

Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities: Exposing Academic Tactics of Mitigation in the Critique of the 2012 Phenomenon

John Major Jenkins. January 23, 2014

In late 2013 I wrote a critique of an article by Kevin Whitesides & John Hoopes, called “Seventies Dreams and 21st Century Realities: The Emergence of 2012 Mythology.” It was published in mid-2012 in the German journal called *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, alongside the award-winning 2012 treatment by Barbara MacLeod and Mark Van Stone and a review of Dr. Joseph Gelfer’s anthology of 2011 (*2012: Decoding the Counter-cultural Apocalypse*), in which I have a chapter. Their article was freely posted last year (2013) on Hoopes’s (or Whitesides’) page at Academia.edu.

The editors at *ZfA* offered me their standard policy of writing a critique, which would be assessed for academic standards in their internal peer-review process. I had to abide by four limiting conditions they sent me, primarily that my piece was not to be an argument for my own theories but rather would comment and critique only on what was stated in the Whitesides & Hoopes article. I welcomed the opportunity.

The following document should be treated as an ancillary addition to my critique (Jenkins 2014), and whatever response the authors craft to my critique, which they are invited by the journal to contribute. [I have been asked by the chief editor of *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* to remove his emails below, which will now be omitted. They are not germane to the demonstration – JMJ, 8-8-14] They too must abide by the same limiting conditions and peer-review approval that I did. In many ways the following email exchanges *are more revealing of the authors’ true motivations* than my critique could reveal, being limited in space and focus. In a nutshell, we see here two scholars who had made many (at least six) assertions that were easily demonstrated to be incorrect. The mistakes affect having an accurate framework for the development of the so-called “2012 phenomenon” as well as an accurate presentation of my own discoveries, interpretations, and methods. Their errors appeared to be valid only through the implementation of a series of breaches of academic standards — namely, flat-out false assertions vaguely cited to a source that, in fact, doesn’t provide any support. This tactic would be difficult to perceive within the peer-review process, because it betrays a basic honesty that “professional” scholars are assumed to be honoring and practicing.

Unfortunately, this article by Hoopes and Whitesides is emblematic of other papers that have been published by various scholars, and my fact-based exposé of this article could easily be applied to several other articles and books on 2012 by professional scholars. The following exchanges are lengthy, but revealing. Basically, confronted by my well-written and documented critique, Whitesides and Hoopes proceeded to attempt to subvert the process through repeated questions and requests for my previous books (going back to the 1980s and included my poetry, travel books, and experimental quasi-fiction). Even after I responded at length, the requests were repeated in variant phrasings, which quickly became some form of belligerent badgering. At one point I was accused of never writing those previous books and of lying about my authorship of them. Apparently this unethical attempt to derail the process, even though my critique was already

approved, almost worked, for two weeks later the chief editor of the journal was quite frustrated at the exchanges, none of which should have actually transpired. I did respond to the queries because I wanted to be cooperative and responsive to their questions, and for that reason I engaged their requests even though they were, at bottom, diversionary. The results are the following lengthy exchanges between December 21-23 and January 8-10, which I can summarize as follows:

- Professional scholars malign me and my work in a peer-review journal, asserting falsehoods backed up by deceptive citations.
- I succeed in writing and getting approved for publication, in the same journal, a corrective critique of their article.
- Following the standard policy, they are invited to respond.
- They are outraged. Instead of playing by the rules of the academic process, they implement diversionary tactics and, when that fails, propagate more dis-information about me on the Internet (Whitesides' S.O.T.T. post of Jan. 9).
- Despite the diversions intended to cause the journal editor to pull the plug, the editor puts his foot down and reaffirms the plan to publish my critique.
- The authors agree to finish their response by the end of January.

Now, the authors could simply acknowledge the fair and fact-based corrections I made, which total seven points of correction (see email of January 9 below), or they could engage in additional subterfuge by asserting more falsehoods, as they did in their original piece. This should not get past the peer-review process. However, in the playbook of corrupt and unethical scholarship and polemics, there are ways to loop-hole detection. We will have to wait a few months to see what happens.

My critique of the factual flaws as well as the unprofessional and self-serving underlying motivations within the essay by Whitesides & Hoopes has been noted by others. One researcher “found it [their essay] unreadable due to the very attitudes that you are critiquing here”, and noted that:

They twist the facts, invent whole concepts, and criticize others for things they do themselves, but it is worse, in that it is filled with contempt. Well done for taking Hoopes to task on that ridiculous “Mayanism” page. It is as if Hoopes has been assigned the task of defending the ivory towers of Mayanist academia against infiltration by “the great unlettered”.... and is authorized to use any tactics he can think of, to snatch the kudos of Maya discoveries back into the fold. Bravo for showing the conceit and hypocrisy in the statements of these academics (personal communication, 12-2013).

Another well-known writer-researcher who tried to have rational fact-based exchanges with Hoopes about the topic of ancient civilizations concluded that he “is a weasel on steroids” (in part because he exploits public platforms like Wikipedia to craft false narratives by manipulating his own distorted summaries while asserting dubious intentions and “influences” onto the person he seeks to defame).

John Major Jenkins
January 23, 2014

My piece is titled “The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon): A Critique of the Whitesides & Hoopes Essay.”

Dec 16, 2013. Approval for publication from the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* editor was granted, observing that he was glad that I had closely observed their four conditions. Several small changes were made to conform to their style standards, which I was asked to review, and then the paper would be sent for Whitesides & Hoopes for their comment. He closed with wishing me a good visit to Peru.

I replied with two minor changes, he approved, and we were done. My piece was then sent to Whitesides and Hoopes. Several days later (on December 21) a response from Hoopes and Whitesides was sent to me and the journal editor, asking me to send them many of my previous publication titles from a bibliography on my website, from a list of my writings they pulled off of one of my websites:

Dear John [Jenkins],

I hope this message finds you well.

Kevin Whitesides and I were recently contacted by Gerd Hövelman, the editor of the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, to ask if we would like to prepare a response to the comments on our article "Seventies Dreams and 21st-Century Realities" that was published last year.

It is our understanding that among your principal complaints are what you assert is the issue of incomplete citation of your published work. However, without access to a complete set of your publications, especially your books, it is impossible for us to be thorough in our consideration. You specifically mention issues that pertain to the prior use of terminology as well as your long-term attention to specific research topics. In particular, you state:

“[Whitesides and Hoopes] may respond to this by saying that they are not concerned with that approach and that it’s not part of the 2012 phenomenon as they define it. But if that is so then a conundrum appears, because *that is my stated and demonstrated primary concern since the early 1990s...*”

In order to fairly evaluate this primary concern, we wish to be diligent in considering all of your published work on Mayas and their beliefs. The books published by Four Ahau Press have been repeatedly cited by you in various publications. However, despite years of diligent effort—including requests through our respective university interlibrary loan systems and queries of online booksellers--we have not yet been able to obtain copies of certain publications, including two that you cite in your recent comments to the *ZfA*. We therefore kindly request that you provide us with either digital or photocopy reproductions of the following books:

Journey to the Mayan Underworld (Four Ahau Press / Self Publications, 1989)

Mirror in the Sky (Four Ahau Press, 1991)
Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies (Four Ahau Press, 1992)
Mayan Sacred Science (Four Ahau Press, 1994)
The Center of Mayan Time (Four Ahau Press, 1995)
Izapa Cosmos (Four Ahau Press, 1996)
Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy (Four Ahau Press, 2012)

Please note that we are specifically requesting a copy of the 1992 edition of *Tzolkin*, not the 1994 edition, since this is the one that you yourself reference as being of particular significance. This is necessary for scholarly accuracy.

If it is not too much trouble, we would also be helpful for us to have copies of these as well:

Scenezine Selections (Four Ahau Press, 1990).
Outside the Cage (Four Ahau Press, 1991)
7 Wind: A Quiché Maya Calendar for 1993 (Four Ahau Press, 1993)

We would also like request a copy of this book, which we hope will provide us with bibliographic information we may have inadvertently overlooked:

A Bio-Bibliography of the Writings of John Major Jenkins: 1971 to 2012 (Four Ahau Press, 2012)

In compiling this list, we have referenced your own bibliographical listings of your publications, including this one: http://johnmajorjenkins.com/?page_id=20

These books may be provided as PDF files or they can be mailed in hardcopy format to:

John W. Hoopes
Anthropology Department
University of Kansas
Fraser Hall, Room 622
1415 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, KS 66045-7556

Thanks very much for your kind assistance with this request.

Cordially,

John Hoopes
Kevin Whitesides

John W. Hoopes, Professor, Department of Anthropology
The University of Kansas, 1415 Jayhawk Blvd., Rm. 622, Lawrence, KS 66045

[\(785\) 864-2638](tel:(785)864-2638) - office [\(785\) 331-7473](tel:(785)331-7473) - mobile
<http://kansas.academia.edu/hoopes>

I sent a quick query to Dr Hovelmann:

Dear Dr Hovelmann,

Greetings and Happy Holidays. Whitesides and Hoopes are requesting a large number of books from my 23+ years of publishing which don't have anything to do with my review. I can't see how not having these books on hand hinders their ability to respond to my review. Do you think this is a reasonable request? I thought the conditions of correspondence required focusing on the material at hand, not "considering all of [my] published work on Mayas and their beliefs" (as they stated). The requested titles are not relevant, and my cited 1992 title (*Tzolkin*) was simply reprinted in 1994, as stated in the bibliography, and I know Hoopes has a copy (as I mentioned in the text).

Please advise. Happy solstice,

John M Jenkins

Dr Hovelmann replied to me on December 22, 2013 with an email of 600 words. He advised as to the need for us all to follow the conditions of the peer-review process and the fair and open-minded atmosphere of the journal. He said they were free to use any source they desired (which I understood) but he also said he didn't understand why I had a problem with Hoopes's literature request. I felt that Gerd did not fully understand that Hoopes was requesting my full catalogue going back to the 1980s, including rare and limited editions in unrelated genres (poetry, fiction, etc).

This response was quite surprising. I decided to re-read my piece and consulted with my friend Kris for feedback. We felt a detailed response to Hoopes and Whitesides was a good idea (cc'ing Dr Hovelmann on it), with a brief separate email to Dr Hövelmann. I realized where a little crack of possible ambiguity was to be found in two places of my review, which could be clarified with two citations added. But with their request for all my titles going back to the 1980s, it was clear that Whitesides & Hoopes were wanting to write something more like a critique of my life biography based on my multi-genre writings. The critique-response process that the editors at *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* had invited and approved was not the place for that kind of survey. In fact, the process was not to be a trial for my work, but a critique of their article. They were trying to turn the tables, a strategy that both Hoopes and John B Carlson had attempted before. I first responded to Dr Hövelmann --- this explanatory email was longer than it probably should have been, and seems to have been the cause of some frustration to Dr Hovelmann, but I was at pains to address the ridiculous requests of the authors (primarily via Hoopes) while not derailing the publication of my review:

Dear Gerd,

It may be best to file this and wait until after the holidays, but I wanted to send it out now as I'm leaving soon for Peru. I will not be able to engage more responses from

the authors, and I don't think there should be any more, until after January 5. The good news is, I reasonably responded to Whitesides and Hoopes's request, and there is an easy solution to the issue, which I think arose due to two spots in my review. Please don't feel obliged to deal with this right now; let's all enjoy the holidays. My (hopefully helpful) email to you is below.

I have an easy solution to this issue. I will cc you on my response to Hoopes & Whitesides. I'm sorry that this catches us all at a busy time of the year. I thought from this point it was a straightforward process. I must quickly respond to a few of your comments, in the hopes of clarifying. Generally, Whitesides and Hoopes apparently desire to offer a larger critique of my lifework and biography, drawing from most of my writings going back some 24 years. The titles they've requested include poetry, experimental fiction, biography, travelogue. I really think this engages in a different kind of personal biographical-critique that is outside the bounds of the critique-and-response of their article, which you so kindly offered to facilitate.

I did not require them to be aware of these types of titles, but I think an ambiguity in a sentence on page 2 of my review may be the culprit. In this passage I noted their "neglect" of my "many books, articles and online venues", which led to my discussion of the earliest relevant title of mine (Jenkins 1992), that I know Hoopes has at hand (the 1994 edition is the same as the 1992 edition). The "many books, articles, etc" I alluded to are *not* the body of personal bio and very early research, poetry, and travelogue (which they are requesting) but rather the relevant and available sources, such as: "Jenkins (2009; 2011), www.Update2012.com, and www.Alignment2012.com/Chapter3.html." This is the relevant citation, and I suggest we add this in a footnote after "...neglected and overlooked."

