From: mit123 <mit123@etv.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 2:40 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Cc: bizday@nytimes.com; business@washpost.com; edit.features@wsj.com; newseditors@wsj.com; IBFX / Interbank FX <marketing@ibfx.com>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Identification number RIN3038-AC61

Mr. Stawick,

What gives you the right to restrict the free excercise of a person's choice in the forex market to take on his or her own risks? I am opposed to the recent proposal of changing the forex margin requirements from 100:1 to 10:1 and troubled by both the consequences and the motivation behind it. The consequences should be obvious to you. Have you considered the negative impact it will have on the U.S. forex industry and how it will put many people out of a job in this country if this proposal is passed?

There is no rational reason for this new margin requirement to be enacted. It is the role of government to police illegality, fraud, and unethical activities in the forex industry or activity that could negatively impact the general public's safety and welfare. It is not the role of government to micro-manage the risks of individual traders who enter the market of their own free will to take on the risks of the market in a free market society. Should the government restrict individuals who want to start a small business, being that the new business failure rate is about 95 per cent? This is as ridiculous as a referee blowing a whistle and giving a penalty to a player who attempts a risky 3-point shot. It is the role of the referee to make sure there is no elbowing, steps, illegal procedures, not to dictate what shots he can take based on the risks of making it.

Yes, there are a lot of unethical forex dealers in this country, but should the honest dealers be negatively impacted and penalized because of the criminality of the few? Would you burn down a house to destroy three or four rats? Your job should be focused on going after the Bernie Madoffs of the world and not restricting the free entry of individuals into the market who may have a chance by their own wits to succeed in the forex market.

And I am concerned about the motivation behind this new margin requirement. Is this new proposal a result of pressure from the Wall Street stock industry lobby? Is the stock industry concerned that over the years more and more money is exiting the equities market, going into the forex market? Are they concerned that liquidity in the equities market will dry up eventually because of the exit? Are they worried that people in this country and all over the world are becoming enlightened about the stock manipulation and corruption that goes on in the stock market? Are they troubled that people are realizing the soothsayers and fortune tellers of Wall Street that are recommending buying stock in the market are in many cases pushing horse dung on them, as much as the Wall Street banks that sold toxic, straw pies to millions all over the world? Are they concerned that people are no longer going to be gulled into blindly funneling their hard-earned money into a 401k plan into the hands of equities fund managers, which is the quickest way to confirm the existence of black holes at their own expense and at the gain of stock brokerage firms who have a stranglehold on the market and Washington D.C.?

Anyone who knows anything about investing and trading knows that diversification is the prudent way to go. By changing the margin requirements in the forex will bar many average traders with average income to hedge in alternative investments, such as the forex, forcing them back to the Wall Street snake pits to lose their money during the inevitable, re-occuring crashes that cycle through the equities market. This proposal is good for the stock industry interests, bad for the average person on the street.