

# Welcome Julia!

**Post by "Cassius" of May 4, 2024 at 6:44 AM**

Welcome [Julia](#) !

There is one last step to complete your registration:

All new registrants must post a response to this message here in this welcome thread (we do this in order to minimize spam registrations).

You must post your response within 72 hours, or your account will be subject to deletion.

Please say "Hello" by introducing yourself, tell us what prompted your interest in Epicureanism and which particular aspects of Epicureanism most interest you, and/or post a question.

This forum 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](#).

Please understand that the leaders of this forum are well aware that many fans of Epicurus may have sincerely-held views of what Epicurus taught that are incompatible with the purposes and standards of this forum. This forum is dedicated exclusively to the study and support of people who are committed to classical Epicurean views. As a result, this forum is not for people who seek to mix and match some Epicurean views with positions that are inherently inconsistent with the core teachings of Epicurus.

All of us who are here have arrived at our respect for Epicurus after long journeys through other philosophies, and we do not demand of others what we were not able to do ourselves. Epicurean philosophy is very different from other viewpoints, and it takes time to understand how deep those differences really are. That's why we have membership levels here at the forum which allow for new participants to discuss and develop their own learning, but it's also why we have standards that will lead in some cases to arguments being limited, and even participants being removed, when the purposes of the community require it. Epicurean philosophy is not inherently democratic, or committed to unlimited free speech, or devoted to any other form of organization other than the pursuit by our community of happy living through the principles of Epicurean philosophy.

One way you can be most assured of your time here being productive is to tell us a little about yourself and personal your background in reading Epicurean texts. It would also be helpful if you could tell us how you found this forum, and any particular areas of interest that you have

which would help us make sure that your questions and thoughts are addressed.

In that regard we have found over the years that there are a number of key texts and references which most all serious students of Epicurus will want to read and evaluate for themselves. Those include the following.

["Epicurus and His Philosophy"](#) by Norman DeWitt

[The Biography of Epicurus by Diogenes Laertius](#). This includes the surviving letters of Epicurus, including those to [Herodotus](#), [Pythocles](#), and [Menoceus](#).

["On The Nature of Things"](#) - by Lucretius (a poetic abridgement of Epicurus' "On Nature"

["Epicurus on Pleasure"](#) - By Boris [Nikolsky](#)

The chapters on Epicurus in [Gosling and Taylor's "The Greeks On Pleasure."](#)

[Cicero's "On Ends" - Torquatus Section](#)

[Cicero's "On The Nature of the Gods" - Velleius Section](#)

The Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda - [Martin Ferguson Smith translation](#)

[A Few Days In Athens" - Frances Wright](#)

Lucian Core Texts on Epicurus: (1) [Alexander the Oracle-Monger](#), (2) [Hermotimus](#)

[Philodemus "On Methods of Inference"](#) (De Lacy version, including his appendix on relationship of Epicurean canon to Aristotle and other Greeks)

"The Greeks on Pleasure" -Gosling & Taylor Sections on Epicurus, especially the [section on katastematic and kinetic pleasure](#) which explains why ultimately this distinction was not of great significance to Epicurus.

It is by no means essential or required that you have read these texts before participating in the forum, but your understanding of Epicurus will be much enhanced the more of these you have read. Feel free to join in on one or more of our conversation threads under various topics found throughout the forum, where you can to ask questions or to add in any of your insights as you study the Epicurean philosophy.

And time has also indicated to us that if you can find the time to read one book which will best explain [classical Epicurean philosophy](#), as opposed to most modern "eclectic" interpretations of Epicurus, that book is Norman DeWitt's Epicurus And His Philosophy.

(If you have any questions regarding the usage of the forum or finding info, please post any questions in this thread).

Welcome to the forum!

