

# How Science Works, and How It Doesn't

(A revealing dialogue between Stanley Guenter and John Major Jenkins)

March 2012, Compiled 8-27-2013, two notes added 1-16-2014

This exchange is openly available [in the archives of the \*Archaeological Haecceities\* website](#), where it first unfolded in early March of 2012. For the convenience of readers, and to clearly illustrate the biased attitude and unscientific strategy of critique that “professional” Maya scholars have employed against me, I extract and repost the relevant exchange between me and Stanley Guenter below. I have not corrected typos. It begins after a contentious exchange with the site’s director, Johan Normark, which can be read in full at the above link. I was trying to redirect the conversation into a productive area of my recent research. Stan Guenter, who must have been observing from the sidelines, then pounced, invoking his strange obsessions with UFOs and pseudoscience.

**From John Major Jenkins on March 6, 2012 at 03:30, to site moderator Johan Normark:**

If you or your readers are interested in setting aside your vitriolic polemics and engaging with the ongoing research into the Tortuguero inscriptions:

“A Reassessment of Date Ambiguities on Tortuguero Monument 2.” March 2, 2012. Deciphering dates in Maya inscriptions often requires accepting “scribal errors.” The previously proposed date decipherment for Tortuguero Monument 2 requires one, but additional data in the text suggests that another date is indicated, one that points us to Lord Jaguar’s birthday in 612 AD. Further examination of Monument 2 in the Carlos Pellicer Museum may resolve the issue.”:

<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/TRTMon2.pdf>

**From Stanley Guenter, on March 6, 2012 at 07:34:**

John,

we’ve had our run ins before, and it should be no surprise that I find your “scholarship” lacking again. I just looked through your “A Reassessment of Date Ambiguities on Tortuguero Monument 2”. No surprise that you’re trying to pull data out of the Tortuguero monuments. Unfortunately, your article is rather sloppy (you cite my paper with Marc Zender in the text itself as merely Zender 2000, for example) and it is more than apparent that you are no epigrapher. This is not a problem; even non-professionals can do good work. But when your work isn’t good, it merely highlights why you are not a professional. You rely far too heavily on Gronemeyer’s drawing and analysis, in order to come up with your alternative reading. The fact is, the text is far too badly eroded for any date to be clear here. What you (following Gronemeyer) take to be a 5 tun indicator looks

nothing like it to me. There are two very distinct glyphs for a 5.0.0 Period Ending (Naah Ho'tuun in Mayan) and a 15.0.0 Period Ending (Wi' Ho'tuun in Mayan). There is no generic glyph for 5 tuun Period Ending, that could cover either possibility, and the glyph in question on Stela 2 doesn't look like either one. Simply because it has a bar in front doesn't make it a Period Ending glyph. In fact, all of the glyphs in the fourth circle on Altar 2 are probably lunar glyphs from the Supplementary Series. The actual haab date probably fell in the extremely eroded fifth circle. I don't consider this date decipherable, to be honest, and it is rather amusing to see you spend so much energy trying to pull out an alternative date, and demonstrating your lack of epigraphic knowledge so clearly in the process. It is amusing to see you try to pull out of this hideously eroded inscription a reference to your favorite position for the birth date on Tortuguero Monument 6. It is no different than the UFOlogists insisting that a grainy photograph of some lights in the sky support their ravings about Roswell. Sorry, but bad data, in no matter how great a quantity, does not support other bad data. Those don't form reliable facts. All that you have shown here, John, is that you are without a doubt a pseudoscientist, and not a reliable scholar.

**From John Major Jenkins on March 6, 2012 at 18:29:**

Stan, good to hear from you and thank you for reading my reassessment of the ambiguities in the TRT Monument 2 inscription. Actually, your presumption that I was casting about for evidence or support for my 2012 work is incorrect. I have been working through many texts sequentially, and my attention was drawn to certain texts that contain apparent "scribal errors" in order to make proposed date reconstructions work. Using the same criteria of analysis employed in the reconstruction of dates, I wanted to test for other possible date interpretations. The date currently suggested for Monument 2 (9.14.0.0.0) requires a scribal error in the Haab numerical position. I explored other possible interpretations. One of these is based upon what appears to be a bar in the position where the stone-binding occurs. I cited other examples of "5"-tun stone-bindings that relate to both 5-Tun and 15-Tun period endings, one from the west side of the Palenque Temple XIX platform inscription, and one from TRT Mon 6 itself. I was not concerned with the glyph itself, as you seem to believe, but I accepted Gronemeyer's reading of its general shape as being supportive of a stone-binding event. This and the apparent Ajaw glyph in the Tzolkin position supports a period-ending date. As I explained in my essay, the vertical bar was suggestive of a 5-Tun period ending, and this led to me exploring other period-ending beyond Katun endings. The date I located, 9.14.5.0.0 also requires a scribal error, but it is at least on par with the interpretive strategy of Gronemeyer. I was then surprised to find that this date falls on 12 Ajaw 8 Kankin, which I had already proposed as the best candidate for Lord Jaguar's birthday (Nov. 28, 612 J). My findings were based on my direct eyeball-to-glyph scrutiny of the eroded DN at E4 on TRT Mon 6, when I visited the museum in March 2011. Stan, have you studied TRT Mon 6 in person? In regard to TRT Mon 2, I then suggested that if we could revisit the poorly drawn glyphs on the hidden dorsal side, we might find better evidence for one or other of the proposed date reconstructions. I'm well aware of the ambiguous nature of these eroded sources of data, that is why "date ambiguities" is in the

title of my essay. I suggested a way that one might secure clearer evidence, if there is a DN on the dorsal side. Not sure why you have a problem with that, Stan, and instead begin mudslinging, invoking UFOs, and inaccurately judging my intentions and efforts.