Similarly, my 1992 book is the "early 1990s" title I was thinking of in my statement in my Conclusion, about my concern with reconstructing Maya cosmology since the early 1990s. I thought the allusion was clear, but we can reiterate an explicit citation (Jenkins 1992; 1998; 2009) after "...primary concern since the early 1990s" to clarify the matter and obviate their mistaken belief that my much earlier multi-genre writings are relevant. I apologize for this slight wedge which they seem to have focused on. These two additions would clarify the matter greatly and solve the issue. Nevertheless, although now their request is moot, in good faith I am still responding to them with comments and links to some of the material they requested.

Please note that Hoopes & Whitesides wrote to me, in the recent email he cc'd you on, that "The books published by Four Ahau Press *have been repeatedly cited by you in various publications.*" And then they go on to request all my titles. They are not responding to my critique here. They have immediately side-stepped the response process and have redirected into a completely unrelated context by invoking my citations in other "various publications." What is the context of my statements in those "various publications"? They may be, and probably are, presented in a completely different personal context of discussion of my life work.

Nevertheless, as you will see in my email to Hoopes & Whitesides I've gone down the list and explain each of the titles they requested. Most of the titles are completely irrelevant and from different genres. Hoopes actually already has some of them, a few were never officially offered for sale, while one is free on my website and others are indeed available for sale. Links are provided, so I am trying to be conciliatory, even when I consider many of the sources personal and irrelevant. The bio-bibliography, for example, details life events during my life as a writer including my early memories, the death of my parents and events in my marriage. Again, if I may risk repetition and be clear: My complete body of work would only be relevant if they were writing a critique of me and my life, personally. That can be for another day, but I don't think it is what we are trying to facilitate here, in a simple critique-and-response (or non-response, if they so choose).

In my review I also noted their incomplete citation to my 1998 book (they cited only the year of publication). I then drew quotes directly from that source to demonstrate a contradiction with their assertions. Their response to this does not require anything apart from that source. If they want to invoke some other source for some polemical reason, it still doesn't explain why the source they cited does not contain the support for their assertions, but rather contains evidence for something completely different. I am not "complaining" or "asserting"; this is a demonstration. It is a demonstration with relevant evidence being cited.

Beyond this, there is the very important correction of their crediting the first use of the "2012 phenomenon" phrase to Robert Sitler, when it is clearly and demonstrably used earlier by Stray, in a book that they have in their bibliography. A considered response to these things doesn't require accessing my multi-genre output since the 1980s, as I've supplied the relevant citations as support for my critiques.

I am trying to abide by a process of clear communication here. I hope I am being clear, and again I am sorry the timing of this is not good. I'm going to Peru in 3 days, and you are on vacation. Their implied suggestion that my review did not provide them with the necessary materials for their considered response is very misleading. The two additions will clarify this. I intentionally constructed my review to include or cite the relevant sources I knew they had, or I provided links to free and stable online pages or excerpts. I could go into greater detail, but you will find more details in my email to them. Best wishes,

John M Jenkins

And I immediately then sent my long response to Whitesides & Hoopes, with Gerd cc'ed. I felt that this email was a fair, well considered, and complete response to what was, at base, an attempt by Hoopes and Whitesides to muddle the critique-and-response process:

I am taking to heart and responding with careful consideration to your email. You've made a very broad-brush request. Given the wide variety of materials in the list and the debatable relevance of most of it, it's reasonable that a compromise is necessary, and you can't expect me to send off fifteen packages in the mail tomorrow morning. That wouldn't even be possible. As such I will give you links, when possible, to some of the items and direct you how to acquire others, while reminding you that you already have the most relevant items.

Only a few of the books in that large list --- some published, some not --- that you requested might be relevant. They are the ones you already have. Most are irrelevant because, in the strictest terms many belong to completely different genres. I provide explanations for each title below. I offer this out of courtesy, but it is apparent that you desire to write a critique of my overall life and work, drawing from my vast multi-genre oeuvre. You assert this need after stating, in your email, that "The books published by Four Ahau Press *have been repeatedly cited by you in various publications*" (my italics). And then you go on to request most of my titles. You are not responding to my critique here, or anything in my critique. You have immediately side-stepped the response process and have redirected into a completely unrelated context. What is the context of my statements in those "various publications"? Why are they, or the citations in them, relevant to you responding to my comments in my review? Your belief that those early sources are relevant to my review can be solved with the simple addition of two citations to my review, which I discuss below.

In any case, I'm happy to clarify the relevance of my various titles below. The problem is that practically all of them are totally irrelevant, unless you are wanting to write a critique of my life. Here are the relevant ones: *Izapa Cosmos* (1996) became Part IV in my 1998 book, which you have. The 1992 and 1994 editions of my *Tzolkin* book are virtually identical, and I know that you (Hoopes) have the 1994 edition (see below). These must be the "two books" I cited in my review that you "have not yet been able to obtain copies" of. You already have them.

You stated in your email that one of my "principal complaints" is that I "assert" an issue of "incomplete citation" of my published work. You reference a quote in my Conclusion, where I wrote that my "stated and demonstrated concern since the early 1990s" is to reconstruct ancient Maya cosmology (including what they thought about 2012). Here, I was alluding to my 1992/1994 book that I previously discussed. That discussion pointed out *not* an "incomplete citation" on your part, but the fact that the book was completely overlooked and not cited at all (even though it is a book that you, Hoopes, have cited before and are therefore familiar with). In that book, I state my interest in reconstructing the Maya Venus Calendar, demonstrate that reconstruction, and reconstruct how a sequence of Long Count Katun endings point to a solstice in 2012. So, my statement is referential *not* to a grab-bag of other earlier books, but to that already cited and discussed book from 1992. To be clear, we can add a parenthetical citation after the statement on page 6, reiterating the 1992 book. Thank you for pointing out that slight ambiguity; I

thought it was already clear that my 1992 book was the work from the early 1990s I would necessarily have been referring to, since I already discussed that book in that way in my earlier comments.

Right before those comments about my 1992 book on page 2, I allude to your neglect of my earlier work. This passage refers not to my *much earlier books* from different genres, but to my “books, articles, and online venues” leading back to the 1992 book, which I then go into as the best and earliest example. It would be helpful to clarify the sources that I was alluding to with a footnote after “...were neglected and overlooked.” The footnote would cite: “Jenkins (2009; 2011), www.Update2012.com, and www.Alignment2012.com/Chapter3.html.” This may or may not be why you thought it would be relevant for you to access my personal and much earlier writings that you requested. However, I was referring to relevant and available studies, such as the ones clarified in the new citation which I am going to ask Dr Hövelmann to add to the review. Similarly, as mentioned above, I am going to ask that, for clarity, the following citation is added after “...since the early 1990s” in my Conclusion: (Jenkins, 1992; 1998; 2009).

The clearest location of an “incomplete citation” to my ideas is in your critique of my Izapa interpretations, where you cite my 1998 book without any specific page numbers. This would be a clear example of an incomplete citation, since it doesn’t include the specific page numbers that support your contentions. In regard to the evidence, in that book, for my interpretations of the Izapa site, I provided specific page numbers and three quotes, as well as a web-link to a lengthy excerpt from my book regarding my interpretations, sources, and methodology. My quotes and citations contradict what you asserted. So, yes, your citation was incomplete. I did not require that you needed to assess my earlier difficult-to-find work as a precondition for understanding my Izapa interpretations, but only that you should have more accurately cited and summarized the source you already loosely referenced. Because what you asserted is not supported by anything in that source.

Kevin, in our brief exchange of July you admitted that you must have gotten the citation wrong, so maybe your response could include this acknowledgment. You had also said that you’re all about correcting mistakes so this would be a good time, since your misconstruction of my interpretations and “hermeneutics” paint a wrong picture of my work. Furthermore, I explained in my footnote 18 how it is a fallacy to back-project later explorations onto my breakthrough reconstruction work of the 1990s, so please don’t misconstrue my later elaborations in this way, by interjecting a citation to some later source.

With one exception (Jenkins 1996) I did not allude to or cite earlier work that could not be easily accessed. However, that monograph became Part IV of my 1998 book, which you have. And the point of citing that book was minor (see below for details).

The larger body of my writings going back to early poetry and travel books and biographical writings is irrelevant to the context of my work on Izapa and 2012. The two *relevant* sources are the 1998 book you cited and my 1992/1994 *Tzolkin* book. I’m sorry

you've misunderstood my explicit statements in the text of my review and in the bibliography, which is that whereas my 1992 *Tzolkin* book was reprinted in 1994, the two editions are virtually the same. I did not cite a specific quote in this book that would need to be fact-checked; rather, I mentioned six topics within the book (preserved in both printings since they are virtually identical) regarding my discussion of authors, issues, and items connected to the 2012 phenomenon. That is the relevant and specific context of my reference to my early writings related to the 2012 phenomenon.

You request, in part, that I provide early sources that verify my "prior use of terminology." This can only refer to the discussion of the 2012 phenomenon "term" (or phrase). However, in the first section of my review *I did provide* quotations and links to personal communications, previous usages, and citations to Stray's prior use of that phrase (in his 2005 book, which is in your bibliography). You are asking for something that I already provided in my review. Please re-read the footnotes and the first two pages of my review.

As a pretext for your considered response of my critique of your article, you request virtually my entire body of writings that I listed on my website. Most of these titles are completely irrelevant to helping you respond to my critique and belong to different genres. A few of these titles are projects I've written but haven't officially offered for sale. Several of these titles are poetry, travelogue, or biographical in nature. Several titles discuss my earlier work on the Jaloj Kexoj paradigm and Maya philosophy, but these were written before I engaged the Izapa-2012 research (and you already have the Jaloj Kexoj book). The two most relevant titles are ones you already have, another title is free on my website, two were subsumed into other publications that you have, and two titles were published *after* you wrote your article. Please allow me to clarify each title for you. If there is anything relevant in this material I'd send it. However, I constructed my review to be self-contained such that the supporting evidence for my critiques and corrections is either cited to sources I know you already have or can be accessed in the web links.

Journey to the Mayan Underworld (Four Ahau Press / Self Publications, 1989)

This book is primarily a travelogue. It mentions 2012 in passing and sketches how the Maya calendar operates. I have occasionally referenced it simply as my earliest publication in which I mentioned 2012. It was optioned for republishing but has not gone forward. I did not cite this book or allude to it in my review. I had a chapter online at one point, involving hitchhiking through New Orleans after my trip to Central America. Pure travelogue "on the road" stuff. I hope you'll buy a copy when it gets republished, it's a fun read. But not relevant unless you were wanting to document my earliest travel stories and the adventures of an oblivious 22-year-old traveling "on a shoestring" through Maya country. It does convey how I fell in love with the Maya people and the Maya world. But again, that's biographical stuff.

Mirror in the Sky (Four Ahau Press, 1991)

This book is primarily a spiritual autobiography, with poetry, philosophy, and “astrolo-mythic” travelogue. Events that transpired in my young life in 1984-85. It sketches Native American Vision Questing, the Maya calendar, and the symbolism of my painting called the Tree of Life. I did not cite this book or allude to it in my review. It belongs to a totally other genre.

Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies (Four Ahau Press, 1992)

Dr John Hoopes, you have this book. It is available online as an HTML CD-Rom or the original book --- though rare ---- is quite available online (www.bookfinder.com). If you didn't have it, as you stated, it could have easily been acquired. I intentionally cited this book in my review, because I know at least you (Hoopes) have it. The 1994 BSRF edition is virtually the same as my 1992 edition, which I have stated to you in previous emails, and thus both contain the same discussion of the 2012 phenomenon topics I mentioned in my review-critique.

Mayan Sacred Science (Four Ahau Press, 1994)

Hoopes, you told me years ago that John B Carlson sent you a Xerox copy of the original 1994 edition of this book. It was originally called *Jaloj Kexoj and PHI-64*, and was reprinted in 2000. It has been available on my website for years: <http://alignment2012.com/jaloj.htm>. It contains research into the Maya “Jaloj Kexoj” principle, Maya math and philosophy. It was written *before* my Izapa-2012 research unfolded. It is not cited in my review and is irrelevant to my review of your article and your assessment of my Izapa-2012 work in my 1998 book.

