

BSVA: Let the Builders Compete

BRC-234 and the campaign to steer Bitcoin toward BRC-100

Political commentary | 21 October 2026 | @BitcoinSvGuide

Just one year after Teranode opened the door to new possibilities, Bitcoin still needs builders free to explore them. It does not need one competing architect organizing a timetable for making other builders' work harder to use. We are barely into this new chapter, and already being asked to decide which approaches should be left behind.

1 Builders are working and users are worried

Barely a year after Teranode's public release, BSV developers are doing what we hoped they would: experimenting, improving wallets and finding new ways forward. [1]

That should be a moment of opportunity. Instead, users hear that familiar wallets are headed for failure. Independent developers must defend their work against blanket claims. Now **Ty Everett (aka @ProjectBabbage on X)**, one of the architects promoting BRC-100, proposes a shared timetable for narrowing the free services those wallets use. [2, 3]

Imagine being one of those builders. You spend months improving a wallet people depend on. Before anyone produces a fair comparison of what your latest version can do, a competing architect is proposing that providers organize a retreat from arrangements supporting your approach.

How is that supposed to encourage innovation?

The work is real. ElectrumSVP has improved payment-proof handling and verification. PiWalletSV is developing air-gapped signing. MrBen (Palmer) has announced Tabellarius, a radio P2P payment project. Its technical architecture remains unverified, but the ambition illustrates why experimentation matters: builders are exploring uses beyond another phone wallet. None of these examples settles the scaling debate. [4, 5, 7]

BRC-100 deserves that opportunity too. Its developers should build it, test it and make it attractive. But believing in your own architecture does not entitle you to organize the ecosystem around the presumed failure of everyone else's.

The objection is not that Ty has a preferred solution. It is that he is proposing pressure on people who prefer something else.

Index

Section	Page
1 Builders are working and users are worried	1
2 A retirement policy is not a performance test	2
3 Who appointed the retirement committee	2
4 The damage starts before the restrictions	3
5 Give the builders their chance	3
Sources and a note on the argument	4

2 A retirement policy is not a performance test

Our earlier report, *BRC-100: Show Us the Scale*, asked a plain question: where are the comparative tests? Show which wallets fail under heavy network traffic, and show the recommended replacements meeting the same demands. [2]

I have not seen Ty publicly answer those questions. Instead we get BRC-234, which supplies no such comparison. It simply changes the subject from what competing wallets can achieve to which services should remain freely available to them. Same negative direction; different tactic.

Ty describes his proposal as a way to retire reliance on free full-chain scanning and indexing. The text is blunter about the later stages: "**Later stages are intentionally impractical for ordinary legacy use**". [3]

Read that again. Impracticality is an intended outcome of the proposed free-service rules. It is not a failure discovered by testing a competing wallet.

An indexer helps your wallet find payments and reconstruct records. BRC-234 asks participating providers to progressively narrow their guaranteed free coverage using increasingly restrictive address and transaction-identifier patterns. Ordinary users may eventually need different services, more retained records, payment for broader access or changes to their software. [3]

If providers deliberately narrow support and users then struggle, nobody should call that proof their wallets could never have scaled. The conditions would have been changed around them.

3 Who appointed the retirement committee

Nobody owes anyone unlimited free indexing. Servers cost money. Providers can charge, limit usage, seek sponsorship or decide a service no longer makes commercial sense.

Patience and financial backing have helped major BSV businesses develop. TAAL disclosed converting C\$27.8 million of Ayre-held debt and interest into equity in 2020; Ayre acquired the remaining shares in 2022. CoinGeek itself reports that Ayre funded the launch of the Bitcoin Association. [8]

Salaries, test networks and global events require real funding. BSV's development has benefited from capital committed to future adoption. Small developers deserve room to build toward that future too.

Calvin Ayre gets to choose what he funds. It is his money. **Ty isn't Calvin Ayre. He is another developer.** Promoting his own architecture is his right. Organizing restrictions intended to make competing approaches impractical is an attempt to hamstring the competition.

Why do major infrastructure projects get investment and time to develop, while competing wallets get a retirement schedule for supporting services? Investment and free indexing are different arrangements. That does not justify coordinating restrictions against competing approaches.

This is political: an attempt to organize the ecosystem around a preferred direction while the engineering contest is still open.

BRC-234 does not require BRC-100. Paid indexing and broader free services remain possible. But users can reasonably see an indirect continuation of the same campaign: first question whether their wallets have a future, then propose a policy that makes familiar support harder to rely upon.

That looks like fear-based marketing advancing from another direction. Sincere belief in a cause does not erase the pressure on competing builders.

4 The damage starts before the restrictions

I've been in Bitcoin since 2013. I've watched arguments harden into camps, and camps turn into wars and forks. I hate seeing wallet choices become another dividing line in BSV.