**Added by John Major Jenkins at 18:38:**

I believe it is worth trying to reconstruct dates based on the available evidence. This often requires a fairly difficult intellectual deduction process using different elements of evidence from different parts of the text. Stan, I know you like “just the explicit facts” handed to you, but we have to work harder than that to reconstruct date sequences and narratives. An example of this is Stuart’s reconstruction of the date sequence on the stucco portion of the inner pier from Temple XIX Palenque. Not much there to go on, but all things considered it was enough.

**Sent by Stan Guenter on March 6 at 19:34:**

The three dates on the stucco pier of Temple XIX are legible and obvious and the one has a Period Ending reference, making the dates easily decipherable. The carving on Monument 2 of Tortuguero is completely eroded and illegible. That you would compare these two is only yet again a testament to your lack of expertise with Maya inscriptions.

**Sent by John Major Jenkins on March 6 at 20:21:**

Actually, I cited those two inscriptions as examples that a 5-Tun stone-binding could refer to a 5-Tun period ending or a 15-Tun period ending, but my examination of 15-Tun period endings did not result in matches with the possible Tzolkin-Haab positions. And, the Monument 2 glyph at A4ay is NOT totally eroded and unreadable. Gronemeyer sees enough in the shape to suggest a stone-binding statement, AND it occurs directly after the Haab position, where we would expect it to be. Previous investigators (including Gronemeyer) assumed the period-ending would be a Katun ending. I pointed out that the bar form within the A4ay glyph-block MIGHT indicate a “5” and thus a 5-tun stone-binding marker. Again, you see nothing here, whereas the careful scrutiny of Gronemeyer, previous investigators he cites, and myself see something (a possibility). To me, that possibility then suggested taking a look at 5-tun period-endings that may match the Tzolkin-Haab positions. A scribal error is required in all scenarios, and thus the ambiguities. Thus result the several date alternatives, which may be resolved by a look at the dorsal side.

**Sent by Stan Guenter on March 6 at 19:30**

John,

your trying to lecture me on working hard to reconstruct date sequences and narratives is both laughable and pathetic. I have been doing so for more than 15 years now. My first independent study of Maya inscriptions was the dates on Coba Stela 1, soon to be published in a revised version in an edited volume on the archaeology of Yucatan. I'll send you a copy when it is finished. Teasing the maximum information out of eroded inscriptions is my specialty, thanks to excellent training from my professor, Peter Mathews. It is clear you have not had any such intensive training and you are grossly unfamiliar with the intricacies of Maya hieroglyphic writing. And this is why you keep making basic mistakes that completely undermine all the rest of your "scholarship". (I put that word in quotations because your work appears to consist of little more than misinterpreting the work of real scholars, and then trying to put a New Age spin on it.)

You admit that "I was not concerned with the glyph itself", which completely undermines your claim to be doing real scholarship. You attempt to provide an alternative reading for the date on Tortuguero Monument 2 and yet you are so unfamiliar with Maya hieroglyphic writing that you can't even determine for yourself what the glyphs might be, and have to rely entirely on the opinion of other scholars. Since this is the case, you should not even be attempting to reinterpret this data. You are simply unqualified to do so. The glyph that Gronemeyer saw as a potential 5 tuun Period Ending, and that you insist Gronemeyer must be right on (despite having no ability to properly judge that fact), simply does not have the outer forms to be either of those PE glyphs. As I pointed out yesterday, the glyph in question is far more likely to be one of the Supplementary Series glyphs, referring to a lunation. The actual haab glyph probably fell in the fifth circle on the monument, or perhaps even later in the text if an 819 day count was included. In any event, the haab is entirely missing and there is no 5 tuun PE glyph visible in the inscription. The kins have a coefficient of 1 and that means the tzolkin day name must be Ahau (though there is no evidence for this in the actual surviving carving, despite your claim that it has the "typical oval form of an Ajaw glyph" (all tzolkins have that same "oval form")).

John, this date is simply not reconstructable. I wish it was, but anyone who says otherwise, Gronemeyer and yourself included, is simply deluding themselves. We can suggest possibilities but there isn't enough surviving detail to eliminate other alternatives that would be equally possible. The only reason you have chosen to latch yourself onto this 716 alternative date you propose for Monument 2 is because it allows you to argue for a connection to Monument 6, your true passion. But by your own admission the tzolkin would be written in error, which is extremely rare (and you haven't the slightest reason to believe there is any error, since we can't read the date anyways). Your proposal cannot be taken seriously.

And neither can you. You have the audacity to lecture me on doing epigraphy and proper scholarship, even going to the point of rhetorically asking me if I have ever studied Tortuguero Monument 6 in person. Coming from someone who wasn't even aware of Monument 6 and its 2012 date until just a few years ago, after writing a number of books on the subject (and while real epigraphers were very aware of the 2012 date on the monument in question – it is published in Linda Schele's 1982 Maya Verbs book, after

all) – this is extremely rich. For your information, John, I first studied Monument 6 with my own eyes in 1997, when I was working on my first archaeological project in the Maya area, in eastern Tabasco. So I had plenty of opportunity to study the inscriptions of the region, and when Marc Zender joined us at the University of Calgary, and got a job as epigrapher at Comalcalco, he and I had numerous, long discussions on these monuments. The only thing about Monument 6 that surprised me when Dave Stuart published his reading was that you 2012ers were so blissfully unaware of it beforehand. If any of you did real scholarship you should have found out about that decades ago. That you didn't speaks volumes about your quality as "scholars". Monument 2 doesn't read the way you wish it did, and neither does Monument 6, and you are not going to be taken seriously, not because of a conspiracy against your work, but simply because your work is of such poor quality and your statements are demonstrably false.

