Reference: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Calendar_reform

Talk:Calendar reform

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Jump to: navigation, search

WikiProject Time [hide]

Time portal

This article is within the scope of **WikiProject Time**, a collaborative effort to improve the coverage of Time on Wikipedia. If you would like to participate, please visit the project page, where you can join the discussion and see a list of open tasks.

???	This article has not yet received a rating on the project's quality scale.
???	This article has not yet received a rating on the project's importance scale.

[show]**To-do List:**

Here are some ***tasks you can do***:

Expand: Timeline
Other:

Vital Articles

The Wikipedia 1.0 Editorial team identified the following articles relating to Time as **Vital**: "for which Wikipedia should have a corresponding high-quality article, and ideally a featured article." Those marked with this icon: are also considered to be **Core** articles, "one of the core set of articles every encyclopedia should have."

Their quality-scale rating as of **February 2008** is listed alongside each:

- Calendar - **B**
- Clock - **B**
- Day - **B**
- History - **B**
- Month - **B**
- Second - **B**
- Time - **B**
- Week - **B**
- Year - **Start**

Any help in improving these articles would not only further the efforts of WikiProject Time, but Wikipedia overall.

Contents

[hide]

- 1 C&T Calendar
- 2 Reformed Reform article
- 3 Numbering Years v. Reforming the Gregorian
- 4 New Earth Calendar - exceptions to leap year rule?
- 5 lede is wrong
- 6 Western reforms?
- 7 Alienation
- 8 13 Month Calendar
- 9 Deletion of Sol and New Earth Calendar references
- 10 Mention of proposed calendars
- 11 "Missing" days
- 12 Two related Articles
- 13 Astronomically Correct Calendars Proposed

[edit] C&T Calendar

As a recent calendar-reform proposal, I thought this deserved mention. I just want to note that I am not Henry, this is not intended to be promotion or spam, it's just that the article is so stubby that adding a paragraph about a new proposal does sort of put it out of balance. But I don't see how to describe it in less than a paragraph... and I think that citing sources is important. If they look too link-spammy let me document them here for the record in case anyone decides they shouldn't all be in the article. I think the proposal is a bit nutty, by the way, and his page describing it contains some astonishingly flippant and dismissive remarks about possible objections. Dpbsmith (talk) 12:25, 31 Dec 2004 (UTC)

- Johns Hopkins press release on the new calendar
- Dick Henry's argument in favor of the C&T calendar
- Slashdot discussion of Dick Henry's C&T

In my quest for reform of the calendars, I have been attempting to update my arguments/thoughts since 1970-71 after my name got 'first time' in media print Via Tribune, Chandigarh (06 June 1971); and then as Time by Metric (Times of India, New Delhi (04 July 1971). Today, I stand in favour for *shifting a day from July (thereby making this month of 30 days; and adding this day gained into the month of February making this of 29 days in all Years* falling in line for my proposed Vij's Gregorian Rhyme Calendar 2005-2006 under discussion with Calndr-L group. Added advantage of this format is that NOT ONLY the four(4) quarters and two(2) half years can have 91-days or 13 weeks in each quarter ON KEEPING THE 365th day & 366th days of the year outside of the calendar format BUT *durations in each month follow the Kepler's Laws (unlike the C&T calendar or International Fixed Calendar). I evolve the period of 373632-years wherein the THREE cycles: 128-yr,(7*128=896-yr/159 Lwks)and the 834-yr_148 Lwks can be made use of/for the CIVIL calendar. 128-yr cycle gains over others by NOT MAKING any drastic change except that the CENTURIAN RULE gets modified from 100/400-yr "Leap Day Rule" to 128/896-yr for making the adjustment for leap day accounting. Luni-solar alignments are possible using (33,33,33,29)years or [(33,31)& (33,31)] i.e. 2*64-yr aligning using 19-year lunar cycle with 235 lunations - alongwith 'rationalised Tithi/ phases' of duartion 138*7-day/965th. Values for Mean Year and Mean Lunation are possibly the best 'comparable with any calendar'.
Brij Bhushan Vij (metricvij AT hotmail.com) 7 January 2005

ADDED by Brij Vij on 20100417:

The Astronomical Poem (revised number of days in any month)

" 30 days has September; April, June, July and November
all the rest have 31 except February which has 29
except on years divisible evenly by 4; except when YEAR
divisible by 128 - as long as you remember that
"October (meaning 8) is the 10th month and
December (meaning 10) is the 12th BUT has 30 days & ONE
OUTSIDE of calendar-format" – Anonymous (mod Brij)

[Refers to: http://calendars.wikia.com/wiki/Modified_Gregorian_Calendar]

> I disagree with what Brij says about rules (a) and (c), but one can point
> out after the rules that, that each year whose number is divisible by 2688
> has 53 weeks under both rules (a) and (c) and so in 2688 years, there are
> 29 rather than 30 leap week years additional to the regular leap week
> years of rule (a).

It is in my view that *Chris Carrier or who-so-ever* since I do not get any reply from his E-mail ID at Bonavian calendar 'insertion' developed when he was a child of 11-years in a California school. I now read the last para….(not having read earlier) – a rejoinder to Bonavian 28-yr/896-year rule, as: "I recall my mail to Calndr-L on *Bonavian New Year Rule* of Monday, September 13, 2004 2:08:36 PM, claiming my inputs that I discussed with listserv members, presenting my 896-year cycle as:

"In years divisible by 28, a thirteenth month of 35 days duration is added, named Mercedonius, which, since we are still using Roman names, is logical because that was the 13th month name the Romans were using when they still had leap months pre-Caesar. The 35 day leap month is shortened to 28 days in years divisible by 896 to fix the average year length at 365+(31/128) days.
For a free copy of BASIC software that will give the date in all three Bonavian Calendars, send email to my Internet address 72157.3334@compuserve.com."