# Not Neo-Epicurean, But Epicurean

1. Not "flourishing," "human potential," "self-actualization," or "meaningfulness," but happiness grounded in the feeling of pleasure.
2. Not "absence of pain" as a full statement of the goal of life, but "the Feelings are two, pleasure and pain" and "Pleasure is the beginning and the end of a happy life."
3. Not virtue for the sake of virtue, but virtue as instrumental for the attainment of pleasure.
4. Not "the greatest good for the greatest number," but "Every desire must be confronted with this question: What will happen to me if the object of my desire is accomplished and what if it is not?"
5. Not "humanism," "transhumanism," "individualism," "collectivism," "egoism," "altruism," "social progress," "Marxism," "democracy," "tyranny," or any "one size fits all" political ideal of any kind, but social structure based on friendship which "is formed and maintained by means of a community of life among those who have reached the fullness of pleasure."
6. Not "hard determinism," but "some things happen from necessity, some from chance, and others through our own choice."
7. Not "supernaturalism," but "materialism."
8. Not "supernatural gods," or "life after death," but confidence in a fully material universe and "for those men for whom wisdom is possible, and who do seek it, such men may truly live as gods."
9. Not only "short term hedonism," but "it is to continuous pleasures that I invite you."
10. Not "rationalism," but "all reason is dependent upon sensations."
11. Not fearful of death nor careless of losing life, but valuing life for the opportunity of pleasure it brings.

## Our Posting Policy At EpicureanFriends.com:

**"No Partisan Politics," "No Supernatural Religion," and "No Absolute Virtue"**

This forum is dedicated to promoting the philosophy of Epicurus, and not to any partisan political positions whether "left," "right," or "center." The task of rediscovering Epicurean philosophy requires that such discussions be held elsewhere. Posts violating this rule are subject to removal.



Epicurean philosophy firmly rejects the viewpoint that there are any supernatural forces or absolute virtues or Platonic ideals of any kind. Argument which is based on supernatural claims, or "absolute" virtues or ideals of any kind, are in violation of this rule and subject to removal.

**Nothing can be created from nothing.**

**Nature has no gods over her.**

**Do not assign to the gods anything that is inconsistent with incorruption and blessedness.**

**Death is nothing to us.**

**There is no necessity to live under the control of necessity.**



**He who says "Nothing can be known" knows nothing.**

**All sensations are "true."**

**Virtue is not absolute or an end in itself - all good and evil consists in sensation.**

**Pleasure is the guide of life.**

**By "Pleasure" we mean all experience that is not painful.**

**Life is desirable, but unlimited time contains no greater pleasure than limited time.**

---

**Post by "Julia" of May 4, 2024 at 8:31 AM**

Hello to Cassius, the entire podcast team, and everybody else,

I live in Western Europe, and found this happy garden at the end of a long and painful path of trial and tribulation, which wasted much precious time in confusion. May my past experience be the fertile ground in which to root my exploration of this newfound land, and may my appreciation for the pursuit of pleasure be deeper for the time by which it was delayed.

The most recent junctions, which led me to where I am today – which is to say, led me to my eventual arrival at Epicurus and his philosophy through listening to Lucretius today and during those past few days in Athens, which led me to finding you, my fellow Epicurean friends – is a most curious and unexpected of reversals: as I dove ever deeper into Stoicism to fortify my body and mind in preparation for my next attempt at victory in the battle that was my life, I, by chance, came across a summary[1] contrasting Epicureanism with Stoicism. From there, I eventually came across a post[2], again contrasting Epicureanism with Stoicism – and that's when I finally understood: Fate no longer improvises with me, I do not longer live in violent times, nor do I continue to depend on impulsive and changeable people, but looking forward, I may well expect to be able to spin a long thread, and therefore, my staunch stoic stance serves me not. That's when I understood that Stoicism might have helped me to weather the storms, fateful and inevitable as they were, but it will not help me chart a course, now that the skies are clear and the sun is out, nor will it help me steer my ship through the ocean of life, now that the sails are set and the winds are favourable!

More than merely being certain that Epicureanism will offer me a reliable guide for what time remains, I also feel this to be so – and take pleasure in the discovery.

Julia

-----

1. [“Epicureanism Vs Stoicism | Overview and Explanation” by Vox Stoica](#)
2. [Nietzsche - On Stoicism And Porcupine Skins](#)

---

### **Post by “Don” of May 4, 2024 at 8:54 AM**

Great first post! Welcome aboard our little boat!

---

### **Post by “Kalosyni” of May 4, 2024 at 9:04 AM**

Welcome to the forum [Julia](#) 😊

## Post by "Cassius" of May 4, 2024 at 9:13 AM

Yes indeed that is an excellent first post and you are very welcome here! In my own case, I particularly welcome those who indicate an interest in Nietzsche, because I think Nietzsche was "one of us" in many ways with his appreciation of Epicurus. I am not so bold as to say that we are smarter than Nietzsche in avoiding the "passivist" interpretations of Epicurus that Nietzsche found impossible to accept, but in my own mind I just put Nietzsche's criticisms down to his own peculiarities. A proper interpretation of Epicurus is entirely consistent with, and indeed the best way to, lead a strong and confident life, or paraphrasing your words, it's the best path "to fortify ... body and mind in preparation for [every] attempt at victory in the battle that [is] life."