**Sent by John on March 6, 2012 at 20:05:**

Stanley,

Whoa, take it down a notch, cowboy. I'm just trying to have a rational conversation about the date ambiguities on TRT Mon 2. I have suggested more than one alternative date possibility for Monument 2. You are ascribing a level of certainty to my essay that is simply not there. Of course I rely on the work of other scholars for aiding my interpretations — don't you? I'm glad you saw TRT Mon 6 in person. You must have missed the relevance of the DN at E4 and other arguments that I applied to reconstructing Lord Jaguar's possible birthday, presented in my report of June 2011: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/T6Monument.pdf>

I have made my photographs freely available, some of which also clarify the glyphs around P4. Despite the long awareness that specialists have had of TRT Mon 6, It's obvious (and somewhat perplexing) that a careful scrutiny of the Monument 6 inscription has happened only recently, with Gronemeyer & MacLeod's Wayeb no. 34 in 2010. And the astronomical analysis of the dates has likewise only appeared recently, with my 2010 SAA piece. I'm afraid that your wildly reflexive judgments against me, which were clearly revealed in the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion of 2010 (<http://johnmajorjenkins.com/closing-remarks-on-the-mec-facebook-discussion>), are still sadly evident. But let's not get wrapped up in the angst around that, okay? What I'm suggesting is that a look at the hidden dorsal side of Mon 2, which Blom roughly drew decades ago, MIGHT reveal enough data that the date on the ventral side could be confirmed. That's all. You don't have to go into madcap accusatory hand-waving about the large body of writings and pioneering work that I've produced over the last 23 years.

Again, Gronemeyer did not see the glyph at A4ay as a 5-Tun marker, he only saw it as a tun-binding (period-ending) possibility. The vertical bar suggests the "5". It may be wrong, it may be right; these are possibilities. We can be open or closed to investigating further, and I think that the rough drawings by Blom do not do justice to what might actually survive — there might be clearer data if they were re-examined. If someone has pursued this, and actual data or photos exist, please let me know.

By the way, the second part of my essay is now posted at The Center for 2012 Studies: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/TRTMon2-further.pdf>

**Added by John on March 6 at 20:08:**

By the way, you have certain perspectives on TRT Mon 2; they do not agree with Gronemeyer's. Can you direct me to any other analyses of TRT Mon 2, by you or others? I draw from Gronemeyer because there isn't much else out there that has been published, and he has thoroughly studied the site.

**Sent by Stan on March 8, 2012 at 18:35:**

No, I am not aware of other studies of this monument.

**Sent by John on March 8, 2012 at 00:50:**

Stan, in your first post of 7:34 a.m. from March 6, you wrote: "In fact, all of the glyphs in the fourth circle on altar 2 are probably lunar glyphs from the Supplementary Series." Firstly, your terminology does not utilize the accepted terms: altar 2 is Monument 2 (it certainly cannot be categorized as an "altar"); your "fourth circle" refers to cartouche A4. But that's okay, you may be working from memory and I respect the work you've done on the glyphs. However, it is very unlikely that A4 contains lunar Supplementary Series data, as you suggest. It is a short text narrative and therefore would be sparse in its citation of supplementary material, much like TRT Jade 1. Following Gronemeyer, who cites Grube, it is more likely that after the A1 ISIG cartouche, there is a dense 4-block cartouche (A2, similar to an example from TRT Monument 1) that contains the Baktun, Katun, Tun, and Winal place values of the Long Count. Then, in Cartouche A3, we see a 2-block construct which clearly contains a Tzolkin notion in the lower place; the upper place would therefore be the remaining Kin level of the Long Count. A4 should thus follow with the Haab position, and it does, but directly before the Haab we instead see another block which Gronemeyer deduces, correctly I believe (because of other similar examples), to be a god from the 9-day night cycle. Then comes the Haab position, as expected after the Tzolkin place value in A3, which sure enough conveys a numerical value (as a Haab should) — an "8" or possibly a "13"). In the lower portion of A4 we find 2 blocks, which Gronemeyer interprets as being a stone-binding marker followed by an eroded glyph that should, in this typical semantic construct, be the identification or "name" of this monument, which is "owned by" the person named in A5, most likely the "Lord of Tortuguero." All of this makes perfect sense in terms of Gronemeyer's analysis and logic, which draws from recognized semantic constructions (following Grube and other examples from the Maya corpus), and which I agree with. There is no room or reason for the lunar SS data as you suggest.

Sent by Stan on March 8, 2012, at 18:34:

John, obviously my reference to “Altar” was just a mistake for Monument. I could as easily ask you about “Carouche” in your last post. We’re beyond such juvenile debating tactics, or at least I am. But, when you know next to nothing about the subject matter at hand, I guess you are forced to grub around for any rhetorical cudgel you can find. I do not like to use “cartouche” for these circles because cartouche has a very specific meaning in Maya epigraphy and, as well, numbering these cartouches leads to the nonsense of having 4 different glyphs in two rows in “Cartouche A2” for example.

I am glad you respect my work with hieroglyphs. I cannot honestly reciprocate the sentiment. You simply don’t have the expertise to understand the differences between these eroded signs and what they could possibly be. This is why you rely entirely upon the pronouncements of Gronemeyer and Grube and other real epigraphers. I could have a rational discussion with them about these possibilities but with you I can point to the outer forms and you will just rush back to your argument from authority “Grube and Gronemeyer say X!” as if that trumps the actual forms of these signs in question.

I already pointed out to you that the none of the glyphs in the fourth circle qualify as a 5 tuun period ending marker, neither of the Naah Ho’tuun or Wi’ Ho’tuun variety. Thus there is no reason at all to favor your alternative date. That is the important thing to consider, as it renders your entire post moot, especially since you still have to posit a complete and blatant mistake in the Ahau coefficient of the tzolkin, which would make this the most egregious example of a mistake I am aware of in Maya calendrics. Given the lack of any proof for the haab you need, or the PE marker you thought you saw, your argument fails and fails spectacularly. No epigrapher is going to support you on this.