My claim for this cycle is that it is possibly the shortest lunisolar cycle with 'exact 159 Leap Weeks' & 11082 LUNATION, NEEDING only ONE DAY/Tithi of value =1.00103690881356 day, I call that belong to Harappan Lunar-Tithi calendar: http://www.brijvij.com/bb1920_caL-harappa.pdf ".
My position about distribution of 10-Kepler Leap Weeks (over the 149 'normal div. six(6), are placed at: (a) http://www.brijvij.com/bb_896-yrs-159lwk.pdf and
(b) http://www.brijvij.com/bb_896rev-distr.claim.pdf
The cause of confusion, however, had been that 896 is NOT 'exactly divisible by six BUT HAS complete 159 Leap Weeks' unlike many other cycles that *'do not have exact weeks in the cycle'.*
Apart, this cycle has:

			46751/896 Mean Yr		Mean Ln	
896-yrs	327257.0019441237 days	46751.0003 weeks	=365.2421875 days	11081.9667 Lunation	=327257/11082 days	**326918 Tithi**

Mean Year =7*[365+31/128)=365.2421875 days =7*[52+159/896] days
Mean Lunation =(327257+1) days/11082 =29.530590146183 days i.e. 29d 12h 44m 2s.9886, which is the current value. [Note: 29.53058881 days =29d 12h 44m 2s.8732].
It is to be 'observed' that adding 1 day/tithi per 896-years AUTOMATICALLY take care of ONE LUNATION over 29*896 = 25984-years/ 321377(+1) lunation in [25984-yrs =9490453 days; and 321377 lunation = 9490452 days, thus adding one lunation make up for CLOSE to ONE CYCLE of Precession of Equinoxes: http://www.brijvij.com/bb_Precession-n-896-yrs.pdf
[metricvij at hotmail.com] AUTHOR.

Re: Glorious India

From: **twca@theworldcalendar.org**
Sent: Thu 3/04/10 2:20 AM
To: Brij Bhushan Vij (metricvij@hotmail.com)
speakerloksabha@sansad.nic.in; manmohan@sansad.nic.in; ak.antony@sansad.nic.in;
Cc: svpatil@sansad.nic.in; ksibal@sansad.nic.in; kapilsibal@hotmail.com; pachouri@sansad.nic.in; spjaiswal@sansad.nic.in

Brij Bhushan Vij, sir:

The World Calendar Association has concerns that although the calendar you favor is not The World Calendar, your promotions use terms such a 'A World Calendar', 'The Alternate World Calendar', 'ALTERNATE proposed World Calendar', 'A possible World Calendar', etc and ‘The World Calendar' on a silver coin.

I've found only one link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org in your documents. So it seems that advertising your calendar version with words that are similar to The World Calendar simultaneously minimizes the role of source documents in presenting a broader picture. Your tendency to repeatedly refer to the mid-20th century obstacle at the United Nations as prelude to and reason for your version tends to overstate the decision, assuming it to be entirely too final. ‘As it turns out, perception of The World Calendar in use was a problem that The World Calendar is not.‘ (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/CalendarMathProblemSolution100206.pdf)

Much has changed since the 1950s. Limited reasoning that prevailed during that period will not optimally improve our future, no matter how many times it is used to validate the endless search for a different approach that is better than The World Calendar. Awareness of consciousness has increased along with growing knowledge of the universe. A replacement for the Gregorian calendar should not ignore the extreme advantages of sustainability that a memorizable calendar includes.

Among your equations detailing accuracy, there appears to be nothing about your version being simple enough to memorize and use (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/2.htm), eyes open or eyes closed, without a physical crutch, printed or electronic or otherwise. The World Calendar Association challenges the world to also judge calendar alternatives in terms of simplicity of application, like a clock. We do not forget that the calendar is an accumulation of thoughts about time. As long as our primary calendar hinders its own use — as when we seek or do not have access to the required physical copy needed to plan past next week— we’ll continue to ignore our choice to remain stuck.

In your documents (PDF, html, e-mail), please specify that your calendar version is neither endorsed by nor in any way connected with The World Calendar or The World Calendar Association. In fairness, each disclaimer should include a direct link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org.

When correctly capitalizing ‘The World Calendar’ and ‘The World Calendar Association’ (TWCA), thank you.

Wayne Edward Richardson ('Wayne')
Director, The World Calendar Association – International

'SHOULDN’T OUR CALENDAR BE AS SIMPLE AS OUR CLOCK?'
http://www.theworldcalendar.org/TWCandDescription.pdf

On Thu, December 17, 2009 12:12 pm, Brij Bhushan Vij wrote:
>
> Excellency/sirs:
>
> As the year turns, I offer an alternate to The World Calendar, a topic
> that I have been developing since 1970-71, while still in Air Force. Gist
> of my documents is placed at:
>

> http://www.brijvij.com/bb_364-dGreg-cal-Reform.pdf that I believe cover
> most anomalies that led to failure of the efforts made at United Nations
> (1955).
>
> NEVER did man develop the simplest 'modification to Gregorian calendar by
> mere shifting the day of July 31st to 2nd month as February 29th; and
> devise Leap Weeks plan on divide six(6) like having a Leap Day on divide
> four(4). Also, please see:
> http://www.brijvij.com/bb_metro-contrbn.2007.pdf
>
> apart from my documents that I have been discussing with USMA & Calndr-L
> groups.
>
> My profound regards,
> Brij Bhushan Vij
> (MJD 2454933)/1361+D-358W51-04 (G. Thursday, 2009 December 17H13:19
> (decimal) EST
>
> Aa Nau Bhadra Kritvo Yantu Vishwatah -Rg Veda
> Jan:31; Feb:29; Mar:31; Apr:30; May:31; Jun:30
> Jul:30; Aug:31; Sep:30; Oct:31; Nov:30; Dec:30
> (365th day of Year is World Day)
> My Profile:http://www.brijvij.com/bbv_2col-vipBrief.pdf
> HOME PAGE: http://www.brijvij.com/
> ******As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****
> "Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"
> Contact # 001 (201) 675-8548
>

