is designed to absorb this. Whether @jeffrey *wants* to absorb it is a separate question. The project’s anti-platform stance [Fisher, 2009] suggests ambivalence about growth-for-growth’s-sake.

10.3 AI as Collaborator

The AestheticAnts system already uses AI for routine maintenance. The agent memory system logs interactions and maintains continuity across conversations. If AI capabilities continue to advance, a future version of this system could do more than maintenance: it could write pieces, generate KidLisp programs, compose ensemble scores, and draft papers. The solo-author risk (§8) diminishes if the “solo author” is augmented by an AI collaborator that understands the project’s history, philosophy, and codebase.

This is not speculative in the way the other scenarios are. It is already happening. The question

is one of degree: by 2031, does AI handle 10% of the creative work, or 50%? The answer will depend on choices @jeffrey makes about what he delegates and what he insists on doing himself. The project's emphasis on personal voice, on the "PSYCHO" papers that bear the author's temperature, suggests that the most important work will remain human. The infrastructure around it may not.

10.4 What If He Stops

The projections above assume continued effort. But the 94-project history (§2) contains a pattern that must be named: @jeffrey has walked away from things before. No Paint had five incarnations. Each one was abandoned, not because the idea failed, but because the implementation calcified—because the gap between what the tool *was* and what it *should be* grew intolerable. The restarts were not failures of commitment. They were expressions of it.

The risk for Aesthetic.Computer is not that @jeffrey loses interest. Fifteen years of circling the same problems rules out casual abandonment.

The risk is *structural exhaustion*: the accumulation of operational weight—server bills, user support, hardware testing, paper submissions, grant applications, dependency updates—until the maintenance load crowds out the creative work that makes the project worth maintaining. Ukeles [Ukeles, 1969] argued that maintenance is art, but even Ukeles acknowledged that maintenance without recognition becomes invisible labor.

Three scenarios for cessation deserve consideration:

1. **The quiet fade:** development slows to sporadic commits, the servers stay up but the community drifts, and Aesthetic.Computer joins the long list of ambitious personal tools that exist as archives rather than living systems. This is the most common outcome for solo-authored creative computing projects. It is not dramatic. It is the default.
2. **The deliberate stop:** @jeffrey declares the project complete at some natural boundary—perhaps when the OS boots reliably on a dozen laptop models, or when the paper count

reaches a round number, or when the 100th piece is published by someone other than him. He returns to painting on canvas (the Venice Family Clinic exhibition in May 2026 suggests this thread is already active). The code remains open. Someone may fork it. Most likely, no one does.

- 3. The 95th restart:** @jeffrey walks away from Aesthetic.Computer to build its successor. This is the pattern the history predicts most strongly. No Paint became Aesthetic.Computer. Aesthetic.Computer could become something else—something that absorbs the lessons of the OS, the piece model, the ensemble networking, and the 3D rasterizer, but sheds the accumulated infrastructure weight. The new project starts clean, in a single file, and the cycle begins again. From the outside, this looks like failure. From inside the 94-project lineage, it looks like the process working exactly as designed.

The honest assessment: scenario 3 is unlikely within 5 years because Aesthetic.Computer has achieved escape velocity in ways No Paint never

did—a registered user base, a bare-metal OS, a blockchain integration, 19 papers, a language with 16,000+ programs. The sunk cost is too high for a clean restart. But scenario 1 is entirely possible if the sustainability question (§8) goes unanswered. A project this ambitious, maintained by one person without stable funding, is always one bad year away from the quiet fade.

The mitigation is the same one that has sustained the project so far: making the work itself rewarding enough that the operational burden is tolerable. The papers, the performances, the 3D rasterizer written from scratch, the bare-metal boot that takes 7 seconds—these are not features on a roadmap. They are the creative practice. If the practice stops being interesting, the project stops. If it stays interesting, the project survives anything short of the lights going out.