Again, a larger critique of my life, my many areas of investigation and writing, different areas of focus I've had on Maya studies, and my biography are beyond the ken of your invited response to my critique of your article. Relevant aspects of my work, such as my work on the correlation question, could have been cited, which are in the 1992/1994 book. Nevertheless, I am doing what I can to give you directions on where you can find or purchase the books, even if they are not relevant.

The Center of Mayan Time (Four Ahau Press, 1995)

This book contains early research into Izapa archaeoastronomy, the Creation Myth, the 2012 reconstruction, and my 1994 article (“The How and Why of the Maya End Date”, which is online: <http://alignment2012.com/Why2012.html>). That breakthrough article of

1994 is all about the *astronomy* of the era-2012 alignment, and how the astronomical features are found in the Maya Creation Myth. I did not cite this book and rarely do because it is a preliminary work on a new area of investigation --- the material in it was subsumed into an audiotape offering and then my 1998 book.

Izapa Cosmos (Four Ahau Press, 1996)

This monograph became Part IV of my 1998 book, which you have. In my review, I cited it only in the context of it providing my first publication of the Izapa ballcourt-solstice alignment. Its relevance is marginal to my review, except that it provides another piece of evidence that my reconstruction work is based in astronomy, regarding my discovery of the Izapa solstice-ballcourt alignment (material which can also be found in Part IV of my 1998 book). Some of that section of my 1998 book is verbatim from this 1996 monograph.

Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy (Four Ahau Press, 2012)

This booklet is for sale on my website. <http://alignment2012.com/2012-in-2012.html>. It was published in October 2012, after your article was written and published. I may have offered to send one or both of you a copy at some point (or maybe that was Van Stone?) In any case, it appeared *after* your article was published. Why would it be relevant for you to ask me to send this to you now, unless perhaps you are trying to acquire my titles, for free, for a future writing project?

You also request the following early books:

Scenezine Selections (Four Ahau Press, 1990).

This booklet is a compilation of political articles and excerpts from my 1989 travelogue. It contains a piece on the Maya calendar that became an “additional article” in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, which you have. Two of the chapters are posted free on my website: <http://alignment2012.com/fap16.html> and <http://alignment2012.com/fap17.html>. These are both travel stories. This early booklet is irrelevant to any source that I would have expected you to cite or be aware of for understanding my 2012 reconstruction work. But again, my review is not intended to be an argument for my theories, but to critique and correct your article. Conversely, your response should not be intended to *argue against* my theories, but to respond to my critique of your article and willingly correct it when the facts require a correction be made.

Outside the Cage (Four Ahau Press, 1991)

This booklet was experimental quasi-fiction, including poetry in a screenplay format, personal experiences, dreams, and song lyrics set to a cosmic backdrop. It is unnecessary for you to have this unless you were planning to write a critique of my personal life and other examples of my experimental quasi-fictional genre writing and poetry. That is not a relevant area for you to delve into in your response to my critique of your article.

7 Wind: A Quiché Maya Calendar for 1993 (Four Ahau Press, 1993)

This book is online on my website for free. <http://alignment2012.com/7wnd.htm>. It is a guidebook to the Quiché Maya calendar.

A Bio-Bibliography of the Writings of John Major Jenkins: 1971 to 2012 (Four Ahau Press, 2012)

This book is biographical and details formative experiences of childhood, personal life goings-on such as the death of my parents, financial challenges, and marriage events during the process of my writing career. I'm flattered that you are interested in such a personal document, but I would never expect anything in this book to be relevant to you being better informed about the actual arguments that underlie my Izapa-2012 reconstruction work, unless you wanted to engage a larger discussion of my life, upbringing, tribulations and triumphs, and personal biography. But since you are interested in my personal life, in good faith I send you the links to my family genealogy pages: <http://alignment2012.com/Doc-edited-final.html> ; <http://alignment2012.com/pharamond.html> ; <http://alignment2012.com/Fornjot.html> ; <http://alignment2012.com/Fourriversflowing.html>.

Okay, I have responded clearly and honestly to your request. I was given an opportunity to critique your article, and a condition was placed on it that it would not involve an argument for, or debate about, my theories. I abided by that, but you seem to want to pull me in that direction. My larger body of work, which you request I send you, includes experimental fiction, poetry, travelogue, songs, bio-bibliography. I feel this material is beyond the concern of my critique and your response to it. In my edited and approved review I provided links to relevant supporting sources, including the books I know you have and hundreds of pages of online material.

Out of courtesy and in good faith I went into some detail about the various books you requested. However, most of those books are irrelevant to you making a considered response; others you have, or are available, and I provided links. You seem to be wanting to write a larger treatment of my life, biography, and overall legacy of writing and ideas. This could be interesting in the hands of a good biographer who understood the larger

trajectory of a person's life, especially a person whose work includes genres beyond non-fiction research writing. But I don't feel the critique-and-response space approved by the editors at *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* is the place for such an ambitious large-scale survey. I did not assert or imply in my critique that you needed to be aware of anything outside of the sources I cited and that I know you have, or that could be accessed in the online links I provided. You can of course cite anything you want, but instead of turning the tables and seeing this as a trial for my work, you might want to approach it for what it is, a critique of your article. It should be a simple matter for you to reply to four main points that I offer, and which I summarize below.

- 1) The prior use of the phrase the 2012 phenomenon by Geoff Stray and myself; citations and links were provided. I supplied the citations and links and access to other books are not required.
- 2) Overlooking my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin* as an early source for comments and critique of authors and ideas connected to the 2012 phenomenon. This is a book I intentionally selected to cite because one of you (Hoopes) cited it in an earlier article you wrote, and therefore must be aware of it. (In other words, I did not allude to earlier relevant work which is impossible to find).
- 3) Your limited definition of the 2012 phenomenon, and its conflation with the problematic term "Mayanism". I pointed out contradictions. Your response does not require access to my previous books.
- 4) Evidence (citations and online excerpts from my 1998 book) that my actual statements contradict your assertions, the evidence being drawn exclusively from the same book you cited as support for your assertions. I supplied quotes and online links; the issue involves only my 1998 book and your demonstrably flawed summary of its contents. Access to other books are not required for a response, but of course you are free to do so.

A simple reply would be to just acknowledge the corrections. I summarize these four points here as a reminder and to redirect us back to the actual content of my review, because a considered response to these points does not require access to a larger body of my multi-genre previous writings that you didn't cite in your article and that I didn't cite in my review. And best if you don't just send me another email but that you reply to my review, in a publishable response to the editors, in the context of the facts and arguments I provided within the review. I don't see why any further delay is necessary in responding to my review, if you so choose.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

A Personal Postscript. I am preparing for the Peru trip, leaving in three days. I did my best and worked on my responses for 16 hours yesterday, and 2 hours this morning. Gave it 150% and rethought it repeatedly, getting feedback from Kristian. Now it's in the hands of the Fates. 12-23-2013

My review is at [Coining-the-Realm-ed.pdf](#), with the two new citations added on pages 2 and 6.

Meanwhile, Kevin sent me an email on December 23:

Hi Johns,

I'm not intending to get into any long debates here or to address most of what the two of you have been saying in these recent e-mails. I simply wish to address the assertions that a) wanting to be familiar with your oeuvre can ONLY be for purposes of writing a critique of your life and b) that just because you have writings in other genres that they are somehow not relevant to analysis.

This is not how scholarship works. Ask any historian or biographer. When you are analyzing something (a topic, a person, a place, etc.), you try to find the widest representation of that that you can. It doesn't matter what the genre is and it certainly doesn't have anything to do with 'critique'. If I was interested in Aldous Huxley, which I am, I would (and do) try to find anything about or by him that I can, in ANY genre or format. I scour archives, I make personal requests, I get in touch with the family if they are passed on, I do internet searches. Trying to get a full grasp of a person's oeuvre is standard academic research practice. Genre is largely irrelevant and critique is not the goal.

So, just on that point alone, wanting access to your earlier writings is simply standard scholarly/research practice. I would want them whether I was promoting or critiquing you. In fact, my goal is to do neither, but is simply to document and analyze relative to other culture trends and scholarship and, actually, relative to our paper, you weren't even a significant component of the research (although you wouldn't guess that by reading your review). We added a small note about you in the conclusion just as a way of alluding to more contemporary popular authors continuing and expanding upon the formative representations of the phenomenon which we documented in the bulk of the paper.

Also, it is very unusual for the subject of research (again, a very minor subject relative to the paper) to tell the researchers how to do their research, what they should write, and what the limits of their sources should be. You have already written your own response. Please don't presume to write ours for us (said with all due respect).

Kevin

P.S. - You must surely understand that, for me (and for scholarship more generally), getting things right (as I correctly told you is my goal) does not simply mean taking your word for granted and republishing it. If that were the case, I would simply publish an interview with you. The process of research demands that I assess available sources on my own and come to my own conclusions rather than simply have you tell me what is true and relevant and in what places I should and shouldn't look.

I now had to field the requests from Hoopes, apparently made in collusion with Kevin, as well as the separate email from Kevin himself, while making sure Gerd was informed as to what was transpiring. I responded to Kevin:

Dear Kevin, [December 23]

There are frameworks within scholarship. A critique-and-response is a limited framework. And there are also citation standards of "scholarship" that seem to have fallen overboard in the piece you wrote with Hoopes, the result being misconstructions and unsupported assertions about my

work and the history of the 2012 phenomenon. The critique-and-response process can sort that out. This IS how scholarship works.

I attempted to discuss things with you more informally in July and October [and November]. I put much time and thought into my review (which had to be in a quite small page count), as well as my long explanatory email of yesterday, and I am abiding by the conditions of the process offered and approved by the editors at *Zeitschrift fur Anomalistik*. You have the option of not responding. If you do respond, I'd appreciate it if you would please address my critiques directly and acknowledge factual corrections when they are clearly supported with evidence (such as Stray's prior use of the 2012 phenomenon). I think of the process as bringing out and honoring facts and evidence. The footnotes in my review contain a trove of supportive online links --- hundreds of pages --- that are relevant.

There's no need for debates in emails. The process should not have even involved the recent exchange, but of course I'm willing to go the extra mile to clarify and I even gave you links and pointers to some of my early personal writings from different genres that you (and/or Hoopes?) requested. It would be odd if you and/or Hoopes choose to construct some other narrative of indictment that is of a more personal nature, rather than addressing the well-supported points and corrections I made in my critique.

I'm off to Peru until January 5, so will not be checking email and engaging in informal email debates. We should abide by the process so kindly facilitated by Gerd and the editors. I suggested to Gerd that we set this aside until after New Years, then you can submit your response or choose not to. It's unfortunate this culminated right before the holidays, that's just how it unfolded. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

To which he responded:

John,

You have completely misconstrued and ignored the intent and content of my e-mail. I was simply responding to two specific assertions that you made in your e-mail. The first, that wanting to see your whole oeuvre must imply an attempt to critique you. It doesn't. The second, that certain genres are irrelevant to analysis. They aren't. That is the only thing I was responding to. I certainly don't require the context of a formal journal response to make such points by e-mail.

Of course a critique-and-response is a limited framework. I wasn't responding to your ZfA response piece. I was responding, in e-mail, to two specific assertions that you had just sent to me in an e-mail explaining an interest in certain pieces of your writing that you have in your own bibliography is inappropriate. I was simply explaining to you why they are, in fact, relevant to my form of analysis. Now, you certainly have every right to share or not share your personal material as you see fit. I, personally, don't grudge you that and don't expect that I inherently should have access to your unpublished work if you don't want to share. But, that doesn't mean that I'm not interested in it and that it isn't relevant to me. For one thing, I'm a collector and like to have as complete a collection as possible. But, for another, I do simply like to be as thorough as possible where I can be (and will do my best to clarify whatever misinterpretations need to be corrected or clarified relative to our article). As I said, when I thought I was going to be doing work on Huxley, I had plans on covering as much of his material as possible including his extensive archives with correspondences and all manner of "genres" of material. When you research, you try to understand a person as best as you can, in the full, whether or not that material actually ends up in the final written piece or not.

