

Barefoot Innovation Podcast: Anders Brownworth, Co-Founder, and Bob Bench, CEO and Co-Founder, Radius

***Note that transcripts may sometimes contain errors and that transcript timing notations do not match the posted podcast**

- Jo Ann Barefoot: [00:01](#) I am really excited about today's show. I am in Boston at MIT, more or less. And my guests today are Anders Brownworth at Radius, co-founder of Radius, and Bob Bench, who is CEO and co-founder of Radius as well. I want to welcome you both.
- Anders Brownwor...: [00:25](#) Thank you.
- Jo Ann Barefoot: [00:27](#) Anders, you and I have known each other for a long time and Bob, we've crossed paths many times in the past. And I was really excited to have an opportunity to sit down and talk with you for this show. And maybe to illustrate why I'll just start by asking you to introduce yourselves and tell us about your backgrounds, because you both have really unique backgrounds. So Bob, let's start with you.
- Bob Bench: [00:47](#) Sure. So I'm the co-founder and CEO of Radius. We started this company in 2024. As a spin out of research we had done at the MIT Media Lab in the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. My training is I'm a bank examiner and regulatory lawyer by training and found myself working with Anders about eight years, more than eight years ago. I think almost 10 years ago at Circle when I was brought in to help lead some regulatory efforts for Jeremy and Anders was at that point a very old hand in blockchain technology, which is how we've been working together ever since.
- Anders Brownwor...: [01:25](#) Yeah. So Anders Brownworth, background is computer science software type stuff. And I suppose pertinent here is yes, I did meet Bob at Circle. I was one of the original employees at Circle early on and built a lot of the infrastructure sort of back there. Just before I left, I had a hand in building USDC, getting that out the door. And then, so that was the digital dollar on the internet. And Bob said, "Hey, now I'm over at the Federal Reserve. Do you want to come over and do the real digital dollar?" I'm like, "Yeah, sure. It sounds like a great idea." So I joined for the Hamilton project there.

[02:06](#) We worked several years together there with close coordination with MIT and the work going on there at the Digital Currency Initiative. And since then, both Bob and I have worked at the Digital Currency Initiative working in research and various things, but basically stablecoins and that kind of technology. We started Radius as something that came out of the work that we did at the Federal Reserve. And we've been here, as Bob has said, a couple of years working on really, really scaling to global scale, a transaction processor that operates in the millions of transactions per second, not the hundreds or thousands. So that's what we're on.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [02:55](#) That's fantastic. And I will just say, I lived in the neighborhood when Circle was in its old spot and did we call that Seaport or that neighborhood?

Anders Brownwor...: [03:06](#) Yeah. Yeah. Congress Street.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [03:08](#) Yeah. Used to walk past it all time, of course, knew the team back then. So it's really fun for me to be back in town. I was at Harvard for two years as a senior fellow. So tell us first a little bit more about what Radius is doing. Amplify on that and then we'll go deeper on what it all means.

Bob Bench: [03:29](#) Yeah. So through work at Circle, then later at the Fed, one thing that really stuck with us was that moving money on new types of networks was very compelling, primarily in the sense that money could move a lot faster, cheaper. This isn't new to anybody. And the question was, where are those upper bounds of that fast and cheap, to put it simply? And when we built... We're part of the team that built USDC, we sell on Ethereum for some fairly straightforward reasons. One of those was its developer community was large. It had smart contracts that were pretty well understood. And I'm just going to go into that detail if we want.

[04:11](#) At the Federal Reserve, we were hit with very different requirements than USDC, which was were Congress to ask the Federal Reserve in theory to build a central bank digital currency that operated on something like the open internet. You were really talking about every person not in China and North Korea having access to a digital dollar in their phone in theory and certain concentrated days of the year in which you might have billions of persons trying to push send out a payment at the same time. Call it Black Friday in the West, certain holidays when gifts are important. And so we really had to think from first principles of how do, at that point, I think we called it

around, we estimated by using actually WhatsApp as the amount of people on the free internet.

