

CASSIOPEA - PROGETTO INIZIALE

Cassiopea - Initial Project

Contents

Introduction	4
What is an anarchist space?	6
Some notes on the present moment	8
The world around us	9
The anarchist milieu (in the so-called Italy)	11
So, why this place?	13
Initiatives and events	15
Conflicts and critique	17
Books, that is, the memory of the fenix	19
The printed archive-library	21
The digital library-archive	24
Some practical points to confront	26

CASA CASSIOPEA

INITIAL PROJECT

Via Campi 20, 13877, Magnano (BI)

This is not the final translation into English, but a draft that was done under a lot of time pressure. A better version, completed with introduction and more appropriate wordings will – hopefully – be out very soon.

Introduction

Every day the boundless stretches of ocean are traversed by thousands of fishes and other organisms. Every floating object, every sliver of shadow, reveals itself to be a coveted spot: indeed, it provides a bit of relief from the intense sunlight, and offers safe shelter from large seabirds and hungry predators. Some small fish, unable to find suitable hiding places, have thus begun to hide in the strangest and most unexpected places. The cassiopee, small but so colourful that they resemble a star-lit sky, also often swim around in large schools, seeking food and warmth in the ocean currents. It is between their arms that these fishes, for a few minutes or a few hours, find refuge, while waiting to go and resume their mysterious itineraries, which will lead them to cross the infinite stretch of the sea.

Jellyfishes and minnows have routes, to follow or reinvent, that are obviously different. Sometimes they cross, sometimes they diverge. There are no borders at the bottom of the sea, neither are there limits to the distance to cross, if not those given by the will but also by luck. But sometimes these routes become intertwined so that, when the winds don't blow in the right direction and when gales, instead of entertaining the fishes risk flushing them away, a hidden crevice could become providential.

A place to rest, re-organise, compare with others and reflect. Not a place to live in, not a physical place to preserve or that wants to create aggregation around its own identity. Much less justify any aggregation amongst individuals that is not dictated by ideas and projectuality. Since it would rather drift along its own course, the only way the house-jellyfish will cross the fishes, is to help them by making their traveling projects a reality. Because, beyond how comfortable it may be, the place of the fish is still the pelagic vastness, with its struggle and its joys, its sorrows and its surprises, and certainly not the enveloping and reassuring hug of a cassiopea.

What is an anarchist space?

An anarchist space should be a place that seeks to accommodate sensibilities that are hostile to every form of authority, every party, every religion and every form of oppression and technical– or economic – regulation of life.

Anarchism, for some individuals, arises from a tension toward permanent conflictuality, attack and self-organization of ones struggles and their own lives well before its political-theoretical conceptualization in the 19th century. The desire for freedom has accompanied the human beings from time immemorial as a feeling against its progressive organization into hierarchical and oppressive societies.

In a world, then, that increasingly reduces the space for individuals to act, homogenizing them to dominant patterns of thought and life-style, attacking their perceptions of reality through the technological universe it soaks them into, the necessary destruction and rediscovery of tiny fragments of an impossible autonomy are adventures that might be worth living. To take the risk of a life detached from and against the claims of the Dominion and the needs of this existence.

Because this is neither the only, nor the best of possible worlds, and because trying to overthrow this social system, with its relationships of power and exchange, it means trying to give substance to a utopia, at least in our darkest and most joyful dreams. Without having any definition to propose, especially without having any metaphysical architecture of relationships to impose, we only know that an ethical tension drives us towards the search for spaces and places that are simply not the wastelands we live in. Deserts of ideas, of passions and of desires, deserts of encounters and clashes, of loves and conflicts, even bitter and vivid but never delegated to others nor to the authority of the State. And since in the sunburned sand the thousand flowers of freedom cannot bloom, it is necessary to push this barrenness to the margins of our lives, and try to give space to what that which remains, unknown but pregnant of a potentiality nulla creatore, desert it is not.

Some notes on the present moment

The world around us

The world order to which we were accustomed, has waned. The “end of history”, a spiel that has accompanied us from the fall of the Berlin wall, has shown to the world its illusory face.

History is by no means over. Just by considering the recent wars we can see clearly how this tired game of balances has broken. The U.S.-driven World, namely that of the international police operations (as the two invasions of Iraq were defined in the past) no longer exists. By now, no State or alliance of states, has enough military, economic and technological power to guarantee itself an effective deterrent capacity. Paradoxically, not even the atomic bomb seems to be able to guarantee it anymore, and more and more often the threat of its use is manifested.