Many of us have similar stories of detouring through Stoicism, and ultimately finding it empty, and I'd encourage you to share yours here as you see fit. The more times we see and hear the pattern the easier it becomes to recognize the problems and see how Epicurus resolves those errors.

I am going to tag in this file our friend [Elli](#) in Greece, who posts frequently on the [Epicurean Philosophy Facebook group](#), as she also shares similar interests.

It would be helpful to know too - did you find us via Google or Facebook or searching podcasts, or how?

---

## Post by "Cassius" of May 4, 2024 at 12:20 PM

Julia -

Thank you for posting that Vox Stoica link. I had not heard that before and am glad I am now aware of it.

I find it to be very inaccurate as to Epicurus but very typical of Stoic interpretations that center on fear and on tranquility, as if Epicurus were not concerned with "pleasure" at all. It starts off on the wrong foot, talking as if Epicurus did not value \*both\* stimulating and non-stimulative pleasure, and gets worse from there.

If you have heard our Lucretius Today podcasts over the past year you have likely heard us discuss these issues, and it is for many reasons that I share Nietzsche's contempt (I regret so strongly a word but it is accurate) for Stoicism. The quote to which you linked does not emphasize it nearly as well as the one in which Nietzsche calls Stoicism a "fraud of words."

The true Stoics of the ancient world generally held Epicurus in contempt, and I give them credit for understanding the depth of the issues involved, rather than glossing over important differences and looking for an eclectic blend as does this commentator.

These are fascinating issues and very worth discussing so thank you for linking to that. I will likely start another thread on that episode at some point and I am tempted to record a point by point response to it.

If I thought that this commentator's interpretation of Epicurus were correct, I would have nothing to do with Epicurus, nor would I recommend Epicurus to you or anyone else! 😊 To be clear, I think he is flat wrong in asserting that Epicurean philosophy is all about running from pain, and I am happy to defend Epicurus from the false praise of someone who can apparently see him only through Stoic eyes.

---

### Post by “Cassius” of May 4, 2024 at 3:22 PM

Here is our current collection of Nietzsche quotes on Epicurus relating to Stoicism, including the "fraud of words" quote:

Post

#### [Collection of Nietzsche Quotes Relevant To Epicurean Philosophy](#)

The collection at NewEpicurean.com is [here](#).

[I will work on expanding the list at the EpicureanFriends Wiki here.](#)

To carry forward the point of the significance of Nietzsche just a little, here i think is the root of N's problem with Epicurus, in Antichrist Section 30:

-----  
*"The instinctive hatred of reality: the consequence of an extreme susceptibility to pain and irritation—so great that merely to be "touched" becomes unendurable, for every sensation is too profound.*

The...



Cassius

March 21, 2019 at 8:57 AM

## **Beyond Good And Evil**

[\(Gutenberg edition, translated by Helen Zimmern \) Chapter 1, section 9](#)

You desire to LIVE “according to Nature”? Oh, you noble Stoics, what fraud of words! Imagine to yourselves a being like Nature, boundlessly extravagant, boundlessly indifferent, without purpose or consideration, without pity or justice, at once fruitful and barren and uncertain: imagine to yourselves INDIFFERENCE as a power—how COULD you live in accordance with such indifference? To live—is not that just endeavouring to be otherwise than this Nature? Is not living valuing, preferring, being unjust, being limited, endeavouring to be different? And granted that your imperative, “living according to Nature,” means actually the same as “living according to life”—how could you do DIFFERENTLY? Why should you make a principle out of what you yourselves are, and must be? In reality, however, it is quite otherwise with you: while you pretend to read with rapture the canon of your law in Nature, you want something quite the contrary, you extraordinary stage-players and self-deluders! In your pride you wish to dictate your morals and ideals to Nature, to Nature herself, and to incorporate them therein; you insist that it shall be Nature “according to the Stoa,” and would like everything to be made after your own image, as a vast, eternal glorification and generalism of Stoicism! With all your love for truth, you have forced yourselves so long, so persistently, and with such hypnotic rigidity to see Nature FALSELY, that is to say, Stoically, that you are no longer able to see it otherwise—and to crown all, some unfathomable superciliousness gives you the Bedlamite hope that BECAUSE you are able to tyrannize over yourselves—Stoicism is self-tyranny—Nature will also allow herself to be tyrannized over: is not the Stoic a PART of Nature?... But this is an old and everlasting story: what happened in old times with the Stoics still happens today, as soon as ever a philosophy begins to believe in itself. It always creates the world in its own image; it cannot do otherwise; philosophy is this tyrannical impulse itself, the most spiritual Will to Power, the will to “creation of the world,” the will to the causa prima.