[04:56](#)

And so what does about 4.2 billion people need to push send at the same time? And at that point, Ethereum would not cut it. Solana would not cut it. There was nothing in what we'll call the public blockchain space that was going to solve that problem. So our time at the Federal Reserve was going back to that first principle of, if every human on the planet has access to a dollar on their phone, what network would you use to do it to transact in it, thinking about security and reliability and resiliency and performance. When that project ended, the great thing about the Federal Reserve was they enabled us to build all that work and the open source.

Jo Ann Barefoot:

[05:34](#)

Yeah. Great.

Bob Bench:

[05:34](#)

So that was incredible leadership from J. Powell down to say, "This is a public good and we're going to keep it a public good." And so when we ended our time at the Federal Reserve, we went back to MIT and kept working on that research, kept trying to understand if we're ultimately trying to make money move like data on the open internet, it needs to effectively be something like TCPIP, meaning it's linearly scales. And so the goal of Radius is quite literally to build linearly scalable money. And the use case for that is we think machines are going to be doing more of the work and you remove humans from the clicking and the sending, you're going to need a lot more performance and it should be a lot cheaper.

[06:15](#)

So that's what we're doing. We're not trying to do many things. The one thing we think about as our example is the filament by Edison. Edison, there was plenty of electricity around New York City at the time. There was generators, there was wires, but there was really no way to have interior illumination in any consistent way because they hadn't figured out the filament itself. I think of public blockchains as filaments that we've been trying over the last decade to try to see what's the filament that's going to enable linearly scalable money. We think we've got it right. We know of a lot of work to do, but we're really trying to build that filament or that network that enables linear scalable money.

Anders Brownwor...:

[06:54](#)

Yeah. The key in that is the fact that blockchains globally order all transactions and that actually is not necessary. You don't need to order every transaction amongst every other. The only thing that you actually need to order are the ones that conflict.

So we've built from first principles, from the ground up, a system that doesn't require global linear order. And because we do that, we can scale linearly. In other words, we want to go faster. All we do is we add more resources and then the whole system runs faster. It's a giant distributed system that's able to scale up pretty linearly. So yeah.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [07:37](#) So I want to dig deeper into a lot of these topics, but before we do that, can you just say a little bit more about where Radius is and its growth journey and what your business model is?

Bob Bench: [07:48](#) Sure. So we began, like I said, in very early 2024 with team members from that team at the Fed and then some folks from MIT. Most of us have been working together for somewhere around five to 10 years, building multiple products, including USDC and then Hamilton. And our goal there was to do the hard work early. We solved a very hard problem, which takes considerable amount of engineering. We're primarily an engineering shop that happens to have a former bank examiner in the founding group. And so the idea there was we wanted to get to our standards of scalability and reliability before we went public.

[08:28](#) We raised capital in late '23. We started the company in early '24. We got to Testnet of the company in summer of '25 and we launched Mainnet earlier this month. So we have a live network up right now working closely with Brale. Brale's best known as run by a gentleman named Ben Milne who founded Dwolla, which was really the first open internet payment system. We're backed by great VCs like Accomplice and Lightspeed. And the goal now is to focus on where we are seeing the emerging agentic payment use case for firms like Cloudflare and Akamai, who really are going to be the first line that monetizes the open internet. So that's where our focus is entirely for the next quarter.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [09:17](#) So you have said that we are going to need a payment system that goes from being able to serve billions of people to being able to serve a vastly large number of agents. So what is that going to take? What's the secret to that?

Anders Brownwor...: [09:35](#) Well, so I would argue that it takes a centralized network. A decentralized network, you end up paying for that. In every transaction that you make, you must pay the premium so that your transaction is replicated to many effectively disinterested nodes and replayed, et cetera. That's expensive. So in order to reach these scales, yet keep the cost way down. I mean, keeping

the cost way down is probably way more important than being able to scale to the hundreds of millions of transactions per second. Keeping the cost down is the gateway. That's the entrance. So really what we do is we excise all the things that are not absolutely required. And in this case, to reach real global scale with AI agents. They're probably not buying houses. They're not doing high value transactions. They're buying tiny bits of data for tenths of a penny.

[10:46](#)

Those kinds of transactions, you don't want the fee to take away all the value of the transaction. So we believe that lowering the fees to absolute the basement enables a whole new era or a whole new world of transactions, types of transactions, businesses, et cetera, that just don't make sense right now when everything has to go through a credit card with a 25 cent fee or whatever it happens to be. Yeah, that's a big one right there.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [11:20](#)

And Radius makes money. And what's the revenue model?

