

The Constitution is an integral part of the Optimism Collective. Article 2 talks about the importance to counteract “excessive consolidation of power”. Specifically this addresses the balance of short-term (Token House) and long-term (Citizen House) perspectives. However, while the Citizen House balances power by giving one person one vote, the Token House does not seem to consider the consolidation of power. While it remains clear that a single person/entity can purchase as many tokens as they can afford, there is a decent amount of delegates, that facilitate the governance process for individuals. Yet the top 20% of delegates have power over 82% of the total OP delegations.

One could argue that this doesn't matter because the total delegations (32M OP) are only a small fraction of the total supply (4,295B) which is true. However, If over time the delegation rate rises, it would strengthen the current trend. Let me give you an example: The top 10% of our worlds population hold 85% of all wealth, while the remaining 90% own only 15% of all wealth. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The trend always starts somewhere and can manifests from there onwards. I am not saying that we are on a critical edge here but I do think it is important to create systems that don't manifest a trend towards consolidation of power.

If I am an OP holder and I want to delegate but don't know much about it, I will choose one of the first 10-20 shown to me (analogy: the rich get richer). Why not design a system that supports delegatees (that a word?) to choose a delegate based on their believes, values and motivation to be a delegate? Instead of promoting to choose based on “Most voting power” or “Most delegates”. It would be simply a matter of rearranging the delegates.

Curious what you guys think about that.

Cheers

Tassilo