

The Rest of the Iceberg: Appendix 1 to *Ivory Tower, House of Cards: How Scholars and Their Publishers Violate Science* by John Major Jenkins (November 2015).

Brief Preamble

I feel compelled to say a few things, as the effort of compiling and writing this appendix was accomplished on an important anniversary — November 7, 1996 was the day I completed my monograph *Izapa Cosmos*, which signaled the finalizing of my book *Maya Cosmogony 2012*. That monograph became Part IV in the book. So much of my life as an author and teacher has unfolded during this past 19 years, one Metonic cycle. I've gone into this a bit in the preface to this book, *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*.

I feel a sense of relief to be signing off on this book. This appendix, as one can see, is practically a book-length compilation in itself. I had to assess and read and summarize and compile these items, hunting down original MSWord docs, so it's been a long couple of days. I went for a walk earlier, and it's a briskly sunny Fall day in Colorado. The sun has just gone down, as I see through the trees from my office window. I just got back from a short motorcycle ride, over to the liquor store nearby. A beer and a whiskey shooter. Home now, I celebrate with gratitude the blessings of my life, and finally finishing this project.

The main text of the narrative — the book itself — runs some 64,000 words. Appendix 1, here completed, runs to over 50,000 words. Appendix 2 is in the body of the book — an annotated list of online links. Appendix 3 consists of the evidentiary documents and correspondence with scholars and their publishers, running to some 97,500 words. Appendices 1 and 3 are conceived to be separate, free, online resources, but their content is summarized within the narrative of the book, in the Appendices section. The entire book totals 210,000 words.

It is November 7, 2015, 2 Chuen in the 260-day Tzolkin calendar. In the New Era Long Count dating that I prefer, it is 0.0.2.16.11. If you understand my arguments and the evidence I've assembled, it is not a 6th Age that we have entered (as Frank Waters believed), but the 1st Age (of five repeating World Ages) in an entire precessional cycle of some 25,800 years. That might sound incredible, but there are reasons for it, ones that embrace ancient cosmological ideas among not only the Maya, but among a host of ancient global traditions. And now there is reason to believe that galactic alignments, as the midnight and noon markers of the Great Year, are tied to a process of change on the planet that human beings are beginning to recover, remember, revive, and understand (for the first time since before recorded history began).

It is late 2015. The 11th day of the 16th Uinal of the 2nd Tun — 1,051 days after December 21, 2012. The tail end of era-2012, the alignment range I identified and defined in the mid-1990s. A sabbatical is in order, but one reprisal remains to be explored: the World Age importance of December 21, 2020. Until then, signing off,

John Major Jenkins
Windsor Colorado • 2 Chuen. LC 0.0.2.16.11

Appendix 1. The Rest of the Iceberg

There are a very many additional examples of bad behavior and sub-standard scholarship by professional Mayanists that could be discussed here. A much fuller treatment can be found at Update2012 (<http://www.Update2012.com>). For this Appendix I have selected four examples which cover a spectrum of different representational issues.

Two additional items (items five and six) are, I must emphasize, not in the category of scholars violating science; but they are not without problems. The first is my review of an important award-winning essay published in mid-2012, by Barbara MacLeod and Mark Van Stone. In it, I respond to an invitation to be persuaded as to the question of the creators of the Long Count knowing about precession and intentionally designing their calendar to target the future galactic alignment in era-2012. Related to the first item, the second item reviews an article Michael Grofe wrote in 2003, which is publicly posted on the *Maya Exploration Center* website.

I'll cover the seventeen items/topics in the following list:

- David Stuart & Stephen Houston
- Nicholas Campion
- Mark Van Stone
- Stanley Guenter
- Review of MacLeod & Van Stone's "Great Return" article, with my response to the invitation/challenge
- Review of Michael Grofe's 2003 article
- Various Others (12 topics, see p. 37)

The reader will notice the final, seventh, item: Various Others. A few other books and authors on 2012 are worth mentioning and contextualizing in relation to the overall academic attitudes toward 2012. For example, the book by historians Matthew Restall & Amara Solari called *2012 and the End of the World* (2011); *Apocalyptic Fever* by Richard G. Kyle (2012). And a rare open-minded book, by literature professor Robert Sitler, called *The Living Maya* (2010).

a. David Stuart & Stephen Houston

These are two well-respected epigraphers who mentioned the 2012 date on Tortuguero Monument 6 in a 1996 journal publication. During the many years that I was debating 2012 on the University of Texas Mesoamerica Forum and the academic e-list Aztlán (which they both were members of), neither volunteered the information about the 2012 date on the Tortuguero monument. This was odd, considering that many times other scholars asserted, as a critique of my work, that "there are no Classic Period 2012 inscriptions."