Anders Brownwor...: [11:23](#)

Similar to most networks. We make money by charging a fee on transactions. It's just that you can do many, many, many more transactions for a penny for us than you can with other networks.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [11:38](#)

So as our listeners try to get their heads around this, what else has to happen in the infrastructure to get from where we are today to what you're envisioning? And is it a kind of easy, inevitable journey, or is it going to take a whole lot of really hard things happening?

Anders Brownwor...: [12:04](#)

I would say it's easy and inevitable for an AI agent and it's not for normal rational humans. A normal rational human is used to using a bank account and a credit card, et cetera, et cetera. An AI cannot apply for a bank account or a credit card. So native internet money is the only choice for an AI agent. For us, we have to shift over to a, we'll call it a blockchain based or an on chain based financial life. So I think this is because of that, because that barrier is so low for an AI agent, has no history, it doesn't need to connect old things it did with new things. It's just starting from scratch. So that part is actually, I think, pretty easy and will become pretty explosive very quickly.

Bob Bench: [12:57](#)

I mean, if I think about the steps it takes, and you've been doing this for some time now, for a new technology to be applied to financial services or monetary systems. And then we had these conversations with the Fed. The really fun part about working at

the Federal Reserve was we came in there from Circle after creating the first US-based stablecoin with USDC, thinking that what we were doing was revolutionary. And the cool part of the Fed was you had people, for example, like our old Boss Jim Cunha, who's still advisor of this company now, or guys like Larry Sweet at the New York Fed, who had been changing how money works for decades. Particularly the generation of bankers at the Fed who have been through the late '60s, early '70s, when they really started digitalizing those money.

[13:48](#)

I remember my first day at the Fed, I had a meeting with Larry and Jim, and Larry's like, "Oh, this is just 1971 all over again." And it's not about revolution, it's about understanding what are the steps it takes to take an existing financial instrument and move it on a new database. So if we think about the big idea here, we have a database. We have a new database model. And the question is, well, what monetary instrument works in that database model? Well, what we did learn at the Federal Reserve and what we still believe is that borrowing the Federal Reserve making significant changes to its backend database infrastructure, you cannot move money at certain speeds using Federal Reserve money just because the settlement lag is pretty long in the core infrastructure. So the other alternative there is stablecoins. So the first step is do we have a monetary instrument that's trusted and regulated that can run in these networks?

[14:40](#)

Yes, they're called stablecoins. And with the Genius Act, they are now written into law. A lot of regulation needs to be written. A lot of work in Washington to do that, but we have an instrument that runs on these networks reliably. That's the first thing. And then we have to have a way for agents or persons to interact with these new networks. Well, you can do that with smart contracts and Andres was one of the authors of the USDC smart contracts. So that is a heavy focus for us right now is, can smart contracts work at a million transactions a second reliably. We're not sure. We have to work on that. And can those smart contracts interact with these agentic systems or these artificial intelligence systems? Well, fortunately you have some really smart folks that came out of Coinbase called Coinbase Developer Platform, namely this guy named Erik Reppel who built the x402 protocol, which is a way for machines to talk to systems to pay, spend in stablecoins. And Anders was earned early contributor to that.

[15:39](#)

Likewise, Stripe just built what they call the machine payments protocol, which is a similar type of protocol. So what you're

starting to get is stacked systems of infrastructure, moving a monetary instrument that's well regulated and recognized. And so we're getting there. Where we are not is that adoption curve of people getting comfortable or now machines getting comfortable with the trust that it needs to spend money. I think those are some of the bigger challenges here. And I also think there's just a general hump we need to get over that's being fixed, which is making stablecoins a standard instrument for day-to-day financial activity.

[16:20](#)

My thesis is until something is a standard instrument for payroll that goes into someone's direct deposit, it does not become a standard form of money. So my great-grandfather was paid in cash, my grandfather was paid in checks, my father was paid in checks in later direct deposit. I'm still paid in direct deposit. So as a CEO of a company and I want to run payroll, I have to take money from my money market account on Monday for it to show up in my Chase account on Wednesday to click send so everyone gets paid the next Monday. That is an absurd cycle of payment. I should be able to do payroll tomorrow at 4:59 PM, click send and it goes in there, everyone's wallet. So we have some adoption curve to solve, particularly on just general population adoption for stablecoins, but the infrastructure is very closely there.

