Real Millennium Group™
Go 2 Zero Debates - File 5
****

These are conversations and debates with Go2Zero supporters. Alan Dechert is the creator of the Global Era Calendar which he hoped would be used starting this year to eliminate the religious connotations of our current AD/BC system, and begin with Year 0, so all the millennia and centuries begin in the "0" year, such as 2000, instead of the current 2001 year. The first 4 files that are primarily posts from me and Alan. Files 5 and 6 contain posts from other people, as well as myself about this and other related subjects. My correspondence is in **Bold** lettering, people other than Alan are in Blue.

****

(These posts are responding to Alan's idea of starting with year zero, but not month or day zero.)

Subject: Re: Problems of having a Zero Year
Date: 01/20/2000
Author: D. Scott Secor - Millennial Infarction Mitigator <y2k@uswest.net.NO$PAM>
This is perhaps your finest hour ... in your fifteen minutes of fame. (Dedicated to Yogi Bera, who just might have said such a thing had he been given the opportunity.)

But why stop at "zero" years? Why not promote "zero" months, days, hours, minutes, seconds, ad nauseam? In case you hadn't noticed, I continue to favor the notion of a ZERO POINT betwixt 1BCE and 1CE (AD). Alas, it was nothing more than a fractional second in the whole scheme of things. Why prolong the agony of nothingness for an entire year? Of course I haven't followed astronomy for many years, so that probably makes me somewhat biased. ;-)
Ciao,
D. Scott Secor, Year 2000 Institute Site Index

****

Subject: Re: Problems of having a Zero Year
Date: 01/21/2000
Author: John Barron" <news at europa dot demon dot co dot uk>
Damn... you beat me to it. We already do this for time of day, no-one sees any problem with midnight to 1 am being hour zero, as in 0:35, etc. So, let's be consistent & have month 0 to month 11, day 0 to 364/365 of the year & day 0 to whatever. Oh, & while we're at it, let's scrap this daft idea of "30 days hath ..." & switch to thirteen months of 28 days each. Some kind of leap adjustment is still necessary, of course, but hey, let's not make it more complex than necessary. I don't see in principle any reason why we should not do exactly this. Strangely, I think it may somehow not happen, mainly because if you've got something that works, even if it's sub-optimal, and people are used to it, then it's too much like hard work to change. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!

****

Subject: Re: Problems of having a Zero Year
Date: 01/21/2000
Author: D. Scott Secor - Millennial Infarction Mitigator <y2k@uswest.net.NO$PAM>
It'd never fly. Think of it in these terms ... "28 days hath September and all the rest, except for the leapunits." No rhythm whatsoever.
Ciao,
D. Scott Secor, Year 2000 Institute & Board of Inquiry, Mpls., MN USA
We may all be "toast", but must continue probing the toaster with a fork until the issues are resolved.

****

(This is Alan's reply, which leads me to post the message that follows, and ties in with some things I was saying in File 4 of the Debates)

Subject: Re: Problems of having a Zero Year
Date: 01/21/2000
Author: adechert <adechert@my-deja.com>
If the dentist says "you need a filling." Why don't you tell him to fill them all?
If a room in your house needs painting, why don't you paint them all?
If you need a new computer, why doesn't everyone buy one too?
If we need a new Senator, why not replace them all?
If we need ....
In general, the answer is one word, "discretion."
--Alan Dechert

Subject: Re: Problems of having a Zero Year
Date: 01/21/2000
Author: bjwyler <bjwyler@my-deja.com>
It seems that others agree with me on certain points. Consistency is necessary -- if you're going to have a year zero, you rightfully should have a month zero and a day zero. As I said in my last post, I am in favor of a more accurate and easier calendar. And as John said, the less changes made, the better and easier the transition will be. That is why having a year, month, and day zero is not quite as good as our current reckoning -- it is mathematically correct in some systems, and it is applicable to the computer sciences, and so forth, however, I hope my following example and explanation will clear up why applying this principle to the calendar is not the easier method.

To begin with, Time is linear (a scalar quantity as you put it), hence the word, timeline. We can represent the passing of time, and the events occurring during this passing, on a single straight line. We can also factor in the theory of alternate timelines, by having additional lines branch off from the main line and from each other. But each line continues in a single, linear direction, hence the term parallel universes or realities. Of course, as we progress, other factors might come into play such as singularities, which have the power to bend space and time. However, for the simplicity of counting, the higher principles need not apply.