**Sent by John on March 9, 2012 at 19:23:**

Stan,

“Carouche” was clearly a typo. Your use of “altar” vs the correct “Monument” term could be misleading to readers following our discussion. My correction was in service to clarity and was not intended to be “juvenile debating tactics” as you asserted. That should have been clear from my conciliatory sentence that immediately followed my correction: “But that’s okay, you may be working from memory and I respect the work you’ve done on the glyphs.” Similarly, you overreacted to my simple question, previously, regarding whether you’d visited TRT Mon 6 in Mexico. It’s kind of hard to have a civil conversation if you’re going to project non-existent nefarious intentions onto me. But let’s try.

I sketched in my previous post, for you and our readers, the logical process published by Gronemeyer by which he reconstructed the likely text narrative on Monument 2. He, in turn, cited Berlin (on the stone-binding hand-sign he perceives) and Grube (for precedent on the likely semantic structure of the text). These are not simply “pronouncements” as

you dismissively claim, but are, rather, arguments and evidence-based logical processing of the data from the text narrative. I've been tracking DNs and date sequences, and following the epigraphic arguments and work for many years, and Gronemeyer's provisional reconstruction of TRT Mon 2 – eroded though it is – is the best interpretation I've encountered. It also seems to be the only published interpretation, and you yourself are unaware of other published work on this text. (Thus, of course I give it weight and largely agree with it; but there are other date options). In your reactionary rejection of my words you are in essence largely disagreeing with Gronemeyer. You also disagree with Gronemeyer's "cartouche" terminology, and that's your prerogative. But you nevertheless write: "numbering these cartouches leads to the nonsense of having 4 different glyphs in two rows in "Cartouche A2" for example." Look at Figure 1 in my first essay (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/TRTMon2.pdf>). As I cited Gronemeyer as pointing out, there are similar examples of this type of "four glyph-blocks in one cartouche" from TRT Monument 1. And, in addition, the A2 cartouche clearly contains 4 internal glyph blocks, even though they are eroded. Just take a look. So ... you not only disagree with Gronemeyer on this point (despite his secondary supportive citations made to Berlin and Grube and ACTUAL EXAMPLES of such constructs on another TRT monument), but you believe this is "nonsense." Correct me if I'm wrong, Stan, but you did intend to say that perceiving 4 glyph-blocks within cartouche A2 is "nonsense"? Perhaps we should ask other readers of our exchange to take a look and tell us if they see four glyph-blocks within A2 (just click on the PDF link above to see it).

Your thumbs-down opinion about my alternative date (9.14.5.0.0) is perfectly fine, and not that surprising. However, your assessment of my rationale in suggesting it (and one other possibility) is skewed toward your denigrating default assumptions. As a viable possible alternative to the 9.14.0.0.0 proposed by Berlin and Gronemeyer, my 9.14.5.0.0 date is at least on even ground (because BOTH date proposals require a scribal error). Their 9.14.0.0.0 date requires a scribal error in the Haab position. Your statement that the scribal error in the Tzolkin position that my alternative date (9.14.5.0.0) requires is "the most egregious example of a mistake I am aware of in Maya calendrics" is an extremely odd and misleading assertion. Many scribal errors have been identified in the Maya texts; there's actually one in TRT Mon 6. Finally, I need to remind you that the whole point of my essay was to highlight ambiguities in the date ascribed to the TRT Monument 2 text, with possible alternative solutions at least on even ground with the rationale proposed for 9.14.0.0.0. So — here it is again — I simply suggested that a closer look at the currently hidden dorsal side of Monument 2 might resolve those ambiguities. And several scholars including one epigrapher do support me on this. The results may be inconclusive, but we won't know unless we move forward in the investigation and give it a try. That's how science works.

---end of exchange

## **Part 2: The Story Goes On, and On, and On**

An important addendum must be added. Guenter did not respond to my final post (above). However, the thread continued three months later with a post by Jim Smith.

Johan Normark and Jim Smith went back and forth a few times and then I noticed the continued thread, and posted my comments. It was at this time that I decided to organize and present my dossier on Jim Smith, primarily from research I had done a year-and-a-half earlier. I posted the link to the PDF of this dossier, but Normark deleted it following pressure from Jim Smith. I received an angry email from Jim Smith (the user of many aliases) and, within the same day, I also received a threat from another email address/name (one that I recognized from the previous year during the exchange with Jim Smith/Tom Brown) that simply exclaimed: "I am going to destroy you!" I suspected this was from the irate lunatic Jim Smith, whose secret motivations and stealthy behavior I had just exposed with my dossier. I left for Mexico that day, for the First Izapa Round Table Conference. We stayed at a hotel with spotty internet, I was swept up into the conference's activities, and I therefore did not check my email for 4 or 5 days. When I did, I observed a series of emails from Jim Smith demanding my responses to his accusations. It unfolded like a monologue, a bloated and self-aggrandized energy vampire who was not getting the food/response he desired, until he ended his monologue with a huff of displeasure. In any case, this addendum to the thread of March 2012 unfolded in June of 2012. It can be read in full here: <http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/02/16/2012-jenkins-is-being-misunderstood-again/> and is reproduced below. Since Normark deleted my link to my dossier on Jim Smith's unethical and secret attack methods, I have re-added it below (in large font).

By: **Jim Smith** on June 15, 2012  
at 00:02:

1. Although I withdrew from "2012" things > 6 months ago, I do a search occasionally to see whether any comments have been made on the materials of my that remain on line. Thus, I came to this thread.

Actually, I do not, and never have, had any interest in debating Jenkins. In the thread that you cited above (<http://the2012deception.net/?p=101>), I wanted to hear straight answers to the simple questions that I asked him.

Two years later, he apparently still has none.

Since he and his colleague Deborah Skye ("The Reincarnated Maya Princess with the Millionaire Mind") have taken to making legal threats against their detractors (such as Jenkins's comments about your "slanderous" statement in this thread), you may like to read about similar threats that he made against 2012hoax.org (<http://www.2012hoax.org/forum/t-460029/a-list-of-errors-requested-from-jmj>).

