

THE CALENDAR HAS A MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM THAT THE CLOCK DOES NOT

By WAYNE EDWARD RICHARDSON
DIRECTOR, THE WORLD CALENDAR ASSOCIATION – INTERNATIONAL (2005 – present)

The clock uses hours that evenly divide each repetitive day-night cycle, but days cannot exactly and evenly divide the year. The calendar compensates for the inability of humans to alter the length of a day and the length of a year.

The original goal of a calendar was probably to define the beginnings of seasons. The four seasons give the calendar year natural quarters. As knowledge of the solar system increased, humans added or adjusted leap days to sustain calendar alignment with the seasons. The moon's journey around Earth approximates the length of a month. Had the 28-day moon cycle defined the month, the resulting thirteen months per year would not have been equally divisible by the four seasonal quarters. Instead, some very old politics ordered twelve months with their current lengths of 28, 29, 30 or 31 days.

WEAK OPPOSITION

Somewhere in all this enters the week. The current seven-day length is thought to be shorter than when it was first introduced, but the exact first date of use is unknown. Religions include accounts of creation that reference seven days and long-term use of the seven-day week has framed it in tradition. Seven day-night cycles that include periods of work and rest seem adequate; having no equal and corresponding counterpart in the solar system does no harm. But for whatever combinations of reasons, theories, reverence and events, unwillingness to afford any deviation from the definition or flexibility in the application of the week is the source of failure for calendar reform to date.



Last century's calendar reform movement involved many years of research and thousands of people from every walk of life. Conclusions reached included acknowledgement that from the many alternatives explored, The World Calendar offered the most advantages in replacing the deficient Gregorian calendar. Among the different calendar finalists, the annual day without a number (two in leap years) was not restricted to The World Calendar. The math problem has a solution after all.

As the United Nations attempted to approach a vote on applying this solution in 1954, it met opposition. Before most people had even heard of The World Calendar, hesitancy to offend any beliefs associated with the traditional week was a primary reason given for withholding key calendar reform support. Citing lack of evidence that a majority of citizens favored calendar change, United States supporters were reminded to act through Congress. A typical pause for more study, which had already been plentiful, might not have adequately calmed aroused sensitivities. The political truce instead declared other priorities more important and that additional study, at that time, "would serve no useful purpose."

Another fifty years has passed and the Gregorian calendar continues to invade as a silent thief. Previously examined and dismissed calendars have resurfaced — sometimes with new names — not because they are now better than The World Calendar, but because pre-1956 delays have been taken as too final. Communication technology no longer permits hiding the best choice in context of past; more people than ever before are learning about The World Calendar for the very first time. Before the next calendar epoch, let this also, this time, be known: The option to celebrate each Worldday and Leapyear Day holiday as a **Double Sabbath** solves the traditional-week dilemma. Unless and until individuals justify denying themselves this personal and non-prohibited choice, continuity of the week continues without interruption. As it turns out, perception of The World Calendar in use was a problem that The World Calendar is not.