Classifying the strength of a Tornado uses the Fujita (spelling may be incorrect) scale, and classifies a tornado based on wind speed. F0 is the lowest category, followed by F1, F2, F3, F4, and finally, F5. Here, this system starts with zero, such as you propose to do with our calendar. However, these numbers are merely descriptors to separate one category from another, with no mathematical basis, other than the fact that the numbering sequence identifies one category as being a higher classification than the one below it, in this case using wind speed (i.e. by the basic use and definition of the numerals 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, we know that 1 is more/higher than 0, 2 is more/higher than 1, and so forth). However, if we needed to find out how many different categories exist for classifying a tornado, we would have to use the simple, basic procedure of counting, which begins with the numeral 1. The first category is labeled F0, making it category 1. The second category would be F1, making it category 2, and so on until we reach a total of 6 categories. Would it be easier to have the first category as F1, and the highest as F6? Of course, because our natural way to count any object is by starting with 1, whether it be a physical object we can see and hold, or a concept such as a series of categories or a calendar. In the higher principles of mathematics, it may not be natural or proper to start counting with one, but higher principles do not, and cannot, apply to a simple, basic arithmetic problem, just like that simple

basic arithmetic problem will not work in the higher principles. Sometimes, the simplest solution just works the best.

Just like the Fujita scale, we can apply any kind of descriptor to the categories we have developed in order to classify the intangible object of Time itself. For the purpose of keeping track of time, man has developed several categories, all of which we are familiar with. For the most part, numerical descriptors are used to tell one unit in a each category apart from another unit in the same category. The Chinese are an exception, as they use word descriptors for each unit in the category of years. The Christian Era year 2000 is the Chinese Year of the Dragon. Using word descriptors is more difficult to place in an ascending, or descending line than it is with numerical descriptors, the basic definitions of which are understood and accepted world wide. Unless one is familiar with the Chinese calendar, one would not know where in the cycle the Dragon, Dog, Cat, Rat, etc. years are placed in relation to each other, whereas using numbers such as 1, 2, 3, etc., anyone from any part of the world can generally understand that Year 1 would be followed by Year 2, and so forth. However, we can use any descriptor and starting point on a line based on what we are trying to represent with that line. Scales and symbols on a map differ from map to map, and so on, but when it comes to counting the number of years in the Chinese calendar, or the symbols on a map scale, we must always start with one to reach the true value as determined by the definition of our ten basic numerical symbols.

0 1 D E X B & #
0---1---2 A---B---C 8---7---9 $---?---@
These figures represent the different ways of assigning a descriptor (value) to a point on a line and the segments between those points. The first line represents the go2zero calendar, but any of these can apply to our calendar system, since these values are merely used to differentiate the points and segments from each other. Each point represents the beginning of a new segment, equivalent to January 1. Each segment is equivalent to the 12 month period we term a year. If we want to know how many points and segments we have, we need to add up, unit by unit, each item in order to get a total. Based on our counting system, and the definitions of our numerals, if we wanted to know how many points we have, we would count each one in succession with 1, 2, 3, for a total of 3 points (1 + 1 + 1 = 3). The same for the segments, which would be counted 1 and 2, for a total of 2 (1 + 1 = 2). That means, the 0, A, 8, and $ would each be equated with 1 in our addition. The segments 0, D, X, and &, would also be equated with 1 in our addition. As you can see, each descriptor has no mathematical meaning to the numbered count in our addition. If we wanted to count the total number of objects in each line (points and segments), the first point in each line would be 1 in our count, the first segment in each line would be 2, and we would reach a total of 5, the numeral of which would correspond to the third point in each line. By looking at each line, we can see that none of the points or segments relate to their mathematical count, so some work is required to find out where each point and segment is located in the line in relation to each other, just as additional work is required to find out which year follows the year of the Dragon in the Chinese calendar, and if it is the first year in a new cycle, or the fifth year in the current cycle, and how many total years have passed.

The first line would be a little easier to comprehend for a total stranger with no prior knowledge of the calendar, but who does know the basic meanings of the numerical symbols. Yet, some additional thinking is required since the descriptors do not match the numerical value of their placement on the line. We know that three January 1st's have passed, meaning 2 years have passed by looking at the line, but writing out the third point as January 1, Year 2 is misleading, because we have actually started the third year at that point. The 2 does not match up with it's

numerical value of 3. It would be much simpler to make the descriptors of the calendar categories match up with their numerical value as this line shows:

1 2

1---2---3

Here, we can see we have two segments, each corresponding to it's numerical value and three points, each corresponding to it's numerical value as well. If you are saying that there are actually five objects in the table, you are right, but the calendar has a separate system for each object -- years, months, and days, just as the points are separate and distinct objects from the segments. We are just highlighting two of them to show their relation to each other, and mark the end of one segment from the beginning of another. At the point in time where we would be on this calendar -- January 1, Year 3, we can see that we have completed two full and separate years, and are now in the third year. The numerical value of the year we are currently in matches with the descriptor we have given it. This makes it much more easier and quicker to figure out how many New Year's have been passed in the line, just as our current system makes it easier to know which year we are in, and how many years have passed in the calendar, because it is equivalent to our simple procedure and definitions for our most basic method of counting. We are in the 2000th year, meaning 1,999 years have passed thus far. Again, sometimes the simplest solution works the best.

BJWyler
The RMG
www.RealMillenniumGroup.com

****