

# Thoughts and Discussion on Organizing Epicurean Community

Post by “DavidN” of February 7, 2024 at 10:38 PM

## [Quote from Pacatus](#)

Thoughts on Organization

The following are loosely adapted (and stripped down) from the “twelve traditions” perspective of AA and other 12-step groups:

1. The Epicurean Community (the “Garden”) exists for the common well-being and happiness of its members, as founded in Epicurean philosophy and based in friendship.
2. There is only one authority for the Community, and that is the Canon,\* as it has evolved and is actively interpreted by the Community members themselves.
3. The only requirement for membership is the sincere desire to learn and apply Epicurean philosophy personally in one’s life, according to one’s own circumstances and understanding.

There are no “loyalty oaths” or “pledges of allegiance” required.

4. The Epicurean Community is a community, not an institution. Hierarchical structure should be minimized – while recognizing leadership roles such as “administrator” or “monitor” or “secretary” and the like (for in-person as well as online groups and meetings) as necessary for the functioning of the Community.
5. Although professionals in various disciplines (such as philosophy, sociology, physics, neuro-science and the like) may have much value to add to the understanding of Epicurean philosophy – especially its application in modern times – the Garden is not a professional association, but a community of like-minded people, all of whom have a voice.

With that said, individual members have varied areas of expertise (such as translation) and levels of knowledge pertaining to the philosophy itself, which

ought to be acknowledged and respected.

6. No dues or membership fees should be required (as this might effectively deter from membership some who sincerely desire to learn and apply Epicurean philosophy). But voluntary contributions may be openly welcomed as needed to support the practical functioning of the Community – so long as they are not used to create a “ranked hierarchy” of membership status on that basis.

This is not to preclude membership designations based on such things as participation in the Community.

7. Both the Community (as a group) and individual members may pursue outreach activities for the purpose of bringing Epicurean philosophy to as wide an audience as possible. But members who prefer to remain anonymous as such, outside the Community, should have that anonymity honored and protected by all in the Community.
8. No member of the Community should ever, in such a way as to implicate the Community (or pretend to speak on its behalf), express any opinion outside on such controversial issues as those of partisan politics or sectarian religion.

(Anyone may, of course, express their personal understanding of how Epicurean philosophy informs their opinions on such matters – while taking care not to implicate the Community or its other members.)

9. All discourse among members should be characterized by civility, respect and friendliness – even (and especially) where strong opinions differ.

+++++

\* “Canon” here could include all of the “classical” Epicurean corpus – such as Lucretius; or only the extant works attributed to Epicurus himself, with others included as “classical” interpreters.

+++++

These are my thoughts – but I would not argue them, or make an issue out of any of them. I’m just, personally, not that strongly wedded to the question. 😊

Display More

I think this applies more to a discussion group like what we already have, an actually community requires ownership, skin in the game on the part of the community members. As this is an area of interest of mine I have a section in my notes for development of a community in general not necessarily focused on epicureanism that should be applicable if the time every

came. Firstly I would point to the historical hierarchy of epicurean communities, having founders and scholars. whatever that role may entail I do not currently suppose. Beyond this I have quite a few sections of notes from studying modern intentional community organizational structures, and membership. As much as our strong independence streak may lead us all to desire a situation devoid of hierarchy or that is completely egalitarian, my studies on the subject would suggest that in reality this simply isn't sustainable. But compatible distributive hierarchical systems do exist that give greater stability and utility, without imposing on members self-sufficiency more than is necessary to form, organize, coordinate and maintain community. I think one of these or some adaptation thereof would eventually serve well in the formation of an epicurean community. I would go into deeper detail on the subject but I am not currently in that mindset to dig into those notes.

That being said section 8. is a given, I would say any Epicurean community should refrain from playing politics, except in general conceptual terms.