Jo Ann Barefoot:

[17:11](#)

So are you saying that, if I'm following you, that we're going to need stablecoin adoption and acceptance and high functionality, widely used as the foundation for the agentic AI to do what you're talking about?

Bob Bench:

[17:35](#)

No, I think agents will use them naturally, but I do believe that there is a current gap in stablecoin adoption that most persons, because they don't receive payroll and stablecoins, which I think is generally speaking in more optimal form of their payroll. And you could tokenize deposits could do the same thing in theory. They're not seen, most Americans aren't comfortable with them, but I think machines will be comfortable with them fairly immediately, just because machines are not going to spend 30 cents per TX with Visa. So I just don't think it's going to happen.

Jo Ann Barefoot:

[18:05](#)

Yeah. I can't help noticing that you've twice now talked about machines getting comfortable. So trying to think that through. Talk more about the issues in designing or creating the types of agents that we need, including the questions of liability, who's going to... If something goes wrong in an agentic system, what happens?

Anders Brownwor...:

[18:35](#)

Well, I'm not the guy to answer the liability question. That's Bob. But what you do, this is what I do. I sit down in front of my computer, I bring up a coding agent and I say, "Let's write an application that is able to put an x402 challenge in front of, let's say I have a little PDF I want to sell on the internet." So I have it go try to figure out how to put that in front of this PDF and it ends up basically going out and spidering the web and figuring out, "Okay, I need to have some money here. How do I do that? I need to be able to challenge the user so that they pay before I give them the book, et cetera." It goes and figures those things out. So the trick for us is, all right, how do we write our docs in such a way that an LLM can understand it? And we are AI first here. So the whole point is like we need to write docs that a LLM can very quickly understand and pump out purposeful code, like useful code.

[19:46](#)

So that's what we've been focusing on and it's quite incredible. The jump literally in the last month on just that, understanding the landscape, being able to work with Radius, understand what's different about us than what you might get with a standard blockchain. All of these things have to be, you have to surface that. So we've done that and at this point now you can say, "Yeah, go ahead and build an app that does X, Y, or Z and use the Radius network and it will." That's been a fun little... It's like a... Back in the day you would do this Google SEO hack where you would figure out, how do I write my webpage such that it shows up as the first result in the organic Google results? The same thing is happening right now for AIs. How do I write my content so that it is understandable and becomes a featured thing that an LLM will return? That's been a fun little project.

Bob Bench:

[20:49](#)

Yeah. I mean, agentic search optimization is a really fun project. And so as owners put, you want to write all your documents to be agent first. So instead of having PDFs or docs, you have marked on files. But if you think about who's liable, and I guess I'm the lawyer here. So one is I'm a huge fan of Charlie Munger. Always figure out what you don't want to happen and just don't go there. And so the question is like, well, what's the bad thing that would happen with agents and micro transactions? And how do you control that? Or how do you make sure that doesn't happen? And then step back. So one is you don't want to lose your money. That'd be bad.

[21:26](#)

And so the first question when we were building this system was, well, can agents have private keys or not? The keys to your account. And we saw early on in the agentic space, people were losing money because they would give the private keys to their

wallet to an agent. And the thing about agents is there, you can convince them to give it up. And so thinking about what are the ways to make agentic commerce anti-fragile. So first off, agents don't get wallets. Wallets are usually held in a secret envelope somewhere in the file. Secondly is, well, you don't really want to give that wallet too much money. So when we were talking and building, this is actually a lesson from the CBDC world, which was the banks had strong concerns about deposit flight to CBDCs and now the same conversations are happening with stablecoins.

[22:16](#)

And so one was like, you can cap the size of a wallet. So when we were talking policy, obviously we were engineers, so we didn't have a policy role to feed. That's a big line. But they're asking, "Well, how do we not intermediate the banks with CBDC?" And our answer was, "Well, most Americans are extremely illiquid. Most Americans only have several thousand dollars of cash to their names." So if you just capped CBDC wallets at \$2,000 or \$3,000, you're really not just intermediating many banks in the United States. That's a very, very small amount of banks that depend upon that \$2,000 account. And so with agents, you think of it like in a little differently, which is, "Well, I don't want my money stolen in case AI tricks my agent for giving out."