Actually, the Jenkins/Skye collaboration raises an interesting question. She claims to be a reincarnated Maya priestess who interacts fully with her former selves when she goes to ancient sites. She also claims to "see, hear, feel and interact within multi-dimensional realms, between worlds and time and space." As if that weren't enough, she's also "an intuitive and empath who can hear the voices of spirits when she's in ancient sacred sites".

Which leads one to ask, "If Jenkins believes that she's for real, why does he think anyone needs HIM to tell us anything about the ancient Maya?"

By: [Johan Normark](#) on June 15, 2012

at 04:50:

Good point there. Maybe she needs him to fill the male spectrum? She seems to be focusing on women (but I admit that I have just glimpsed at her website, <http://deborahskye.com/>). Maybe each archaeologist should have her as a coach so we can see and feel the ancients without getting dirty? Do I need a sex change? Can quantum physics help me with that sex change? The questions are endless.

By: [John Major Jenkins](#) on June 15, 2012

at 04:57:

Ah, Jim Smith, the deceptive liar with many aliases. As you probably don't know, I have tracked your various user-names and identities on many sites, including Amazon, Wikipedia, Youtube, and elsewhere. The entire dossier is being prepared for publication. It began with my lengthy replies, "straight answers", to your critiques in early 2010, which you could not accept, nor were you able or willing to sustain a rational and cordial dialogue on Maya astronomy and other traditions. You would just start slinging invectives, go away, and attack again later with the same talking points that I'd already responded to and clarified. Then came your Youtube screeds, your 2012Hoax posts, Wikipedia disinformation, and so on. Get a life. Your small-minded critiques of other people's deeper and more sincerely lived truths, such as my friend's, that can't be resolved in your little linear brain reveal your petty, sad, and pathetic heart. But we expect that from fundamentalists, so no surprise there. Note that you're using this thread in an inappropriate way, just like you used Amazon and Wikipedia — you didn't even respond to the content of the thread. You just troll around the internet like a bottom feeder looking for places to plant your toxic and misleading lies. What are you, 12?

By: [Johan Normark](#) on June 15, 2012

at 05:06:

This is my blog so I decide who is using this thread in an inappropriate way, not you.

By: [John Major Jenkins](#) on June 15, 2012

at 05:17:

As far as I can tell, an appropriate use of your blog involves providing a venue for unvetted liars, like Jim Smith, who have personal axes to grind. Your ethics have slipped. Get some sleep.

By: [Johan Normark](#) on June 15, 2012

at 05:27

1. I do not live in your time zone. It is early morning over here (6:27 local time). 2. Your description of Jim Smith (venue, personal axes to grind) seems a lot like you yourself. Since you are here, and I let you tell you what you want, does that not make you a liar?

By: [Jim Smith](#) on June 15, 2012

at 14:07:

We can find out who the liar is here, by getting your straight answer to a simple question:

Do you, or do you not, believe that Deborah Skye is what she claims to be? (See my previous post.)

If your answer is "no", then why are you making videos with her? And if yes, then who needs YOU to tell us anything?

By: [John Major Jenkins](#) on June 16, 2012

at 14:03:

To respond to Jim's and Johan's interest in why I supposedly haven't responded to Jim Smith's previous questions/critiques about my work, the answer is 1) I responded at length to Jim Smith over a six week period of email exchanges when he contact me under the alias "Tom Brown" in March of 2010; and 2) as an effective dialogue, that exchange was meaningless because "Tom Brown" did not reply to my patiently presented explanations and corrections but rather he escalated his comments into vitriolic accusations. The question of great importance for understanding the motivations of Jim Smith and what drove his subsequent sabotage campaigns is this:

Jim, why did you contact me under an alias name, Tom Brown, in early 2010?

*[Here is the dossier I assembled proving and exposing the aliases used by Jim Smith on many websites as well as his tactics of slander and defamation. I put this together from my notes and posted it online in June of 2012 because of Jim Smith's continuing assaults and spread of disinformation]:*

<http://update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf> (re-added because Normark deleted it)

By: **Jim Smith** on June 15, 2012

at 20:02:

Hello Mr. Normark,

Since JMJ has attacked your ethics and made legal threats, you may wish to see how his previous accusations of that sort turned out.

<http://www.2012hoax.org/forum/t-460029/a-list-of-errors-requested-from-jmj#post-1480837>

I've withdrawn from all things 2012, and as I understand the situation, the materials that I contributed to 2012hoax are no longer mine, but theirs. For that reason, JMJ's objections about what's said about him on that website are a matter between him and 2012Hoax. Of course, if he could demonstrate that anything I contributed is false or misleading, I would use my good offices to persuade 2012hoax to retract it.

To date, he has not been able to do so, just as he has not substantiated his accusation of "slander" against you.

By: **Johan Normark** on June 15, 2012

at 20:18:

JMJ simply wants the attention. Let us not feed the troll because the way he react is not healthy for him. Let us hope he comes to the insight of what is troubling him before it is too late.

By: **Jim Smith** on June 15, 2012

at 20:36:

Agreed.

The ongoing issue with Jim Smith's attacks did not end there. In September I did an interview with Jeffrey Pritchett, which was posted on his blog. It including my discussion of critics of my work, and a link to the Jim Smith exposé. Smith contacted Pritchett, threatened him, and Pritchett deleted that section from the interview. I have restored the uncensored interview in my own posting here, with the resulting email exchange with Jim Smith and some comments at the end: <http://alignment2012.com/Interview-Pritchett-September2012.pdf>.

But it did not end there. In October of 2012 Jim Smith emailed me and informed me that he was filing a case against me with his local police department, accusing me of "extortion." This was apparently based upon my suggestion (documented in the link above) that I'd be happy to remove my dossier if he would first rectify all the false information about me that he had peppered around the Internet on many websites including Wikipedia, Amazon, Youtube, 2012Hoax.org, and others. This was a gesture of reconciliation, a laurel wreath extended. He rejected it, probably because it would require that he acknowledge his unethical stealth tactics and the fact that I'd already responded to his questions and clarified his incorrect notions about my work and Maya cosmology (when he contacted me under the alias of Tom Brown in early 2010). I ignored his lunatic threats, as I've learned that such psychologically unstable and unhappy energy vampires feed on any response you offer. But I've also felt that my only recourse would be to accurately and objectively document his actions (which is why I posted my dossier).