[Beyond Good And Evil, \(Gutenberg edition, translated by Helen Zimmern\)](#) Chapter 5, section 188

In contrast to *laissez-aller*, every system of morals is a sort of tyranny against “nature” and also against “reason”, that is, however, no objection, unless one should again decree by some system of morals, that all kinds of tyranny and unreasonableness are unlawful. What is essential and invaluable in every system of morals, is that it is a long constraint. In order to understand Stoicism, or Port Royal, or Puritanism, one should remember the constraint under which every language has attained to strength and freedom—the metrical constraint, the tyranny of rhyme and rhythm.

[Beyond Good And Evil, \(Gutenberg edition, translated by Helen Zimmern\)](#) Chapter 5, section 198

All the systems of morals which address themselves with a view to their “happiness,” as it is called—what else are they but suggestions for behaviour adapted to the degree of DANGER from themselves in which the individuals live; recipes for their passions, their good and bad propensities, insofar as such have the Will to Power and would like to play the master; small and great expediencies and elaborations, permeated with the musty odour of old family medicines and old-wife wisdom; all of them grotesque and absurd in their form—because they address themselves to “all,” because they generalize where generalization is not authorized; all of them speaking unconditionally, and taking themselves unconditionally; all of them flavoured not merely with one grain of salt, but rather enduring only, and sometimes even seductive, when they are over-spiced and begin to smell dangerously, especially of “the other world.” That is all of little value when estimated intellectually, and is far from being “science,” much less “wisdom”; but, repeated once more, and three times repeated, it is expediency, expediency, expediency, mixed with stupidity, stupidity, stupidity—whether it be the indifference and statuesque coldness towards the heated folly of the emotions, which the Stoics advised and fostered; or the no-more-laughing and no-more-weeping of Spinoza, the destruction of the emotions by their analysis and vivisection, which he recommended so naively; or the lowering of the emotions to an innocent mean at which they may be satisfied, the Aristotelianism of morals; or even morality as the enjoyment of the emotions in a voluntary attenuation and spiritualization by the symbolism of art, perhaps as music, or as love of God, and of mankind for God’s sake—for in religion the passions are once more enfranchised, provided that...; or, finally, even the complaisant and wanton surrender to the emotions, as has been taught by Hafis and Goethe, the bold letting-go of the reins, the spiritual and corporeal licentia morum in the exceptional cases of wise old codgers and drunkards, with whom it “no longer has much danger.”—This also for the chapter: “Morals as Timidity.”

---

## Post by “Julia” of May 4, 2024 at 8:33 PM

### [Quote from Cassius](#)

[...] I find [that Vox Stoica link] to be very inaccurate as to Epicurus but very typical of Stoic interpretations [...]

While I do agree with you, I cannot help but have sympathies for the creator of this “overview and explanation” (as he calls it), because those very inaccuracies were what made Epicureanism appealing to me *then* - they made it seem like I might find even more quasi-Stoic material down this road, which, due to the high Google rank of this site (and its sister sites, like newepicurean.com, the podcast, et cetera) thankfully I did not. *Now*, the more that I relearn and have a chance to get my head set back straight, the less those inaccuracies are appealing.

To put it differently, those inaccurate representations helped lure me astray from the path of a Stoic – “lure”, because if I would have been conscious of what awaits me, that notion would inevitably have elicited a dry, cold chuckle accompanied by a dismissive hand gesture.