The news was forced out in early 2006, through the efforts of Geoff Stray and Robert Sitler, with David Stuart then offering a rough translation on the UT Meso Forum in April 2006. My subsequent research revealed that not only Stuart & Houston (in 1996), but Gillespie & Joyce (in 1998) and Brigham Young University scholars (around 2000) had noted the 2012 inscription on Tortuguero Monument 6. In her concordance of Maya Verbs (1982) Linda Schele had noted it, and Robert

Sitler pointed out to me that it was also briefly noted in the voluminous end-notes to *A Forest of Kings* (1990), which Schele co-wrote with David Freidel. So, many scholars were aware of this 2012 text, but none were very forthcoming about it. For example, during the lengthy debate about my 2012 work on the Aztlan e-list, in the summer of 1999, no scholar volunteered the information.

The issue with Stuart & Houston pertains to their very first assumption about the text, found in footnote 7 on page 301 of their 1996 article:

The reference is notable for its uniqueness. Prophecy forms an important body of colonial literature but is poorly represented in classic Maya texts, where future statements relate almost exclusively to impersonal events that are safely predictable (e.g., the 13 baktuns will be finished at 13.0.0.0.0 in the Maya Long Count) (Stuart & Houston 1996: 301, n. 7).

“Impersonal events” that are “safely predictable.” In other words, not really a “prophecy” of some future event to occur in 2012. Confusingly, Gillespie & Joyce interpreted it as such even while citing Stuart & Houston’s article:

As more Classic-period occurrences of the name Bolon Yokte are found, we will better understand his symbolic referents and relationships. For example, the name appears on Tortuguero Monument 6 in the context of a future event, the end of the current Great Cycle that began on 4 Ahau 8 Cumku (Gillespie and Joyce, 1998: 291, n. 16).

Please note that in both cases the mentions of the date were relegated to footnotes outside of the primary considerations of the text. These items were gathered together in an essay I published online in May of 2006 (<http://www.alignment2012.com/bolon-yokte.html>) which was expanded and rewritten for *New Dawn* magazine (September 2006). That article was called “The Maya Lord of Creation and 2012,” using a phrase (the “Lord of Creation”) that was replicated later by John B. Carlson in his articles discussing Bolon Yokte, God L, and 2012.

Stuart & Houston (1996) admitted that their interpretation of the inscription as involving the “descent” of the Bolon Yokte K’u had “some technical problems.” Although re-offered in 2006, it quickly came under scrutiny and was superseded by the work of Barbara MacLeod and other epigraphers. Nevertheless, Stuart and Houston tenaciously held onto their falsified position that there was no future event indicated on the monument, that it was a “prophecy that wasn’t.” Houston argued this in a 2008 blog post, with Stuart reinforcing it in a 2011 blog post. David Stuart was on record several times (e.g., the NPR “Earth Sky” interview of April 4, 2012) asserting in no uncertain terms that there was “absolutely not” any future event indicated in the inscription. By April of 2012, however, MacLeod and Gronemeyer’s work (August 2010) was long available, which showed the reasons why a future event was indicated in 2012 — nothing all that controversial, just a period-ending ceremony involving Bolon Yokte. The reason involved the verb placement *after* the date statement, followed

by the Bolon Yokte passage. A typical “event” formula was thus identified: Date, verb action, subject of action.

One of the main problems with the attitude of Stuart & Houston is typical of scientist types. They believe that Maya mythology is the realm of the imagination, and has no connection to astronomy. We see this bias quite clearly in their essay of 1994, which I reviewed in 1995 (see <http://alignment2012.com/fap11.html> and appendix in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998)). But some other bias is present, especially evident in Stuart’s comments. When John Hoopes announced, on the UT Meso Forum, the favorable treatment of my work in the New York Times (July 2007, <http://alignment2012.com/NYTimes.html>), Stuart responded by saying he had “little patience for 2012 pseudo-science (a kind term)” and that real Maya traditions were “as awe-inspiring as anything that modern gurus can conjure from their imaginations.” (David Stuart, July 2, 2007, UT Meso Forum) Later, he blamed “New Age hacks” for the origin of the 2012 doomsday meme. (This false statement remains uncorrected to this day: <https://decipherment.wordpress.com/2009/10/11/q-a-about-2012/>.) As late as December 22, 2012, Stuart’s maledictive contempt was evident when he wrote on his Facebook page: “Frustrated to see the “Mayans were wrong” meme now being repeated in the media. No they weren’t, folks. The various hacks, junk scientists, tourism boards, and galaxy-gazing self-promoters who misrepresented the ancient Maya and their calendar were the ones who were wrong, as we knew all along.” Here, “galaxy-gazing” seems drawn from the title of Chapter 23 (“Gazing into the Galaxy”) in my 1998 book.