October was an extremely busy month. Having just returned from Brazil in late September followed by a presentation event in Boulder, Colorado, in October I gave a presentation in Los Angeles, then traveled to Honduras for TWO premieres of the documentary film that features my work, *2012: The Beginning*, followed immediately by a flight to Winnipeg, Canada, for another premiere showing and a presentation. I then returned to Fort Collins and attended the Hollerween Music Festival where I was to do a reading (from my spoof piece: <http://alignment2012.com/Survive-the-Non-Apocalypse.pdf>). All of this occurred before October 28, after which I was drawn into helping a friend acquire a printing press in Denver, and then investigating and saving from being scrapped an old newspaper press in Kansas. In November I did the Red Ice interview, another radio interview, a webinar with producer Shannon Kring Buset, and a presentation in Fort Collins on November 16, after which my wife of 13 years announced that she wanted a divorce. Within four weeks she was moving out, while I was at a conference in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Despite Jim Smith claiming, in his June 2012 post to Normark's blog, that he was "withdrawing" from 2012, he continued his email harassment and uploading of false information about me even into 2013. He made some comments to a Maya piece written by Greg Schwartz on the "21<sup>st</sup> Century Blues" blog in January, slandering me once again by name. I somehow ran across this and posted a reply. Schwartz questioned Smith,

found him to be a lying weasel, and I agreed to write a “2012 in Retrospect” piece for Schwartz’s site. It was posted on his “21<sup>st</sup> Century Blues” blog: <http://21stcenturyblues.wordpress.com/2013/02/07/2012-in-retrospect-by-john-major-jenkins/>. Schwartz added an end comment regarding Jim Smith’s attempted posts, which were vile and venomous. (Unlike Johan Normark or Bill Hudson on his 2012Hoax website, Greg Schwartz exercised a discriminating awareness and questioning assessment of Smith and quickly determined, with no help from me, that Smith’s motives and statements were personally vindictive and factually false). Here’s an excerpt of Schwartz’s comments:

John has dealt with his own share of the blues over the past 13 years, particularly in regard to defending his work against what seems like an inordinate amount of detractors (as he notes in the article.)

I got a taste of that myself when one of those detractors contacted me last month with some very critical venom for John and his research after I had cited John as a major influence on my own interest in 2012 (in my debut post here on the blog, [“What happened to our paradigm shift?”](#))

This critic had such a venomous and vindictive tone in his assertions that John was a “snake oil salesman” that it led me to question him on his motives and why he had such particular contempt for John, as opposed to all the real snake oil salesmen and corrupt deceivers in this crazy mixed up world? The man dodged my query several times before one last message in which he insisted I not contact him again. That was fine by me, as his odd obsession led me to speculate whether he was just a kook or possibly something more sinister. I certainly wouldn’t put it past the New World Order power brokers to employ disinformation agents tasked with shooting down any research that could possibly give the good people of humanity some hope that a transformative era of positive change could indeed be afoot (I ran into a couple of these types in cyberspace during my UFOlogy research in 1997 when I was working on my X-Files spec script.)”

– end of excerpt

But that didn’t stop Jim Smith from tossing up another slander filled video on Youtube within a week. **The most disturbing thing about Smith is that his strategy is just a more virulent strain of hatred and intolerance that is employed, in a more muted form, by many of the professional scholars. For example, Guenter’s words, above, ooze with fundamentalist disgust and hatred that I have even dared to address him directly. I refused to be the straw man of his fantasy which he could gleefully torch in the bonfire of his hatred for “pseudoscience.”** Ironically, a sober reading of our exchange (above) reveals Guenter, not I, as the purveyor of a pseudo-logical and unscientific processing of evidence and data in a Maya text.

### **Part 3. The Guenter Files**

I recall my one in-person encounter with Guenter, in August of 2008 in Antigua, Guatemala. I was speaking at a conference organized by the Jades Maya Cosmology Museum. Coincidentally, another conference was going on in town, in which Guenter and other archaeologists were speaking. In fact, the Jades SA was also involved in promoting that conference, and had invited everyone to a “meet and greet” get together at their large store. I was there, hanging out and meeting people, and someone pointed out Guenter. I had just read something online —maybe it was Normark’s blog? — in which Guenter had mentioned how Schele had noted the Tortuguero “2012” date in her 1982 book on Maya Verbs. I had wondered why, then, Schele did not mention the Tortuguero 2012 date to me when I met her in 1995 (and I broached the subject of my Izapa & 2012 research, having sent her a letter about it in May of 1994) or why she didn’t mention it in her dismissal of the importance of the 2012 date, which she posted to the Aztlan e-list in 1996 (<http://alignment2012.com/scheletoGardner.html>); see also: <http://alignment2012.com/app5.htm>). So, I figured this could be a topic of discussion with Guenter. I walked up and introduced myself. I was astonished to see his face go quickly from surprise, to horror, to a stony cold tinged with disgust. He seemed horrified that I had appeared before him, in this celebration event that was apparently, in his mind, being held for him and his professional colleagues. Well, no, there was another conference taking place in town, featuring presentations on Maya cosmology AND a delegation of Maya leaders. I sensed his apprehension but suggested that we talk about 2012. Some excuse for begging off was seized upon, and he departed.