Re: Minimal or NO change RE: 2010 calendar modified

From: **twca@theworldcalendar.org**
Sent: Thu 3/04/10 2:26 AM
To: Brij Bhushan Vij (metricvij@hotmail.com)
Cc: sonny@pondrom.org; calendar listserv (calndr-l@listserv.ecu.edu); nkklrp@hotmail.com; Vladmir Pakhomov (domino@dubna.ru); US Metric Association (usma@colostate.edu); rkgarg@mail.nplindia.ernet.in; India Mission, NY (india@un.int); elana.beiser@wsj.com; Toke Norby (toke.norby@norbyhus.dk)

Brij Bhushan Vij, sir:

The World Calendar Association has concerns that although the calendar you favor is not The World Calendar, your promotions use terms such a 'A World Calendar', 'The Alternate World Calendar', 'ALTERNATE proposed World Calendar', 'A possible World Calendar', etc and ‘The World Calendar' on a silver coin.

I've found only one link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org in your documents. So it seems that advertising your calendar version with words that are similar to The World Calendar simultaneously minimizes the role of source documents in presenting a broader picture. Your tendency to repeatedly refer to the mid-20th century obstacle at the United Nations as prelude to and reason for your version tends to overstate the decision, assuming it to be entirely too final. ‘As it turns out, perception of The World Calendar in use was a problem that The World Calendar is not.‘ (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/CalendarMathProblemSolution100206.pdf)

Much has changed since the 1950s. Limited reasoning that prevailed during that period will not optimally improve our future, no matter how many times it is used to validate the endless search for a different approach

that is better than The World Calendar. Awareness of consciousness has increased along with growing knowledge of the universe. A replacement for the Gregorian calendar should not ignore the extreme advantages of sustainability that a memorizable calendar includes.

Among your equations detailing accuracy, there appears to be nothing about your version being simple enough to memorize and use (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/2.htm), eyes open or eyes closed, without a physical crutch, printed or electronic or otherwise. The World Calendar Association challenges the world to also judge calendar alternatives in terms of simplicity of application, like a clock. We do not forget that the calendar is an accumulation of thoughts about time. As long as our primary calendar hinders its own use — as when we seek or do not have access to the required physical copy needed to plan past next week— we'll continue to ignore our choice to remain stuck.

In your documents (PDF, html, e-mail), please specify that your calendar version is neither endorsed by nor in any way connected with The World Calendar or The World Calendar Association. In fairness, each disclaimer should include a direct link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org.

When correctly capitalizing 'The World Calendar' and 'The World Calendar Association' (TWCA), thank you.

Wayne Edward Richardson ('Wayne')
Director, The World Calendar Association – International

'SHOULDN'T OUR CALENDAR BE AS SIMPLE AS OUR CLOCK?'
http://www.theworldcalendar.org/TWCandDescription.pdf

On Tue, February 16, 2010 5:26 pm, Brij Bhushan Vij wrote:
>
> Sonny & all sirs:
>
>>Every one will agree that the biggest problem with the current calendar is
>> >the odd number of days in a month. Changing to 28 days per month
>>would not make it perpetual and quarters would require odd months, but
>>it would solve a lot of weekly and monthly problems.
>
> (Reference: http://www.brijvij.com/bb_metro-contrbn.2007.pdf)
>
> I thank you for joining my aim of REFORM of calendars - especially the
> Gregorian, since an Alternate to this is 'precisely - what is wanted!'
>
> It is a great idea to 'compare my efforts' with yours and most calendars
> in use, to arrive at a possible 'Alternate World Calendar'. I have brought
> these facts and placed at:http://www.brijvij.com/bb_wrld-cal.Nu-app..pdf
>
> and drawn the comparision of 'several' proposals that have come up at:
> http://brijvij.com/CalndrsComrd.doc; and now take the liberty of posting
> an updated 'views' that I hold on my 896-year cycle and the attachment
> from you, sir. I hope, I am not over stepping, my zeal. Further, I submit:

>
> (a) Un-equal number of days in 12-months only meet the duration taken by
> Earth - due to Keplers' Laws of Planetary motion;
>
> (b) so long as the FOUR quarters of 'year' meet business requirement of
> 91-days (13 weeks) in each quarter; and the remaining period of
> 1.242189669781 day is taken care, either by Leap Days or Leap weeks, this
> cannot be a hurdle;
>
> (c) A 28d-13 month calendar, may have the advantage of JUST ONE MONTH
> repeated 13 times (13x28 =364 days) but human mind's impediment
> (especially the tiny-tots) at Nursery classes need to strain in
> 'learning/memorising' that all months henceforth shall have 28 days and
> 'number of months in the year' would be 13 (Thirteen).....? Imagine the
> cost of TEACHING!
>
> Instead, just shift a day JULY 31st to 2nd month as FEBRUARY 29th (ALL
> years).
>
> AND, if the year of introduction, gets agreed to Y 2007 i.e. the FIRST
> Kepler Leap Week after [(Y2000 - 80)+/- 128] or Y1920, current Y2010 is a
> Leap Week year 'normally occuring' on divide six basis; after year Y2004!
> I shall love to
>
> It is unfortunate, I am an individual working as a ONE MAN organisation,
> investing my 'time & resources' since 40-years. Since my childhood, I
> have learnt to STOPNOT till the goal is reached.
> Please see: http://www.brijvij.com/bb_896-claim.pdf
>
> I shall love to see my efforts bring some desired benefit to human
> society, keeping goal of Smithsonian Institution: Let knowledge grow from
> man-to-man! I believe, any cycle can be worked on DIVIDE 'six (6)' plan on
> inserting Leap weeks & Kepler Leap Weeks, as:
> http://www.brijvij.com/bb_harappaTithi-Cycles.pdf
>
>>After the world see the benefits associated with this step, the next step
>> >(whatever it is) will be easier.
>
> I am in full agreement. But, who shall bell the cat? Or see through, what
> 'this odd man' has harped all his life, sir. It is the political will that
> need be revoked and the calendar question - given a FRESH hearing, at
> United Nations - and remain above vetoing, sirs.
>
> My regards, to all:
>
> Brij Bhushan Vij
> (MJD 55243)/1726+D-058W08-02 (G. Tuesday, 2010 February 16H18:43 (decimal)
> EST
> Aa Nau Bhadra Kritvo Yantu Vishwatah -Rg Veda
> Jan:31; Feb:29; Mar:31; Apr:30; May:31; Jun:30
> Jul:30; Aug:31; Sep:30; Oct:31; Nov:30; Dec:30
> (365th day of Year is World Day)