His 2011 book on 2012 (*The Order of Days*) likewise exhibited a perverse cluelessness and a baseless denunciation of my work. My review of Stuart’s book is essential for understanding the unfortunate reflex that kept many scholars from looking at the evidence for how the ancient Maya thought about 2012: <http://update2012.com/review-stuartsbook.html>. See also our exchange in 2007: <http://alignment2012.com/stuartexchange.html> and my response to Stuart “2012 Q & A” blog: <http://update2012.com/responsetostuartsblog.html>.

As for Houston, his blog post “What Will Not Happen in 2012” says a lot, and my comments suggest where his thinking on 2012 has ignored an important parallel between the building dedication and the 2012 date, as “like-in-kind” events that point to “worldrenewal” as the likely interpretation for how they were thinking about 2012: <https://decipherment.wordpress.com/2008/12/20/what-will-not-happen-in-2012/>. But he didn’t respond to my comments, which were also reported in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin Books). Instead, Houston engaged in an email with Van Stone, right on the heels of my comment offered on his blog, in which they referred to me as a “mosquito” and that Houston didn’t see any need to respond to my comment because I wasn’t an epigrapher (emails shared with me, of early January 2009). However, the point I made did not have to do with epigraphy, but with a cosmological parallel, in Maya thought, between “house” and “cosmos” — one which Houston himself has identified and written about!

As recently as 2015 Houston maintains a dismissive attitude toward 2012, as can be seen in the role he played in rewriting the revised 9th edition of Michael Coe’s book *The Maya* (1966).

See my full review and comments in Appendix 3. Stuart's attitude to 2012 seems to have waffled in the direction that there may be a "literary device" common to both the La Corona 2012 inscription and the Tortuguero 2012 inscription — ideas which start to rub shoulders with my own. See <http://alignment2012.com/12-3-2012.html>. Also see <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/LaCorona2012-StepbyStepguide.pdf> for my rejected/censored comment offered to Stuart's blog, on the La Corona 2012 inscription.

b. Nicholas Campion

As mentioned elsewhere, I pitched an article around 1999 to Nicholas Campion, in response to his advertisement for submissions to his *Culture and Cosmos* journal. I didn't get a response, and my intended essay evolved into a piece I posted on my website (<http://alignment2012.com/lzapa.html>), which in turn evolved into a chapter in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*.

I was somewhat surprised to see Campion included in the Oxford IX Archaeoastronomy conference, where Maya scholars would be talking about 2012. The conference papers were fast-tracked by John B. Carlson for publication in the *IAU Vol. 7 no. 278*, edited by Clive Ruggles and released in July of 2011. Campion's contribution cited my work in the context of a "Maya Prophecy Movement" (MPM), which seems to be a concept of his own devising. The example of Campion is useful because he represents an outsider to Maya Studies looking in, as it were. He is especially relevant because he wrote a book called *The Great Year*, about the precession of the equinoxes, astrology and astronomy. How my work fits into some of his pet topics could have been more deftly treated, but it seems he decided to identify the party-line on how to frame my work, without seeming to have much of an understanding about it. For example, citing only my 1998 book, he seemed oblivious to the three books that followed, the last of which came out in 2009, giving him plenty of time to be updated and informed before writing his own piece in 2011.

When I read Campion's 2014 book, in mid-2015, I could see that he was fixed upon some odd notions about 2012, and decided to reach out with a simple question. The ensuing exchange is interesting, evasive, and not untypical of everything else demonstrated in this book. My initial email of July 28, 2015, with the Subject line "Greetings from Maya researcher John Major Jenkins":

Dear Nicholas Campion,

July 28, 2015

I've been meaning to contact you for some time, but the illness of my wife and other challenges have made life difficult. Part of the difficulty is the seemingly bottomless amount of mistaken readings and careless treatment of my work — some of it innocently under-informed but quite a bit of it intentionally malicious (e.g., the efforts of John Hoopes). I seem to possess an unpopular ethic in which I invite dialogue with critics and commentators, so that I can understand better where they are coming from, and that they

may better understand and represent my work.¹ As such, I have a specific question for you, regarding your articulation of a "Maya Prophecy Movement."