You DID, in all due right, try to discuss this with me more informally in the summer and again in October and I gave you what, in my mind, were perfectly true and reasonable, if unfortunate, accounts of why it would necessarily be quite some time before I had time to respond thoroughly to them (I wasn't about to prioritize your complaint over my own wedding, honeymoon, moving, or starting my PhD). I don't blame you at all for trying to go directly through ZfA, but I was entirely sincere in my timescale and was not being evasive or rude. I have only just now, in the last week, finished the first quarter of my PhD and have literally been engaged and pre-engaged and over-engaged in nearly every waking moment from your first e-mails in the summer until the end of last week (including significant events in my personal life which you aren't privy to) and I just now am starting to have some time to catch up on projects which I was meant to be finished with over a year ago (including 5 book reviews, another co-authored article, and several other projects--and I won't even have time for all of those over the winter break). I have specifically not been ignoring you any more than any of the other people I have committed my time to who are also waiting for me to get back to them on our respective projects. You set the ball rolling on the ZfA response and, given that, I'm happy to honor that and to respond directly to your points. But, if you are going to send me e-mails suggesting that the only reason I can be interested in your oeuvre is in order to critique your life, then I am going to have to correct you on that misunderstanding. That is all.

I think you would find me much more sympathetic and less combative than you may suspect if you simply relaxed a bit and stopped assuming that I have an alternative agenda to defame you. I really don't want to be a part of your war against things anymore than I want to be involved in anyone else's war against you. Whether or not I agree with all of it, your work doesn't particularly bother me for any personal reasons. I have close friends with whom I disagree far more strongly than I do with you and on things far more metaphysical than what you write about and I enjoy spending time amongst the types of communities that we are both a part of. For me, this has nothing to do with a personal or professional vendetta, though I think you have built it up that way in your mind, which I think is reflected in the approach that you have taken to our correspondences since day one, which puts me into a defensive/combative mode.

So, now that I have time (for a brief moment), and especially since it is now being formalized, you will certainly get your response to the ZfA article, though now that I have time, you probably would have got an informal response more quickly. But, I hope that in the future, you may take a less combative and more productive correspondence. I am, actually, planning a piece that will spend more time on your work than I have in past articles (though, again, you are not my prime focus) and, given a cordial atmosphere, I would certainly want to run the historical account by you for accuracy and clarification. But, I am disinclined to do so if our conversational mode is primarily antagonistic, in which case I would be content in sticking to primary source materials.

Anyway, enjoy Peru. I'd love to be there, myself. I quite enjoyed my own journey there in early 2001. I hope that it can provide you an opportunity to relax and not take things so seriously for a little while. I was hoping that I could have a bit of a break myself. Was looking forward to a NYE in Portland at the Beloved Festival (<http://www.belovedfestival.com/>), but the tickets sold out as soon as I got paid.

Cheerio,

Kevin

It was now Christmas eve when I read this last email from Kevin. I truly had no time for continued email and did not respond to Kevin. I'd already made my case to them, responded at length to their requests, directly to Kevin's previous email, and I was now preparing for Christmas Day with friends and then departure for Peru.

After Peru

I returned from Peru on January 6, recovered from 28 hours of airplanes and airports, and on January 7th set to work on my trip report. John Hoopes was waiting in the wings, planning to renew his requests with a final bid to upset the journal editors so that they would cancel the whole plan. In the academic critique-and-review process, authors are obligated to respond to the critiques and statements made by the review, not divert into madcap belligerent requests. Hoopes, over the next two days, threw three or four different requests at me from different angles. This shows that instead of being a responsible scholar and admitting that corrections were necessary to his article, he instead tried to subvert the peer-review / critique-and-response process.

I was not all that surprised to receive a direct email from Hoopes on the 8th, even though I had already responded in great detail to his requests and felt that now it was time for him and Whitesides to either respond to my critique or decline the invitation to respond. None of the following back-and-forth should have been necessary, and I probably should have not fed the beast, but I felt I needed to show good faith in the application of reason and cooperation to the requests and questions. What unfolded was a farce that revealed the desperation of Hoopes and Whitesides, a desperation that sought to disrupt my academically viable and *peer-review approved* critique of their flawed article.

Hoopes seems to have taken the lead on crafting this barrage of many-pronged requests --- which itself is ironic because, in July, Kevin admitted that he was responsible for the statement about my “hermeneutics” and asserting that I “promoted” the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles. No matter, Hoopes would apparently speak for both of them. Nevertheless, as we will see, Whitesides had his own unethical ad hominem “Plan B” waiting in the wings, which he employed after the following exchange played out and ended with yet another lengthy and well-considered response, by me, to Hoopes’s various questions and requests.

The lesson, for me, is that you can’t present facts and evidence to irrational people (even if they are degree-holding scholars) who are blinded by their own false constructs and desire to mitigate someone else. This entire episode is emblematic of the larger treatment of my work by scholars, including the critiques of Stan Guenter, David Freidel, David Stuart, and Anthony Aveni who I had a revealing exchange with in November.

Dear John [Jenkins], [January 8]

I hope that you are now back from Peru and able to resume this important discussion.

I concur with Kevin Whitesides that, "wanting access to your earlier writings is simply standard scholarly/research practice," and also affirm that, "The process of research demands that [we] assess available sources on [our] own and come to [our] own conclusions rather than simply have you tell [us] what is true and relevant and in what places [we] should and shouldn't look."

In your statement to the ZfA, you write about me and Kevin:

"They may respond to this by saying that they are not concerned with that approach and that it's not part of the 2012 phenomenon as they define it. But if that is so then a conundrum appears, because that is my stated and demonstrated primary concern since the early 1990s – yet they seek to critique it. In doing so, *they do not accurately portray my interpretive methodology nor do they cite or address any of the evidence I've brought to bear on my interpretations and reconstruction work* (since that is not their concern); instead, they engage in *vague citation practices*, insinuations of unscientific methods, guilt-by-association constructs, *and assertions that are not verifiable and are not supported by the source they cite*" [emphasis mine].

If we are to address your interpretive methodology since the early 1990s and avoid "vague citation practices" and "assertions that are not verifiable," it is *essential* that we have access to the materials that you have published since the early 1990s, *including the several publications issued by Four Ahau Press*. This must include especially the items that you yourself cite in your statement, such as the original 1992 (*not* 1994) edition of *Tzolkin* and the original edition of *Izapa Cosmos* (1996).

As Kevin has noted, it is not acceptable to simply have you tell us what is true and relevant or not, or what certain sources actually say or don't say. We *must* be able to examine the original materials and *draw our own conclusions, especially given that you charge us with incomplete or incorrect citation of your own work*.

The books published by Four Ahau Press are ones that you yourself routinely cite but which have proven to be utterly unavailable either from libraries or from booksellers, hence our reasonable and direct request for copies from you. If you are unable or unwilling to provide us with copies of *your own work*, this may become a relevant factor in our critique of your scholarship and your complaints.

I agree that there is no need for debates in emails. I think that our request is reasonable and we look forward to receiving these materials from you soon so that we may formulate our response.

Sincerely,
John Hoopes

Dear John Hoopes, [January 8]

You should re-read my previous email of December 23, which went into great detail responding to your request, which you repeat in your new email, that I send you certain previous publications. I'll restate in brief for your convenience. This is not about an argument or trial for my work. It is a review-critique of your article, which contains statements about my work. You may choose to respond to my review or not; it has already gone through the editorial review process among the *Anomalistik* editors and has

been approved for publication. In my previous email of December 23 I clarified for you two citation areas that may have caused some confusion on your part.

My critiques and corrections are backed up with citations to sources you have or which you cited in your piece. I provided explicit quotations to support my critiques. The *Izapa Cosmos* (1996) source was cited only as evidence for my early publication of the Izapa ballcourt's alignment to the solstice sunrise azimuth, showing that my approach was concerned with astronomy. Since you don't believe that it contains such a reference, in good faith I provide a jpg of one page in that monograph that reports my solstice-ballcourt alignment observation (see attachment).

Likewise, as I mentioned to you in my previous email, the first 1992 edition of my book *Tzolkin* is virtually identical to the 1994 edition. You have the 1994 edition. The relevance of this book relates to my charge that you *neglected to cite* a relevant early source that discussed core elements of what was later identified with the 2012 phenomenon. My book addressed ideas, authors, and concepts central to the 2012 phenomenon, as I listed in my critique. In good faith, I attach jpgs of the Table of Contents from the 1992 edition and, if you compare to the same in your 1994 edition, you will find that the respective Table of Contents are identical. I am not simply telling you what my book contains; you can check for yourself to confirm that my book does indeed contain discussions of those topics, as I mentioned in my review-critique of your article.

Your assertions that are *vaguely cited* and *not verifiable* in "the book source you cite" is referential to my 1998 book (*Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*), which you have. I made this clear in my review-critique and in my email to you of 12-23. You cited only the year of publication, not a page number within the book (that's vague). Your assertions cannot be verified by anything in that book (there's no mention of a perennial mythology or archetypal readings, etc), and in fact your assertions can be contradicted by actual quotes from that book (which I provided in my review-critique of your article).

My statement that you engage in a "guilt-by-association" construct is referential to your assertion (asserted but not supported by a citation to any supporting evidence) that I "promoted" the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles, whose ideas you had just critiqued. The associative construct is "A is dubious, B promotes A, therefore B is dubious." My response was to provide links and cite specific quotes (to active web pages or sources that I know you have), which shows that I disagree with their central beliefs about 2012. And I also cited to McKenna's own words in his Introduction to my 1998 book, which indicate that he himself differentiated his findings from mine and credited my book as a "revolutionary work of discovery and synthesis" (that is, unprecedented and different than his own).

I trust that the jpgs I've attached will address your questions about the congruence between the 1992 and 1994 editions of my book *Tzolkin*, and whether or not my 1996 monograph actually does contain a reference to the Izapa ballcourt alignment to the solstice sunrise (as that was the only reason I cited it). And, again, as I previously

mentioned, that 1996 monograph was subsumed into Part IV of my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*.

As for other clarifications, please re-read both my critique-review and my lengthy email of December 23, as you seem to be overlooking things I already said, provided links to, and clarified. Again, many of the sources you were citing are far outside any relevance --- including poetry, experimental fiction, and biography --- and I did not cite or require you to be aware of these sources in order to respond to my critique-review of your article in the *Anomalistik* journal. Again, this is not the space for a trial or survey of my overall multi-genre output going back to the 1980s. It is a critique of your article, co-written with Whitesides. My arguments are supported within the text and footnotes and citations in my piece, the [three] relevant ones being my 1992/1994 book, my 1998 book, and my 2009 book, all of which you have and, from previous exchanges we have had, I gather you have read. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Attached: jpg images from *Izapa Cosmos* (1996)
jpg images of the Table of Contents of the 1992 edition of my book *Tzolkin*, which is identical to the Table of Contents in the 1994 edition, which you have.

Hoopes responded immediately:

Dear John [Jenkins], January 8

If you are not able to provide copies of your early 1990s Four Ahau Press books, which we have now requested from you numerous times, we will state in our published response to your complaints that you have been unable or unwilling to provide them for our consideration.

Having spent quite a bit of time looking for them, I am now beginning to seriously doubt that they even exist.

John Hoopes

I sent a quick note to Gerd, thinking (again) that this should be the end of it:

Dear Gerd,

Just to let you know, I did respond to John Hoopes' email yesterday, and reiterated my lengthy clarifications of my Dec-23 email, and even sent him four jpgs of pages from the two sources he requested (which are, in fact, sources he already has in one form or another, but which he repeatedly says are unavailable).

He then ignored my good faith fulfillment of his request and simply repeated that I should also send him my entire list of published and unpublished sources. The fact is that the seven main points in my critique do not require reference to any of these multi-genre writings which include poetry and experimental fiction, much of it produced before my 2012 research.

In my email to you just prior to Christmas I suggested two minor citation additions, but since I already clarified this to Hoopes and Whitesides informally in my lengthy email of 12-23, it's perfectly fine if you want to just publish the completed version of my review that we agreed on. I trust the overall process and the authors can construct whatever response they wish to, if they so choose, based on my review of their article that you have already sent to them. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

But Hoopes kept at it:

From Hoopes to me (cc'ing Kevin Whitesides), January 9:

John [Jenkins],

You may think we are "well prepared and well informed to respond to my review-critique" in the way that you think we should, but that's not how it works.

As Kevin noted,

"... it is very unusual for the subject of research (again, a very minor subject relative to the paper) to tell the researchers how to do their research, what they should write, and what the limits of their sources should be. You have already written your own response. Please don't presume to write ours for us (said with all due respect)."

If you are unable or unwilling to help us obtain copies of your published work, we will address that in our response.

As I mentioned, I've begun to doubt that the Four Ahau Press "books" from the early 1990s--ones that are repeatedly cited in your own publications--actually exist. Providing copies of them will be the best way to persuade me and others that they do.