> My Profile:http://www.brijvij.com/bbv_2col-vipBrief.pdf
> HOME PAGE: http://www.brijvij.com/
> ******As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****
> "Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"
> Contact # 001 (201) 675-8548
>
>
>
>
>
>
> CC: calndr-l@listserv.ecu.edu; nkklrp@hotmail.com; domino@dubna.ru;
> twca@theworldcalendar.org; usma@colostate.edu
> From: sonny@pondrom.org
> To: metricvij@hotmail.com
> Subject: 2010 calendar modified
> Date: Sat, 13 Feb 2010 20:50:55 -0600
>
>
> Everyone,
> First, I want to thank you all for your work on calendar reform. It has
> been a passion of mine as well. I understand why ancient thought so many
> years ago has put us in a position where we can not correct it in the past
> 2,000 years. The dumbest ideas proposed (like mine) are equivalent to
> "the invention of wheel" compared to ISO 8601 that we have now.
>
>
> A simple suggestion for improvement is an incremental approach (i.e. the
> minimum change with maximum effect). Everyone will agree that the biggest
> problem with the current calendar is the odd number of days in a month.
> Changing to 28 days per month would not make it perpetual and quarters
> would require odd months, but it would solve a lot of weekly and monthly
> problems. After the world see the benefits associated with this step,
> the next step (whatever it is) will be easier.
>
>
> I have modified a popular 2010 calendar of Jon Wittwer (Vertex42.com) to
> compare the two.
>
>
>
> _____
> Hotmail: Trusted email with powerful SPAM protection.
> http://clk.atdmt.com/GBL/go/201469227/direct/01/

RE: The Rule & Jitter Re:.. Leap Week Rule

From: **twca@theworldcalendar.org**
Sent: Thu 3/04/10 2:38 AM
To: Brij Bhushan Vij (metricvij@hotmail.com)
Cc: Karl KEV Palmen (karl.palmen@stfc.ac.uk)

Brij Bhushan Vij, sir:

The World Calendar Association has concerns that although the calendar you favor is not The World Calendar, your promotions use terms such a 'A World Calendar', 'The Alternate World Calendar', 'ALTERNATE proposed World Calendar', 'A possible World Calendar', etc and ‘The World Calendar' on a silver coin.

I've found only one link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org in your documents. So it seems that advertising your calendar version with words that are similar to The World Calendar simultaneously minimizes the role of source documents in presenting a broader picture. Your tendency to repeatedly refer to the mid-20th century obstacle at the United Nations as prelude to and reason for your version tends to overstate the decision, assuming it to be entirely too final. ‘As it turns out, perception of The World Calendar in use was a problem that The World Calendar is not.‘ (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/CalendarMathProblemSolution100206.pdf)

Much has changed since the 1950s. Limited reasoning that prevailed during that period will not optimally improve our future, no matter how many times it is used to validate the endless search for a different approach that is better than The World Calendar. Awareness of consciousness has increased along with growing knowledge of the universe. A replacement for the Gregorian calendar should not ignore the extreme advantages of sustainability that a memorizable calendar includes.

Among your equations detailing accuracy, there appears to be nothing about your version being simple enough to memorize and use (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/2.htm), eyes open or eyes closed, without a physical crutch, printed or electronic or otherwise. The World Calendar Association challenges the world to also judge calendar alternatives in terms of simplicity of application, like a clock. We do not forget that the calendar is an accumulation of thoughts about time. As long as our primary calendar hinders its own use — as when we seek or do not have access to the required physical copy needed to plan past next week— we’ll continue to ignore our choice to remain stuck.

In your documents (PDF, html, e-mail), please specify that your calendar version is neither endorsed by nor in any way connected with The World Calendar or The World Calendar Association. In fairness, each disclaimer should include a direct link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org.

When correctly capitalizing ‘The World Calendar’ and ‘The World Calendar Association’ (TWCA), thank you.

Wayne Edward Richardson ('Wayne')
Director, The World Calendar Association – International

'SHOULDN’T OUR CALENDAR BE AS SIMPLE AS OUR CLOCK?'
http://www.theworldcalendar.org/TWCandDescription.pdf

On Mon, March 1, 2010 12:06 pm, Brij Bhushan Vij wrote:
>
> Karl, and all Sirs:
>>I advise both organizations to be very sceptical of Brij’s proposal.
>
> Karl may have his reasons to be sceptical about my proposal, and I have
> little to 'add more than what I have tried to elucidate' being a
> non-astronomy individual - having started my career from scratch. I must,
> however, thank Karl for his indirect guidance and twisting my mind. The
> fact that my Alternate World Calendar aims at 'showing - a possible way