As if the geopolitical turmoil and lust for power by states, were not enough, the environment in which humans live, along with all other organisms of this Planet, is increasingly deteriorated and made unstable by the impact of the social organization we have “chosen” for ourselves: industrialization and urbanization, indeterminate and indefinite growth, exploitation and pollution. Extreme events, drought and heat waves, diseases (infectious and otherwise) new and old batter every ecosystem and there seems no end in sight.

Not that the economic and social environment we have created is much more stable, then: inflation and rising energy prices will make it increasingly difficult to survive inside of this society. On the one hand we are forced inside of this social system we live in by a all encompassing organization of our relationships and our life, on the other hand, it is impossible to survive within it, as much as its possible to survive outside of it, without having to surrender to labor and accept every injustice it comes with.

And obviously it is not with their dreaded solutions that we can be reassured about the future: between green economy (nuclear power), digitization, medicalization and engineering of life, the forms of domination continue to deepen in reality and make even the very possibility of reflecting on living in a radically different world more and more difficult.

Indeed, it is our own body and the material reality that surrounds us that are becoming something new that binds us more and more inexorably and inextricably to this sinking world. If history is therefore not over, they are trying to put an end to utopia in the very least; if they cannot guarantee the eternity of this system of power, they are trying to guarantee at least that some form of system of power will exist forever.

Despite this oppressive present, there are still flashes of joy and revolt that illuminate this tragic, yet dystopian, comedy in which we have found ourselves living. What has perhaps begun to be lacking is a dream worth living for, as much as dying for, or even the desire of a radical and irreparable break with the totality of this society. The refusal of control and the thirst for freedom, though wonderful in themselves, are not enough on their own to shake that which is real; the flare-ups of blind rage, however ardent and exciting, unfortunately tend to consume themselves and all too often end up lending an ear to calls for calm. Indeed, how can one think it possible to decouple the desire to not be ruled from the consciousness of the necessity of having to plunge a dagger of destruction into the putrescent body of the enemy and from the consequent will to act in this regard?

*

The anarchist milieu (in the so-called Italy)

From the perspective of the anarchist milieu, we live in an extremely problematic moment. Short-term prospects are difficult to imagine: if there is no cultural and relational context in which the complexification of certain ideas, and an amount of publications appropriate to the misery of this period and its problems. At the same time there is a lack of a real context of struggles and of relationships that would distribute and disseminate these potential ideas and publications. If paradoxically, this era was fecund for radical critique and the continued blowing over the embers of dissatisfaction and refusal of resignation, it appears that this feeling resides within us, but with no prospects and no momentum of ideas, than in those around us who would perhaps even take pleasure in being inflamed. Or else it is all useless, and this society has already covered with a fire-proof blanket the evil passions that lodge within individuals.

The dynamic relation between thought and action, in fact, seems almost to have broken down: action determined by urgency, emergencism, heterodirected by the 8 o'clock news, overwhelms what is an impulse to act concordant with one's individual revolutionary project. Besides, following is easier than charting one's own path, like it's easier to recognize each other on basis of insignia than doing so on the basis of ideas and affinities. But quality will never flow from the quantity moribund action. Might as well, there~~fore~~ore, stop, think and look forward. Anarchism, luckily, has always survived, even from itself and its own paucity. And the covers of social peace always have some mending from which a breath of breeze can attempt to reignite the embers.

So, why this place?

We think that insurrection is something distinct to confronting and warring with power. It is something that looks at the world, that seeks to violently undermine the State not only as an “entity”, but first and foremost as social relations. That seeks to strike at Capital by destroying the quantitative value of things and of living beings, making what surrounds us unique and immeasurable and thus rendering the sale as much as exchange impossible. It weakens the Technical System because it makes us once again masters of our own bodies, of our time, of our capabilities, able to reinvent our own space. For all these reasons the destruction of the Dominion does not spring from yet another emergential panic, but from a desire for utopia.

From the desire to live to the fullest and most joyfull the days we have.

As for the here and now, we want to try to rediscover a way of action that develops from individuals and knows how to be consequential with a radical thinking both in the ways of life and the relationship with others, as much as with the relation with the enemy. If one does not want to become a nobody, may they eschew names, if one does not want to obey, let the rulers be overthrown. However, the sadness of these times calls for new projectualities that are capable of turning towards, perhaps above all, to the medium and long period. Neither a seed buried under snow, nor a Noah’s Ark, nor a time capsule, can be the models of reference we use to overthrow reality though. Something new has to be devised. Will spaces be found for this, and will it result in the discovery of new affinities? Who knows.

