

From : Brij Bhushan Vij <metricvij@hotmail.com>
Sent : Monday, February 12, 2007 6:41 AM
To : CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject : Reason unknown RE: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar



Sonny Pondrom, sirs:

I am reluctant to bring this up because a perpetual calendar has been my dream for years. The perpetual calendar has so many benefits over the Gregorian calendar.

History of calendar reform has undergone a 400-year period; and without reaching a format for an 'Easiest, Surest and Cheapest' possibility of A World Calendar - like shifting July 31 to February 29.

Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to overcome,.....It also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

Do obstacle deter research? What attributes?

The new calendar could satisfy this very large group of world citizens by simply letting each blank day push the start of the next year back by one day (two days during leap years). All along EXPERTS have talked to overcome 'blank days'. My divide by six(6) plan using $[3*(7*128)]\text{-years}/(3*159)=477\text{ LWks}$ to get: Mean Year = $7*(52+1/6+29/2688)=365.2421875$ days. perpetuality of calendar format can be achieved by keeping 'World Peace Day - 365th day) and Leap Sunday - once every four years (except during div.128th years)' OUTSIDE of the calendar format BUT within the year of occurrence - to get: Mean Year = $(365+31/128)= 365.2421875$ days.

However, years that begin on Sunday using the current naming convention, does make years somewhat unique. In the format for Year 2007 Reformed format at my Home Page: <http://www.brijvij.com/>

the year start is at MONDAY (01) thro Sunday (00/07) in 52 weeks(364-days) of 4 equal quarters (91-days or 13-weeks) BUT keeping 365th (World Peace Day) & 366th (Leap Sunday) outside of calendar format.

The third reason deals with the first new calendar requirement that does change the number of months and/or days per month. There is NO CHANGE to month names for easy & cheapest adaption/adoption by shifting only ONE day July 31st th February

29th; in rhym with known number of days during each month of Gregorian calendar, causing minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar.

Yearly quarters of 31, 30, 30 or 30, 30, 31 are easily remembered.

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)

HOME PAGE: <http://www.brijvij.com/>

Regards,

Brij Bhushan Vij

(MJD 2454144)/630+D-043 G (Monday, 2007 January 12

H17:14(decimal) IST

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)

HOME PAGE: <http://www.brijvij.com/>

*****As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****

"Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"

Contact # 011-9818775933 (M)

001(201)675-8548(when in US)

From: Sonny Pondrom <sonny@PONDROM.ORG>

Reply-To: East Carolina University Calendar discussion
List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>

To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

Subject: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar

Date: Sun, 11 Feb 2007 20:23:33 -0600

I am reluctant to bring this up because a perpetual calendar has been my dream for years. The perpetual calendar has so many benefits over the Gregorian calendar. This calendar preference was even more pronounced when I read the history of the Gregorian calendar origin. History points out ignorant men, thousands of years ago, set down their personnel interest and inaccurate based rules that we must live with today.

Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to over come, that I fear it will not come to pass in my great great grandson's life time. However, a series of new calendars that over-come one obstacle at a time will lead to a better calendar. The introduction of new calendars may take several generations, however, this incremental approach is likely to succeed. This article explores making the first in a series new calendars with minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar. It also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

As you may know, a petition for the World Calendar (http://personal.ecu.edu/mccartyr/wca_history.html) to the League of Nations was turned down citing the "blank days" as offensive to religions due to the elimination of potential holy days. The new calendar could satisfy this very large group of world citizens by simply letting each blank day push the start of the next year back by one day (two days during leap years).

The second reason for postponing the perpetual calendar is that knowing the first day of January is on a Sunday does not tell you whether the current year is 2006 or 2007 (or any year for that matter). However, years that begin on Sunday using the current naming convention, does make years somewhat unique.

The third reason deals with the first new calendar requirement that does change the number of months and/or days per month. This feature is similar to the dozen or so proposed perpetual calendars. However, with the starting day of each year changing slightly, it would be easy for anyone to remember that throughout the whole year, weekdays will always fall on the same date.