Little did I know, but at this time Guenter was collaborating with David Freidel to craft a “pseudoscience” college class which featured a Power Point presentation and a clear denunciation of me and my work. Guenter was actually teaching this class in Texas by 2008 or 2009, and Freidel himself used the same Power Point presentation in at least one conference presentation. This came to my attention in May of 2009 when, in a CNN interview that both Freidel and I did, he called me “a charlatan.” I emailed him and asked him why he believed such a thing. He stated that I was charlatan because (paraphrasing) I believed in and taught the doctrine of astrological causality to a gullible public. I replied and pointed out that I criticized and disagreed with the “doctrine of astrological causality” in several chapters of my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies* (Borderland Sciences Research Foundation). He agreed to discuss / debate me and, as a basis for this, he sent me the Power Point presentation crafted by him and Guenter. **I was astonished to find that every single reference to me or my work was factually false or inaccurate yet craftily conflated with all manner of 2012-related tripe in the marketplace, even suggesting that mine was a doomsday book alongside all the others.** It wasn’t a fact-based and rational critique against my work, *it was an inquisitorial indictment*. I responded with a list of corrections and comments, and suggested he also send my response to Guenter. No response from Freidel. Or Guenter. Three months later, I email; no response. Two months later Freidel’s collaboration with Villaseñor appeared online, which simply repeated the accusations while crafting additional misconceptions and assertions (see my response here: <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoVillasenor.html>).

As for Guenter, I didn’t see him around later that evening in Antigua, and I didn’t hear from him again until he participated in the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion (about my SAA presentation on the astronomy within Tortuguero Monument 6), in late 2010. Here,

Guenter was in full-fanged attack mode. But his straw-man methods and *ad hominem* strategies were easily exposed. This should have been a defining moment in my defense of, and the respectful reception of, my work. But although the debate was sponsored by scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*, and the transcribed proceedings are posted on that organization's website as a 206-page PDF, no subsequent scholar writing on 2012 has dared to cite it, apparently because it reveals too much about the evidence for my arguments as well as the irrational and unprofessional strategies of mitigation employed by "professional" scientists and scholars (**Note:** MacLeod mentioned it in the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* essay published in Germany in mid-2012). I had invited them all to participate and then sent the PDF to many who opted not to. In my postscript to the 3-week-long debate/discussion, I summarized the efforts of Guenter thus:

Unyielding criticism came from Stanley Guenter. In the debate process several very interesting things were revealed about Stanley's methodology and stance toward my paper. Stan's very narrow filter of allowing only explicit and tangible evidence results in his oft-repeated mantra "there is no evidence." But with that same filter you can mitigate a large proportion of the amazing work done by many Mayanists and ethnographers reconstructing indigenous knowledge systems. He himself claims that these other Mayanists are "wrong, demonstrably so." Stan admits his bias against archaeoastronomy, and constantly rejected my deductions. Why? Because deductions are based on indirect evidence, or different types of evidence which he doesn't class as "real" evidence, and cannot be allowed through his filter. I then quoted Stan himself indulging in deductive reasoning in a passage from his Palenque essay, revealing a double standard in the application of his rule. Oddly, through cleverly caveat-wrapped linguistics he also rejected actual facts that were presented in my paper, such as the astronomy connected with December 21, 2012 (it's a solstice.) This underscores what should be considered a rather large problem in Stan's treatment of my paper.

Another problem with Stan's comments can be identified in his past treatment of my work, which may in fact fuel the circular persistence of his critiques. He, demonstrably so, comes into the discussion with a prejudicial bias against me as a "2012er," one of "those guys" who he believes engage in "pseudoscience." It is thus not surprising that he would have a vested interest in "debunking" my paper and would be reticent about accepting the possibility of my arguments for astronomy in Tortuguero Monument 6. Instead, he always defaults back to a null-set hypothesis and the narrow filter of explicit evidence, combined with digging through my writing archives for bits and pieces of what he thinks will be polemically compromising. This is not the practice of rational science, as anyone who has studied the psychology of debunkers knows, who are adamantly fixated on proving an opposite. Here's the necessary disclaimer or Catch-22, or conflict of interest, that fundamentally calls into question Stan's assessments:

Stan has produced and used in his classroom a Power Point presentation that David Freidel also has used, which he sent to me in May 2009. In it, almost every single point of reference to me and my work was factually incorrect. I immediately sent my comments and corrections back to Freidel and Stan,

expecting a reply, but there was none. (It is here: <http://www.update2012.com/response-to-freidelMay.html>.) Just a few days ago I asked Stan if he had incorporated my factual corrections into his presentation, and he said he had made some changes. I invite him to send me his revised Power Point presentation so I can check it again for continuing errors. Bottom line: the many definitive declarations in Stan's critique should be regarded as highly suspect due to his demonstrable misrepresentation of my work in the past. In addition to that, many of his critiques simply assert a need for explicit evidence, and don't engage the full content of information presented. I responded clearly to his critiques, which can be found in the discussion.

(From the version posted at <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>, which has a few additional typos corrected, compared to the version posted at the *Maya Exploration Center*: [http://www.mayaexploration.org/research\\_pubs.php](http://www.mayaexploration.org/research_pubs.php).)

## Conclusion

So, this three-part presentation tries to give a complete picture of how one prominent Maya scholar and archaeologist, Stanley Guenter, has perceived and attempted to critique and/or mitigate my work and how his strategy is not much different from that of the underinformed debunker-priest cyber-stalker named Jim Smith (in fact, both were JMJ bashers uncritically green-lighted by Johan Normark on his Archaeological Haeceities website). Who was practicing responsible and rational processing of factual evidence, and who was blinded by irrational forces and below-the-belt strategies intended to mitigate will be very clear to anyone who bothers to read the actual exchanges and links I have assembled here. It should be remembered that my work has, for almost 20 years, been about *reconstructing what the ancient Maya thought about 2012*. I have used evidence-based arguments, deductive reasoning, and documentation practices that exceed what is often found in PhD dissertations and academic peer-review papers. It was precisely when I had the great good fortune to be invited to present my work at the by-invitation-only academic conference sponsored by *The Society for American Archaeology* (in April 2010) that the JMJ mitigation machine went into overdrive.