I'll be as brief as possible. I've always appreciated your work and I agree with your perspectives in most of what you've written on ancient cosmology and astrology. One issue I've had, however, relates to your MPM construct and my role in it. In your *IAU* article of 2011, I am definitely placed within this category, which is presented primarily with doomsday overtones. You do provide a query regarding whether the MPM is "violent or peaceful" and quote Eden Sky for the "peaceful" contingency. Your comment, which segues to my astronomy work, that Arguelles's 2012 interpretation involves an "exact astronomical and calendrical alignment" (p. 250) is very misleading — especially in your context of introducing the precession of the equinoxes and my galactic alignment reconstruction (in the same paragraph). I often see these kinds of loose conflation of my work with ridiculous notions and authors such as Arguelles, who you note produced an "imaginative reconstruction of the Mayan original" (2012:64). (Actually, it's not a "reconstruction" at all but an *intentionally constructed modern myth* with Arguelles at the center, a "new dispensation" from the mouth of the discarnate Pakal, and a total re-imagining — which I exposed in my 1992 book titled *Tzolkin* and my 1996 online article "The Key to the Dreamspell Agenda".)

I can only encourage a greater discerning and application of informed critical thinking. As I've discussed since the 1990s and clearly presented in my book *The 2012 Story* (2009), Arguelles' "galactic synchronization" is *not* the same as the galactic alignment. This galactic synchronization is a loosely defined and stated mystical concept, and certainly is not an "exact" astronomy. I assume you did not read my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, or anything else I wrote after *Maya Cosmogony 2012* (including my chapter in the Gelfer anthology of 2011, *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*) — not to mention thousands of pages of interviews, articles, and essays on my various websites, freely available.

I can now ask my rather pointed question. In the *IAU* (2011) anthology which you contributed to, there are essays by Carlson, MacLeod, and Callaway which explicitly discuss 2012 in terms of a "prophecy." My work does not offer a "prophecy" for 2012 in any way comparable to what your other members of the MPM have done. Rather, I articulated that the Maya Creation Myth is a cultural and cosmological

¹ My work, simply stated, has been concerned since the mid-1980s with reconstructing aspects of ancient Maya astronomy, cosmology, and mythology. When I understood, in the late 1980s, that the 13-Baktun cycle ending in the Long Count fell accurately on a December solstice, I was intrigued to investigate whether this was coincidental or intentional. I was emboldened when I discovered that Maya scholar Munro Edmonson (1988) had also noted this, and considered it unlikely to be coincidence. However, his speculative output on the question amounted to about four sentences, and was not pursued. My findings and interpretations of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya are easily stated, but are never accurately summarized by critics before my work is put down or dismissed. I find this troubling and unacceptable. I expect more from professional scholars.

artifact that encapsulates what the Maya expected at cycle endings — that the vain and false ruler Seven Macaw (the archetype of self-serving egoism) was bound to appear. As I've stated in my work, this is not exactly a prophecy (especially in the sense assumed by various 2012 prophets and their critics), but an understanding of cycle dynamics. Similarly, the galactic alignment of era-2012 is not a "prophecy" or a "prediction," but an astronomical calculation. **My question is: why are Carlson, Callaway, and MacLeod not part of your MPM category, but I am?** If the answer is that they are attempting to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 — well, that has also been my *modus operandi* since the early 1990s (a time when virtually every scholar, scientist, astronomer, and academic publisher considered 2012 to be a joke, not a valid topic of intellectual investigation).

Your continuing interest in Maya astrology/astronomy came to my attention when I noted the publication of your book *Astrology and Cosmology in World Religions* (2012). On page 64 you mention Arguelles as being the inspiration behind the 2012 doomsday movie (certainly not; it was Graham Hancock whose 1995 book *Fingerprints of the Gods* was optioned for a handsome price). Then you cite (end-note 32) John Hoopes's article in Gelfer's anthology (*Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, 2011) for the argument against the various dubious 2012 theories. Well, ahem, I've been writing about exactly that, often, since the 1990s. Critiquing what later came to be called "the 2012 phenomenon" has been an aspect of my work since the early 1990s — e.g., I exposed the errors of Arguelles's Dreamspell system in my book *Tzolkin* (1992/1994). The use of the phrase "the 2012 phenomenon" by myself, Jonathan Zap, and Geoff Stray, going back to before Hoopes and other scholars appropriated it, *includes* scholarly writings and critiques of 2012. And why should this not be so? Because elitist scholars like Hoopes wish to separate myself from the realm of scholarly infallibility — even though they come lately to the topic, armed with prejudice, bias, and an inability to accurately understand and assess the philosophical and astronomical material under consideration. Hoopes wishes to containerize unwanted outsiders to the Guild, to basically construct a virtual concentration camp. The effort targets threatening individuals, including myself, even while my pioneering ideas have come to be echoed and explored by professional Maya scholars, without credit given despite my frequent direct communication with them.