Because it is easy to declare oneself in contraposition, sure, but then what? Outside of cities, these strongholds of nightmare, where space is differently

colonized by power, are there are still perspectives to be explored, like that of reinventing a obstinately hostile Life that questions transformation of Dominion?

And what if it is then not actually a stark and Manichean choice in reality, but an oscillation between multiple poles, a continuous movement and transformation in the spaces of one’s own tensions and projectualities?

We must take into account that certain webs or relations no longer exist, and it appears increasingly difficult, stationing in one’s place, to manage to grasp what is happening out of sight, polluted by newspapers and by our diminished capability of comprehension. Because of this, it is also important to reinvigorate exchanges and comparisons, including international ones, that make themselves bearers of news, analysis, perspectives, manifesting thoughts that eschew mythopoiesis and feelings of victimhood, innocence and militantism. The crossroads can be unexpectedly fecund for the errant knights of the Idea.

Initiatives and events

We have said that this space would like to nurture the consciousness that it is necessary first to start with oneself, one's desires and one's projects. Each individual with their own tensions and peculiarities, only then one can push on to adventure – whether alone or in company.

Obviously one doesn't need a program to implement, already well defined and clear in their head: rather, we think of projects that dialogue with reality, by experiencing a mutual transformation in the continuous cross-reference between thought and action. Clearly one needs though, to reject becoming a leader, as well as being follower in order to creatively give oneself to desertion, opposition, destruction, generation and any other evil passion of freedom that crosses our path.

To give impetus to ideas and dreams, in a place that is a possible meeting point, but is not a point of mediation between autonomous individuals and between different and independent realities (but which at least start from the sharing of certain foundations, such as the rejection of delegation, hierarchy and politics), was the wager from which all the reflections about the possibility and sense of opening a new anarchist space at this historical moment and in this geographical space: a shady place with no defined course to follow, a melting pot of singular trajectories that intertwine themselves in their attempt to express the multiplicity of human desires and possibilities. So, ensure that in this space perspectives that actually criticize obedience and hierarchies radically – also within anarchist groups – and homogenization – also within anarchist thought – can be experimented there is need for the broadest freedom: those who share the general ideas of the house – when, how and if they wish – will be able to organize events and initiatives, being the only and sole individuals responsible for what they themselves organize. The association of individuals, as much as singular individual will, however, have to be prepared to accept critique. Even harsh ones.

Beyond the necessity for destruction and the reflections around this, being able to get in touch with different bodies of knowledge and experiences from one's own is also important to give breath to one's radical prospective. Of course, exchanges and initiatives should not take place for personal profit. Rather, those who so wish, might try to invent ways of organizing workshops or labs, days of exchange or moments of gifting outside the economic circuits to which we are accustomed. The impossibility of living autonomously from this world does not preclude the possibility of nonetheless opening up questions about other ways of feeling, relating and sustaining oneself. But since the critique of militancy is aimed at the conception of life in its totality as perpetual moments of struggle and of latent potential for social conflict, so too that which does not wear the guise of "Movement" and "Struggle", cannot be exempted from some minimum principles of relation in a perspective of freedom and practical critique with respect to whatever moves and sustains this world. It is up to each individual sensibility to figure out in what terms to make these things transpire within everyday life.

Conflicts and critique

This place is not suitable for the prideful and the haughty. Neither for the touchy and thin skinned. Nobody is above receiving criticism, because nobody knows for sure the road that brings towards social revolution. Rather, it is with our hearts that we attempt to make inroads on these paths, in which one must gaze with piecing eye and no distractions or illusions that which lies behind the next turn. Not what we expect to find, neither what we wish deterministically to happen.

Because of this printing, similarly to the organization of an event, signifies being open and receptive to confronting its consequent critique. In whatever form that that may come, be it harsh, insensitive, ironic, destructive violent or insulting. Because intelligence means also being able to gather substance, if it is present, that prescinds form. Anyhow, the anarchist movement of the past survived even the lead shot at Malatesta during his US conference in Patterson on the 3rd of September 1899. Domenico Pazzaglia, in discord with the ideas presented by the italian anarchist, decided to shoot him in the legs. All truths be told, we should add that in that era, the proof of concept of ideas was the continuous attempt to detonate the social world, very different from the literary distinctions and the barricades of paper that we are today accustomed to and that make us recoil and take offense. But should we begin to reintroduce reality to our words? Maybe by pruning away our political etiquette and pacified relationships? How can we think of conflicts, if not as moments that individuals can confront as best that they think, without having to demand a centralized decision making body the legitimization of ones own actions? As in many other aspects of anarchism, everyone is responsible for their own actions.