> via my calculations' that may mean POSITIVE outcome, if need for Reform of
> Gregorian calendar is felt 'ignoring' political barriers.
>
> My posts to Calndr-L have only meant 'improving upon' the exisiting
> factors impeding the progressive *Socio-scientific and Politico-economic*
> approach - the title I used of my contribution, in a paper during
> International Conference of Time & Frequency (1981), at National Physical
> Laboratory, New Delhi.
>
> My regards to all,
>
> Brij Bhushan Vij
> (MJD 55256)/1726+D-071W10-01 (G. Monday, 2010 March 01H13:08 (decimal) EST
>
> Aa Nau Bhadra Kritvo Yantu Vishwatah -Rg Veda
> Jan:31; Feb:29; Mar:31; Apr:30; May:31; Jun:30
> Jul:30; Aug:31; Sep:30; Oct:31; Nov:30; Dec:30
> (365th day of Year is World Day)
> My Profile:http://www.brijvij.com/bbv_2col-vipBrief.pdf
> HOME PAGE: http://www.brijvij.com/
> ******As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****
> "Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"
> Contact # 001 (201) 675-8548
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Subject: RE: The Rule & Jitter Re:.. Leap Week Rule
> Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 12:30:38 +0000
> From: karl.palmen@stfc.ac.uk
> To: metricvij@hotmail.com; twca@theworldcalendar.org; india@un.int
>
>
>
>
>
> Dear Brij and Others
>
> Brij has quoted me when writing his note to The World Calendar Association
> and India Mission NY. So I feel obliged to add my part.
> I advise both organisations to be very sceptical of Brij’s proposal.
>
>
>
> From: Brij Bhushan Vij [mailto:metricvij@hotmail.com]
> Sent: 28 February 2010 03:24
> To: Palmen, Karl (STFC,RAL,CICT); theWorld Calendar Association; India
> Mission, NY
> Subject: The Rule & Jitter Re:.. Leap Week Rule
>
> Karl, sir:
>>I see Brij does show all the leap week years for the first three 896-year
>> cycles and there are 477 = 3*159 of them, so giving the intended mean
>> year.
> I thank you, for this.
>>A year has 53 weeks rather than 52 week if and only if one or more of the
>> following apply:
> (a) The year number is divisible by six
> (b) The remainder of the year number when divided by 896 is 93, 183 or
> any number a multiple of 90 greater
> (c) The year number is divisible by 896

> I feel Rule (a) and (c) need be combined to read: "The year number is
> divisible by 'both' 6 & 896" to be a *regular leap week*.
> Brij is poor at drafting calendar rules, so I produced the above set. By
> drafting these rules, I do not imply any recommendation for this proposal.
>
> I disagree with what Brij says about rules (a) and (c), but one can point
> out after the rules that, that each year whose number is divisible by 2688
> has 53 weeks under both rules (a) and (c) and so in 2688 years, there are
> 29 rather than 30 leap week years additional to the regular leap week
> years of rule (a).
>
> The following definitions after the rules, may be helpful:
> A regular leap week year is a year that has 53 weeks because of rule (a)
> A Kepler year is a year that has 53 weeks because of rule (b) and (c)
> An additional leap week year is a Kepler year that is not a regular leap
> week year.
>
> Note that one year every 2688 years is the Kepler year that is also a
> regular leap week year and so is not an additional leap week year. Rule
> (a) needs to be labelled separately from rules (b) and (c) for these
> definitions to work.
>
>
> Also, this take me back to my ORIGINAL (1992) published contribution,
> where I said:
>
> "THE LEAP WEEK RULE : An 896-year span shall have 327257.01010776 days,
> to account 159 ‘leap weeks’. All years shall have 52 weeks, OTHERN THAN
> THOSE YEARS DIVISIBLE DIVISIBLE BY SIX (6), which shall have an added
> 53rd week as the leap week of the year, only TEN (10) additional
> inter-calary leap weeks need adjustment at a frequency of every 90-years
> - the first three (3) years later (i.e. during 93rd year) and the last
> three (3) years earlier (i.e. during 87th year), if the 896th year itself
> happen to be divisible by SIX (6)".
> This is not clear and contains information that does not belong to the
> rules. Also the average value of 896-years in the calendar is exactly
> 327257 days. Not all periods of 896-years have that number of days. For
> example, the period beginning with year 6 (ending with year 901) has
> 327264 days. This arises because 896 is not divisible by six.
>
>
>>This comes at the cost of jitter.
> This refers to getting 159 years of 53 days in 896-year on average rather
> than 159 1/3 as would be the case if all Kepler years were additional leap
> week years.
>>Take the 173-year period of from year 2605 to year 2777 inclusive. It
>>has only 28 leap weeks all of them regular. Yet 173 year have
>> 173*(159/896)=30.69977… leap weeks
>>on average. The difference is a jitter of 2.69977… weeks equal to
>> 18.8984375 days. Such a jitter is an
>>inevitable consequence of having 28 consecutive intervals of 90 years or
>> less between the
>>additional leap week years.
> The jitter arises becuase WE ARE NOT CONSIDERING the 10th Kelper Leap Week
> i.e. Y0896, Y1792 and then Y2688 [the years that were the cause of
> 'confusion' or j-factor]. Thus, 10th and 20th Kepler Leap Weeks occur/are
> placed during 0893rd and (893+896) i.e. Y1789th. Y2688 is NOT a KLWk, as
> such [Y1789+896} i.e. Y2685 does NOT exist among KLWks.
> Here you might see that the 'jitter you mention' of 173 years is that of
> ONLY 83-years.
> This is incorrect. There are only 28 years of 53 weeks in the 173 years
> from 2605 to 2777 inclusive. This gives rise to the jitter.
> The same jitter also arises from looking at the 2688-173=2515 years from

> 90 to 2604 inclusive. These 2515 years have 448-28=420 regular leap week
> years and all 29 additional leap week years. This is a total of
> 420+29=449 leap week years compared with an average of 2515 years of
> 2515*159/896 = 446.30022… . The difference is 2.699777… weeks equal to
> exactly 18.8894375 days as with the 173 years. The jitter of the 173 years
> reverses the jitter of the 2515 years. The jitter is a backwards and
> forwards motion.
>
> The movement of leap week years from the 896th and 1792nd to the 893rd and
> 1789th years does not affect this at all, unless the 2685th year were
> added, then the mean year would go up to 365.244791666… days. (we'd lose
> this).
>
> Another property of the calendar proposals that you should be aware of as
> that most of the additional leap weeks years are next to a regular leap
> week year. This includes the nearest (1974, 1975) and the next (2064,
> 2065). See the list in http://www.brijvij.com/bb_896rev-distr.claim.pdf .
>
> Karl
>
> 11(01(16
>
> --
> Scanned by iCritical.
>
>
> _____
> Your E-mail and More On-the-Go. Get Windows Live Hotmail Free.
> http://clk.atdmt.com/GBL/go/201469229/direct/01/

