selection, or the cost of electricity in China. Nor does it have anything to do with the very complex and "taller" protocols. Instead, the solution is in simplifying things through "narrower" protocols, segregation of problems, and enabling innovation.

For example, the TCP/IP protocol mandates nothing about how a switch or a router "should" be designed, how the people who own and operate those machines "should" be paid, or about what applications the networks supporting those machines "should" run. Now that's a plus, not a minus and in fact, we must be grateful to the TCP/IP designers who never dictated rules as to how other people should innovate. If they had, then we'd still be licking stamps and pasting them on envelopes.

Now it is quite possible that we could be wrong and some other variant of proof-of-stake might be superior. Well, in that case, we must admit that the Proof-of-Stake Blockchain Protocol/Governance Protocol would be far more superior than Eleutherus/GP. Even so, all the advantages that come with narrow protocols would apply. A few to mention are layer isolation, vendor independence, user independence, developer independence, etc…

Finally, regardless of our opinion or whether anyone is right or wrong, trust-based alternatives are easier to deploy and would, therefore, continue to evolve.

LET'S DEAL WITH THE ENEMY

We firmly believe that the high costs involved in the blockchain networking does not relate to the technology itself, but to the fact that the blockchain industry is a "vertical silo" characterized by balkanization, "tall" all-in-one protocols, widespread incompatibility, and high costs.

In our view, that is the elephant in the middle of the room, and the only way to overcome this hurdle is by designing a protocol that is much simpler and focused than the one in the seminal works. Our viewpoint is better explained through the following diagram.