This obviously, means not regarding Casa Cassiopea as a citadel to conquer, a stronghold to defend and to control. This is politics, its a racket. Obviously an approach that tends to limit the possibility of other individualities to utilize the space, imposing for long periods ones presence, knowing it unwelcome, cannot be acceptable. It is hinging upon ability and relational intelligence to foster the possibility for this space to become a crossroads of differing ideas and experiences, or for it to become an identitarian bastion, only time will tell.

Books, that is, the memory of the
fenix

Printing, distributing, gifting conserving and translating are crucial actions for an international and insurrectional anarchist prospective. These days, we have the ability to integrate in one place both a digital archive and a physical one. These do not have to be coincidental, but can be differentiated by thematic and projectuality.

The core of the house will be a printing infrastructure, computers to typeset, a digital and physical archive for easy consultation and lastly but not least, the possibility to live together and the space to live, discuss, engage and translate without the urgency and the haste that characterize our urban way of life. These last concepts are for use essential elements for re-inventing anarchist publication and give like this impetus to different struggles and moments of rupture, even if they might seem as “secondary” elements in respect to the technical printers and paper cutters. But it is ideas that come before the those words which are penned or typed on a screen, and to fertilize ideas it takes time, patience and a context which propence to the flowering of curiosity and the lust for knowledge.

So, the ambition is that who is hungry for ideas and dense discussion, in this place may find it in any moment – at the very least in printed form. A temporary respite, from the desolation and the absence of prospectives that rages within all of us.

Returning to the problem of our frenetic and occasionally *militant* lives, how many projects are trundled along on mere scraps of time? How many assemblies are in essence formal moments that leave no space for the living together the multitude of small acts and instances that, similarly or perhaps more effectively, make us truly comprehend who we have in front of us? The assemblear rhetoric and embarrassed silence are instead masks with which we hide who we truly are. Relationships based upon assemblies cannot but become victims of these masks and in fact become performances of shadow-play and marionettes. Our era, furthermore, keeps us on the corners us, imposing upon us to fill every second with the possibility of instant communication: better see each other every few months for two days, eat and drink and sleep together, get lost in the woods and watch the stars, than every week on the wed.

The printed word has always held in our eyes a special role for anarchism. Much more than for other forms of thought, in which the party substituted the need for discussion and written information sprung only from the center to then arrive in each section, to be only assimilated by each member and made factually, *recta doctrina*. Anarchism, decentralized and without central coordinating bodies, has instead always given life to a lively and untamed press, for which every individual could redact their own texts, plundering others or allowing oneself to be inspired in original ways, and distribute them freely and spontaneously to others. In the past, publications maintained the relations between diasporas and countries of origin (in an economic and linguistic sense but also to connect struggles), it served to disseminate ideas via translations and correspondence and it was a school ground (not institutionalized or formalized by definition) to learn new languages. Finally it even fed the resistance and revolt in territories controlled by the most oppressive and policed of states, mediant clandestine smuggling of printed materials. In other words, the reticular and spontaneous circulation of texts, while it may seem inefficient and chaotic, on the other hand facilitates a true exchange and an authentic debate. In theory.

These days, to print, bind, edit and typeset though, there is the risk that one may lose oneself or appear obsolete in the face of the informatic and communicative power of social media and instantaneous messaging. But nothing can substitute a book which, obstinate and refractory, rests dusty in a library, waiting for curious hands to pick it up and, blowing away the dust, audacious eyes scan its pages. Materiality will never be supplanted by what is virtual. This is not a statement, but a desire. If in this world there is the wish to destroy reality, transforming it into a formless telematic and virtual mush, printing, conserving and diffusing ideas of revolt stamped upon paper will always have a sense of resistance and a potential of rebellion. At least towards the future.

The printed archive-library

And if this collection of material to conserve in an archive was not indiscriminate but followed some precise guidelines? If not only, because space is not infinite. So in a digital form it is possible to contain the “entirety” of anarchism, on a bookshelf, in a limited space, we must make some choices.