The problem with citing this article by Hoopes is that you validate a biased "debunker" whose attitude to my work, and 2012, is best called juvenile, contemptuous, and malicious. The examples are numerous and proven. He is hostile to the idea that 2012 had meaning to the ancient Maya. His friend John Carlson is complicit in green-lighting and then defending two false and slanderous statements Hoopes published in *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Volume 22 (released March 2011). Why Carlson would like to support a false mitigation of me will become clear in a moment.

Hoopes's "Mayanism" term in his article's title, which you cited, is an invented construct that Hoopes lifted and distorted out of an earlier proactive usage by anthropologists

(Kay Warren and Victor Montejo), where it was not used in the pejorative way that Hoopes uses it. Hoopes's "Mayanism" construct reveals his effort to trademark his own concept which is basically synonymous with "the 2012 Phenomenon." We see his interchangeable usage in the article he wrote with Whitesides for *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (2012). In this article, Whitesides & Hoopes state that Robert Sitler (2006) coined and defined the phrase "the 2012 phenomenon." This is not true; but it indicates how Hoopes and Whitesides seek to rewrite the accurate narrative and whitewash the credit deserved by independent scholars working outside their guild. I published a corrective rebuttal, which was approved and published in the same peer-review journal (2014)² in which I cited my own and Geoff Stray's use of that term going back, demonstrably to 2002. (There is also an early occurrence of it in an unpublished book outline in my archives from 1996). Sitler used it because *he got it from the phone conversations I had with him*, in 2004, while he was writing his 2006 article for *Nova Religio*. It is used more than once in Stray's published book, *Beyond 2012*, of 2005. Incredibly, in their response to my published critique, Hoopes and Whitesides wiggled around admitting this and several other damaging errors. Maya Studies suffers for claiming such hostile, low-quality scholars, who are unethical and unable to admit and correct errors, and intentionally propagate slanderous, false, and damaging assertions about a living person.

It's ironic that you cited Hoopes's article in the Gelfer anthology, because I have a chapter in the same anthology. You should read it.³ I also wrote a review of the anthology, specifically to respond to the ridiculous and misleading critiques of my work offered by Larsen and Hoopes.⁴ My exposé of Hoopes's flawed "Mayanism" was also published in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (international distribution with Tarcher/Penguin Books). The same fact-based exposé was registered in the Talk pages of the Mayanism Wikipedia entry that Hoopes has constructed since 2008; consequently, there was a call by other Wiki members to delete the page, due to its problematic status.

Meanwhile, Michael Grofe's work has been finding evidence that the Maya could accurately track the Sidereal Year, the Tropical Year, and thus the precession of the equinoxes (see his article in the IAU anthology). This is the kind of evidence that supports my work, not to mention the publications on the "2012" text from Tortuguero (including my 2010 SAA presentation, freely available on my website since late 2010). It is the kind of evidence that critics like Hoopes and Aveni either ignore or snidely misrepresent.

It's been unfortunate to witness you and other observers of the 2012 topic fall into line behind the malicious debunkers — most of whom are adamantly fixated to their conviction, adopted in the 1990s, that 2012 means nothing — that it is not an authentic artifact of ancient Maya thought (e.g., Houston and Stuart). This is not a tenable position, especially given the two 2012 inscriptions (La Corona and Tortuguero)

² Posted, free, as a PDF at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

³ Also posted online at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

⁴ Likewise at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

and the work of Grofe, Carlson, Callaway and MacLeod. The problem seems to lie in the inability of critics to recognize that my work with 2012 is in a completely different category of approach than the marketplace goofballs with whom I'm conflated. You placed me in the Maya Prophecy Movement category. My interpretations, based on evidence at Izapa, in the Creation Myth, the ballgame, and king-making rites — are simply stated as a two-part paradigm involving astronomy and ideology. The astronomy is the precession-based galactic alignment and the ideology is the doctrine that 'deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal'. The first part is being supported more and more by MacLeod's 3-11 Pik formula and Grofe's work (and evidence on Tortuguero Monument 6). Note that my interpretations are based on *evidence within Maya traditions and the site credited by scholars as being involved in formulating the Long Count / 2012 calendar*. What could be more relevant? I believed, in the early 1990s, that evidence could be explored to offer an interpretation of what the Maya believed about 2012. I did this, through many books and articles, while professional Maya scholars lampooned and dismissed. It was not until the 2010 monograph by MacLeod & Gronemeyer, on the 2012 inscription from Tortuguero, that Maya scholars published an investigation focused on what 2012 may have meant to the ancient Maya. This was 16 years after I first published on 2012, with this approach.