Which of the current perpetual calendars should be used to model the new calendar? Thirteen months may be too big of a change for the first generation of calendars. This feature might be better later, when all the days in every month would be the same. Twelve month calendars would be no change. Calendars similar to the "World" or Symmetry454 calendars may be best for the first generation of calendars. Yearly quarters of 31, 30, 30 or 30, 30, 31 are easily remembered.

From : Brij Bhushan Vij <metricvij@hotmail.com>

Sent : Wednesday, February 14, 2007 11:33 AM

To : CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

Subject : RE: Earth Calendar Metonic Cycle Symmetry RE: EARTH CALENDAR



David, Karl sirs:

.....sLssLsLssLs

as is sometimes be necessary to correct the 19-year cycle.

I had shown distribution of 19-year solar cycle & $(5*47)=235$ lunation, using phase/tithi value of 138W/965 in count of 'tithi count' of solar days of $(27*960*10/3)$ units. Inter conversion between Tithi count and 'solar days' - in a seperate mail had been worked & shown as *ratio 961:960* i.e.

25947:25920 [Tithi Value =1.00104166666666666666666666666667 day, which is in closer approximation to 19-years/6932.5; or 235

lunation/6932.5]. Some other calculations of importance were exhibited at:

<http://www.brijvij.com/XorT-units-5x47lunation.doc>

Short and Long count of 'lunation' may have some hidden advantages BUT cumbersome adjustments, rather than STANDARDISING the *tithi or phase value*, as I proposed.

The 2-hour difference between 19-year cycle & 235 lunation can be resolved by 'omiting a tithi' once every 220-years (instead of 228-years).

Regards,

Brij Bhushan Vij

(MJD 2454146)/630+D-045 G (Wednesday, 2007 January 14

H22:01(decimal) IST

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)

HOME PAGE: <http://www.brijvij.com/>

*****As per Kali V-GRhymeCalendaar*****

"Koi bhi cheshtha vayarth nahin hoti, purshaarth karne mein hai"

Contact # 011-9818775933 (M)

001(201)675-8548(when in US)

From: "Palmen, KEV (Karl)" <K.E.V.Palmen@RL.AC.UK>

Reply-To: East Carolina University Calendar discussion
List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>

To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

Subject: Earth Calendar Metonic Cycle Symmetry RE: EARTH
CALENDAR

Date: Wed, 14 Feb 2007 13:12:48 -0000

Dear David and Calendar People

I've already remarked that David's Metonic Cycle is symmetrical.
It goes

sLssLsLssLssLsLssLs

where 's' is a short 12-month year and 'L' is a long 13-month
year.

Not only is the full 19-year cycle symmetrical, it is also
symmetrical when truncated to 11 years

sLssLsLssLs

as is sometimes be necessary to correct the 19-year cycle.


Karl

08(12(27

-----Original Message-----

From: East Carolina University Calendar discussion List
[mailto:CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU] On Behalf Of david chambers
Sent: 25 January 2007 12:03
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject: EARTH CALENDAR

In order to keep the monthly cycle in sync with the seasons, an extra month, Gaia, is added thus making some years thirteen months long; this 19 year sun cycle corresponds to 235 moon cycles.

From :	Oscar van Vlijmen <ovv@HETNET.NL>	 Inbox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 1:29 PM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar	

> From: Irv Bromberg
> Date: Mon, 12 Feb 2007 09:58:46 -0500
> Subject: Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar


> The vast majority of people in their use of calendars just go by their
> calendar hardcopy or their computer system's presentation of the
> calendar. No matter what are the underlying details of the calendar,
> they will just use it, oblivious to whether the new calendar is a
> wholesale reform or a minor tweak,.....

In the mean time we'll have to fear that only one scenario is truly viable:
only Microsoft is able to impose upon the whole world (OK, 97%) a new
calendar.

It was Microsoft who dictated for instance the non-ISO rule that week
numbers start with 1 on January 1. To Microsoft the ISO rule, still in use
in (European) businesses for administrative purposes, was non-existent and
not important.

Samo samo with the Kuwaiti algorithm (not invented by Microsoft, but
implemented by them) to implement a near-religious conformant

type of
Islamic calendar (as opposed to the arithmetic type).
Is anybody working at Microsoft?

