



Paying for Strangers

An unmetered inference endpoint, the handle that closed it, and what a day of it costs

The payment rail was never the problem. Knowing who was asking was.

@jeffrey

Aesthetic.Computer — September 11, 2026

ORCID: 0009-0007-4460-4913

<https://aesthetic.computer>

Abstract. A companion report asked whether an art archive could sell itself to language-model agents and answered, after building the turnstile, mostly no [Scudder, 2026b]. Its strategy table left one option scored *untested*: sell to handles rather than to crawlers. This report takes up that option and finds that Aesthetic.Computer had been running the product already, for free, without noticing. `/api/ask` proxies Anthropic and OpenAI on Aesthetic.Computer’s own keys and backs four shipping features; its entire authorization was a three-entry CORS origin allowlist, which is a browser convention and not a check. The model was selected by a caller-supplied `hint` field, so there was no ceiling on what a stranger could spend per request, only on how many tokens came back. A sibling endpoint, `/run`, accepted unauthenticated writes to any live code channel, making the channel name itself the credential. Both were closed in a day. Authorization now resolves an `@handle` through the existing identity path; anonymous callers are clamped to the cheapest model and 512 tokens rather than refused, because a free tier that becomes an outage is a worse product than no free tier; and a handle receives a daily token budget that degrades to the anonymous tier on exhaustion rather than closing the door. We report production measurements from the deployed system, and settle by experiment the question a prior cost analysis could only pose: OpenRouter’s per-key dollar limit is a hard server-side stop, returning HTTP 403, and it fires *early* — the refusal arrived while the readable counter still showed 39.6% of the cap remaining, because that counter is eventually consistent. For a cap whose purpose is bounding a bill, erring early is the correct direction. We close with what the episode suggests about failures that are invisible because nothing is broken.

1. INTRODUCTION

A recurring question in this practice is where cultural value, once accumulated, can be captured. A companion report put that question to language-model agents: the Whistlegraph archive was fitted with an x402 paywall, priced, and advertised to crawlers [Scudder, 2026b]. The answer was a negative result. Two of the three priced endpoints computed their answers from files the same site published for free, so a rational agent never paid; and across retained logs, no agent ever asked. That report concluded that the binding constraints on machine commerce are substitutability and discovery, not payment infrastructure, and scored six strategies against those constraints. One, *agent handles*, passed non-substitutability and was marked *untested*.

This report tests the adjacent case. The buyer is not a crawler but a person holding an `@handle`, and the good is not derived data but inference. The finding is that the experiment had already been running. Aesthetic.Computer has been buying language-model inference for anonymous strangers since the feature shipped, through an endpoint nobody thought of as a product because it had never been priced, metered, or gated.

Section 2 describes the surface. Section 3 is the audit. Section 4 describes what replaced it, and Section 5 how. Section 6 reports measurements from production, including an experiment that settles a question a prior cost analysis could only pose. Section 7 states what this does not establish.

2. CONTEXT

Aesthetic.Computer is a mobile-first runtime and social network for creative computing, in which programs are addressable *pieces* [Scudder, 2026a] and identity is an `@handle` resolved through Auth0 against a MongoDB collection. Four shipping features call language models: `make` and `paint`, which generate pieces from a described intent; `translate`; and the prompt system itself. All four route through one client module, `lib/ask.mjs`, to one backend function, `/api/ask`.

That function is 616 lines and proxies two vendors — `api.anthropic.com` and `api.openai.com` — using API keys held in Aesthetic.Computer’s production environment. It is, in every respect except that nobody called it one, a hosted AI service with a free and unlimited tier.

3. THE AUDIT

Three defects were found, in ascending order of consequence.

3.1 An origin header is not a credential

The whole of `/api/ask`’s authorization was:

```
if (!dev && !allowedOrigins.includes(origin))
  return { statusCode: 403 };
```

against a three-entry allowlist. The `Origin` header is a browser convention: browsers set it honestly and refuse to let page scripts forge it, which is what makes CORS useful *to browsers* [WHATWG, 2026]. Nothing else is obliged to participate. Any client that is not a browser — `curl`, a script, a crawler — simply sends the string. The control was doing real work against the threat it was designed for, cross-origin reads by a page, and no work at all against the one that mattered here, which is cost.

3.2 The caller chose the model

More consequential, and less visible. The model was parsed out of a caller-supplied `hint` field. A request could name any model the proxy would forward, including the most expensive available. The only ceiling in the code was `max_tokens`, which bounds the response but not the price of producing it. An anonymous caller could therefore select Aesthetic.Computer’s cost per request, and the difference between the cheapest and dearest model on offer is roughly a factor of thirty.

3.3 A channel name as a credential

A sibling endpoint, `/run`, accepted `{piece, source, codeChannel}` and published the source to a Redis channel, from which any subscribed browser would execute it. It required no authentication and set `Access-Control-Allow-Origin: *`. Its protection was that channel names were unguessable: eight `base64url` characters, minted client-side, and documented in the source as “a shared secret... make it unguessable.”