For an ordinary user, the fear is personal. Will the wallet I understand keep working? Can I recover my savings? Am I being warned about a demonstrated problem, or pushed toward somebody else's preferred product?

For a builder, the uncertainty hits months of work. Why improve an existing design if influential voices keep presenting it as something the ecosystem should abandon? Why put scarce time into engineering when another retirement argument demands attention?

This is how innovation can be stifled without banning a line of code. Confidence drains away. Builders spend energy defending their legitimacy. Users stop knowing whom to trust.

The hostility is already visible. After CryptoRebel submitted a concrete security-hardening proposal for BSV Desktop, @SendBSV's reply in the accompanying discussion read: **"b Blocked for malicious behavior"**. That remark is not evidence that Ty ordered a block. It is an example of the factional atmosphere surrounding legitimate technical scrutiny. [6]

A community this small cannot afford to make independent builders feel like enemies for choosing another approach.

5 Give the builders their chance

The proposal's own timescale makes the presumption harder to accept. Its first calendar gate is six months after block 1,000,000; its final gate is six and a half years afterward, with transaction-volume conditions and further activation rules. [3]

That leaves room for inventions nobody has made yet. Better indexers. Different funding models. Wallets combining familiar address payments with newer verification and delivery methods. Why organize a retreat before seeing what those builders accomplish?

If failure is imminent, show the evidence and explain how this schedule addresses it. If developers have years to adapt, stop speaking as though their failure is settled.

Ty is free to persuade people that BRC-100 is the best choice. Providers are free to decide what they can afford. Users and independent developers are equally entitled to reject the idea that Bitcoin needs a coordinated path away from their existing arrangements.

Teranode was supposed to expand what we could build. A year later, we should be opening possibilities, not organizing whose approach gets left behind.

Prove your ideas deserve adoption. Give competing builders room to innovate instead of coordinating restrictions that make their existing designs harder to use.

Bitcoin needs their ingenuity, not a timetable for pushing them aside.

Sources and a note on the argument

BRC-234 asks service providers to reduce the blockchain information they promise to make available free of charge. Providers would choose whether to follow it, and they could still offer broader services, free or paid. It does not change Bitcoin's rules or require anyone to use BRC-100. **The concern is that widespread adoption could make competing wallets harder or more expensive to use, pushing users toward a preferred architecture.**

The restrictions would arrive in stages over several years, depending on both time and network activity. The schedule runs from Bitcoin block 1,000,000, rather than the proposal's publication date. We have not established that providers have adopted it. This paper warns about the consequences if they do. [3]

Calling this political pressure is our interpretation of Ty's public statements and proposal. He may sincerely believe his approach is best for Bitcoin. **We are arguing that trying to make competing approaches harder to use is the wrong way to win adoption.** Readers can examine the sources below and judge that argument for themselves.

[1] BSV Association, 14 October 2025. [Teranode first public release announcement](#). Release is distinct from full network deployment.

[2] BitcoinSvGuide, *BRC-100: Show Us the Scale*, seven-page edition, 18 October 2026. [Report collection](#). Includes @LightBSV's public challenge to alternative wallets and the distinction between node and wallet benchmarks. That speaker's claims and Ty's proposal are separate acts.

[3] Ty Everett, [BRC-234 PR #348](#), open and unmerged when reviewed on 21 October 2026. [Pinned proposal](#), particularly its user-impact overview, rationale, timetable and consumer safeguards. Later revisions may change the terms analyzed here.

[4] ElectrumSVP, 17 September 2026. [Release v0.2.0](#). Local proof reuse applies when the required data is available; these improvements are not proof of million-TPS performance.

[5] PiWalletSV, [project documentation](#). The offline signer uses an online companion and retains backend dependencies; its design does not establish hyperscale indexing performance.

[6] TruthMachine, 20 October 2026, [BSV Desktop PR #135](#), and the publisher's supplied screenshot of @SendBSV's response. Inspection and mocked fetching confirmed missing internal-destination restrictions in the original handler, not a complete remote exploit or theft. The screenshot does not verify account-block state or coordinated blocking. [bWalletX's response](#) separately demonstrates constructive engagement with the report.

[7] MrBen (Palmer), @71Nous, Tabellarius announcement supplied by the publisher and [reproduced publicly](#). No code or technical documentation was located establishing its BRC-100 status, indexing dependencies or exposure to BRC-234. It is an example of announced experimentation, not a demonstrated victim of the proposal.

[8] TAAL, [debt conversion announcement](#), 1 May 2020; [completed acquisition announcement](#), 22 December 2022. CoinGeek's [8 July 2022 release](#) states that Ayre funded the Bitcoin Association's launch. These establish historical backing, not the Association's current funding breakdown, mining profitability or an obligation to subsidize indexing. The paper does not attribute specific current salaries, testnet bills or event costs to Ayre.