11. Conclusion

Aesthetic Computer is a project that knows what it is. It is not searching for product-market fit, pivoting toward enterprise, or optimizing for growth metrics. It is a personal creative computing instrument being built in public by a single person who has been making versions of it for more than a decade across 94 predecessor projects.

The next five years will be shaped by forces both internal (the pace @jeffrey can sustain, the funding he can secure) and external (240 million surplus PCs, the generative art economy, the academic conference cycle). The project's infrastructure—bare-metal OS, paper mill, piece model, social network, blockchain minting—is built to absorb these forces. Whether it will is a question of stamina, luck, and the willingness of the world to care about creative computing tools that are not owned by a platform.

Nelson wrote in 1974 that “you can and must understand computers NOW” [Nelson, 1974]. Illich wrote in 1973 that tools should expand personal

autonomy, not require institutional mediation [Ilich, 1973]. Ukeles wrote in 1969 that maintenance is art [Ukeles, 1969]. Aesthetic.Computer is the synthesis: a tool that is personal, convivial, and maintained as a creative practice. The bet is that this synthesis, applied to surplus hardware and sustained over time, creates something that lasts.

Whether it does is the only interesting question. This paper offers no answer, only a reading of the forces in play. The code will decide.

ORCID: 0009-0007-4460-4913

References

Samuel Aaron. Sonic pi – performance in education, technology and art. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Live Coding*, 2016.

Mark Fisher. *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* 2009.

Ivan Illich. *Tools for Conviviality*. Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

@jeffrey. Aesthetic computer '26: A mobile-first runtime for creative computing, 2026a. Companion paper describing the AC platform.

@jeffrey. Repository archaeology: Tracing aesthetic computer through 94 predecessor projects, 2026b. Companion paper on the project's software lineage.

@jeffrey. Five goodiepalian threads through aesthetic computer, 2026c. Companion paper on Goodiepal's influence on AC's design philosophy.

@jeffrey. Kidlisp '26: A minimal lisp for generative art, 2026d. Companion paper describing the KidLisp language.

@jeffrey. notepat.com: From keyboard toy to system front door, 2026e. Companion paper on the political economy of a single piece.

@jeffrey. Ac native os '26: A bare-metal creative computing operating system, 2026f. Companion paper describing the bare-metal OS.

@jeffrey. Pieces not programs: The piece as a unit of creative cognition, 2026g. Companion paper on the piece model.

@jeffrey. Plorking the planet: From laptop orchestra to planetary organ, 2026h. Companion paper on laptop orchestras at planetary scale.

Kenneth L. Kraemer, Jason Dedrick, and Prakul Sharma. One laptop per child: Vision vs. reality. In *Communications of the ACM*, volume 52, pages 66–73. ACM, 2009.

Theodor H. Nelson. *Computer Lib / Dream Machines*. Self-published, 1974. Revised edition, Microsoft Press, 1987.

Seymour Papert. *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful Ideas*. Basic Books, New York, 1980.

Casey Reas and Ben Fry. *Processing: A Programming Handbook for Visual Designers and Artists*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2007.

Mitchel Resnick, John Maloney, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Natalie Rusk, Evelyn Eastmond, Karen Brennan, Amon Millner, Eric Rosenbaum, Jay Silver, Brian Silverman, and Yasmin Kafai. Scratch: Programming for all. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(11):60–67, 2009.

Ivan E. Sutherland. A head-mounted three dimensional display. *Proceedings of the AFIPS Fall Joint Computer Conference*, 33:757–764, 1968.

Dan Trueman, Perry Cook, Scott Smallwood, and Ge Wang. Plork: The princeton laptop orchestra, year 1. 2006.

Thomas Turino. *Music as Social Life: The Pol-*

itics of Participation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2008.

Mierle Laderman Ukeles. Manifesto for maintenance art 1969! 1969. Proposal for an exhibition “Care”.

United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). The global e-waste monitor 2024, 2024. URL <https://ewastemonitor.info/>.