The second part of my reconstruction work (the "ideology" or "spiritual teaching" part) is explicitly echoed in the work of John B. Carlson, beginning with his Oxford/Peru presentation and the resulting IAU article of 2011. He reiterated this interpretation of 2012, that *deity sacrifice and world-renewal go together in 2012* — which echoes my work. And, brace yourself, I pitched my work to him (in writing) for publication in his *Archaeoastronomy Journal* in 1994, 1995, and 1999. He ignored and declined, despite phone calls in 1997 and 1998. You can make of that what you will. After he falsely denigrated my knowledge of Maya astronomy in a lecture he gave in May 2010, and I called him on it, he's ignored my numerous cordial attempts to dialogue with him.

I've even allowed for the possibility that he worked out a Classic Period expression of the same paradigm that I reconstructed at Izapa, in the pre-Classic period. He reiterated his work again in the recent book *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (eds. Milbrath & Dowd, 2015), where Ed Krupp snidely alludes to and casts down the "End Times Follies" which, as we can understand from his previous article of 2014 (in the *Handbook of Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy*), I was supposedly involved in creating. As you can imagine, it's a bit strange to have my unprecedented 2012 interpretation (deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal in 2012), which I've enunciated and published since the 1990s, echoed without credit (perhaps even plagiarized) and simultaneously cast down *in the very same book*.

I've ranged over some related topics to provide some context for my simple question to you: **Why am I part of your Maya Prophecy Movement category, while the other scholars who've explicitly discussed the "Maya**

prophecy" of 2012 — in the same anthology in which you contributed your MPM observations — are not? Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

He responded the same day:

Hi John,

Thanks for your letter. I am acknowledging briefly out of courtesy but I am on semi-vacation for a few weeks, so won't answer in detail.

The last thing I would want to do is misrepresent you. When I am back in the uk I will look at my iau article afresh.

If you can give me a few weeks, I will happily reply and will be more than happy for you to set the record straight if I have misrepresented you.

With my best wishes,

Nick

Dr Nicholas Campion,
Director, Sophia Centre for the Study of Cosmology in Culture,
Programme Director, MA Cultural Astronomy and Astrology
Senior Lecturer, School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology,
University of Wales Trinity Saint David,
Lampeter, Ceredigion, Wales, SA48 7ED,UK.

I respond to Nick:

Thank you, I appreciate you looking into this. Please cut me some slack if some of my comments appear angst-ridden. These have been difficult times. Enjoy your vacation! Best wishes,

John

He responds:

Hi John,

that's fine.

I appreciate your independent position as neither being in the academic-critical circle (for want of a better term), nor the Mayan/New Agers (for want of another better term).

best wishes,

Nivk

So, I decided to await his more considered response as promised. Nothing was forthcoming for almost three months,

so I sent a reminder with the Subject line "Awaiting your comments." All emails transpired on October 26, 2015:

Dear Nick, October 26, 2015
It's been almost three months since I sent you my rather lengthy email which nevertheless asked a simple question. I figured three months would give you enough time to consider the various facts I explained in my email. I assumed it was not necessary for me to explicitly provide quotes and citations to the places where Maya scholars have assumed, accepted, discussed, and explored a "Maya prophecy" in 2012 — mainly because they occurred either in anthologies you also contributed to, or sources you've also cited and thus are aware of. So, in essence I was hoping you could answer my question, regarding your "Maya Prophecy Movement" container:

Why am I part of your Maya Prophecy Movement category, while the other scholars who've explicitly discussed the "Maya prophecy" of 2012 — in the same anthology in which you contributed your MPM observations — are not?