From :	Palmen, KEV (Karl) <K.E.V.Palmen@RL.AC.UK>	
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 11:48 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Lunar Weeks for Yerm Calendar	

Dear Calendar People

In the earliest days of the Yerm Calendar
http://www.hermetic.ch/cal_stud/palmen/yerm1.htm ,
I divided the month into four lunar weeks.
I then used a simple division into three 7 night weeks plus a
week of 8 or 9
nights.

However I now realise that the Yerm structure allows for a more
accurate
division into lunar weeks, than is possible in any lunar or
lunisolar calendar
where the lunar months are corrected by a leap day.

The following weeks of a yerm calendar month have 8 nights:
lunar week 4 of months 01, 03, 05, 07, 09, 11,
lunar week 3 of months 13, 15, 17, 02, 04, 06, 08,
lunar week 2 of months 10, 12, 14, 16, 01, 03,
lunar week 1 of months 05, 07, 09, 11, 13, 15, 17,
while the other lunar weeks have 7 nights.

I've listed the weeks in reverse order to show the continuity
of alternate
months from row to row.


This results months having lunar weeks thus:

```
7878 7787 7878 7787
8778 7787 8778 7787
8778 7877 8778 7877
8787 7877 8787 7877 8787
```

The last two months shown do not occur in a short yerm.

Karl

08(12(25

From :	Engel,Victor <Victor.Engel@HHSC.STATE.TX.US>	 Inb ox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 11:39 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar	

In the mid-nineties I worked at Dell, programming their HR database. The interface with the Payroll vendor was a weekly process. The group I was involved with got a CFO teaming award for our efforts in changing pay frequencies to the new standard, but the payroll vendor had been using a weekly cycle the whole time.

As I recall, all years had 53 weeks, the 53rd week being an incomplete week. I don't recall what the rule was to determine which week was week one. It was NOT the scheme used in Outlook. I think a determination was made by a priestly class in a dark room somewhere.

Victor

-----Original Message-----

From: East Carolina University Calendar discussion List
[mailto:CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU] On Behalf Of Amos Shapir
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2007 10:24 AM
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar

I totally agree with Irv on that. So where do we go to from here? There are two principles of possible reform for the Gregorian calendar embedded in

Irv's article:

- There is no central authority which can impose a change, so any reform would just evolve out of common usage;
- The best chance is for a move towards a week-based calendar.

The way I see it, we are already in the middle of an evolutionary process

which will eventually result in a reformed calendar. Its main stages are:

1. People's affairs become centered around a weekly cycle, rather than depend solely on seasons or lunar cycles. This stage was initiated 3000 years ago, but had become dominant at the time of the industrial revolution,

and now is almost done.

2. Holidays and other public events are defined by week and day-of-week scheme, rather than a fixed Gregorian date. This stage is almost done in the USA (except for Easter and Christmas, and New Year day). Other countries will eventually follow.

3. Yearly scheme of week numbers is used, rather than the more cumbersome week-in-month. This stage is now going on -- both the calendar on my computer and the printed one on my desk bear week numbers, which were not there just a few years ago.

4. Slowly and quietly the definitions of events start to rely on week numbers. This stage is imminent, it will start once someone notices that "week 13" is easier to express than "last week in March".

5. Once people get used to determining dates by week numbers, month names fall into disuse.

6. The final nail will be an official (or at least commonly used) definition

of when a year should have 53 weeks; by then this would have only the effect

of formalizing a prevalent custom.

I assume that such a process would last a lot less than most people estimate; it may be done by the end of this century.

Note that the price for converting computer systems is much

smaller than is usually flaunted; such systems are updated and even replaced quite often, and the cost of gradual change in the way events are dated would become insignificant compared with other changes -- e.g., those week numbers I mentioned above just came along with Windows XP at no extra cost. And as computers become more connected, they become easier to maintain and update using central resources, so the price of change per computer drops, rather than increases, as their numbers grow.