Re: Divide Six (6) RE: [USMA:45796] Re: The Pitch RE: RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication

From: **twca@theworldcalendar.org**
Sent: Thu 3/04/10 2:15 AM
To: Brij Bhushan Vij (metricvij@hotmail.com)
barkatfish@hotmail.com; Dr Banerjee Hd. T & F (banerjee@csnpl.ren.nic.in); Histr of Sci. - INSA Bag
Cc: (insa@vsnl.net); Indian Express New Delhi (letters-delhi@express2.indexp.co.in); Vikram Kumar
(vkmr@csnpl.ren.nic.in)

Brij Bhushan Vij, sir:

The World Calendar Association has concerns that although the calendar you favor is not The World Calendar, your promotions use terms such a 'A World Calendar', 'The Alternate World Calendar', 'ALTERNATE proposed World Calendar', 'A possible World Calendar', etc and 'The World Calendar' on a silver coin.

I've found only one link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org in your documents. So it seems that advertising your calendar version with words that are similar to The World Calendar simultaneously minimizes the role of source documents in presenting a broader picture. Your tendency to repeatedly refer to the mid-20th century obstacle at the United Nations as prelude to and reason for your version tends to overstate the decision, assuming it to be entirely too final. 'As it turns out, perception of The World Calendar in use was a problem that The World Calendar is not.' (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/CalendarMathProblemSolution100206.pdf)

Much has changed since the 1950s. Limited reasoning that prevailed during that period will not optimally improve our future, no matter how many times it is used to validate the endless search for a different approach that is better than The World Calendar. Awareness of consciousness has increased along with growing knowledge of the universe. A replacement

for the Gregorian calendar should not ignore the extreme advantages of sustainability that a memorizable calendar includes.

Among your equations detailing accuracy, there appears to be nothing about your version being simple enough to memorize and use (http://www.theworldcalendar.org/2.htm), eyes open or eyes closed, without a physical crutch, printed or electronic or otherwise. The World Calendar Association challenges the world to also judge calendar alternatives in terms of simplicity of application, like a clock. We do not forget that the calendar is an accumulation of thoughts about time. As long as our primary calendar hinders its own use — as when we seek or do not have access to the required physical copy needed to plan past next week— we'll continue to ignore our choice to remain stuck.

In your documents (PDF, html, e-mail), please specify that your calendar version is neither endorsed by nor in any way connected with The World Calendar or The World Calendar Association. In fairness, each disclaimer should include a direct link to www.TheWorldCalendar.org.

When correctly capitalizing 'The World Calendar' and 'The World Calendar Association' (TWCA), thank you.

Wayne Edward Richardson ('Wayne')
Director, The World Calendar Association – International

'SHOULDN'T OUR CALENDAR BE AS SIMPLE AS OUR CLOCK?'
http://www.theworldcalendar.org/TWCandDescription.pdf

On Sat, September 12, 2009 11:26 am, Brij Bhushan Vij wrote:
>
> Stephen, sir:
>
>>.....Although why not eliminate the feet/inches values entirely?
> THIS, to some extent make a 'start - to THINK METRIC', I guess. Time
> between ONE *ASH EVENT to next* is a fixed event.
>
> I have often wondered: What calendar format is desired that led to "US
> exercising a VETO" leading to NO MORE consideration of the World Calendar?
> As far me, I have tried to produce several formats <
> http://www.brijvij.com/bb_metro-contrbn.2007.pdf>
>
> that can be 'fit candidates' leading to become a possible World Calendar
> for ALL AGES.
>
> My combining [896-yrs/159 LWks + 834-yrs/148 LWks = 1730-yrs/307 LWks (on
> addition of THREE days/tithi) make up for the EXTRA lunation adjusting for
> getting the *CURRENT* Mean Lunation, making this cycle important
> 10*[1730-yrs/21397.1 lunation]
> making possibly the best option for Mean Year & Mean Lunations -
> especially using my *DIVIDE SIX(6) Plan*. Also, please see:
> http://www.brijvij.com/bb_harappaTithi-Cycles.pdf
>
> Regards,
>
> Brij Bhushan Vij
> (MJD 2455088)/1361+D-263W37-06 (G. Saturday, 2009 September 12H13:44
> (decimal) EST
>
> Aa Nau Bhadra Kritvo Yantu Vishwatah -Rg Veda
> Jan:31; Feb:29; Mar:31; Apr:30; May:31; Jun:30
> Jul:30; Aug:31; Sep:30; Oct:31; Nov:30; Dec:30

> (365th day of Year is World Day)
> My Profile:http://www.brijvij.com/bbv_2col-vipBrief.pdf
> HOME PAGE: http://www.brijvij.com/
> ******As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****
> "Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"
> Contact # 001 (201) 675-8548
>
>
>
>
>
>
> From: barkatfish@hotmail.com
> To: usma@colostate.edu
> Subject: [USMA:45796] Re: The Pitch RE: RE: Mathematics improvement due to
> metrication
> Date: Fri, 11 Sep 2009 23:25:34 +0000
>
>
>
> Cricket laws have evolved over the years - a move to metric has (I would
> guess) never be deemed important or necessary. I'm making presumptions of
> course.
>
>
> I would have thought that Brij would be more interested in the time
> between each Ashes series - what with it being in the UK or Australia each
> time. ;-) ;-)
>
>
>
> Date: Fri, 11 Sep 2009 15:28:51 -0700
> From: jmsteele9027@sbcglobal.net
> Subject: [USMA:45795] Re: The Pitch RE: RE: Mathematics improvement due to
> metrication
> To: usma@colostate.edu
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> I have no idea whether the rest of the world would respond favorably to
> modifying the Laws of the Game to rounded metric values. Few in the US
> play or have ever watched a game of cricket. This would have remarkably
> little to do with the US going (or not going) metric.
>
> As 0.01 m resolution seems to suffice in the metric conversion, 0.01 feet
> or 0.1 inch would be more than sufficient in the reverse direction. The
> rest of the digits in those values are just "decimal dust." Although why
> not eliminate the feet/inches values entirely?
>
> --- On Fri, 9/11/09, Brij Bhushan Vij <metricvij@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> From: Brij Bhushan Vij <metricvij@hotmail.com>
> Subject: [USMA:45794] The Pitch RE: RE: Mathematics improvement due to
> metrication
> To: "U.S. Metric Association" <usma@colostate.edu>
> Date: Friday, September 11, 2009, 4:56 PM
>
>
>