It's a straight-forward question. On page 216 of my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*, after discussing the monuments and archaeoastronomy at Izapa, I wrote: "**...these three ways of thinking about the alignment are not in conflict. Instead, they reveal to us the ways that the creators of the Long Count thought about the era-2012 alignment. There is no "prophecy" here.**"

Ironically, this quote is from Chapter 18 of my book, which was closely based on the essay I prepared in 1999 and pitched for publication to various outlets, including Carlson's *Archaeoastronomy Journal* and your *Culture and Cosmos* periodical.[1] Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

1. <http://www.amazon.com/Culture-Cosmos-Number-Nicholas-Campion/dp/1907767681>

He responded that same day:

Dear John,

I presume the sentence you are querying is this: 'The favoured application of precession in the MPM is the coming conjunction between the December solstice sun and the Galactic equator (Jenkins 1998)'.

Given that you wrote the major literature on this conjunction, and that it became a favoured astronomical motif of the MPM, I don't see the problem. The sentence can be read as assuming either that you are part of the MPM or not. It doesn't say, and I didn't state you are part of it.

I didn't write the sentence as you are reading it.
Best wishes,
Nick

My response:

Nick,

Thanks for your quick response. In citing my 1998 book in that passage (below), you are conveying that my work is responsible for "the favoured application of precession in the MPM". If you did not intend to include me as a member of your MPM, and knowing that such an association has dubious implications, then why didn't you provide a note or caveat to make that clear to the reader? You might, for example, cite my work for my arguments as to how the said precessional alignment was embedded by the Maya into their various traditions, but then cite others who appropriated my work and leveraged it into a dubious MPM context (such as Brent Miller, Gregg Braden, or Lawrence Joseph). Without that distinction, your statement enables a loose conflation and blame applied to me — when in fact I did not approve of how my work was co-opted and distorted by others.

"The favoured application of precession in the MPM is the coming conjunction between the December solstice sun and the Galactic equator (Jenkins 1998)." (Campion 2011)

The other part of my simple question involves all of the other scholars who assume, accept, discuss and explore a "Maya prophecy" in 2012 (Callaway, Carlson, MacLeod) — in the same IAU anthology in which your article appeared, based on the Oxford IX conference in Peru (January 2011). Since they explicitly assume and embrace a "Maya prophecy" in 2012, why were they not part of your Maya Prophecy Movement?

John

He offers a defense rather than an answer:

Hi John,

I had one sentence in which to make the point and I thought you were the best reference. The reference doesn't actually give anything away about your attitude. For all the reader knows you might have said the whole thing is complete rubbish!

If I ever expand on this I will certainly make things clearer as you suggest. best wishes,

Nick

By this time I was tired of this kind of evasive semantic run-around. Please note that he never answered my question, as to why the other Maya scholars were not included in his MPM category. And so it goes.

Nick,

Okay, fair enough. Thanks. My friend Michael Grofe mentioned a while back that an article based on his presentation at your conference (Sophia Center) was going to be published in one of your anthologies. Was that released yet? Can you direct me to it? Thanks,

John

His concluding response:

Hi John,
Michael's article is in press - hopefully out before too long,
all the best,
Nick

So, another exchange and my simple question was evaded. The obvious supposition is that he simply perceives that "real" scholars can't be guilty of the prophetic utterances which his vaguely conceived MPM concept implies.

c. Mark Van Stone

My various critiques of Van Stone's extremely problematic writings and statements about 2012 can be found at Update2012.com (<http://www.Update2012.com>). The following paragraphs are taken from that site:

Mark Van Stone. Author of the self-published book *2012: Science and Creation*. Van Stone's dubious strategy of critiquing my work, by constructing work-arounds, is transparently clear as documented in the detailed exchanges we had in 2008 and 2009. All of what I offered in response to his questions and comments was totally ignored in his 2010 book. He quoted popular New Age author Gregg Braden for a loose definition of the galactic alignment, and proceeded to critique the galactic alignment without citing my work or even mentioning my name as the originator of the "2012 alignment reconstruction" — the first person who showed that the galactic alignment involved astronomical features and concepts that were known to the Maya. Our email exchanges of 2008, which he instigated, are here:

<http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008.html> and <http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008-2.html>. After my book *The 2012 Story* was released in October 2009, he sent me a fairly hostile email, which I responded to in November 2009:

<http://www.update2012.com/ResponsetoMarkVanStone.html>. Around March of 2010 his book was released; it was an elaboration of a Power Point presentation he devised in 2008 and posted in an image-and-text form on the FAMSI website. Despite its convoluted organization and errors of fact, it was lauded and endorsed by his friends John Hoopes and John Carlson. My first review of the published book (June of 2010) is here:

http://www.update2012.com/Review_Mark_Van_Stone-book.html. A few months later I invited Mark (along with other scholars) to participate in the debate of my SAA presentation on the Tortuguero astronomy. This became the MEC-FACEBOOK Debate of November-December 2010. He declined, and a brief email exchange ensued: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone-emails-Dec2010.pdf>.