[23:06](#)

So you can create agentic wallets that are capped at say \$20 because in our system, \$20, depending on how we structure our costs, can be 200 million transactions. So agents don't need more than \$20 to do potentially a year's worth of events for a single agent. So a lot of it is building in the systems that prevent the bad thing from happening so you don't go there. And this is more capable in our system because we are centralized. And I will say there is going to be a world of agent commerce that is much more focused on networks like Bitcoin and Zcash that are going to be less centralized, less efficient, but likely more open for considerable, broader use cases.

Jo Ann Barefoot:

[23:52](#)

Fascinating. I'm enjoying talking with you. Our audience can't see you, but you both smile as you describe what you're doing. I can see the excitement about it creating this. So you started to touch on it, Bob, both of you really have, but if we think about the risk and regulatory challenges, we have a lot of policy and regulatory people who listen to this show. What are the things that they need to understand and get right that are most important?

Bob Bench:

[24:31](#)

I think the single most important conversation for people who have spent most of the career around financial services regulatory policy in Washington is understanding to what role were the framers of the Bank Secrecy Act in the early 1970s thinking of what was in scope for transactional surveillance. When we think about what Radius does, we really see ourselves as internet infrastructure. And when we say internet infrastructure, there's a bunch of ways to solve for bad things not happening on the internet. And Anders can speak more, but these are things like spam protection or passwords or account data. Another really great way to solve for bad things happening on the internet is charge people for doing things. If it costs X amount of dollars or X amount of sense to get... If you go to a concert and that concert costs you \$10,000 and you're watching at Symphony Hall, you're probably going to behave yourself.

[25:33](#)

If the concert's free to go to, maybe the person does bad things because you don't care if you get kicked out. The internet's very similar. If you make the internet slightly expensive, but just too expensive for billions of bots to attack, it makes the internet a much better place, much more efficient place. And so when I think about the framers of the Bank Secrecy Act in Congress, the current model of the Bank Secrecy Act would be something around \$84,000 would be the threshold for transactional surveillance. Or the other way to put it is a brand new Cadillac. So a brand new top line Cadillac costs somewhere around \$84,000. And that was what Congress thought of when they said, "This is the level at which we should get into people's liberty."

[26:19](#)

And when we talk about Radius building native internet infrastructure that will charge maybe a tenth of a penny, is that within what the framers of Bank Secrecy Act thought? And then that is such a broad chasm. And I think if there's one question that I really think Washington, and I've worked for a regulatory consulting firm that made lots of money on that industry, and I had to be the chief compliance officer at Circle, managing that process. There needs to be a rationalization of that process. There should not be a, for example, like for example, for sanctions reasons, we can go into our systems and block countries that are comprehensively sanctioned, as is required by law.

[27:07](#)

But whether a tenth of a penny transaction, so an agent, an artificial intelligence model can review a photo of a shipping container in LA to understand, to run a trading model for a financial services company, is that a KYC up all event as the

framers of the Bank Secrecy Act contemplated when they put a \$10,000 limit in 1971. I think that is a single most important policy decision. And actually, I think Congress is starting to have this conversation. And I think those ... I've been practicing this... I was trained in this in 2005 at the OCC. You were one of the people that helped lead that agency. I think there's a very honest rationalization of that industry these days. And I think when you come to things like internet infrastructure, charging fractions of a penny, it may not be necessary to have the full suite that was contemplated in 1972 for a transaction that would buy a brand new Cadillac.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [28:04](#)

Is there risk that AI can take the fraction of a penny transactions and disguise bigger activity through that?

Anders Brownwor...: [28:16](#)

Yeah. So there are problems. Okay? So here's the way that I look at it, again, not the lawyer. So with that out there, I would argue that traditional finance doesn't necessarily know all of the things that you can do to constrain the problems that arise in a financial system, nor do people on the other side from the crypto world, have a respect for the 120 or however many long years have been put into stopping people from doing bad things with the financial system. So I think the two sides are not really facing each other. You're looking past each other. And the way to really fix this is for the two sides to be able to work together. Both need to learn from each other. It's pretty obvious that... Well, at least I think it's pretty obvious that design decisions made 50 years ago when money first became digital might not be the design decisions you make now, given the fast, always on, cheap computers, internet is always there, plus effectively the entire field of cryptography.