You see, to succeed within the setting I found myself in, to be victimized dreadfully for the majority of my existence, yet remain dead set on someday emerging the victor, I was hell-bent on being harder than the life I had to lead; if I wasn't already as empty inside as Stoicism is, I certainly wanted to be, so we were quite the match, and its theistic, platonic aspects, moronic bordering on malicious as they are, served as an anchor in a microcosm characterised by arbitrariness and powerlessness in the face of pain. Mind you, hedonic calculus did not fail me at all, but, being surrounded by Western culture, it lead me straight to Stoicism:

As a child, I knew to endure and prevail, such that someday I will get to see the bright side of life. Thus, I chose to toughen up to make it. I wanted to hold nothing dear to my heart, so nobody can pull its strings. I wanted to be a robot, because robots are strong and don't have feelings. I wanted to be like those steely heroes of popular culture, who succeed against all odds. I learned to keep to myself, to keep my mouth shut, to go through the motions, no matter what, no questions asked. When faced with suicidal ideation, I knew that was for cowards -- but Stoics are brave. When faced with illegal transgressions of my rights as a human or my boundaries as a person, I knew that was unjust – and when plagued by the emotional need for justice to be restored, I trusted in fate; everyone else would only let me down, anyway. During all this time, during many years, I needed a reason to fulfill my duties, to keep up discipline, to exceed expectations. However, the burden to perform at that level under such circumstances for so long would have been too much for me, being an isolated minor; would have been too much for me to see through in terms of the delayed gratification implied by my innate hedonic calculus. By instead embracing fate and the pursuit of virtue as a goal in itself, the gratification became immediate. That Stoic delusion allowed me to short-circuit my wires enough to keep me going, to keep me on track. For years and years, my mantra was: “Just one more day. I can do it one more day.” And so I did, again and again and again.

Eventually, my life *did* change, and suddenly, everything was great! Only...after so many years, the first half of what hedonic calculus had meant for me – “toughen up” – was all that remained in my psyche. I had forgotten the remainder – “in order to enjoy the bright side”. This was not an immediate problem: I had the guide rails of society, exams to pass, rent to pay, and so I simply kept performing. When things happened to get too easy, I made them harder for myself. Adversity was all I knew, so too much normal life, too little stress, too much freedom made me tense and uneasy, like a captive animal being warily suspicious of the wild. Granted, I was still dead inside, but things were going objectively well for me. I thought this is it, I thought I had made it.

A few years down that road, I happened to date someone kind and caring, who wasn't quite satisfied with my universal four-season answer to the question of how I feel: “I'm fine.” In an effort to embrace the challenge and perform well, I learned, ever so slowly, to recognise and

name feelings. Thus, “good” and “bad” became the first words I relearned after having so thoroughly been drowned in the anaesthetic of Stoic mentality. While certainly well-intentioned, this unsupervised visit to the recovery room soon led me to unravel in anguish as the numbness subsided. My career came to an unscheduled full stop, and I found myself with nothing to do – nothing to *fulfill* – such that, without an external definition of the mould and pattern I portrayed, the emptiness that was I imploded in on itself.

I never recovered. Years of experts, their diagnostics, evaluations and reports. Countless hours spent with therapists – trauma therapists, behavioral therapists, occupational therapists, even speech therapists as my childhood impairments resurfaced. When before nighttime meant pitch-black empty darkness, as I began to dream again, it meant nightmares. When before daytime meant robotically functioning with vigilant readiness, as I began to reconstitute as an actual person, it meant PTSD. This prescription drug, that prescription drug. Sports. Art. Music. Travel. I never recovered.

So I gave up. I gave *in*; in to the tempting bait that if Stoicism propped me up once, it would prop me up twice – and who needs feelings, anyway?!

Having grown up around military installations, I reached for biographies of members of the special forces, who quite universally embody many aspects of modern Stoicism, and, it seemed to me, did on a continuous basis what I failed to do: They did their duty, they functioned, performed. Consuming that material was repugnant and agreeable at the same time – it was repulsive, yet soothing – it was anaesthetic, but also analgesic. I went ahead, getting simultaneously worse and better, getting more capable and less human with each step again. The solid ground of empty spaces – my familiar territory. So I soon looked for an audiobook version of Marcus Aurelius' Meditations – you know – to listen to at breakfast, lunch and dinner, to listen to in bed, to rush things a little.

