### Space cap

**The standard is Maximizing expected well-being–**

**1] Binding–pain and pleasure are the only things with intrinsic value and disvalue–if I put my hand on a hot stove I will pull away–ethics must be binding bc if they arent then its impossible to generate obligations**

**2] Death is bad–it’s impossible to pursue pleasure if you are dead, that means that we should always try to prevent death to give subjects the ability to pursue pleasure.**

**3]Moral uncertainty means extinction first**

**Bostrom 12[Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey .If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring  that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe**

**Billionaire’s capitalist agenda is destroying the environment.**

Gammon 2021 https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/19/billionaires-space-tourism-environment-emissions

How the billionaire space race could be one giant leap for pollution One rocket launch produces up to 300 tons of carbon dioxide into the upper atmosphere where it can remain for years Last week [Virgin Galactic](https://www.theguardian.com/science/virgin-galactic) took Richard Branson past the edge of space, roughly 86 km up – part of a new space race with the Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos, who aims to make a similar journey on Tuesday. Both very wealthy businessmen hope to vastly expand the number of people in space. “We’re here to make space more accessible to all,” [said Branson](https://www.reuters.com/lifestyle/science/virgin-galactics-branson-ready-space-launch-aboard-rocket-plane-2021-07-11/), shortly after his flight. “Welcome to the dawn of a new space age.” Already, people are buying tickets to space. Companies including [SpaceX](https://www.theguardian.com/science/spacex), Virgin Galactic and Space Adventures want to make space tourism more common. The Japanese billionaire Yusaku Maezawa spent an undisclosed sum of money with SpaceX in 2018 for a possible future private trip around the moon and back. And this June, an anonymous space lover paid $28m to fly on Blue Origin’s New Shepard with Bezos – though later backed out due to a [“scheduling conflict”](https://www.npr.org/2021/07/15/1016510564/blue-origin-space-18-year-old-bezos-oliver-daemen-netherlands). But this launch of a new private space industry that is cultivating tourism and popular use could come with vast environmental costs, says Eloise Marais, an associate professor of physical geography at University College London. Marais studies the impact of fuels and industries on the atmosphere. When rockets launch into space, they require a huge amount of propellants to make it out of the Earth’s atmosphere. For SpaceX’s Falcon 9 rocket, it is kerosene, and for Nasa it is liquid hydrogen in their new [Space](https://www.theguardian.com/science/space) Launch System. Those fuels emit a variety of substances into the atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, water, chlorine and other chemicals. The carbon emissions from rockets are small compared with the aircraft industry, she says. But they are increasing at nearly 5.6% a year, and Marais has been running a simulation for a decade, to figure out at what point will they compete with traditional sources we are familiar with. “For one long-haul plane flight it’s one to three tons of carbon dioxide [per passenger],” says Marais. For one rocket launch 200-300 tonnes of carbon dioxide are split between 4 or so passengers, according to Marais. “So it doesn’t need to grow that much more to compete with other sources.” Right now, the number of rocket flights is very small: in the whole of 2020, for instance, there were 114 attempted orbital launches in the world, according to Nasa. That compares with the airline industry’s more than 100,000 flights each day on average. But emissions from rockets are emitted right into the upper atmosphere, which means they stay there for a long time: two to three years. Even water injected into the upper atmosphere – where it can form clouds – can have warming impacts, says Marais. “Even something as seemingly innocuous as water can have an impact.” Closer to the ground, all fuels emit huge amounts of heat, which can add ozone to the troposphere, where it acts like a greenhouse gas and retains heat. In addition to carbon dioxide, fuels like kerosene and methane also produce soot. And in the upper atmosphere, the ozone layer can be destroyed by the combination of elements from burning fuels. “While there are a number of environmental impacts resulting from the launch of space vehicles, the depletion of stratospheric ozone is the most studied and most immediately concerning,” wrote Jessica Dallas, a senior policy adviser at the New Zealand Space Agency, in an analysis of [research on space launch emissions](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0959652620302560) published last year. Another [report from 2019](https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/RocketEmissions_0.pdf) penned by the Center for Space Policy and Strategy likened the space emissions problem to that of space debris, which the authors say creates an existential risk to the industry. “Today, launch vehicle emissions present a distinctive echo of the space debris problem. Rocket engine exhaust emitted into the stratosphere during ascent to orbit adversely impacts the global atmosphere,” they wrote. “We just don’t know how large the space tourism industry could become,” says Marais. A new market report estimates that the global suborbital transportation and space tourism market is estimated to reach $2.58bn in 2031, growing 17.15% each year of the next decade. “The major driving factor for the market’s robustness will be focused efforts to enable space transportation, emerging startups in suborbital transportation, and increasing developments in low-cost launching sites,” the [report](https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/outlook-on-the-sub-orbital-transportation-and-space-tourism-global-market-to-2031---featuring-blue-origin-spacex-and-virgin-galactic-among-others-301333701.html) says. In the past, most space transportation has been focused on cargo supply missions to the International Space Station and satellite launch services, but currently, this focus has shifted to in-space transportation, planetary explorations, crewed missions, suborbital transportation and space tourism. Several companies, including SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic, have been focusing on developing platforms such as rocket-powered suborbital vehicles that will enable the industry to carry out suborbital transportation and space tourism. People have pointed out that the money these billionaires have poured into space technology could be invested in making life better on our planet, where wildfires, heatwaves and other climate disasters are becoming more frequent as the globe warms up in the climate crisis. “Is anyone else alarmed that billionaires are having their own private space race while record-breaking heatwaves are sparking a ‘fire-breathing dragon of clouds’ and cooking sea creatures to death in their shells?” the former US Labor Secretary Robert Reich [tweeted](https://twitter.com/RBReich/status/1413266215385001986) last week. Marais says that there is always an element of excitement to new developments in space – but it’s still possible to be responsible while doing something exciting. She urges caution as the space tourism industry grows, and says there are currently no international rules around the kinds of fuels used and their impact on the environment. “We have no regulations currently around rocket emissions,” she says. “The time to act is now – while the billionaires are still buying their tickets.”