Thanks,

John [Hoopes]

Dear John Hoopes [January 9]

Why would books that I've mentioned in my other publications be relevant to what I said in my critique of your article? You are effectively side-stepping making a response to my critique of your article. It is not I who am presuming to set the parameters of how you write your response, but the conditions of the peer-review process. That IS how it works.

In 1995 I wrote an article on Finnish Mythology, and I've mentioned this in at least one later publication. Is it relevant for you to receive this article? One can clearly apply discernment and critical thinking to determining which of my points require the early sources you are requesting.

We can parse through each one, apply discerning and critical analysis, and easily make a determination. As I previously mentioned, most of the titles in a long list of published and unpublished things I've produced since the 1980s, which you keep requesting that I mail to you, are irrelevant for your considered response to my points in my critique-review of your essay. Others I have supplied links to, ordering info, or you already have (see email of 12-23). I roughly ordered the presentation of my points sequentially as I conceived their importance for correcting the published record:

- My first point is that Geoff Stray used the term "2012 phenomenon" before Sitler (2006). I cited Stray's 2005 book (which you also referenced in your article), and two pages from his website, which logged and preserved dated News Items with the term in 2002. My work does not come into play in your considered response; it is "irrelevant."
- A second point is that Sitler did not define the phrase the 2012 phenomenon in his 2006 essay.
- A third point is that Sitler's 2010 is another book on 2012 (it's in the subtitle) by an academic scholar, but you neglected to list it in your list of 2012 books by scholars.
- A fourth point is that there is a conflict between your stated intention in your Abstract (that it provides the fullest account of the history of the 2012 phenomenon), and a caveat stated four pages later that such an intention is not necessary in your article.
- A fifth point is that your definition of the 2012 phenomenon is a very close reflection of your uses of the problematic and challenged concept of "Mayanism," which you have promoted and developed on Wikipedia and in a previous article.
- A sixth point is that you neglected to cite my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin* as containing very early critiques (early within the critique history of the 2012 phenomenon) of authors, concepts, and topics diagnostic of the 2012 phenomenon (and you have that title).
- A seventh point is that my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (which you cited as support) does not contain support for the assertions you made about my interpretive methods of Izapa iconography, and that the same book contains statements that contradict your assertions (which I quoted and cited).

None of these seven points require access to the sources you have requested. Your recent emails ignore that I already responded to your requests, in good faith and in detail, in my lengthy email to you of 12-23 and again yesterday. Your position becomes repetitive and circular despite my clear responses and even sending you jpgs and links to some of the available sources as well as directions on how you can obtain some of them. I hope you choose to honor the critique-and-response process facilitated by the editors of *Zeitschrift fur Anomalistik*. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

From John Hoopes to me, cc'ing Kevin:

John [Jenkins],

We are not addressing your work on Finnish mythology, but on interpretations of ancient Maya cosmology. You have claimed that we have not given adequate consideration to theories you have put forth "since the early 1990s" and we must have access to primary source material in order to do that. In your critique, you cite publications of yours that we have not been able to obtain. You also make claims of expertise based on the numerous books you have written, including those from Four Ahau Press. We must have access to those books in order to address those claims.

If you are unable or unwilling to provide copies of the books from Four Ahau Press, can you provide the names of libraries--academic or otherwise--where they are available for study?

To Hoopes: [still January 9]

You just wrote: "In your critique, you cite publications of yours that we have not been able to obtain."

We've already established that these are, in your mind, *Izapa Cosmos* (1996) and my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*. You are ignoring that I just sent you a jpg of the page in *Izapa Cosmos* that states my observation of the Izapa ballcourt's alignment to the solstice sunrise --- that's why I cited it --- and I've stated (repeatedly now) that *Izapa Cosmos* was entirely subsumed into Part IV of my 1998 book, which you have. You also ignore that I just sent you jpgs of the Table of Contents for the 1992 first edition of my book *Tzolkin*, which you can check with your 1994 second edition to see that they are identical. You are going in circles now and ignoring the information I'm sending you in good faith, which renders a rational dialogue impossible; please refer to my detailed previous emails. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

From Hoopes:

Dear John,

These are not "in my mind." They are the citations that you yourself make.

If they are not the citations you intend, then you should change the ones in your critique to match the ones that you insist are relevant. However, doing so does not change our need to evaluate the original material, especially given your complaints about how we have considered your published work.

You do not seem to understand what is meant by primary source material. It means the original editions, not later versions of them. If you are going to cite those in your critique, we need to evaluate them in our response.

John Hoopes

John Hoopes,

Your belief, in your mind, that I've cited books or other writings of mine that you don't have access to is not correct, which I demonstrated repeatedly in previous emails, including the sending of links and jpgs. "In your mind" you believe you can't locate my 1996 monograph (*Izapa Cosmos*) and my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*. I cited the earliest publication of the *Tzolkin* book, thus I reference the 1992 first edition. But to be clear, in a footnote on page 2 I stated the book was published in 1992 and reprinted in 1994 (the edition you have). This is also made clear in the citation for that book in my bibliography. The point is actually moot, regarding the shared content of both editions and why I cited it, as I previously explained, and you're worrying to death a red herring.

The other citations to my works include webpages and online excerpts that are all stable and accessible. And the following sources in the bibliography (in addition to the 1992/1994 *Tzolkin* book):

Jenkins, J.M. (1996). *Izapa Cosmos*. Louisville, CO: Four Ahau Press.

Jenkins, J.M. (1998). *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012: The True Meaning of the Maya Calendar End-Date*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Company.

Jenkins, J.M. (2008). December 21, 2012: Some Rational Deductions. In Reed, Jim (Ed.), *Institute of Maya Studies Newsletter*. Miami, FL: www.instituteofmayastudies.org.

Jenkins, J.M. (2009). *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies, and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History*. New York: Tarcher / Penguin Books.

Jenkins, J.M. (2011). Approaching 2012: Modern Misconceptions vs. Reconstructing Ancient Maya Perspectives. In Gelfer, J. (Ed.), *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (S. 163-181). London & Sheffield: Equinox.

These are all sources that you have or I know you have read (the 2008 source was emailed to you in 2008, which you responded to), except the 1996 monograph for which I sent you jpgs of the title page and the relevant page that supports why I cited it --- and which was subsumed into Part IV of my 1998 book.

It's unfortunate that I'm having to repeat myself and cut-and-paste things that I've already stated in my review of your article. Your assertion that my publications I cited are unavailable to you is simply a false assertion, not unlike the several false assertions you made in your article, which I've corrected with relevant citations and evidence. If you are unable or unwilling to respond to the well-supported points and corrections I've offered, then don't.

John Major Jenkins

Dear John [Jenkins],

The only "book" from Four Ahau Press dated to the 1990s that I have been able to examine in even a photocopy facsimile of the original is "Jaloj Kexoj and PHI-64."

I am coming to doubt more and more that these books (including the 1992 edition of "Tzolkin" and the 1996 edition of "Izapa Cosmos") actually exist. However, proving their existence is essential for supporting your claims about your work in the early 1990s and we must have access to them--and others--in order to cite them. I don't understand why this is not obvious.

We will be grateful for your cooperation in providing copies of the 1990s books from Four Ahau Press. If you are not able to make photocopies or scans of the original publications, you may lend personal copies either to us or to our respective institutions with the assurance that they will be returned to you in a timely fashion after we have been able to examine them.

Many thanks,

John Hoopes

Now Hoopes expands his harassment from a different direction, requesting ISBN numbers of my books:

Dear John [Jenkins],

To assist with our search for copies of your published books, could you please provide ISBN numbers for the following titles (listed on your web page entitled "My Books")?

http://johnmajorjenkins.com/?page_id=20

Izapa Cosmos (Four Ahau Press, 1996)

The Center of Mayan Time (Four Ahau Press, 1995)

Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies (Four Ahau Press, 1992)

Mayan Sacred Science (Four Ahau Press, 1994)

7 Wind: A Quiché Maya Calendar for 1993 (Four Ahau Press, 1993)

Mirror in the Sky (Four Ahau Press, 1991)

Outside the Cage (Four Ahau Press, 1991)

Scenezine Selections (Four Ahau Press, 1990). A collection of early essays and travel reports published in the Chicago-based arts and music newspaper called Scenezine, editor Bill Jenkins.

Journey to the Mayan Underworld (Four Ahau Press / Self Publications, 1989)

Thank you,

John [Hoopes]

John Hoopes, [still January 9]

You don't seem to be actually reading the emails I've sent, and you don't seem to be looking at the jpgs I've attached. You are circling back to your original request (which I already addressed in detail multiple times, responding to your questions and sending links, which you've never acknowledged). In addition, you now add an accusation that I've been lying to you and the world about my Four Ahau Press publications, with the implication that I've been engaged in crafting a stupendous deception in my many comments and citations through 20+ years as a professional writer. For you to default to this position when I've provided evidence for my books is quite unprofessional and irrational. One of the jpgs I sent depicts my 1996 monograph *Izapa Cosmos*, two other jpgs depict images of the Table of Contents for my 1992 first edition of *Tzolkin*, and another jpg shows a page from my 1996 monograph that is relevant to your request. Should I send you physical materials rather than photographs, what would prevent you from asserting the equally ridiculous charge that I quickly manufactured them, just for you? Although it may still not allay your commitment to evading the facts and evidence I've laid before you, you can also look up the Library of Congress filings for my early books with Four Ahau Press. I've supplied the evidence, you just aren't processing it. Your insinuation that I've been lying and committing a

decades-long deception is baseless and irrational. I suggest that instead of shifting your thoughts into a strategy of ad hominem accusation, just respond to my review. Have you never had to do this before? Again, if you are unwilling to respond, then don't do it. I'm starting to feel that our email exchange is going to provide ancillary material that illustrates something quite clearly about your scholarship, for all good scholars will readily admit when they've obviously and demonstrably made mistakes. That's how science works. I've pointed out factual errors and offered well-documented critiques and corrections. You might want to go back and read those seven points of my critique I sent in the previous email, which I offered as a summary for your convenience. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Now Hoopes diverts into another tactic by pulling quotes out of my *Tzolkin* book that reference my earlier books. So what? What is the point of that? Evasion and harassment. These harassment tactics are, admittedly, becoming tedious:

Dear John [Jenkins],

Just so you know, one of the reasons why we want to have a copy of *Mirror in the Sky* (1991) is because on p. 160 of the 1994 edition of *Tzolkin* you mention that in the summer of 1991 you sent a copy of that work to José Argüelles and that he responded to it favorably, prompting him to send you information about Dreamspell (the kit that became available in December 1991 and which you say you first received in January 1992).

As you know, 1991 was a critical year for Argüelles, being the time when he first received his Telektonon prophecy and became aware of his identity as Valum Votan. His receipt of your book also immediately preceded the first year-long Dreamspell event, in which Argüelles further developed his own interpretations of the significance of December 21, 2012 and what it represented. Without being able to consult *Mirror in the Sky*, it is impossible for us to evaluate whether Argüelles was influenced at all by your own work and whether what we may have interpreted as his influence on you was actually an echo of the reverse.

On p. 157 of the 1994 edition of *Tzolkin*, you republished a brief article that you had written on January 18, 1992 in which you wrote, "My own Sacred Calendar studies, detailed in two recent books and a forthcoming one to be entitled *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies*, have led me to realize that the Calendar is an amazing, mind-boggling, multi-purposive tool."

We assume these "two recent books" were *Journey to the Mayan Underworld*(1989) and *Mirror in the Sky* (1991), both of which you identify as detailing your own "Sacred Calendar studies." These are referenced in a crucial passage in *Tzolkin*, the book to which you have directed us in order to understand your scholarship in the early 1990s. This is why we think it is important to have copies of both of these other books.

Thanks,

John [Hoopes]

[To Hoopes:]

Yes, I sent him [Arguelles] a copy because I was requesting permission to use several drawings from his book *Mandala*. I also discreetly asked him to calculate my birthday, and confirmed that he was not using the Classic Maya count. And I ordered the Dreamspell kit in order to write a review, and was utterly disappointed by its incomprehensible mumbo jumbo. That led to my first encounters with his circle and my first critiques as published in *Tzolkin*. Arguelles was certainly not influenced by me, and the whole question of influences is up for grabs anyway. I think you apply too much of direct causative agency in your concept of influence, which seems to be predicated on your assumption that people don't think for themselves.