This is not to say that other texts may not be similarly important, but a space has a logic especially if one may know what they will probably find within it. One thing is the bookshelf of an individual, that may reflect their own personal history, meanderings and vicissitudes, be they existential or intellectual, another thing is a library that wishes to go beyond the singular opus of the person that created it to their personal taste in over the years. This may be also the distinction between individual archival collections and collective library projects. To be sure, in some ways, the expressions archive and library should be analyzed and differentiated more accurately also in our way of conceptualizing and imagining them, but these are ulterior problems that necessitate their own allocation to be confronted in their entirety.

Returning to the difference between a digital or printed archive, if in the case of the workshops and the typography, or the possibility of organizing initiatives or events, it is possible for those that share the anarchistic idea and the basic principals of this house without any problems, the printed archive would instead wish to provide a curated source of materials, that is selected, arriving almost to delineate, mediant the juxtaposition of certain texts, a clear revolutionary position antagonist to any party-political or authoritarian model – be it potential.

In the form of printed texts there will not be conserved whichever material, but there will be a proposal of selection for whomever wishes to contribute, from whichever part of the world, and in whichever language, also and especially to stimulate the wish to translate: to document the development of anarchism as a revolutionary thought, with particular attention to ideas and to the organizational forms brought to us by a tension towards insurrection, informality and the problem of the individual faced with social hierarchies, politics and power. These sentiments, in our eyes, transcend the politico-philosophical specificities of the 1800’s and intertwine with a wish for freedom that is historically present and unchanging in the soul and the consciousness of the exploited and the oppressed. Or, better stated, at least some of the oppressed and some of the exploited.

Anarchism, as it was already stated earlier in this text, in some some conceptualizations has always been fundamentally expression (and only in recent times rationalization) of the desire for the radicalization of social struggles that, if although sometimes latent, submerged by reformist recuperation in the exploited masses, by the militant sectorialization and by the repressive and productive apparatuses of the State and Capital, is trapped in the consciousness of its own creative potential and of Life by the technical System. Because of this, the anarchist movement has often regarded with curiosity all those other forms of revolt and insurrection that, often being born spontaneously, did not bear with the the label of anarchism in a strict sense, albeit manifesting themselves in forms absolutely distant from the rigid schema of revolutionary professionalism of authoritarians. In them was alive and burning the desire to live a life profoundly different and in compelling urgency to destroy what every day oppressed their existence.

The participation in the selection of materials will be open to whomever share the idea that an anarchist archive of a certain type may be important, both for the present moment and for the future, and not those who simply want to add paper to paper to simply add to the number of volumes conserved. Obviously that it is impossible to speak of affinity in so broad a context – albeit its not rare to hear the concept of affinity pull one way or another, with no regard to that which it was supposed to mean or describe – and we will have to understand how to effectively make this selection and this participation, that mustn’t necessarily limit itself to a spacial cohabitation, but to a mutual recognition by ideas. For this reason, the time to be able to begin a discussion or possibly some periodic convergences to collect materials are still forms to determine and study.

It will also be to determine, in future, how and in what form, to publish a periodic bulletin, with an inventory, reflections, analysis and critical considerations of the texts that are conserved in the print archive and to understand what should be added to the digital archive or of what happens in the

house, both in the form of events or of printing and publications. Publications ever more important as critique and self-critique are essential elements to that which wishes to stay alive and not mummify in a mausoleum of itself.

The digital library-archive

It's a different case for the digital archive, with the possibility to be able to access an entire network of texts, ideas or positions, and eventually print and bind them directly in the print shop downstairs. It is here that we take the critique of the digital world: an electronic archive will never be eternal and it will not substitute a bookshelf full of books. That which moves oneself must be conserved in other forms. But these are the tools that this world offers us, and we accept the contradictions of using them, going beyond any mythologization and well aware that these are not neutral, they influence our forms of thought, to read and to remember things, even the location of a sentence in a book or of a volume on a shelf. In any case, for more details regarding the anarchist digital archive/library project, that obviously is not limited to Casa Cassiopea, but is addressed to the entire world, the project is called Mycorrhiza. The digital means are born to manage and feed the quantitative, so it appears obvious that if the printed archive pursues an idea of quality, the digital archive makes sense only allowing one to access vast quantities of texts and information. But human relations will be the motor of the libraries, with the physical consultation spaces to restore a qualitative dimension to the research of whom uses these tools.

Some practical points to confront

A rented space and an occupied space present specific problems: money for rent to gather, the police that wants to evict and the persistence in time and in space of a group that has decided to take a space. The problems of Casa Cassiopea are obviously different. First of all, there is no group that has decided to give life to the project, but it is an individual decision, secondly the place is owned, even if its under a free usufruct, it is a complex issue to reflect upon.