**The rock isn’t gonna die – but only the elite will be able to get off it**

**Dickens and Ormrod 7 -**\*Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex AND \*\*Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton

(Peter and James, *Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe*pg 156-157**,** dml)

On the other hand, some sociologists have started mirroring the arguments of pro-space advocates and are considering the development of space resources as a permanent resolution of the second contradiction, and working this into a fundamental critique of Marx’s political economy (Thomas-Pellicer 2004). This raises some of the debates surrounding the second contradiction thesis. **Like the proponents of capitalism’s infinite expansion into an infinite outer space, the** second contradiction **thesis can be seen as depending on** a form of catastrophism: **the idea that society and nature are doomed**. But, first, it is not clear that this is an accurate account of the Left version of the second contradiction. O’Connor (1996) is the leading contemporary Marxist proponent of the second contradiction and he argues that it is most likely to be addressed by state intervention and limited state ownership of the means of production. But **the picture of catastrophism**, whether propounded by Left or Right, **is** quite **misleading. Whatever happens to the Earth and the cosmos there will still be some form of a nature there** (Harvey 1996). Certainly **some people, specifically the poor, may come off much worse than others as a result of such humanization. But this is a long way from saying that capitalism and nature will come to an end** as a result of commodification and environmental degradation. As pro-space activists show, **the pessimism** of the second contradiction thesis **can easily be adopted not just by socialists but by the promoters of capitalism who would use the possibility of the Earth’s ‘demise’ as an excuse to continue privatizing the cosmos**. One example is the revenue generated by Earth-imaging satellites, used largely to monitor climatic and environmental change. Harris and Olby (2000) projected a market of $6.5 billion in 2007 for Earth observation data and services. Developing the rest of the cosmos entails what Enzensberger (1996) might call the next stage of the eco-industrial complex: providing economic opportunities for those in the business of rectifying the degradation caused by capitalism in the first instance. **Humanizing nature on Earth or in the cosmos need be neither a complete disaster nor a complete triumph. The priority for historical materialism is to consider the implications of outer space humanization for particular societies**, particular sectors of the population and particular species and ecological systems.

#### space leads to more imperialist warfare

Loos 11

Maxwell, International Studies Department researcher at Macalester College, 5/3/11, “Ground Zero: Tourism, Terrorism, and Global Imagination”, pg. 18-19, DA: 7/21/, http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=intlstudies\_honors