>
> Sirs:
>>Cricket Pitch:
> The pitch is a rectangular area of the ground 22 yards/20.12m
> in length and 10ft/3.05m in width. It is bounded at either end
> by the bowling creases and on either side by imaginary lines,
> one each side of the imaginary line joining the centres of the
> two middle stumps, each parallel to it and 5ft/1.52m from it.
> See Laws 8.1 (Width and pitching) and 9.2 (The bowling
> crease).
> To popularise cricket the world over, and as a preamble to acceptance of
> transfer to Metric adoption in USA, THIS law could be modified to read as:
> The pitch is a rectangular area of the ground 20m/21.8722 yard (21yds 10
> 1/2in)
> in length and 3m/9.84249ft (118.12 inch)in width. It is bounded at either
> end by
> the bowling creases and on either side by imaginary lines, one each side
> of the
> imaginary line joining the centres of the two middle stumps, each parallel
> to it
> and 1.5m/4.921245ft (approx.59 inch) from it.[Laws 8.1 (Width and
> pitching) and
> 9.2 (The bowling crease) could accordingly be modified].
> This can go a long way to THINK METRIC in USA.
> TIME: to Think Metric
> Brij Bhushan Vij
> (MJD 2455087)/1361+D-262W37-05 (G. Friday, 2009 September 11H16:94
> (decimal) EST
> Aa Nau Bhadra Kritvo Yantu Vishwatah -Rg Veda
> Jan:31; Feb:29; Mar:31; Apr:30; May:31; Jun:30
> Jul:30; Aug:31; Sep:30; Oct:31; Nov:30; Dec:30
> (365th day of Year is World Day)
> My Profile:http://www.brijvij.com/bbv_2col-vipBrief.pdf
> HOME PAGE: http://www.brijvij.com/
> ******As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****
> "Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"
> Contact # 001 (201) 675-8548
>
>
>
>
>
>
> From: vlietstra@btinternet.com
> To: usma@colostate.edu
> Subject: [USMA:45790] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
> Date: Wed, 9 Sep 2009 19:48:12 +0100
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> John,
>
> You are quite right – the rounding is due to Wikipedia. BTW, in 1966 I
> qualified as a cricket umpire for club level matches while I was at
> university, but I have not umpired for many years.
>
>

>
>
> From: owner-usma@colostate.edu [mailto:owner-usma@colostate.edu] On Behalf
> Of John M. Steele
> Sent: 09 September 2009 00:25
> To: U.S. Metric Association
> Subject: [USMA:45780] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
>
>
>
>
>
>
> As an American, I don't know squat about cricket. However, I wonder if
> that rounding is not, in fact, due to Wikipedia. This link claims to be a
> copy of the official rules and says
>
> http://www.lords.org/data/files/laws_of_cricket_2003-8685.pdfLAW 7 THE
> PITCH
> 1. Area of pitch
> The pitch is a rectangular area of the ground 22 yards/20.12m
> in length and 10ft/3.05m in width. It is bounded at either end
> by the bowling creases and on either side by imaginary lines,
> one each side of the imaginary line joining the centres of the
> two middle stumps, each parallel to it and 5ft/1.52m from it.
> See Laws 8.1 (Width and pitching) and 9.2 (The bowling
> crease).
>
>
>
>
> In fact, dimenisons appear rounded to the centimeter through as much of
> the book as I looked at for the playing field, but the ball to the nearest
> millimeter..
>
>
>
> --- On Tue, 9/8/09, Pat Naughtin <pat.naughtin@metricationmatters.com>
> wrote:
>
>
> From: Pat Naughtin <pat.naughtin@metricationmatters.com>
> Subject: [USMA:45778] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
> To: "U.S. Metric Association" <usma@colostate.edu>
> Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2009, 7:02 PM
>
> Dear Martin,
>
>
>
> Also for the benefit of people who don't know the game of cricket – the
> rules have changed.
>
>
>
> The Wikipedia page at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laws_of_cricket says:
>
> The Marylebone Cricket Club is the framer of the Laws of Cricket, the
> rules governing play of the game.
> …
> The Laws retain the Imperial units as they were originally specified, but
> now also include metric conversions.
> The metric conversions are interesting as they not only convert the old