Now you will understand why it is that I have sympathies for the poor Stoic soul, who so duteously recorded that marvelously inaccurate “overview and explanation” of Epicureanism – who knows what might have happened to me, had he labelled his accidental signpost to The Garden more accurately. What I still failed to set forth is how, at long last, Epicureanism manages to expertly stitch together those two disjointed, ostensibly mutually exclusive perspectives visible in the fractured kaleidoscope of my mind: feelings and functioning.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, it does so by expressly making the case for pleasure; by expressly stating the full equation of hedonic calculus, unapologetically, unreservedly including the second half of it: Do unpleasant things *for more pleasure in return* – and do *pleasant things as ends in themselves*. The wisdom of a child. Such a simple truth, yet so very hard to recapture once escaped. Pleasure, being a feeling, is inherently axiomatic and readily operationalized; “happiness”, “flourishing”, “meaningfulness” are all vague, veiled, and nebulous, cannot be readily translated into action, aren't workable principles.

Having gained some self-awareness in therapy, I knew for a long time that I no longer delayed gratification; I didn't know how to anymore. Instead of embracing a task, I'd force myself through it. Instead of preparing a reward, I'd self-soothe meanwhile or recover later. Having gained some self-awareness in therapy, I knew for a long time that I no longer played; I didn't know how to anymore. Instead of *playing* cards, I *engineered* my success in them. Instead of simply enjoying a walk in nature, I exercised mindfulness. Instead of spontaneous humour, I crafted jokes. These peculiarities were known, yet during all those years, *nobody had ever mentioned pleasure to me.*

I recently went for a walk. Was I mindfully present in the moment? Possibly. Did I remain meditatively aware, yet amicably indifferent of my thoughts and impulses? Perhaps. What I do know with certainty is that it was pleasurable. A rich pleasure is what it was, plain and simple. I recently went for a walk for the first time in three decades.

I recently made myself happy. Did I follow one of the prescribed behaviours? Possibly. Did I use any of the self-regulation techniques I had been taught? Perhaps. What I do know with certainty is that it was pleasurable. A rich pleasure is what it was, not self-care, not self-compassion. I recently made myself happy for the first time in three decades.

Elated by the revelation of pleasure, that forgotten concept I was much estranged from, I tried to do things for a reward afterwards, to delay gratification, et voilà, that too worked again, because I was reasonably happy to begin with – happy, not stressed, pressured or tense –, and could anticipate pleasure in return – pleasure, not soothing or recovery.

Next, I realised there were compelling answers to all the big questions – Where do we come from? Where do we go? What about existential dread? Why struggle? Why not live in a box? Is life suffering? If so, why not end it? If it isn't, why not end it? What's the point? – *which were rooted in observation, in proper reasoning.* Finally, here it was: a philosophy that is firmly based on what is perceptible, sensible, and true. That was quite an unexpected game changer, and with it everything just fell into place.

Soon after, I ended therapy, quit prescription drugs, and resumed what I set out to do as a child: to see the bright side of life. Now that I finally have a drop-in replacement for the motivational void left behind by the evaporated dictates of virtue ethics and coercion, now that I finally have an answer to the question of “Why? What for?”, now that I have a sensible reason to act virtuously, to have discipline, now that I can finally get out of bed in the morning and start a task with ease again, now that I am regaining control of my life, I am regaining agency, and at last, for the first time in three decades, I am genuinely empowered and free.

I am recovering.

I can feel it.

### **Post by “Cassius” of May 4, 2024 at 10:08 PM**

Wow that is an incredibly impressive story Julia.

Next to that any response is going to seem inadequate, but I do want to repeat what I think is the heart of Epicurean philosophy - that all this talk of absolute virtue and Platonic ideals and rewards after death is just a pipe dream. Your own life is the most valuable thing you have, and that it is short and you have to make the best of it, and that finding the way to make the best of it is the most important thing anyone can do. It sounds like you're making great progress, and no matter how many detours along the way it sounds like that when you get to the end (which is hopefully very far away) you'll be able to say that you too have lived well. That's all anyone can do, and it sounds like you've done more self-reflection about your situation than most. You can be proud no matter what else happens that you took charge of your life and you didn't give in to the kind of wishful thinking about your situation to which so many people seem to surrender.

---

### **Post by “Julia” of May 4, 2024 at 11:14 PM**

Thank you 😊

---

### **Post by “Martin” of May 5, 2024 at 4:29 AM**

Welcome Julia!

---

### **Post by “Don” of May 5, 2024 at 9:09 AM**

That is an impressive piece of writing! Thank you very much for sharing the story of your personal path.

---

**Post by “Pacatus” of May 7, 2024 at 4:54 PM**

Welcome, Julia!