If for the printed archive there must be a certain coordination regarding what should be conserved and kept within it, the management of the typography, a bar the kitchen or a wood shop, in some ways should be more simple. After all, the fact is “only” to distribute the costs between whom utilizes them, to do and organize the reconstruction work, keep the spaces clean and organized, understand what tools to purchase or how to better the space. Those that follow are some preliminary proposals that then will clearly have to interface with reality and the trajectory which events and relationships within the differing sensibilities and perspectives will bring. Paradoxically, but not unexpectedly, its more complicated to imagine how to carve our spaces that function on totally different logic rather than dedicate oneself to a severe break with what presently is: an ulterior and incontrovertible confirmation of the impossibility of living in freedom while this continues to exist as we know it. And how Casa Cassiopea will never become a “happy island” or a refuge from the brutality in which we are submerged. It does not mean experimenting or realizing a utopia, but to realize how easily utopia slips away and melts between our fingers when we try to hold it. And that our efforts, the crux of our efforts, should be better directed elsewhere.

Let one thing be clear though: organization can never render desire superfluous. Whichever facilitation and whatever procedural organizational tool, however abstruse it may seem, or excessive or even reasonable or effective (a horrible and mechanistic word), if the will is lacking will seem inevitably superfluous and destined for failure. This is an incontrovertible fact. Because with desire anything becomes possible, even in disorganized form, without it, nothing happens, even the most simple and easy task in the world.

Proposals and discussions around Casa Cassiopea, the labs, and the internal organization of the space

A space for discussion must be real. But if a group does not exist, there cannot be a collective moment of dialogue. Equally, it becomes improbable to think of periodic meetings, in which people who perhaps don't even want to see each other discuss. The alternative to the management of a space delegated to a circumscribed nucleus of people that “prepare”, as if as a service, the space for others, may be to try to use, for example, an online platform to gather ideas and reflections in what could be done and what could be organized. Some themes for discussion could be, how to make present what materials there to retrieve with vehicles in other areas (especially those on digital gifting platforms where speed is of the essence), reflections on how to do various structural work, and what priority to give varying on the needs and the interests present: there will be people more interested in building a pizza oven, or a soundproof rehearsal room, or a vegetable garden or so forth.

There is nothing definitive nor convincing in the preceding lines, especially because it is limited to virtual space, it must be clear: on one hand the extreme limitations of online communication, on the other one must understand how formal and informal hierarchies (here we return to the problem of property and the legal caveats that this world imposes upon anything) can be neutralized and confronted in the search for horizontal relations between people who choose each other. Surely on one hand there is the assumption of a broad responsibility towards a space that would like to be a catalyst for the most disparate of projects would help to surpass these problems, on the other hand its necessary to pose oneself the fact that this is not, for example, a squat, where a charge is assured from the first day, so anything goes, even to frivolously demolish a wall, without any prospective of lasting in time, or a projectual reflection in regards to the space. Also for this reason, obviously nothing will be able to equal the liberty that one gathers in the struggle against this world, where there are no bureaucratic hindrances in play. Anyhow, sadly but also a bit by choice, this is not what is happening here.

Instead a way to organize oneself (and to deal with the incompatibilities) as much in the reconstruction work that will be necessary to utilize the various workshops, one could use, utilizing the houses website, another page that shows the availability of certain spaces in the house. To make known that, for example, the following Saturday someone, that is contactable, will paint and that certain tools will be necessary, this will give others the possibility to others to contribute, add themselves, participate, or avoid the space in that moment. Similarly, if a certain workshop is occupied for four days in a row, someone coming from afar might think of postponing their travels. Especially if, as was said before, reciprocally the presence of the other person is not so welcome.

Finally there is the problem of the damn money. Casa Cassiopea obviously has a cost: bills, taxes, reconstruction materials for the common spaces and the labs, tools, and food. Returning to the theme of will/organization, its very simple on a technical/digital level to create a calculator of daily costs. Even so, any form of contribution must be voluntary and up to oneself, or else we return to the world of commerce and commodification. But since we live in the world of the Commodity, if the money is lacking, at some point the lights will cut out, and the machines will stop working, or the restructuring of the spaces will stop. Thus, as we have already said, if Casa Cassiopea will be retained an important space and there will be the will to maintain it alive, all the tools to easily calculate the costs will be there and further, more creative ways to gather money and materials can be found.

Or else, simply, it will go towards its end and close.

materials

CASSIOPEA - PROGETTO INIZIALE
Cassiopea - Initial Project

materials.cassiopea.house