>From: Irv Bromberg <irv.bromberg@UTORONTO.CA>

>Reply-To: East Carolina University Calendar discussion List

><CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>

>To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU

>Subject: Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar

>Date: Mon, 12 Feb 2007 09:58:46 -0500

>

>On Feb 11, 2007, at 21:23, Sonny Pondrom wrote:

>>Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to

>>over come, that I fear it will not come to pass in my great great

>>grandson's life time. However, a series of new calendars that over-come

>>one obstacle at a time will lead to a better calendar. The introduction

>>of new calendars may take several generations, however, this incremental

>>approach is likely to succeed. This article explores making the first in

>>a series new calendars with minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar. It

>>also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

>

>Bromberg says:

>

>There is no merit in such an incremental approach. The "obstacles" have

>nothing to do with how much of a change is made, they are:

>

>- nobody is "in charge" of the Gregorian calendar

>

>- all governments have much higher priorities (or so they think)
>
>- most people don't care
>
>- the world has taken two cracks at this in the 20th century
(League of Nations, United Nations), both efforts went by the wayside,
although I like

>to think that if a leap week calendar had been considered in
either case,
>it would have been adopted!
>
>- before widespread use of computers the switch would have been
much easier

>than today, which requires extensive software reprogramming to
support any
>new calendar, and the effort for such reprogramming is
essentially no
>different for a minimal reform than it would be for a full
perpetual
>reform, the main problem being searching through code to
identify the
>affected program execution points
>
>- as a consequence of the software issues, the cost-benefit
ratio keeps
>dwindling (more and more systems to modify, especially
problematic are the
>increasing numbers of legacy systems for which modifications may
no longer
>be possible, or may only be possible at very high cost)
>
>
>As I have written before, the first and foremost reason to
reform the
>Gregorian calendar is to make it perpetual, which could be
achieved by
>converting it into a leap week calendar and changing nothing
else. If that

>objective is gone from the table, then other aspects like making
the month
>lengths consistent, improving the long-term accuracy of the leap
cycle,
>minimizing its short-term equinox wobble, etc., are certainly
not
>compelling reasons to advocate a calendar reform.
>
>The vast majority of people in their use of calendars just go by

their

>calendar hardcopy or their computer system's presentation of the calendar.

>No matter what are the underlying details of the calendar, they will just

>use it, oblivious to whether the new calendar is a wholesale reform or a

>minor tweak, oblivious to whether the leap cycle is based on astronomical

>algorithms or simple arithmetic. Most people can't be bothered to

>appreciate the benefits of a perpetual calendar. However if they were

>switched to a perpetual calendar for a few years and then were compelled to

>switch back, there would be a rebellion!


>

>

>-- Irv Bromberg, Toronto, Canada <<http://www.sym454.org/>>

Express yourself instantly with MSN Messenger! Download today it's FREE!

<http://messenger.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200471ave/direct/01/>

From :	Amos Shapir <amos083@HOTMAIL.COM>	 Inb ox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 11:24 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar	

I totally agree with Irv on that. So where do we go to from here? There are two principles of possible reform for the Gregorian calendar embedded in Irv's article:

- There is no central authority which can impose a change, so any reform would just evolve out of common usage;
- The best chance is for a move towards a week-based calendar.

The way I see it, we are already in the middle of an evolutionary process which will eventually result in a reformed calendar. Its main stages are:

1. People's affairs become centered around a weekly cycle, rather than depend solely on seasons or lunar cycles. This stage was initiated 3000 years ago, but had become dominant at the time of the industrial revolution, and now is almost done.
2. Holidays and other public events are defined by week and day-of-week scheme, rather than a fixed Gregorian date. This stage is almost done in the USA (except for Easter and Christmas, and New Year day). Other countries will eventually follow.
3. Yearly scheme of week numbers is used, rather than the more cumbersome week-in-month. This stage is now going on -- both the calendar on my computer and the printed one on my desk bear week numbers, which were not there just a few years ago.
4. Slowly and quietly the definitions of events start to rely on week numbers. This stage is imminent, it will start once someone notices that "week 13" is easier to express than "last week in March".
5. Once people get used to determining dates by week numbers, month names fall into disuse.
6. The final nail will be an official (or at least commonly used) definition of when a year should have 53 weeks; by then this would have only the effect of formalizing a prevalent custom.

I assume that such a process would last a lot less than most people estimate; it may be done by the end of this century.