This is a defensible design until the moment something needs to *publish* the channel name — which is exactly what a live-coding session wants to do, so that a phone can scan a code and watch the piece being written. Secrecy and addressability are incompatible requirements on the same string.

4. SYSTEM

The replacement rests on one move: ownership migrates from the secrecy of a name to the possession of a token.

Request to <code>/run</code>	Response
No credentials	410 Gone
Invalid token	401
@jeffrey → jeffrey/...	200
@jeffrey → someoneelse/...	403

Table 1: Observed responses from the deployed endpoint. Anonymous requests answer 410 rather than 401 because the condition is expected to be permanent [Fielding et al., 2022]: there is no way to retry the request as written.




Figure 1: How a request to `/api/ask` is priced. The two ways of not qualifying — no identity, and an identity that has spent its day — arrive at the same place, and that convergence is the design rather than an economy of implementation. Neither is a refusal: the feature answers in both cases, more cheaply. A budget that becomes an outage would be worse than no budget.

4.1 Ownership is a check, not a secret

A code channel is now written `<handle>/<slug>`. A push to it is accepted only when the request carries an access token resolving to that handle, verified through the same `authorize()` path other authenticated endpoints already use. The name no longer needs to hide, so it can be published — and since it can be published, it can be the piece’s public address as well.

Table 1 gives the resulting behaviour, measured against production.

4.2 A tier, not a wall

For `/api/ask` the design question is different. Refusing anonymous callers would be cheapest and would also break the front page for anyone who has never logged in, which is most first visitors to a creative tool. So anonymous traffic is not refused; it is *clamped*, to the cheapest model and 512 tokens, regardless of what `hint` requests (Figure 1). The demo still demos. It costs roughly a tenth of what it did.

A request carrying a valid token reaches the model it asked for. That is the first thing a handle buys, and it is a concrete answer to the strategy the prior report left

untested: the good sold is not data, which an agent can recompute, but access priced by identity.

4.3 A day, not a balance

Each handle receives a token budget per UTC day. The bucket is a day rather than a month because a monthly pool can be drained in an afternoon, leaving the tool dead for three weeks — the worst possible shape for someone who opened an editor to make something. A day resets: the bad outcome is “come back tomorrow,” and exposure is bounded at roughly thirty times a day’s spend.

Exhaustion degrades rather than refuses. A handle over budget is served exactly as a visitor is. Every failure in the system leans the same way deliberately: a budget lookup that errors reads as *unspent*, and the usage write is fire-and-forget after the response is already delivered. Over-serving through a database blip is recoverable; losing a user’s reply to an accounting race is not.

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Three notes on implementation that cost time and may cost someone else time.

Module systems. The gate was first added to `/api/ask` as a static ESM `import` at the top of a file whose first line is `require("@netlify/functions")`. Mixing the two does not raise: the module fails to load, and the host answers 404 `Function not found`. Four shipping features went silent without an error anywhere. A dynamic `import()` inside the handler is legal in CommonJS and resolves the same module.

Client identity. Conversation, the client-side wrapper, is constructed in five places with only a store and a slug, and had no route to a token. Rather than thread one through every caller, a module-level provider is installed once at boot and resolves the token at call time, so signing in or out is reflected on the next request with no cache to invalidate. A missing token is not an error; it is the anonymous path.

A file that could not be searched. `disk.mjs`, the 17,000-line client core, contained a literal NUL byte used as a cache-key separator. This is legal JavaScript. It also causes `file` to report the source as `data` and every `grep` over it to match nothing — silently, with no error and no warning. Four searches for the channel-subscription code returned empty before the cause was found, and the provisional conclusion that the feature had been deleted was wrong. The byte is now written `\0`, which is the same string.

6. EVIDENCE

All measurements are from the deployed production system on 11 September 2026.

Call	HTTP	Reported usage	Remaining
1	200	\$0	\$0.000500
2	200	\$0	\$0.000500
3	200	\$0.0003021	\$0.000198
4	200	\$0.0003021	\$0.000198
5	403	\$0.0003021	\$0.000198

Table 2: Spending past a \$0.0005 per-key cap. The refusal (“*Key limit exceeded (total limit)*”) arrives while the readable counter still reports 39.6% of the cap available, because that counter is eventually consistent — note it is unchanged across calls 3–5.

6.1 Tier selection

The endpoint logs its decision. Anonymous requests naming an expensive model are rewritten; authenticated requests are not, and carry the remaining budget:

```
Anonymous --- gpt-4o → gpt-4o-mini
@jeffrey --- gpt-4o · 25000/25000 left
@jeffrey --- gpt-4o · 24988/25000 left
@jeffrey --- gpt-4o · 24975/25000 left
```

The decrement is real usage reported by the provider, not an estimate. Both vendor paths already parsed token counts in order to draw a progress bar in the server log; the accounting reuses those numbers, so neither path had to learn anything new.

6.2 Addressing costs a QR version

Because the channel name became publishable, the scanned address could become the piece’s published URL rather than a throwaway route. The cost is measurable. At error-correction level L, a version-2 symbol holds 32 bytes in byte mode [ISO/IEC, 2015]. `https://prompt.ac/~1_mUYjNq` is 27 and fits; `https://prompt.ac/@jeffrey/murafi` is 33 and does not, promoting the symbol from 25×25 modules to 29×29. One byte over. The gain is an address that outlives the session.

