

1617

Dear Superintendent Lawsky and General Counsel Syracuse,

I'm writing you today to express concerns about the "BitLicense" proposal. I am, however, modifying the message provided to me by EFF.org, as my concerns are not precisely aligned with what seem to be the more common ones.

I am, you see, in favor of intensive government surveillance on principle, something that seems to be rare in the United States, and I experienced doubts similar to those I fought through to write this letter regarding the PRISM affair. Indeed, in my internal debate, the question of whether this would actually have an impact on illegal businesses was mostly sidelined in favor of the argument of principle versus practicality. My issue is that, while I think that intensive government surveillance is a good thing that can be perverted (rather than something that is intrinsically bad), I do not have a great deal of faith in the current American government, nor do the current social, political, and economic trends seem to me to indicate that things will get better any time soon. If anything, while there are improvements being made in some areas, the majority seem to be getting worse.

I also note that this would not even be direct government surveillance; the government would instead be requiring third-party companies to collect and store the data, which is both troubling to me on its own and an example of one of the many sorts of decisions that make me hesitant to trust the government with this power.

With these objections already listed, others start to gain weight. This likely would, as the letter with which I was provided says, reduce innovation to some degree, and, given what seem to be the prevailing attitudes, it would likely further reduce the confidence of the majority of the American people in their government. I am also concerned about the efficacy of this measure in combating the money laundering that appears to be its objective, but I do not currently consider myself qualified to make an informed decision on that; as the rest of the influences on my decision are already sufficient to keep it on the side it is even if this was 100% efficient where its stated objective was concerned, however, I do not think that further research would be a good use of my resources at this time.

In short, while I may have taken an usual route to get here, I have eventually found that I am joining those in opposition to this program.

O. Hinds