

Ethereum vs Bitcoin vs Sanctions

Ethereum is far more suited for individual empowerment under draconian nation-state attempts for censorship than any other ecosystem.

Where Bitcoin allows you to 'put some BTC in your pocket' and escape the ire of a nation state, Ethereum allows you to do the same, while still being able to access the most limitless financial ecosystem the world has ever created: DeFi.

Bitcoiners often see a few of Ethereum's chinks in the armor; how Metamask defaults to Infura, the larger state size of an Ethereum node, and they extrapolate it into hyperbole and use this as narrative as to why the simplicity of Bitcoin is good.

Bitcoin does not "shine" during times of Nation-State ire. By not even making on-chain native financial applications possible, Bitcoin waves the white flag of providing self-sovereign finance in a trustless way, and gives it straight to the centralized institutions who are forced to bend the knee to those with a monopoly on physical power.

The absence of native DeFi allows Bitcoiners to sneakily critique all of Ethereum chinks in the armor that comes with actually taking the hard route of providing native DeFi. Akin to a cheeto-dust fingered couch potato critiquing the landing of an pro-sports athlete. Sure, they didn't stick the landing, but they did 3 backflips and a 720 twist.

For some reason, Bitcoiners settle for financial services using centralized providers like exchanges, or lenders like Blockfi. The financialization of BTC comes from centralized service providers. Bitcoin shouldn't be getting props because it doesn't even try to offer DeFi; that's not a solution, that's a cop-out. And it's not a 'pro' argument for bitcoin just because it succeeds at not trying.

If you want to recreate the same old financial system that we already have, you can simply make a new money (BTC) and inject it into the current centralized set of financial service providers that largely control credit and operate with fractional lending that we've already had before. New boss, same as the old boss.

Critique on how Ethereum is centralized around Infura is a fantastic example on how critiques on Ethereum are uninformed. Metamask is a client-side wallet that simply defaults to using Infura out of the box. It has no meaningful connection to Infura beyond that it is the default setting. There are many Infura alternatives both inside the US and out, if users would like to continue to choose a centralized node provider to relay their transactions. If users want to opt out of centralized node providers, there are resources for community or project run nodes they can access as well, like the ones on [Ethereumnodes.com](https://ethereumnodes.com). They can also run their own node, of which the difficulty of operation has begun to approach the difficulty of running a Bitcoin node. And all of this is before light-client support has been rolled out, something that the average Bitcoiner isn't even aware of.

Strike, the 'lightning enabled wallet' (which is really just a custodial wallet with a centralized, trusted lightning integration) has to answer to the same OFAC list that any other Ethereum service provider has to.