[29:37](#)

Those two things right there make your design decisions different today. And because if you built a system today from ground up to replace the technology that we have had for these many years, it would look probably a lot like the way cryptocurrencies look. So there are things to learn from that. However, people deploying a cryptocurrency might not respect the fact that, you know what, people do bad things with money and you do want to constrain them. So there are a lot of things. There's a rich design space there that I think is effectively unexplored for this time. So I can't sit down and say, well, here's the five things and then that were answered and there's no problem anymore. Certainly not. We certainly need to have this one hand helping the other kind of way to solve the problem by more comprehensively understanding what the problem is that we're trying to fight here and then what the tools are in the

toolbox and then we can figure out the best ways to handle that.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [30:41](#) I cannot agree with you more about the solutions being and bringing the two sides of the picture together. They both have valid missions and mandates and too often, as you say, they're talking past each other. Did you want to add anything else to what Bob was saying about the policy issues that people need to grapple with?

Anders Brownwor...: [31:05](#) I'm not the policy person. I would just say, even five years ago, I would never have thought some things would be possible without drastically losing your privacy in a system. But it's shocking how much you can do without losing that privacy. Zero knowledge proof, for example, or a good example of this. It's almost incredible. So that design space is effectively unexplored really by people that with deep knowledge of all sides. So I reserve judgment, I guess.

Bob Bench: [31:44](#) I will say one thing broadly in the policy conversation that we saw, you always see when you start working with engineers. Engineers always talk about trade-offs. Of course we can build this, but this is what you're giving up. And so for example, with Radius, a lot of our functions are centralized because we are choosing to not have the expensive process of decentralization. The other place where people talk about trade-offs all the time is the halls of the Federal Reserve because economists always talk about trade-offs. And so the policy conversation, the people who don't talk about trade-offs are lawyers and policy folks generally speaking, because they're just a rule and you're trying to check that box and do that thing. And the cool thing about working with engineers and economists as a lawyer is I really learn about trade-offs.

[32:34](#) And so I think when Anders is talking about, for example, privacy and something like the Bank Secrecy Act, I'll go back to that. You're not just talking about, say for example, the tens of billions of dollars you spend a year to enable that regulation with very limited clarity on what the upside is, but also every single American has multiple replicas of their identity and terribly insecure databases run by persons who are not trained in privacy or operational security, replicated over and over and over again with almost no clarity on the trade-off of upside. And so for any policy conversation with a new technology, it's really important to get engineers in the room and economists in the room because those are two trades that are deeply, deeply trained in trade-offs. And I think if we talked more in

Washington about trade-offs as opposed to binary lines, I think we do a lot better on the policy front.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [33:39](#)

Fascinating. So not necessarily about Radius, but as you know, there's a very widespread perception that crypto of all kinds, including stablecoins, are going to be hotbeds of financial crime and that the trade-off between privacy and anti-crime efforts is insoluble, but there's more transparency in blockchains than there is in traditional transactions. Are you optimistic, pessimistic on whether we can have both? Can we have these efficient markets you're talking about and still police them, so to speak, for financial crime?

Anders Brownwor...: [34:32](#)

I'm an intrinsically optimistic person, so I'm of course going to say yes. I think the question before us, and probably one of the most exciting things right now, is we have the opportunity to redefine money, like how do we really rebuild money right now in such a way that it fits society better than it has. And given the tools that I know are there, and as I said, effectively not really well explored, I think there's a wide design space there. But in order to do that, we have to understand the trade-offs. We have to very deeply understand what it is that we want and what it is that we want to avoid. To some degree, privacy is head-to-head against what you find-the-bad-guy strategies because the only find-the-bad-guy strategies that have been attempted were, well, let's just track the entire thing.