Note that the price for converting computer systems is much smaller than is usually flaunted; such systems are updated and even replaced quite often, and the cost of gradual change in the way events are dated would become insignificant compared with other changes -- e.g., those week numbers I mentioned above just came along with Windows XP at no extra cost. And as computers become more connected, they become easier to maintain and update using central resources, so the price of change per computer drops, rather than increases, as their numbers grow.

From: Irv Bromberg <irv.bromberg@UTORONTO.CA>
Reply-To: East Carolina University Calendar discussion
List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar
Date: Mon, 12 Feb 2007 09:58:46 -0500

On Feb 11, 2007, at 21:23, Sonny Pondrom wrote:

Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to over come, that I fear it will not come to pass in my great great grandson's life time. However, a series of new calendars that over-come one obstacle at a time will lead to a better calendar. The introduction of new calendars may take several generations, however, this incremental approach is likely to succeed. This article explores making the first in a series new calendars with minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar. It also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

Bromberg says:

There is no merit in such an incremental approach. The "obstacles" have nothing to do with how much of a change is made, they are:

- nobody is "in charge" of the Gregorian calendar
- all governments have much higher priorities (or so they think)
- most people don't care
- the world has taken two cracks at this in the 20th century (League of Nations, United Nations), both efforts went by the wayside, although I like to think that if a leap week calendar had been considered in either case, it would have been adopted!
- before widespread use of computers the switch would have been much easier than today, which requires extensive software

reprogramming to support any new calendar, and the effort for such reprogramming is essentially no different for a minimal reform than it would be for a full perpetual reform, the main problem being searching through code to identify the affected program execution points


- as a consequence of the software issues, the cost-benefit ratio keeps dwindling (more and more systems to modify, especially problematic are the increasing numbers of legacy systems for which modifications may no longer be possible, or may only be possible at very high cost)

As I have written before, the first and foremost reason to reform the Gregorian calendar is to make it perpetual, which could be achieved by converting it into a leap week calendar and changing nothing else. If that objective is gone from the table, then other aspects like making the month lengths consistent, improving the long-term accuracy of the leap cycle, minimizing its short-term equinox wobble, etc., are certainly not compelling reasons to advocate a calendar reform.

The vast majority of people in their use of calendars just go by their calendar hardcopy or their computer system's presentation of the calendar. No matter what are the underlying details of the calendar, they will just use it, oblivious to whether the new calendar is a wholesale reform or a minor tweak, oblivious to whether the leap cycle is based on astronomical algorithms or simple arithmetic. Most people can't be bothered to appreciate the benefits of a perpetual calendar. However if they were switched to a perpetual calendar for a few years and then were compelled to switch back, there would be a rebellion!

-- Irv Bromberg, Toronto, Canada <<http://www.sym454.org/>>

Express yourself instantly with MSN Messenger! Download today it's FREE! <http://messenger.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200471ave/direct/01/>

From :	Irv Bromberg <irv.bromberg@UTORONTO.CA>	 Inbox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 9:58 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar	

On Feb 11, 2007, at 21:23, Sonny Pondrom wrote:

Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to overcome, that I fear it will not come to pass in my great great grandson's life time. However, a series of new calendars that overcome one obstacle at a time will lead to a better calendar. The introduction of new calendars may take several generations, however, this incremental approach is likely to succeed. This article explores making the first in a series new calendars with minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar. It also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

Bromberg says:






There is no merit in such an incremental approach. The "obstacles" have nothing to do with how much of a change is made, they are:

- nobody is "in charge" of the Gregorian calendar
- all governments have much higher priorities (or so they think)
- most people don't care
- the world has taken two cracks at this in the 20th century (League of Nations, United Nations), both efforts went by the wayside, although I like to think that if a leap week calendar had been considered in either case, it would have been adopted!
- before widespread use of computers the switch would have been much easier than today, which requires extensive software reprogramming to support any new calendar, and the effort for such reprogramming is essentially no different for a minimal reform than it would be for a full perpetual reform, the main problem being searching through code to identify the affected program execution points
- as a consequence of the software issues, the cost-benefit ratio keeps dwindling (more and more systems to modify, especially problematic are the increasing numbers of legacy systems for which modifications may no longer be possible, or may only be possible at very high cost)

As I have written before, the first and foremost reason to reform the Gregorian calendar is to make it perpetual, which could be achieved by converting it into a leap week calendar and changing nothing else. If that objective is gone from the table, then other aspects like making the month lengths consistent, improving the long-term accuracy of the leap cycle, minimizing its short-term equinox wobble, etc., are certainly not compelling reasons to advocate a calendar reform.