As I've explained in previous exchanges we've had, and which you can find nicely summarized in my 1994 book *Jaloj Kexoj*, the pre-2012 phase of my research focused on Maya philosophy, numerology, and sacred science principles, which led to the Jaloj Kexoj connection. So, the information you seek on this particular model-making phase of my work is fully expressed in that *Jaloj Kexoj / Mayan Sacred Science* book that you have. Again, I haven't invited nor do I require a full exposition of my entire output. The space you will be allotted for your response to my review will certainly be no more than the page count of my own review, so these multifarious requests you are making would have to be far down on the list of what you would have space to present, assuming that you are going to prioritize responding to what I actually wrote in my review.

Your request is clever, however, as it is built upon a passage in my 1992 book. But, as I've said repeatedly, in my review when I referred to my books going back to the 1990s I was referring to the sequence leading back to *Tzolkin*. One can always track ideas and work into previous expressions, and all of my works are linked in various ways. But you are straying very far afield from what you need to respond to my critique, especially considering that your space will be limited. I think it's important to keep in sight that this is a critique and response focused on your article, not a trial for my work. You seem committed to keeping the tables turned, when you should be thinking more about responding to my corrections and the evidence I've cited to support those corrections. Since the list of points is seven, you will be hard pressed to comment on those in the 5 or 6 pages you have to work with. And, if you re-read my previous email that summarized those points for your convenience, you will see that none of them require any material as so far flung as my pre-*Tzolkin* books.

Are you even planning to respond to my 7 points? It doesn't seem like it.

I'll be sending you a lengthy response to your previous email, and then this must end. I'm beginning an editing job next week and will be in the mountains until Monday. I've gone to great lengths to address and respond to your concerns, but you seem to be exploiting this situation to demand all of my writings, which are not relevant to responding to my critique of your article, and which cannot possibly be fully accounted in the brief space you'll have to respond.

John Major Jenkins

Now, there was a side exchange that happened with Hoopes, that he initiated in a different email thread and which employed yet another tactic of diversion, employing the Interlibrary Loan person at his college to search for my various early books, which however were self-published and didn't use ISBN numbers. He already knew this but was clearly trying to build a case that my earlier books didn't even exist! I link this side exchange here: <http://alignment2012.com/Hoopes-ISBN.html>. Hoopes's last response in that thread diverted YET AGAIN with a string of questions about my early exchanges with Terence McKenna; this can be read in the above link. I responded at length,

incorporating his questions (below) and state again that this has to be the last email. It is still January 9:

Dear John Hoopes,

Okay, here's my final response to you. As I mentioned I'm off for the weekend beginning tomorrow then I am beginning an editing job on Monday [note: this was the plan, but it was delayed -JMJ] which will tax my eyesight and on-the-computer limitations. I've responded at great lengths and with great patience to your requests, which have become circularly asserted and repeating despite my clarifications and actually sending you links and jpgs. And it's not my place to be on hand to respond to your questions as you sequentially generate and present them. The following goes into detail but I expect these areas will be useful for you only in some later critique of my larger body of work, since you won't have the space to cover this far-flung ground if you prioritize addressing my critiques of your article, with your considered response to the evidence I cite to support my corrections and clarifications. That should be what you focus on, unless you want to evade acknowledging the several fact-based corrections I've made.

Dear John Hoopes,

JMJ: You seem to be intent on turning the tables and making this about an inquiry into details about my work, details which I've actually shared with you in earlier email exchanges and some of which is explained in *MC2012* (1998) and *The 2012 Story* (2009). Meanwhile, are you planning to respond to my review? The issues that I've brought up in regards to your article have been concisely laid out; for example, I pointed out that you neglected to cite my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin* as containing early treatments of authors, items, and concepts connected with the 2012 phenomenon. This is true even if we only cite it to 1994. In what way do your questions below seek to clarify or illuminate this point? Similarly, my simple point regarding my 1998 book, is that your assertions are not supported by anything in that book, and in fact are contradicted by statements in that book, which I quoted in my review. Your questions do not seem at all oriented to addressing or clarifying my critique. Instead, you seem to be trying to build a separate argument outside of responding to my review. I already responded to many of your questions in the emails I wrote to you and/or Kevin last summer, regarding the advent of the perennial philosophy framework in my work --- I also addressed this in one of the footnotes in my review of your article. The repetition of things I've already stated or shared is becoming tedious.

Nevertheless, I will re-re-re-respond briefly below to your various questions, in the hopes that I won't have to repeat myself again later. I'm offering this, yet again, in good faith. This will have to be the end of it, and now it is your turn to write a response if you choose. None of this extra exchange should have been necessary. You cannot say that I did not cooperate with your many requests and questions. If you believe so, please reread my responses. You haven't even acknowledged receiving many of them but have continually moved on to other requests or questions. Again, my review is well-written, already approved for publication, self-contained and it directly cites sources that are stable online or that you already have.

You wrote:

Dear John [Jenkins],

If you feel as if your remarks are being ignored, it's because you also seem insistent on ignoring the fact that digital versions (which are not photocopied facsimiles) of these "books" on your website are inadequate for objectively documenting that they were "published" in the 1990s. You have ignored Kevin's and my points about responsible scholarship and what that actually requires.

JMJ: No, I haven't ignored your points. You didn't make any points but instead asserted a need to have me send you primary copies of rare and unpublished materials that have nothing to do with my Maya 2012 research and which aren't even in the non-fiction genre. Nevertheless, I repeatedly responded in detail to your concerns with many explanations and links. More to the point, I reminded you that you already have copies of material that you have repeatedly requested.

You again state that "the copies of your early work have been impossible to obtain." Again, which relevant books are you referring to? Your emails waffle between alluding to books cited in my review and other books that you request which are poetry, biography, or quasi-fiction. Please be more specific, because you keep making this accusation while I've gone to great lengths to provide you with links, ordering information, and jpgs. And now you state that digital uploads of books onto my website are not valid. Frankly, it seems you will never be satisfied.

You:

1. When did you become aware of the McKennas' *Invisible Landscape*, in either the original 1975 or second 1993 edition? There is only brief mention of Terence McKenna in the 1994 edition of *Tzolkin*, suggesting that you were not familiar with the McKennas' book (or the specifics of the Timewave Zero model) before the publication of either the 1992 or the 1994 editions of *Tzolkin*. Was the McKennas' theory explored or critiqued in the original 1996 edition of *Izapa Cosmos*?

JMJ: I read the 1975 edition in 1985, as I've transparently shared many times. McKenna and his ideas were not much of a factor in my book *Tzolkin*, written 1991-August 1992, unless I alluded to him in my encyclopedic list of thinkers. Sometime in late 1992 I sent him a copy of my 1992 first edition, with a letter highlighting my appendix that shows how Katun endings in the Long Count can track seasonal quarters leading to solstice 2012. This is probably the conversation he was alluding to in his Intro. I fully understood the astronomy underlying the solstice-galaxy alignment in my independent examination of *Norton's Star Atlas*, and pointed out to McKenna that the alignment would necessarily require a temporal range that embraced 2012. This range was relevant to making calculations and/or for some purported "effect" that some might believe in, which contrasted with his "sudden change" idea on a specific day in 2012 via his TimeWaveZero theory. This is a crux distinction in our respective ideas about 2012. You might want to entertain the notion that I am an informed free thinker rather than a blind follower of others. Sometime around '92 Peter Meyer sent me his Maya Calendrics software along with Time Wave Zero. I loved the Maya Calendrics program; I briefly played a little with Time Wave Zero but didn't really appreciate it. I was intrigued with McKenna's fractal time concept, following the work of Alfred North Whitehead. Please

note, however, that fractal time is not diagnostic of my work or what I promote about time or 2012. If I was a devotee of McKenna's, you'd expect I was on board with this. I do see Fibonacci unfolding in some of the numbers of astronomy and the Maya calendar, such as the 5:8 sun ratio and even a 13:21 approximation of the Maya calendar. The Golden Proportion is embedded in Maya numbers, which I worked out myself in the late 1980s and early 1990s; this involves the Jaloj Kexoj work but does not "follow" McKenna's fractal time rap.

My 2012 work unfolded quickly as my Maya studies were already advanced and a lot of things fell into place when I "got" the solstice-galaxy alignment --- the ballgame, king-making rites, the Dark Rift and Crossroads. None of this is in McKenna's work. When I saw his 1993 [actually, it was released in early 1994] edition of *Invisible Landscape* (I did not buy it new, he sent me a signed copy some months after publication; I already had the first edition) and noted the additions of several sentences, I had the impression that it was possibly influenced by our prior conversations; I'd been sending him little articles I'd been writing since 1991. The alignment was not a clear topic of conversation, due to vagueness in how he and I were conceiving it. When I wrote the "How and Why" article in May 1994, he liked it a lot and offered to post it on his new website, which happened in mid- to late-1995. My own website went up in October 1995, inaugurated with my "Key to the Dreamspell Agenda" critique of Arguelles's increasingly cultic status, which generated enemies and a lot of response and represents yet another early effort of mine to critique the 2012 phenomenon.

The point is that the alignment was not McKenna's idea, nor is it Arguelles's, or Mardyks', or Giamario's, or Roycastle's, or LaVoie's; I actually got more out of *Hamlet's Mill*, which of course McKenna's brief mention in his 1975 points to. You might note that McKenna's description of the "alignment" is quite vague and generalized in his 1975 book, and is actually poorly described. That's why I didn't quite "get it" as an astronomical phenomenon when I read the book in 1985, although the idea lingered with me. I have not claimed to have "discovered" the alignment, but have uncovered its presence in Maya traditions related to the Creation Myth, the ballgame and at Izapa. To answer a question of yours, McKenna's theory was not mentioned in my 1996 monograph, because that monograph was totally about Izapa astronomy, monuments, and calendrics, and was basically subsumed to become Part IV of *MC2012* (1998). Please read that Part IV for a precise and sometimes verbatim presentation of what the *Izapa Cosmos* monograph contains --- I've stated this many times already.

You:

2. When did you become aware of the relevance of the work of Ananda Coomaraswamy and René Guénon to your interpretations of Izapa and Maya iconography and your theory of a galactic alignment? Neither of them is referenced in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998) but both are cited extensively in *Galactic Alignment* (2002).

JMJ: To be clear, my interpretations of "Izapa and Maya iconography" AND my "theory of the galactic alignment" (which due to misconceptions I prefer to call the "2012

alignment reconstruction” were **already in place before I encountered the perennial philosophers**. This is the critical piece of factual information that you must embrace to have an accurate understanding of the sequence of my work. I abruptly encountered Evola, Guenon, then Coomaraswamy in 2000, which quickly influenced my conception for the global approach in my *Galactic Alignment* book proposal, which I wanted to title *Ancient Gnosis and the Galaxy* before my publisher changed it. I was soon intrigued with Coomaraswamy’s unpublished writings that I requested from the Princeton archive, which pointed to an ancient Vedic understanding of the Galactic Center as a root and center. You might not be paying attention to my previous emails, because I explained when the Perennial Philosophy emerged in my work in my emails this past summer. I also briefly noted the sequence of my unfolding work in a footnote in my review of your article, and pointed out how **it is a fallacy to back-project my later elucidations onto a presumed interpretive methodology applied to the Izapa monuments in my earlier work**. This is the fallacy that you and/or Kevin have asserted, but which is not supported by anything in my 1998 book --- which is THE place where my reconstruction was fully worked out and presented, based on astronomy, *not* on an “archetypally” applied interpretation (or however you awkwardly phrased it). I am making the correction; can you honor and acknowledge it?

The point is that perennial and archetypal mythology was not at all on my mind when I achieved my pioneering reconstruction in my 1998 book. I later languaged the similarity of Maya ideas with ideas in world religions through the non-dual language of Coomaraswamy and others. They proved a perfect framework for understanding similar religious and metaphysical ideas shared in global religions, including the Maya, such as sacrifice and renewal at period-endings. And they also are congruent with such clinical terms used by anthropologists such as “reciprocity.” However, I prefer the terms of the Perennial Philosophy (such as “non-dual”) because the more clinical and mechanical metaphors of Western anthropological science seem quite unsuited to the Maya world. This is not so much an idiosyncratically applied, force-fitting of the Maya world to decontextualized ideas, but rather the identification of a conceptual paradigm that is perfectly suited to and congruent with the Maya worldview. Certain core ideas in the Maya Creation Myth affirm this, such as the importance of deity sacrifice for worldrenewal; congruent with Coomaraswamy’s discussions of period-ending “self-naughting,” and so on. Again, this can be heady stuff, and I don’t expect tourists to warm to it easily, but please refrain from judgments if you don’t understand the works of these intellectually challenging thinkers. And it’s not Blavatsky; it’s not Theosophy; it’s not some faith-based belief system, and it’s not New Age-think, unless you are extremely superficial in your categorizing.