> measures but also round them sensibly. For example, the length of a
> cricket pitch in the old rules was 22 yards. Assuming that these are the
> metric yards of exactly 914.4 millimetres, then a direct conversion would
> give a pitch length of exactly 20.1168 metres. However, it seems that this
> has been sensibly rounded, in the Laws of Cricket to 20 metres. I quote
> again from the wikipedia article:
> Law 7: The pitch. The pitch is a rectangular area of the ground 22 yards
> (20 m) long and 10 ft (3.0 m) wide.
> Cheers,
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Pat Naughtin
>
> Author of the ebook, Metrication Leaders Guide, that you can obtain from
> http://metricationmatters.com/MetricationLeadersGuideInfo.html
>
> PO Box 305 Belmont 3216,
>
> Geelong, Australia
>
> Phone: 61 3 5241 2008
>
>
>
> Metric system consultant, writer, and speaker, Pat Naughtin, has helped
> thousands of people and hundreds of companies upgrade to the modern metric
> system smoothly, quickly, and so economically that they now save thousands
> each year when buying, processing, or selling for their businesses. Pat
> provides services and resources for many different trades, crafts, and
> professions for commercial, industrial and government metrication leaders
> in Asia, Europe, and in the USA. Pat's clients include the Australian
> Government, Google, NASA, NIST, and the metric associations of Canada, the
> UK, and the USA. See http://www.metricationmatters.com for more
> metrication information, contact Pat at
> pat.naughtin@metricationmatters.com or to get the free 'Metrication
> matters' newsletter go to: http://www.metricationmatters.com/newsletter to
> subscribe.
>
>
>
> On 2009/09/09, at 07:17 , Martin Vlietstra wrote:
>
>
>
>
>
>
> … I agree, but I have never seen “A cricket ball travels at 85 mph for 22
> yards. How long does it take to travel that distance”?
>
>
>
> (For the benefit of American readers, the standard cricket pitch is 22
> yards long).
>
>
>

> From: owner-usma@colostate.edu [mailto:owner-usma@colostate.edu] On Behalf
> Of Stephen Humphreys
> Sent: 07 September 2009 23:26
> To: U.S. Metric Association
> Subject: [USMA:45762] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
>
> There are questions like 'a car travels at 70 mph for 10 miles.....' -
> I've seen many like that. Also when teaching about conversions I've seen
> questions asking for answers using 'either metric or imperial'. Martin -
> in the past I've directed you to websites showing such questions and
> confirmation about being curriculum based.
>
> From: vlietstra@btinternet.com
> To: barkatfish@hotmail.com ; usma@colostate.edu
> Subject: RE: [USMA:45750] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
> Date: Mon, 7 Sep 2009 20:15:46 +0100
>
> The UK curriculum only teaches children how to convert between imperial
> and metric units (approximate conversions only). It does not teach
> children how to manipulate imperial units. For example, no child in the
> UK is taught how to solve the problem “Find the average of 3lbs 6oz, 4lbs
> 2oz, 6lbs 15oz”. They are however taught how to solve the problem “Find
> the average of 1.53kg, 1.88kg and 3.15kg”. They might even be taught how
> to use the “Average” button on their calculators.
>
> From: owner-usma@colostate.edu [mailto:owner-usma@colostate.edu] On Behalf
> Of Stephen Humphreys
> Sent: 06 September 2009 22:37
> To: U.S. Metric Association
> Subject: [USMA:45750] RE: Mathematics improvement due to metrication
>
> I was at school in the 80's and at that time they had dropped imperial
> from the curriculum completely (aside from Teacher/kids talking casually
> using imperial terms, of course!)
>
> Shortly after they made imperial part of the curriculum including
> conversions to and from, usage, etc. In science classes the units were
> and still are only metric though.
>
> From: pat.naughtin@metricationmatters.com
> To: usma@colostate.edu

> Subject: [USMA:45745] Mathematics improvement due to metrication
> Date: Sun, 6 Sep 2009 14:58:23 +1000
>
> Dear All,
>
>
>
>
>
> The Telegraph at
> http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/6138456/Maths-standards-no-better-than-mid-70s.html
> and
>
>
>
>
>
> the Daily Mail at
> http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1211345/Maths-skills-standing-thirty-years-GCSE-grades-soaring.html
> have both reported that metrication has helped students in the UK with
> decimals knowledge.
>
>
>
>
>
> Here is the quote from The Telegraph:
>
>
>
>
>
> It found secondary pupils were much more familiar with decimals than they
> were 30 years ago. Researchers put this down to “cultural changes”
> including metrication and the increased use of calculators and computers.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Cheers,
>
>
>
>
>
> Pat Naughtin
>
>
> Author of the ebook, Metrication Leaders Guide, that you can obtain from
> http://metricationmatters.com/MetricationLeadersGuideInfo.html
>
>
> PO Box 305 Belmont 3216,

> Geelong, Australia
>
> Phone: 61 3 5241 2008
>
> Metric system consultant, writer, and speaker, Pat Naughtin, has helped thousands of people and hundreds of companies upgrade to the modern metric system smoothly, quickly, and so economically that they now save thousands each year when buying, processing, or selling for their businesses. Pat provides services and resources for many different trades, crafts, and professions for commercial, industrial and government metrication leaders in Asia, Europe, and in the USA . Pat's clients include the Australian Government, Google, NASA, NIST, and the metric associations of Canada , the UK , and the USA . See http://www.metricationmatters.com for more metrication information, contact Pat at pat.naughtin@metricationmatters.com or to get the free 'Metrication matters' newsletter go to: http://www.metricationmatters.com/newsletter to subscribe.
>
> New! Receive and respond to mail from other email accounts from within Hotmail Find out how.
>
> Use Hotmail to send and receive mail from your different email accounts. Find out how.
>
> With Windows Live, you can organize, edit, and share your photos. Click here.
>
> View your other email accounts from your Hotmail inbox. Add them now.
> _____
> Hotmail: Powerful Free email with security by Microsoft.
> http://clk.atdmt.com/GBL/go/171222986/direct/01/

Re: PS3 leap year bug

From: **East Carolina University Calendar discussion List** (calndr-l@listserv.ecu.edu) on behalf of **Amos Shapir** (amos083@HOTMAIL.COM)
Sent: Wed 3/03/10 5:48 PM
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

On some technical forum it had emerged that the bug was not about dividing by 4 but about interpreting stored dates as base-16 instead of the correct base-10. The result was that the year "10" was interpreted as 2016 (which will be a leap year) instead of 2010.

Amos Shapir

Date: Wed, 3 Mar 2010 16:42:14 +0100
From: R.H.vanGent@UU.NL
Subject: PS3 leap year bug
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

On the difficulty of dividing by 4

http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/rorycellanjones/2010/03/sonys_millennium_bug.html

rvg