The vast majority of people in their use of calendars just go by their calendar hardcopy or their computer system's presentation of the calendar. No matter what are the underlying details of the calendar, they will just use it, oblivious to whether the new calendar is a wholesale reform or a minor tweak, oblivious to whether the leap cycle is based on astronomical algorithms or simple arithmetic. Most people can't be bothered to appreciate the benefits of a perpetual calendar. However if they were switched to a perpetual calendar for a few years and then were compelled to switch back, there would be a rebellion!

-- Irv Bromberg, Toronto, Canada <<http://www.sym454.org/>>


From :	Engel,Victor <Victor.Engel@HHSC.STATE.TX.US>	 Inbox     Inbox ox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 9:43 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: The Drawback to Pursuing a Perpetual Calendar	

In my opinion, a series of minor changes taken in series, is far worse than taking a single change all at once, however major. The main reason for this is the confusion that would result when referring to dates during those periods. We already have issues with the switch from Julian to Gregorian. Now imagine that multiplied by the number of steps proposed.

Victor

-----Original Message-----

Nevertheless, pursuit of a perpetual calendar has so many obstacles to overcome, that I fear it will not come to pass in my great great grandson's life time. However, a series of new calendars that overcome one obstacle at a time will lead to a better calendar. The introduction of new calendars may take several generations, however, this incremental approach is likely to succeed. This article explores making the first in a series new calendars with minimal changes to the Gregorian calendar. It also gives some reasons for delaying the perpetual attribute.

From :	Irv Bromberg <irv.bromberg@UTORONTO.CA>	 Inbox
Reply-To :	East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>	
Sent :	Monday, February 12, 2007 9:38 AM	
To :	CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU	
Subject :	Re: 'Chronological Julian date' defined	

On Feb 11, 2007, at 17:50, John Hynes wrote:

Another advantage of CJD is that it is easy to convert to/from Lotus/Excel serial dates. For instance, 39124.6147671 is CJD 2454143.6147671. Simply add 2415019 to any date after March 1, 1900.

Bromberg says:

Not quite. If the serial date 39124.6147671 was to full floating point precision of your system and you add 2415019 to it, the sum must have the same number of significant figures as the original value, therefore the CJD value must lose 2 decimal points and get rounded to 2454143.61477. This still has sub-second time resolution, but the decimal point limit is close enough to cause a one-second wobble in computed astronomical moments, depending on where the calculation starts. In serial calculations involving thousands of steps, as is typical for astronomical calculations, those wobbles can add up to a lot of noise error.

The original Windows DateSerial value has the advantage of being standard on most PCs, convenient to use in applications and at the operating system level, and it has 2 fewer digits to the left of the decimal point, hence 2 more digits of time resolution to the right of the decimal point. It has the severe disadvantage that Windows DateSerial numbers can't be negative values, and can't encode any date beyond the year 9999, both for no apparently sensible reason.

My preference is to use a fixed day numbering epoch that is even closer to the present era, such as January 1, 2000, but that was a Saturday, which is slightly inconvenient for calculating the weekday, and it is too easy to confuse with J2000.0 which started at Noon TT on that day. Therefore I prefer January 1, 2001, which was a Monday, "the first day of the 3rd millennium" (debate on that issue notwithstanding). Taking that day as day number one, the ordinal day number for today, **February 12, 2007 is 2234**, which affords one more decimal point of time resolution in floating point arithmetic (for near-present-era dates), compared to Windows DateSerial values.

Different people focus on different periods of time in their

research areas. The best floating point time resolution is always obtained by choosing a fixed day numbering epoch that is near the middle of the date range of interest. In some applications with arbitrary precision computation engines such as LISP or Mathematica it doesn't matter, provided all operands are integers or proper fractions (exact values), but even those computing engines fall back to standard double-precision computation (Mathematica falls back to single-precision for display purposes) when one or more operand is not an exact value.