You:

3. Although there are many references to the Perennial Philosophy in *Galactic Alignment*, there is no citation in the book of Aldous Huxley, whose 1945 book *The Perennial Philosophy* is a central reference for this topic. Is there a reason for this?

JMJ: Huxley was not a central figure in some of my writings; I don’t know why this is, we choose to focus on certain sources and writers and no book one writes can be all

things. I knew he produced the PP book in the 1940s but I preferred Coomaraswamy, Guenon, Corbin, and Seyyed Hossein Nasr. I did appreciate the concise write-up Huxley made in his intro to the *Bhagavad Gita, Song of God*, which I've mentioned on many occasions. You may not be aware but his ideas were drawn straight from his Vedantic studies, which was an early intrusion of non-dual philosophy into Western thought beginning in the 1800s; Alan Watts also followed and wrote of Vedanta. One thread of this "East meets West" process went toward the theosophists but, again, you'd have to be putting the cart before the horse to conclude that everything traces to Theosophy. Hoopes, I think your categories need to evolve a bit as you seem to conflate Theosophy with so many other things, or see it as the original influence on everything including the World Age doctrine in Maya tradition, which is quite a large cart before the horse. I realize it's another handy guilt-by-association construct, but it's kind of like saying a toaster is a radio because they both run on electricity.

You: In his forward to *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, Terence McKenna writes, "In the early 1990s, while in correspondence with John Jenkins, we discussed the possibility that the end-date of the 13-baktun Great Cycle was intentionally chosen by the Maya because of the conjunction of the sun with the intersection of the ecliptic plane and the plane of the Milky Way on December 21, 2012—the 13.0.0.0.0 of the Long Count Calendar."

JMJ: I addressed this above; I believe this conversation emerged directly out of me sending him my 1992 book, probably in August when I produced the first copies, and emphasized the Long Count / Seasonal Quarter / 2012 appendix to him. The idea that the Maya intended 2012 to target the alignment is mine; McKenna had not thought it through to this point. (My idea is not intended to disallow the possibility that 3114 date was also intentionally placed --- I believe both are true because the number of days in 13 Baktuns allows for this, from zenith to solstice.) I recall being excited when I actually scored the contract for the book with BSRF, which happened in September or October of 1992, and have a vague recollection of sharing this with Terence by phone. (I produced the camera-ready master copies based almost precisely on my 1992 first edition, except I redid the calendar pages. My first edition was about 90 spiral-bound copies I sold through my mail order catalog through late 1992 and into '93.)

Terence and I had five or six phone conversations in those early years, after I saw him speak in Boulder in '92, and also letters. Of course, he was the psychedelic guy among my friends, and he was amusing to see speak. He had many ideas and frankly, he wasn't a targeted guy for the alignment or TWZero or anything necessarily. I was inspired that he was a public speaker, sharing interesting ideas, and I decided I could do that to. I'm not sure what you're fishing for here. Even if McKenna had directly instructed me and convinced me that his vaguely defined alignment around the millennium (following *Hamlet's Mill*) was real astronomy, that wouldn't mitigate the work I've done to reconstruct how the alignment is present in Maya traditions and at Izapa. That's the unique and unprecedented thing I've offered. Not to mention my more recent work on Tortugero Monument 6 and La Corona Block 5 (at <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com>) By the way, instead of digging into the 1990s, why not summarize my SAA presentation of April 2010 --- that was a by-

invitation-only academic venue. Isn't the evidence on Tortuguero Monument 6 part of "the 2012 phenomenon"? You're asking me all these questions --- why don't you re-read my most prominent books instead? Such as *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998) and *The 2012 Story* (2009). A concise overview can be found in my book of 2012 called *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy*. (The link for ordering is in my email of 12-23).

You:

One of the reasons why we feel it is critical to have access to the works you cite from "the early 1990s" is because, absent details of this correspondence or other documentation, these original works are essential for establishing the role that Terence McKenna played in your own thinking and vice versa.

JMJ: First, the only book I cited from "the early 1990s" is the *Tzolkin* book. You keep generalizing this point and use the quotes as if you're conveying that I was referenced a larger body of my writings and inviting you to assess it, but I did not. And I clarified this for you in my first email of 12-23; why do you keep coming back to this? I keep having to repeat this to you: look in the bibliography. My only book cited from the early 1990s is *Tzolkin* and the quote is actually "...since the early 1990s", meaning the books in the bibliography beginning with *Tzolkin* and continuing through *The 2012 Story* in 2009. As I mentioned, you can benefit from my comments about Terence in several of those books.

I have explained and honestly described, many times, the roll McKenna played in my work. He was like a mentor that encouraged me to do my work, not his work. Read the comments in *The 2012 Story*, or in Appendix 1 of *MC2012*. Or read my 1994 article that I wrote and McKenna posted on his website (cited in my email of 12-23) --- in it I briefly mention the McKenna's book as well as *Hamlet's Mill*, as well Schele, etc. My thoroughly unique work emerged from a milieu of ideas, and I've been honest to give credit where it's due but also emphasize the unique synthesis I've made. And it was triggered by realizing that the solstice sun's alignment happens at the Dark Rift, looking at *Norton's Star Atlas* in 1993. No one had ever pointed this out in any publication I had seen before or since. And, quickly, other concepts fell into place from Maya tradition, including the ballgame and the Crossroads, and One Hunahpu as solar lord. When Izapa came into view, in the summer of 1994, it all snowballed. Does it need to be said that McKenna and Arguelles were not on this page, were not concerned with this kind of academic investigation, and never even wrote about these concepts? THAT is why there is a huge gulf of difference between my work and theirs. This should be obvious if you were acquainted with our respective works. Do you understand that Arguelles's "galactic synchronization" is NOT the solstice-galaxy alignment? (Read his and Brian Swimme's definition in *The Mayan Factor*.) As I said in my review of your article, just because we all wrote about 2012 doesn't mean we were on the same page with what it means, or even in the same book. And it doesn't mean that I was ideologically "influenced" by them, or was concerned with promoting "their" ideas. 2012 is a Maya idea, not theirs and not mine. You might want to also take to heart, which I also mentioned in my review of your article, that the idea of a period-ending worldrenewal is an eminently Mesoamerican concept; it has a superficially resonance with "New Age" rhetoric (which adopted the

idea from a grab-bag of sources), but it is a fatal and undiscerning fallacy to thereby dismiss its validity in Mesoamerican thought that relates to the 2012 period-ending. Hoopes, I think this is a very large problem in your thinking.

You: Since that is one of the points you wish us to address...

JMJ: And you CAN address that point by addressing Terence's comments in his Intro to my book (quoted in my review of your article), his comments he sent to the magazine that reviewed my book (linked in my review of your article), and my comments disagreeing with Terence's core 2012 idea (cited to my 2009 book in my review of your article). Again, I've already provided you with the evidence that contradicts your various assertions. THAT is what you should first address, before you go fishing for other bits of info elsewhere.

You: ...we wish to be diligent in addressing it. As we noted in our article, we consider publication of the second edition of *The Invisible Landscape* to have been a significant event in the emergence of the 2012 phenomenon. Changes were made to that edition from the 1975 one, especially with respect to specific identification of the December 21, 2012 date. Did the "early 1990s" correspondence that Terence McKenna mentions in the forward to your book come *before* or *after* final editing of the 1993 second edition of *The Invisible Landscape*?

JMJ: I don't know the precise answer to that, but as I've reconstructed it above, the conversations happened before. But what is the relevance of timing? As I mentioned above, I suspected when I saw the extra few sentences in his '93 edition that the additions were influenced by our conversation. My mention of December 21, 2012 in *Tzolkin* (August 1992, sent to McKenna) may have committed him to the precise date, but I think he was using it well before that. So what? You seem to want to ascribe ownership of 2012 to modern people, which is a very problematic assumption and is betrayed by your use of terminology such as "the development of 2012 mythology." Again, a critique that I would have elaborated on if space was provided was a flawed assumption that lies at the root of your entire approach to 2012. You both don't seem to care that much about the effort to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. That is what my work is about, and despite my clarity you constantly seek to conflate me with others. Consider this: the difficulty lies in the fact that the authentic Maya ideas about 2012 (worldrenewal) rub shoulders with the laughable clichés of New Agers who dream of the dawn of Aquarius (worldrenewal). Applying discernment and critical thinking can separate out the strands of confusion. Rather than conflating my reconstruction of a 2012 worldrenewal doctrine in Maya thought with New Age clichés, you could follow the evidence and see that it's a valid concept in Maya thought. Period-ending renewal. Worldrenewal facilitated by deity sacrifice. In my work, that comes from the evidence I've assembled and reconstructed, not from McKenna or Arguelles or Blavatsky or New Age gurus. It doesn't seem like you care to actually cite my evidence, quote from my work, or follow my arguments. They are there for the taking in my 1998 book, which you cited to support a wildly imaginative and seriously flawed reading of my interpretations of Maya myth and astronomy. That's why correctives are necessary,

but you seem to be resisting even on very basic levels of fact-based corrections. Your academic minds might be better and more fulfilling applied to proactive work rather than deconstructions and polemics.

You: Can you provide documentation?

JMJ: You asked for my recollections, and I don't have phone conversations recorded. I fail to see how there is something here that I need to defend or prove. There are a few letters somewhere in old files, but I fail to see what you are fishing for. I have nothing to hide. I can't fathom what you're trying to prove. Again, if McKenna had secretly achieved the Izapa-ballgame-Creation Myth-Dark Rift-Alignment reconstruction and secretly handed it off to me, that would be a big problem and I would be a mastermind of deception. Are you defaulting to that assumption? You seem hell-bent on denying to me the unprecedented reconstruction I've achieved and presented with good argument and documentation, which has found support from recent evidence such as at Tortuguero and in Grofe's work. You've demonstrated that you haven't grasped what I've said in MC2012 and what my methodology was. Frankly, I don't think either of you are versed enough in Western and Maya astronomy to understand much of the astronomy part of my work. You should if you're going to critique my work. I really don't know --- do you two understand astronomy? This is a common problem, so don't feel offended --- even Aveni got precession wrong in his critique of Grofe's work, which we duly noted. Or are you assuming that I've claimed to have "discovered" the solstice-galaxy alignment? I have not! Read the first sentence of my Appendix 1 in MC2012.

You: As you know, Argüelles' original "Dreamspell event" was conceived as a year-long "happening" that was to be initiated on July 26, 1992 (the first "Day Out of Time"). Although the publication date of the edition of *Tzolkin* to which I have access is 1994, in the book you emphasize the significance of April 5, 1993 (correlating with 12.9.0.0.0) as a critical "nexus point." These events and how people were considering them is one of the reasons why having access to your actual literature of the early 1990s—not facsimiles of the same—is essential for understanding the significance of the individuals, publications, and ideas of this period in the emergence of the 2012 phenomenon.

JMJ: This is what I critiqued in my 1992 book *Tzolkin*, reprinted in 1994 with BSRF. No, you aren't going to get an original rare copy of a book you already basically have, and you can't possibly treat that as a necessary lynchpin of your response. Refer to your 1994 second edition for anything you want. My point in citing it was the six or seven things I listed in my review of your article, showing I was commenting on and critiquing "2012 phenomenon" topics. I sent you jpgs of the Table of Contents from both, and they are identical. I corrected Argüelles' belief that the last Katun of the 13-Baktun cycle was supposed to commence on July 26, 1992, which he said in a *Welcome to Planet Earth* magazine interview with Antero Alli. That was one of many corrections I made to Argüelles in that book, written 1991-August 1992 --- the earliest critique of authors and ideas related to the 2012 phenomenon, even if you take the pub year as 1994. So your insistent request for the first edition is irrelevant on several fronts. You ... already ... have ... it. Look up the Library of Congress filing date if you want; I don't have the original paperwork as it got destroyed. You're making a mountain out of a mole hill.