6.3 The per-key limit is a hard stop

A prior cost analysis proposed minting a dollar-capped OpenRouter key per handle, but could not establish whether limit is enforced or merely recorded — the documentation exposes `limit_remaining` and never states what happens to a request that would exceed it [OpenRouter, 2026]. The distinction decides whether a runaway user is stopped or merely observed.

We minted a key capped at \$0.0005 and spent past it. Table 2 gives the run.

Two findings follow. The limit is a genuine server-side stop, returning HTTP 403. And enforcement runs *ahead* of the number a client can read: the refusal fired while `limit_remaining` still showed \$0.000198, because the usage counter updates in jumps every three or four calls.

`limit_remaining` is therefore an observation and never a prediction. The discrepancy leans toward refusing early rather than overspending, which for a cap whose purpose is bounding a bill is the correct direction to be wrong in.

Two further claims were verified in passing. OpenRouter’s endpoint compatible with the Anthropic Messages API [Anthropic, 2026] returns a correctly shaped response including a `cost` field in dollars per call — which would permit metering in money rather than in estimated tokens, eliminating drift between a token budget and an actual bill as prices change. And the vendor CLI that the editor’s bridge already drives connects to OpenRouter given three environment variables and no code change, so an alternative backend is a configuration entry rather than a new protocol. The entire investigation cost \$0.086.

7. ETHICS, PRIVACY, AND LIMITATIONS

What this does not establish. We report the behaviour of one deployment over one day. The daily budget figure was chosen before usage data existed to choose it from, and is deliberately an environment variable rather than a constant; it should be set from the collected data and is not yet. We did not measure whether the anonymous tier’s cheaper model degrades the four features enough to matter to a first-time visitor, which is the central product risk of the clamp and wants a user study rather than a log line. Our own registered-handle count could not be verified for this report: the public endpoint returns a capped page of 100, and a figure of 2,814 obtained from another source is repeated here only as unverified.

Privacy. The gate reads an identity in order to price a request. It stores a token count and a model name per handle per day, and no prompt content. This is a real expansion of what is recorded about a user — previously nothing was — and it is the minimum that metering requires. Prompts continue to leave the machine to two vendors, which was true before this work and is disclosed in the interface.

Disclosure. This report describes defects in a system the author operates, both now closed, and names no third party’s vulnerability.

8. CONCLUSION

The prior report found that a turnstile for machines earns nothing when the good behind it is substitutable and undiscoverable. This one finds the complement: a turnstile that was never built, on a good that is neither — inference cannot be recomputed by the buyer, and the buyer was already standing at the door.

What made the omission durable is worth naming, because it is not carelessness. Every individual piece was reasonable. An origin allowlist is a real control against

a real threat. A caller-chosen model is a feature. An unguessable channel is a legitimate capability pattern. Nothing failed, no error was logged, no alarm existed to fire, and the endpoint answered every request correctly and promptly for as long as it existed. The system was not broken; it was working exactly as built, and what it was built to do included something nobody had decided.

A related failure sat one directory away during this work: the documentation promised that pushing a paper rebuilds its PDF within a minute, and that had not happened since May, because an emergency pause added by hand during an incident outlived its cause by four months. It was invisible for the same reason. The promise was in a document, the contradiction was a `false` in a JSON response nobody read, and the papers were never stale — because they were being built by hand, which is precisely what kept the automation’s absence from being noticed.

Both are the same class of defect: a gap between what a system is understood to do and what it does, held open by the absence of anything that would announce the difference. The gate is the cheap part. Knowing who is asking, and having somewhere that says so out loud, is the whole of it.

References

- Anthropic. Anthropic API: Messages. <https://docs.anthropic.com/>, 2026.
- Roy T. Fielding, Mark Nottingham, and Julian Reschke. HTTP semantics. RFC 9110, IETF, 2022. 410 Gone: the resource is deliberately unavailable and the condition is expected to be permanent.
- ISO/IEC. ISO/IEC 18004: Information technology — automatic identification and data capture techniques — QR code bar code symbology specification, 2015. Version 2 at level L holds 32 bytes in byte mode; version 3 holds 53.
- OpenRouter. OpenRouter API reference: Provisioning keys. <https://openrouter.ai/docs/>, 2026. Documents `limit` and `limit_remaining` per key; does not state what a request exceeding the limit does, which this report measures.
- Jeffrey Scudder. Pieces not programs: The piece as a versioned, performable unit of creative computing. *Aesthetic.Computer papers*, 2026a.
- Jeffrey Scudder. Turnstiles for machines: Instrumenting an art archive with x402, and the three defects found before it could take a dollar. *Aesthetic.Computer papers*, 2026b.
- WHATWG. Fetch standard: CORS protocol and the origin header. <https://fetch.spec.whatwg.org/>, 2026. Set by the user agent and not forgeable by page script; no guarantee for non-browser clients.