-- Irv Bromberg, Toronto, Canada <<http://www.sym454.org/>>

From : Palmen, KEV (Karl) <K.E.V.Palmen@RL.AC.UK>
Reply-To : East Carolina University Calendar discussion List <CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU>
Sent : Monday, February 12, 2007 7:43 AM
To : CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject : Re: EARTH CALENDAR



[Dear David and Calendar People](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: East Carolina University Calendar discussion List
[mailto:CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU]**On Behalf Of** david chambers
Sent: 10 February 2007 20:51
To: CALNDR-L@LISTSERV.ECU.EDU
Subject: EARTH CALENDAR

To interested calendar people

Dear Karl , thank you for directing me (29 jan 07) to your spreadsheets, they are very useful. You show seven rules to apply to the Earth Calendar (EC), that defines it.

I am satisfied with the first three rules, however rules 4, 5 and 6 for me depend on one question, and that is why I made the image of the year chart (in AutoCAD, that no-one can open), which shows every day, week, month and year of the 6940 days.

The question I ask is how can one keep Monday as close as possible to the four phases of the Moon and still add these extra days ? Or to put it another way how far out from this regularity will it stray in the worst scenario ? (The principle behind the EC is, as near as possible, to be able to see the phases on a Monday)

[Karl Palmen says:] This is a very good question.

The answer depends on how simple you want the calendar to be.

If you don't care about simplicity you could forget about the 7

rules and have something like
the Hermetic Lunar Week Calendar
http://www.hermetic.ch/cal_stud/hlwc/hlwc.htm

Another possibility is to use a rule-based lunar calendar like my
yerm calendar
http://www.hermetic.ch/cal_stud/palmen/yerm1.htm
to determine the number of days in a lunar month and lunar week and
have a separate rule to determine the number of lunar months in a
year. This would no longer have all the principal moon phases
occurring on a Lunar Monday. Such a calendar would not follow rules
2,3,4 and 6.

If you want most months of the year to have the same number of days
every year, you'll pay a price of an increased amount that the
principal moon phases deviate from a Lunar Monday. This also applies
to many other types of calendar simplicity.

Rules 2 and 3 imply choosing to have most months of the year have
the same number of days (and lunar weeks) every year.
Rule 4 is then important because, if no year were to have an extra
day either or both the mean year or mean month would be too short no
matter what rule 5 is. Just under 1 in 5 years need the extra day. I
reckon 20 years in 103 is quite accurate.

If the extra month (Gaia in my case) is 30 days, and comes between
June and July, that means there are two consecutive months of 30
days; and when you add an extra day, 4 per cycle normally, the same
thing happens.

[Karl Palmen says:] Actually you'd get THREE consecutive months of
30 days from adding an extra day to a year.
One tip is to count one yerm for each extra month and two yerms for
each extra day and try and have the plot of yerms counted against
months counted as straight as possible. My lunisolar spreadsheets
tell you how many yerms each cycle requires.

http://www.the-light.com/cal/kp_Lunisolar_xls.html

Note that it is also important to have the plot of leap-month
count against the year count as straight as possible, else the
calendar year would move excessively against the seasons.

Also, if rule 5 were to follow the 19-year cycle without
interruption and the months were accurate, the average year would
run almost one day late on every 200 years. This is happening to the
Hebrew calendar.

Also what about the changing length of the Moon's phasing as the
Moon's orbit speed changes as a result of the gravitational pull of
the Sun, and how does that change with the Earth's yearly orbit. ?

[Karl Palmen says:] The moon phase deviates from average by up to 14
1/2 hours either way.

Because the lunation tends to be longer in the northern winter, it is best to have the extra month and the extra day in the northern winter.

I have transferred the AutoCAD file into a bitmap file; the difference being AutoCAD is vector based and bitmap is pixel based, so when you zoom in with AutoCAD everything is just as clear but enlarged. It is a 1 MB bitmap file so I wont send it unless you ask.

I also have Moon phasing diagram by Roger E Critchlow Jr of Santa Fe, NM, which is 250 KB Jpeg, and shows this changing phasing thru one year.

[Karl Palmen says:] Can David explain to us exactly what the file shows?

Karl

08(12(25