Now, please observe that I responded at great length, again, for the third or fourth time, to your questions. My responses since December 21 total over a dozen emails and in length far exceed by many multiples the word count of my review of your article. This is where the email babble must end. These questions I consider to be largely irrelevant to [you] responding to my critique of your article, but they would be relevant for a larger conversation and treatment of my work. You don't have space for that. But again in good faith I've responded. In the past, you (Hoopes) have demonstrated an ability to take things that I've shared honestly and clearly with you and twist them into polemically mitigating comments. Please don't do that. Please respond directly and honestly to my corrections and comments in my review. Both of you: I believe it is your responsibility as scholars to address each one of them, as well as the evidence I cited to support my comments. I suspect that you, like me, will have a limited page count to work within so please try to stay focused on what I've actually written. But again, it is your choice whether you want to respond. Best wishes,
John Major Jenkins [January 9, evening]

Thus ended the exchange. But a curious note can be added here. On the very same evening of January 9, Kevin Whitesides (who was being cc'ed on my exchanges with Hoopes but did not participate in or contribute to the exchanges) posted a link on the 2012 Mesoamerican Facebook discussion group. This Facebook Group is populated by 2012 "debunkers" such as 2012-hater Johan Normark and Bill Hudson, who launched the 2012Hoax.org website which ran, for years, the statement that I was a 2012 (doomsday) "proponent," and it took me months of exchanges with Hudson in early 2012 before he removed it, but only after he employed his own brand of juvenile subterfuge through the aegis of lunatic cyber-stalker and 2012Hoax.org contributor Jim Smith. The link that Whitesides posted was to a total trash piece about me, crafted in October 2012 by the fine conspiracy-theory fools at SOTT.net. Hilariously, they crafted a deranged screed about me being a Cointelpro patsy, or member, or something to that effect. Utter nonsense which Whitesides himself should have been able to discern, except *he chose to set aside decency and critical thinking and instead he vengefully used that trash piece as a personally mitigating item that he could propagate on the internet*. During the several days of lengthy exchanges with Hoopes, Whitesides could have addressed me directly, but instead chose the cowardly act of a stealthy *ad hominem* attack, not unlike lunatic cyber-stalker Jim Smith and other JMJ-bashers. Note that Whitesides' post to the 2012 Facebook page occurred *the same day* as my final lengthy response to Hoopes. The result in the comment thread was concurrence from Bill Hudson and other gullible yuk-yuks, evidence that they don't have the ability to exercise discernment and think for themselves.

Well, a few days passed and finally, on January 12, Gerd Hovelmann sent via email a rather final ultimatum to us all. He put this aside his frustration with Hoopes's unprofessional attempt at muddling the process, he agreed with my two citation additions, and he reiterated his plan to publish my critique-review of the severely flawed article by Whitesides & Hoopes, giving us all a yes or no option with a non-negotiable decision he had made. He would publish my review as planned, and Whitesides & Hoopes would

lighted repeatedly to frame and critique “the 2012 phenomenon” in such a way that renders the entire 2012 topic meaningless, a joke (including what has been my central concern for two decades — that being the effort to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012). This seems to be a response of the guild to the valid pioneering work published by independent researchers, outsiders to their guild, such as myself. John Hoopes is perhaps the most notable critic who has employed unethical and unprofessional tactics in several publications, which I’ve exposed in this particular piece.

Nevertheless, the same exposés of bad and biased scholarship can be applied to his previous publications, such as his comments about my background and sources in *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. XXII, which includes an insinuation that I plagiarized astrologer Dane Rudhyar for my 2012 alignment reconstruction. My attempts to rectify these baseless lies, by trying to contact Hoopes as well as the journal editor, John B. Carlson, and the publisher (University of Texas Press), met with a wall of denial and unethical protectionism. It’s probable that my valid and reasonable scholarship, though “independently” grown via my own dedicated study of the Maya world for going on 30 years, could only be recognized by a European journal that wasn’t invested in 2012 debunking and JMJ bashing, as seems to be the case among a milieu of American Maya scholars and their publishing arms. I basically had to *go outside the corrupt system of American academia* to seek corrections to the ongoing unfair and unprofessional treatment of my work, *which is rooted in the idea that rational investigators might be able to reconstruct what the ancient Maya actually thought about 2012*. For some reason, this basic idea is threatening to scholars like Hoopes and Whitesides, probably because they became committed to the counter-position (that 2012 is an invention of various writers influenced by Theosophy or the 1970s New Age marketplace) before the Tortuguero Monument 6 “2012” inscription was definitively deciphered (by MacLeod & Gronemeyer in 2010 and see my 2010 SAA presentation for the astronomy). Instead of abandoning previous convictions now proven false, they instead went on the defensive and employed various unethical tactics of mitigation against those, such as myself, who have been arguing that 2012 is an authentic artifact of ancient Maya cosmology and is a valid topic of rational investigation (Jenkins 1994, 1998, 2002, 2009).* ---JMJ January 23, 2014.

*Jenkins 1994 = The “How and Why” article, Jenkins 1998 = *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*; Jenkins 2002 = *Galactic Alignment*; and Jenkins 2009 = *The 2012 Story*.

Appendix 1: Email to Whitesides with My Review of His Archaeoastronomy Journal Vol. XXIV Article of late-2012

Here is my final attempted communication to Whitesides (November 19, 2013), wondering when he was planning to respond to my emails of July, regarding his article with Hoopes, and offering him a critique of his “2,012” article that appeared in *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXIV. By this time I was disappointed at getting strung along by Whitesides, as he had also done previously. I gave him the two-to-three months he requested, then contact him in late September or early October, when he irately said he was a still busy. I waited a few more weeks, sent him an email, no reply. Then I sent this

email of November 19. After several weeks and still no reply, I began writing my critique for *Zeitschrift fur Anomalistic* in early December.

Dear Kevin, [November 19, 2013]

Your posting of your Archaeo XXIV article from last year on Academia.edu caused me to pull out my notes, from when I read it last September (in 2012). A few things that I hope you can address:

I'm rather astonished that you didn't mention my book *The 2012 Story* (Penguin, 2009), which provided a summary of the 2012 theories, the history of the Long Count, and also a critique of academia's treatment of the topic (including correcting errors committed by Aveni, Stuart, and others). You cite another book from 2011, so it should have been on your reading list, especially since you've presumed to assert so many under-informed and mistaken things about my work, methods, and interpretations.

You devote many lines to a quote from Judith Polich (1999), which partially and inaccurately paraphrases my 2012 alignment theory. I find that rather curious. Why would you devote so much space to a person who was mangling my ideas? And zero lines actually quoted from me on that same topic? Hmmmm ... You must have learned that tactic from Van Stone. The fact is that I was in correspondence with Polich in '98 after my book came out, and before she published her book. I guess what you demonstrated is that another author found my ideas worthy of summarizing, except your readers wouldn't be able to conclude that because you were vague.

Your article appeared in *Archaeoastronomy journal*. How many of the 2000+ books you allude to based their 2012 ideas on archaeoastronomy? Can you name one? Are you aware that my work at Izapa, which provides the evidence for my reconstruction work, is based in archaeoastronomy? I'd think you should be, but perhaps that was selectively forgotten. So, one book would be my *Izapa Cosmos* book of 1996. Or my book of 1995 called *The Center of Mayan Time*. Or, most importantly, my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. You might not be aware of my 2011 book called *Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions* --- though not dealing with Izapa, it is also uses archaeoastronomy to argue what the ancient Maya were thinking about 2012. That book would fall into the self-published category. Like Van Stone's.

You made a point, in End Note #16, to mention that the McKennas noted the galactic alignment in their 1975 book, citing an earlier brief allusion in *Hamlet's Mill* (1969). Of course, I also noted these occurrences (in Appendix 1 to my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, in the interest of documenting the idea.) BUT, you didn't point out that neither of those books make a specific connection between the galactic alignment and 2012, nor a connection between the galactic alignment and the Maya. Furthermore, my work is vastly different from those two books because I provided evidence, citations, and arguments for the presence of the galactic alignment concept within Maya institutions and traditions, based on the context of the Long Count's place and time of origin --- the Izapan civilization.

Your construct gives the impression that I merely imitated previous work. What I'd like to see is an acknowledgement of the many pioneering and unprecedented contributions I've made, many of which have been plagiarized or parroted by both scholars and laypeople, rather than your cheap and loose conflation of me with the 2012 marketplace mess (much of which I also was the first to critique and expose the fallacies of).

It's nice that you thanked Hoopes and Grossinger for their contributions and help; both are quite misinformed on key points but I'm sure they nevertheless had something to contribute to your constructions. I suppose the vast amount of explanations, resources, and corrections I've offered you in email exchanges over the years were not worthy of acknowledging.

In your future writings on 2012 (which perhaps there won't be because you'll just move onto the next arena like every other trend follower) it would be helpful to your readers if you could identify

a distinction between books that have been concerned with debunking the existing ideas about 2012 (all four of the books by the scholars fall into this category) and books that were engaged in trying to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 (my books). Do you think there is no place for this category within your otherwise all-inclusive treatment? Ask yourself this: what 2012 books presented research into what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 that resulted in interpretations which were later echoed in much-belated treatments of the topic by scholars?

Your article wonders if the 2012 publishing phenomenon is going to end. Well, no, not as long as I'm alive. Because I will continue to publish the unfolding research and evidence that relates to reconstructing ancient Maya cosmology and time philosophy. Part of that will certainly involve presenting the emerging new evidence regarding Izapa, Tortuguero, Palenque, Copan, La Corona, and the ancient Maya awareness of the future galactic alignment of era-2012, but I suspect you won't be interested in that, since you aren't interested in any of the already existing evidence. You repeatedly avoid reporting that my work is concerned with that approach. (Instead you quote the distorted secondary summaries of my work by other writers, just like Van Stone did.) Another aspect of future 2012-related publications will involve my multi-volume chronicle of how 2012 revealed the abject failure of many Maya scholars to behave professionally and decently, including the failure of critics to respond to my corrections and overtures for discussion. I have correspondence going back to the early 1990s; it's quite amazing to revisit and see just where the bad behavior began.

By the way, what's your revised time frame for responding to my rebuttal to the piece you published with Hoopes in *Zeitschrift fur Anomalisk*, that I sent in July? Is it on the docket at all for you? Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

<http://www.theCenterfor2012studies.com>

<http://www.Update2012.com>

<http://www.Alignment2012.com>

<http://www.JohnMajorJenkins.com>

Appendix 2. Previous Queries to the Authors, in mid-2013

I could post here the email exchanges of July, when I first read their article and sent some queries to them both. But this gets to be too repetitive and involved, and for a summary is unnecessary. But the actual exchanges of June 2013 are very revealing, so I link them here: <http://www.alignment2012.com/email-WhitesidesHoopes-June2013.pdf>. In summary, Hoopes responded with a brief request that I send him all my books. This was a recurring *leit motif* in his ill-considered evasive responses to my previous requests for the evidence for his defamatory assertions about me and my work in his previous publications. His goal is to build a compromising polemical argument against me based on my early writings and things I've said in my multi-genre output since the 1980s, including my poetry and personal spiritual quests which contain speculations, dreams, hopes of a young man looking for meaning, and my spiritual visions.

As for Kevin, he did acknowledge that the citation to my 1998 book did seem to be in error, and told me that he was responsible for the "hermeneutics" comment, but he begged off and said he didn't have time to really get into responding to my several points of correction. He needed two months or so. I contacted him again in late September, but he kept begging off. Meanwhile, I noted that he seemed to have lots of time for posting

things and corresponding with others on Facebook, including long exchanges with other posters. I sent a hinting message to his Facebook page, which made him mad. I then responded that I could send him an abridged treatment of my corrections and questions, which he could easily read and respond to in about 45 minutes. No response. Another query to him later. Ignored. Then my email of November 19. Ignored. Thus I began composing my critique of their article in early December, which was approved by the journal editors on December 16. It can't be said that I didn't try to have an informal conversation with them, repeatedly, before I pursued registering the necessary corrections through official academic channels. It should be a lesson to ethically-challenged scholars --- if they are still capable of learning lessons --- to not abuse the peer-review system to craft false narrative, using vague citation practices while asserting misleading and mitigating things about other researchers. It's no surprise that after more than two decades of trying to have rational conversations with professional scholars, I've had to conclude that a high percentage of them are not doing rational scholarship or science, but something of a more dubious nature, like paradigm maintenance, mitigating outsiders by wielding unethical tactics (guild protection), and status-quo reinforcement.



22,011 words. Compiled January 23, 2014.
Several emails deleted on August 8, 2014.

This exchange is freely offered for the purpose of academic critique and is provided to augment my critique-review titled "Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)", published in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (written in December 2013), and the authors' response to my critique (which was to be completed by February 1, 2014).