In this way, global imagination does involve a global gaze. Going back to the image of the earth from space, Masahide Kato argues that it “manifested the totality of the globe eloquently to First World eyes,” marking the “triumph of an ‘absolute’ strategic gaze.”22 Though Kato makes his statements about the globe as part of a larger argument about discourses of nuclear politics, his comments are relevant to the topic of global imagination. Kato argues that the image of the globe from space, endowed with the authority of photography and mechanical reproduction, allows for the production of the “fiction of the globe as a unified whole,”23 which allows for the entire globe to be gazed upon by the First World in terms of economic and geopolitical strategy. This image and the fiction of the earth as a totality, Kato argues, coupled with the logic of late capitalism, suppresses realities that cannot fit into this mode of representation,24 limiting possibilities, and essentially allowing the global North to constitute the world to its advantage.25 While Kato might be a bit of a pessimist, his argument is useful insofar as it demonstrates how the process of imagining the globe as a cohesive whole with specific characteristics is inherently involved in power/knowledge dynamics, at least partially rooted in political economy. Global imagination truly does take on the form of a gaze, insofar as the process of seeing or imagining the globe is simultaneously a process of constituting it. This goes beyond fantasy; the phantasm of the globe, imagined from a set of images, is the global reality for the subject. Going back to Steger’s global political ideologies, Imperial Globalism and Jihadist Globalism appear as the only ways to act, the appropriate (even if contested) responses to the reality of the imagined globe. The process of global imagination thus undergirds practices with real, constitutive material impacts on the world, from tourism to imperialistic warfare.

#### Space exploration will cause environmental exploitation, space militarization, sovereignty conflict and epidemics

Gagnon 1999 (Coordinator of the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space, Bruce K., “Space Exploration and Exploitation,” http://www.space4peace.org/articles/scandm.htm)

We are now poised to take the bad seed of greed, environmental exploitation and war into space. Having shown such enormous disregard for our own planet Earth, the so-called "visionaries" and "explorers" are now ready to rape and pillage the heavens. Countless launches of nuclear materials, using rockets that regularly blow up on the launch pad, will seriously jeopardize life on Earth. Returning potentially bacteria-laden space materials back to Earth, ­­­­­­­ any real plans for containment and monitoring, could create new epidemics for us. The possibility of an expanding nuclear-powered arms race in space will certainly have serious ecological and political ramifications as well. The effort to deny years of consensus around international space law will create new global conflicts and confrontations.

#### Capitalism is driving racism, militarization, and environmental collapse that will cause extinction – all other impacts take a back seat.

Dean 15

(Jodi, professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, “Red, Black, and Green,” *Rethinking Marxism*, 27:3, July 16, Taylor and Francis)