[35:42](#)

Let's have complete visibility. That's the solution to it internally. There's probably other areas where we can... There's some give and take there that would, I think, get to a better outcome. And by that, I mean, cost less and maximize privacy or whatever, the different things that were being restricted. Nothing would be like how many transactions you can do rationally. That should be able to really grow and your privacy should be able to be substantial in a system like that. And you should also have strong confidence that bad activity is being constrained. And what I say, bad activity, not bad actors, because bad activity is what you want to stop. A bad actor is always involved with a lot of bad activity, but sometimes they go and buy a sandwich and maybe they should be able to eat. I don't know. So I think there's a wide design space there.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [36:46](#)

I would love to talk with you for hours. We're almost out of time. Let me ask one last question, which is project out five years, 10 years, whatever timeframe you want and talk to me about how the financial system will be different and how visible will it be? Is it going to change the life of the average person

around the world or is it going to be mostly in the plumbing, so to speak?

Bob Bench:

[37:16](#)

So I think one thing technology always tends to do is degrade margins. And so I start there. And what this technology that we're working on is see just new networks for value exchange are degrading margins. So I always start with Visa. Visa has a 69% operating margin, the largest operating margin, generally speaking, on the S&P 500. They do that because they charge and interchange somewhere around 25 basis points per event plus 30 cents. And they keep about 70 cents of every TX per dollar. That is a astronomically high margin and they've done very well. It's a great business importantly. And the thing about great businesses is technology tends to displace them or lower those margins by necessity. And so what I do think is going to happen is the financial system, the parts of the financial system that have enjoyed very high margins are going to reduce those margins.

[38:20](#)

They won't go away, but they'll be reduced. And I think one person had a great line and there's just Chris Waller. And I think last year Chris Waller said in the speech, it is not the job of the Federal Reserve system to ensure that certain banks stay in business. We live in a competitive open enterprise country. And so if you're a bank that's charging incredibly high fees, or for example, not permitting your persons to move money out of the bank with certain delays because you want to get that kind of flow, that's... Stablecoins are coming for you and banks like Erebor are coming for you. If you choose to take your excess capital in the financial institution and place that towards bonuses and not reinvesting in technology, Erebor is coming for you and entrepreneurs in the banking sector, entrepreneurs in the financial services sector are going to say there's different ways to move value.

[39:09](#)

So I think that's the biggest thing is technology degrades margins, high margin companies in the financial services space are going to be, people are going to come after them. I think that's a big thing. Two is I think what is a user of money is going to change. Our big bet as a company is in five years, there will be more agents in the financial system than humans. That is the big bet of this company. And so what does the financial system look like when most the majority of the actors in the financial system are no longer human beings, but they are programs? And how do you build a financial system that optimizes for that? And I think the secondary question is, what is the regulatory regime for that? Should there be a regulatory regime for that?

Those are really important questions, but I think the two things I think most importantly, margins will collapse of the dominant financial institutions, small institutions that won't change are going to have a hard time, and we're going to have more agents than people in the financial system. Those are my big three.

Anders Brownwor...: [40:10](#)

I would say if you know, "Oh, I just used a blockchain for this transaction. You failed." That should melt away. Nobody says, "Oh, I just used Apple Pay, so therefore I just use cryptography for the..." No, you shouldn't know that. You should just know, okay, instead of, I don't know, inserting my card, I tap here. That's about as far as it goes. It's like a convenience thing. So if there is to be actual adoption, it has to melt away into the background and you should not know really, would not have to know what you're using for some transaction or another. I would hate for buzzwords to become like the norm, like I used this blockchain or I use that smart contract. Forget it, you've lost a script in my opinion.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [41:01](#)

Wow. I have so many more questions. I'm going to let you go. Where can people get information on Radius if they're interested?

Bob Bench: [41:10](#)

So our website is radiustech.xyz that has all of our docs you can get onto our network almost with several clicks from there. If you have a Gmail account, you can click right through and you can test this out right away. We're Radius Tech on Twitter. I am RkBench on Twitter or X, I should say, and we have regular blogs and updates on there as well.

Anders Brownwor...: [41:30](#)

And I'm Anders94 on Twitter.

Jo Ann Barefoot: [41:33](#)

Fantastic. Bob Bench, Anders Brownworth, thank you so much for joining me today. It's been wonderful.

Anders Brownwor...: [41:39](#)

Thank you.

Bob Bench: [41:40](#)

Thanks [inaudible 00:41:42].