At the moment of my presentation in April of 2010 there was NOTHING published by scholars devoted to reconstructing what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. And let's remember that I also presented my pioneering and unprecedented work long ago, at the *Institute of Maya Studies* in Miami, in August of 1997 — where many of my scholarly critics have themselves given presentations. Let's also remember that by 2010 I had published more than five *books* dedicated to the 2012 question, going back to 1995. This work was pursued during a period in which most professional scholars rejected 2012 as a valid topic of inquiry.

Then, as of Gronemeyer and MacLeod's *Wayeb* no. 34 monograph (August 2010), scholars began publishing papers on 2012. Many of them were reactionary debunking pieces, addressing millennial madness psychology, the "2012 phenomenon," or the false doomsday meme. The papers written by scholars that

offered interpretations or suggestions as to how the ancient Maya may have conceived of 2012 were extremely few and were published in three anthologies of 2011 and 2012:

- The Cambridge IAU Vol. 278 (July 2011)
- The Gelfer 2012 anthology (December 2011, in which I have a contribution)
- The *Archaeoastronomy Journal* no. XXIV (August 2012)

Two essays and a review of Gelfer's anthology also appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* journal (MacLeod & Van Stone; Whitesides & Hoopes; review of Gelfer's anthology). I believe all of these were published in the year 2012 but certainly not before 2011. (**Note:** I received a PDF of that journal shortly after composing this essay in August 2013; my critique of the Whitesides & Hoopes article will appear in a forthcoming issue of that journal, with their response, while my queries to Van Stone remain unanswered.) Also, there was Hoopes's review in *Archaeoastronomy Journal* no. XXII. There are other articles here and there, by Krupp (2009), Hanegraff, Defesche, and notably Sitler's 2006 piece and his updated piece of 2012 (both in *Nova Religio*) but they all largely address "the phenomenon" of 2012 with very little mention of what the ancient Maya might have believed about 2012. Along these lines, there are some comments by scholars in the documentary film *2012: The Beginning* (2012).

I have fully reviewed all four of the 2012 *books* by "Maya scholars" (Van Stone, Aveni, Restall & Solari, and Stuart) and they all are very problematic. They ALL contain or repeat errors in assessing either the precession of the equinoxes, my work, the astronomy of the galactic alignment, or Michael Grofe's work. Fair and rational fact-based critiques of these 2012 books by "professional scholars" can be discussed and expanded on at great length, which I have pursued on <http://www.update2012.com>.

Finally, comments by scholars on 2012, the precession of the equinoxes, and whether the Long Count should continue counting beyond 13.0.0.0.0 on December 21, 2012, or should recycle to 0.0.0.0.0, were reported in the December 2012 issue of the *IMS Explorer*. To conclude, I'll share below an excerpt from my contribution to December IMS Explorer issue (online here: <http://alignment2012.com/JMJ-December2012-IMS-Explorer.pdf>), as it sums up nicely my thoughts as of mid-November, 2012:

Q: What do you see as the future of Maya studies, now that the hoopla of 2012 will soon be behind us?

JMJ: Maya scholars came late to treating 2012 seriously as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought (as documented in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*). The Tortuguero monument, as of 2006, forced a serious consideration. My focused work on this topic, going back to the 1980s and generating eight books and hundreds of essays and interviews, with presentations in both academic and popular venues, has for the most part not been accurately treated. Ironically, as we now have some scholars recently interpreting how the ancient Maya thought

about 2012, we find the same ideas I published years ago being repeated (namely, astronomy and an ideology of period-ending renewal). The “hoopla” in the popular marketplace is to be expected, and I have offered critiques of that arena for over twenty years (see <http://Update2012.com>), as summarized in my chapter in Dr. Joseph Gelfer’s anthology *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011).

I’m concerned that Maya Studies – having reluctantly been forced to address 2012 by the mainstream attention to it – will possibly, after 2012 passes, return to avoiding the deeper currents of Maya spirituality and the more challenging aspects of reconstructing ancient Maya astronomy. The 2012 topic has apparently been largely an annoyance, notwithstanding the new breakthroughs in understanding Maya astronomy and the two “2012” inscriptions.

Many hope that things will “get back to normal.” In anticipation of this regression, I launched the field of “2012 Studies” in 2009 and have now posted over twenty research essays on the website for *The Center for 2012 Studies*: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com>. It features my SAA presentation on Tortuguero astronomy and the lengthy and revealing debate with scholars that ensued, sponsored by the *Maya Exploration Center* in late 2010.

Although most of the scholars opted to honor the idiosyncratic doctrine of Pakal from Palenque, and count all the way to the 20<sup>th</sup> Baktun ending in 4772 AD, the IMS decided, ultimately, to honor the 13-Baktun concept abundantly evident in Maya Creation Texts, and recycle the count: December 22, 2012 = 0.0.0.0.1. This was the argument I gave and supported, echoed also by Victoria Bricker. In this rare instance, the evidence and logic won out over the consensus of unconsciously biased scholars, most of whom preferred the 20<sup>th</sup> Baktun accounting because it could de-legitimize 2012 as a *cycle* ending. This issue serves well, in microcosm, to underscore how the biased larger treatment of 2012 has been enacted, but it also gives some hope that, ultimately, the evidence and a rational assessment will prevail.

Despite the personal challenges of October, November, and December, I seized a last-minute opportunity for filming at Izapa in mid-December. Those three months were the busiest and most intense months of my life. Still, I recall going to a fun party with my wife on November 9<sup>th</sup> or so, and my brother’s granddaughter being born at that time, a cause for celebration. I would have preferred that less, rather than more, stressful personal circumstances were piled onto me at that time, but that’s the way it goes. One cannot have any expectations. What unfolded for me in December is documented here: <http://www.alignment2012.com/13th-Baktun-Completion.pdf>.

John Major Jenkins. August 27, 2013

<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com> ▪ <http://www.johnmajorjenkins.com>  
<http://www.alignment2012.com> ▪ <http://www.update2012.com> ▪ [John@Alignment2012.com](mailto:John@Alignment2012.com)