The absence of a powerful Left enables the political Right (in part by shifting what had been the center). The intensified inequality of the last forty years of neoliberalism testifies to the impact of left political defeat.3 Neoliberalism’s subjection of all of society to its economic criteria of efficiency and competitiveness has been carried out as a political project.4 The political system has been the instrument through which neoliberalism has dismantled the achievements of the welfare state, installed competition in ever more domains, expanded the finance sector, and imposed austerity. This is the setting, then, for my appeal to the Left to assemble itself into a party. Key determinants of our lives occur behind our backs—currency valuations, monetary policies, trade agreements, energy concessions, data harvesting. To insist on a politics focused on isolating and archiving singular micropractices abstracted from their global capitalist context obscures the workings of state and economy as a capitalist system, hinders the identification of this system as the site of ongoing harm (exploitation, expropriation, and injustice), and disperses political energies that could be more effective if concentrated. More fundamentally, in treating economic practices as the primary locus of left politics, such an insistence effaces the gap between politics and economics such that questions of strategy, of how to win, are displaced. Morrow and Brault supply a striking example of this effacement when they ask, “What is communism for, if not to improve our everyday lives?” Communism, which previous generations rendered as the world-historical struggle of the proletariat, diminishes into yet another option for individual self-improvement; the abolition of exploitation, expropriation, and injustice replaced by economic determinations of immediate satisfaction. As Ramsey rightly notes, Healy similarly substitutes economic alternatives for political antagonism. 1 Two ideas voiced in the present discussion impress the urgency of the need for a left party oriented toward communism: racism (Buck 2015) and the Anthropocene (Healy 2015). Given anthropogenic climate change, the stakes of contemporary politics are almost unimaginably high. They range from the continued investment in extractive industries and fossil fuels constitutive of the carbon-combustion complex (see Oreskes and Conway 2014), to the dislocations accompanying mass migration in the wake of floods and droughts to the racist response of states outside what Christian Parenti (2011, 9) calls the “Tropic of Chaos” (the band around the “belt of economically and politically battered post-colonial states girding the planet’s mid-latitudes,” where climate change is “beginning to hit hard”), all the way to human extinction. That one city, state, or country brings carbon emissions under control—while certainly a step in the right direction—may be irrelevant from the standpoint of overall warming. Perhaps its carbon-emitting industries were shipped elsewhere. Perhaps another country chose to expand its own drilling operations. Climate change forces us to acknowledge that we can’t build new worlds (Helepololei). We live in one world, the heating up of which threatens humans and other species. Not all communities, economies, or ways of life are compatible. Those premised on industries and practices that continue to contribute to planetary warming have to change significantly, and soon. Forcing that change is the political challenge of our time. Given the persistence of racialized violence and the operation of the state as an instrument for the maintenance not only of capitalist modes of production but also and concomitantly of racialized hierarchy, the challenges of organizing politically across issues and identities are almost insurmountably daunting. No wonder the Left resorts to moralism and self-care instead. It’s easier to catalog difference than it is to build up a Left strong enough to exercise power, especially given the traversal of state power by transnational corporations, trade, and treaties. It’s also easier to go along with the dominant ideology of individualism, which enjoins us first and foremost to look after ourselves, than it is to put ourselves aside and focus on formulating a strategy for using collective power to occupy, reconfigure, and redirect institutions at multiple levels. Here again, not every vision of community is compatible with every other. Those premised on fantasies of racial, religious, ethnic, or linguistic purity directly oppose those premised on diversity. Those premised on reproducing structures of class hierarchy directly oppose those insisting on equality. If something like a party of the radical Left can stretch beyond Greece and Spain, if it can be imagined in North America, it will only be possible as a combination of communism, antiracism, and climate activism. I use “red, black, and green” as a heuristic for the coalition of concerns necessary for such a party. I invoke the heuristic here to double down against critics who prefer a thousand alternatives to the party form. A thousand alternatives (see Healy 2015) is no alternative. It leaves the political system we have—the one that puts all its force behind the preservation of capitalist class interests—intact. Some ideas need to be chosen, systematized into a program, and defended. Consciously reiterating the colors of the Black Liberation Flag, the red, black, and green heuristic positions itself within the histories of communist, people’s, and anticolonial struggles. Left Unity in the UK uses red, black, and green in their logo to suggest a similar constellation. The colors don’t have a fixed meaning; they have appeared differently in the histories of emancipatory egalitarian struggle. In recent struggles, red suggests a politics against debt, austerity, and corporate personhood and allies with anticapitalism and communism as well. Black pays tribute to the IWW, anarchists, black power, and movements against aggressive policing, incarceration, and the murder of African Americans. Green points to climate justice, an approach to climate change that exceeds capitalist emphases on carbon markets and green commodities to encompass the dismantling of the carbon-based economy and the global redistribution of wealth. The three colors should not be read as three separate issues or groups. They should rather be understood as a kind of mutually supporting and inflecting scaffold. An equitable response to the changing climate, for example, is incompatible with the continuation of capitalism. A communism anchored in extractive industry is incompatible with the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. Antiracism directs our attention to those most likely to be exploited and sacrificed in market-driven schemes to address climate change. It also marks the fact of the history of divisions within the Left that have stood in the way of our forging collective counterpower. Here and now, movements are pushing the organizational convergence of communist, climate, and race politics. Moral Mondays, the ongoing protests in North Carolina, bring together an array of political concerns around racial justice, cuts to public services, and the environment. These protests include marches and acts of civil disobedience. The heartbreaking reminder that “Black lives matter” calls for the abolition of structures of institutionalized power that continue to impoverish, imprison, and kill black people everywhere. Protests in Ferguson, Missouri, in the wake of the murder of Michael Brown, have turned the spotlight on the militarization of the police and the buildup of state forces for the defense of the wealthy and white against the proletarianized—poor, brown, and black. Similar buildups of police borders in the United States and abroad attempt to push back the many on the move in response to the “catastrophic convergence” of decades of violent expropriation and climate change (Parenti 2011). The demand for climate justice places the economic inequalities accompanying and constitutive of capitalist “development” at the center of global discussions of climate change. Images from New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina and terms like “sacrifice zones” help articulate the two. Every time an activist reminds us that issues can’t be considered in isolation or every time a student repeats the mantra of intersectionality, the Left is instructing itself to make connections and formulate a politics capable of grasping complexity and of changing the world. The party is a form for that connecting. It provides a location where we see and relate to ourselves as comrades, as solidary members of a fighting collective.

**The plan solves because the model of the Communist Party is the only way to provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct violent tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.**

**Escalante 18** (Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that **base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organiz0ing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States.**One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that **the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible.** There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. **The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism.** Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? **If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base?**Put simply: **in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party.** **It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism.** **We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party.**When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. **We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making.** **The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis.** A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. **Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation.** A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that **our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus.**Furthermore, **party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions.** **It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions.**In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such **accountability is crucial.** **As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing.**Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, **individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror.** Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. **The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends.**The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. **It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party,** but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, **it ought to become clear that** **a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement.** Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. **I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation.** The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.