

# Implement A Roadmap Or 'User Ranking According To Texts Read' System?

**Post by "Cassius" of August 24, 2021 at 10:18 AM**

Good points, Camotero. I try to do that in the material that is sent to each new member, and which is referenced in the signup page, here: [Welcome To All New Participants!](#)

There's also the material referenced here in that opening post:

Hello and welcome to the forum. This is the place for students of Epicurus to coordinate their studies and work together to promote the philosophy of Epicurus. Please remember that all posting here is subject to our [Community Standards / Rules of the Forum](#) our [Not Neo-Epicurean, But Epicurean](#) and our [Posting Policy statements](#) and [associated posts](#).

But you're right it's not explicitly in the form of a roadway or roadmap. As we've discussed things like this in the past I've tried to hold back from an explicit "litmus test," and I suspect it will always be appropriate here on the forum to have a more flexible standard. I referenced "good faith" in the posts above and as I think Godfrey has reminded us in a comment recently, there's the old cliché stated in a Supreme Court case about "porn" that you "know it when you see it."

The transition to a more formal litmus test probably has to come only when someone explicitly sets up a "membership" organization where there are truly formal rules of organization, formal officers, formal directors, etc.

That's where the long thread on the [20 Tenets of the Society of Epicurus](#) came from. We had a long and useful discussion about the details of that, but in the end the division of viewpoint was so great that at least as far as I was concerned personally it did not make sense to proceed in that direction at that time. Probably at some future point those issues need to be discussed again and new efforts made to have a more formal organization, but at this point I think we've made it pretty clear in the initial materials everyone sees that we're not really a formal organization with a formal "catechism."

I doubt that it's possible to do that on a worldwide basis, although that is a constant subject of discussion. One of the practical problems you run into is that the closer you get to a real-world local organization, the more it becomes necessary to address issues that either are or border on "politics" on which people just aren't going to agree. In any "meetup" or informal grouping of people who are new to the philosophy I've found personally that it's impossible to get people to check those issues at the door long enough to see if there can really be agreement on the core issues of the philosophy. We've probably come as far as we have (and I'm wanting us to go much further!) because of the no-politics rule, but the no-politics rule may well be something

that local real-world groups will have a very hard, if not impossible, time implementing.

My own thoughts are by no means set in stone in this and I think that very possibly different approaches are possible and even necessary. For example right now I am seeing major social stresses in Australia over Covid-19 issues, and it would be very interesting to know if those are impacting the Australia group. I am going to see what I can find out about that.

These are great issues to discuss and I hope we get a lot more discussion.