My review of his chapter in the anthology *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (ed. J. Gelfer, 2011), is here: <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>. A more pointed critique of some truly bizarre assertions in his 2010 book is

here: <http://www.update2012.com/Survey-Comments-Van-Stone.html>. (Among these is the incredible statement that apparently gives credit to five scholars for already exploring the galactic alignment, when the sources cited don't even mention it). I also critiqued some of Mark's specific comments in the award-winning essay he co-wrote with epigrapher Barbara MacLeod: <http://update2012.com/Comments-on-Great-Return-8-2014.pdf>.

Below are a few items that are worth directly reprinting in this appendix.

Brief Survey of Comments in Van Stone's 2012 Book John Major Jenkins (8-20-2014)

Van Stone's *2012: Science and Prophecy of the Ancient Maya* (2010) was elaborated from a 2008 Power Point presentation, originally posted online on FAMSI in late 2008. It's gone through several iterations and was officially released in book form in early-2010. My copy is dated May 11, 2010. Although I've already reviewed the book (<http://www.Update2012.com>) it's worth revisiting in a concise way to observe how Van Stone has treated my work. We can do this by searching through the text for his references to key items from my work, such as "Izapa", "galactic alignment", "dark rift", "solstice", "Milky Way", and my name, "Jenkins." In a nutshell, despite our lengthy earlier email exchanges (in 2008) he avoids connecting my name with the concepts and ideas that are diagnostic of my pioneering work. And when he does mention my name, it is in a qualified or slightly denigrating tone.

Starting with the name search, we find his first reference to me on page 20, where he asserts, totally incorrectly, that there isn't much evidence that the ancient Maya were concerned with the solstices. He wrote: "(we don't have *any* [inscriptions], actually) to inform us much about their solstitial attitudes during previous eras". Proceeding as if this was an accepted truism to scholars, he writes: "Despite this, as John Major Jenkins asserts,[9] Middle Preclassic and Late Preclassic architecture (such as some of the "E-Groups" shown above in Fig. 1) *does* often align to the solstice stations on the horizon, indicating that at that time of the Long Count Calendar's invention (LC dates first appear in the Late Preclassic), the Maya *did* place more emphasis on the Solstices."

Van Stone does not cite any of my many books or article, nor does he provide a direct quote, and his paraphrase is fairly unclear. In footnote 9 he cites that this info from me came from "personal communications, 2007-2009." I was not in contact with Van Stone until early 2008; these exchanges have been online since 2009: <http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008.html> and <http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008-2.html> with a link to my letter to Van Stone of May 27, 2008: <http://alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html> along with links to my Institute of Maya Studies article of March 2008. What I actually conveyed to Van Stone in regard to evidence for pre-Classic solstice observations, was the Izapa ballcourt's orientation to the December solstice sunrise, which I was the first to calculate and published (1996, 1998), before the Aveni & Hartung piece that was published in 2000. Van

Stone constructs a clever work-around to acknowledging my discovery and first publication of this and, in fact, asserts Aveni's preeminence in the second sentence of his footnote #9: "Anthony Aveni attests and has published most ancient celestial alignments in his various books."

We have to do a lot of work to reconstruct Van Stone's unstated and indirect allusions and references. He should be referring here to my Izapa ballcourt alignment reconstruction which I explicitly shared with him during email exchanges of 2008, but instead he avoids it, yet redirects to Aveni's work on "celestial alignments," effectively sleighting my contribution. However, Aveni as a sole author only refers to the Izapa ballcourt alignment in his 2009 book, where he reports its orientation 48° in error! This is characteristic of Van Stone's messy writing and citation style.

Van Stone's second reference to me occurs on pp 152-153, where he addresses the pre-Classic Isthmian origin (actually, it is Isthmian-Soconusco) of the Long Count. In his first reference he introduced me with a *setting aside* construct ("Despite..."), in which I appear to diverge from some unstated established consensus. Here, Van Stone again introduces me with a wag-of-the-finger aside, "warning" his readers that:

...we have virtually *no* decipherable texts from the Late Formative era, the time of the calendars' invention. John Major Jenkins, a self-described "2012ologist," rightly points out the danger of using Classic-era texts to interpret the thinking of peoples several centuries earlier and many miles away. He contends that the differences I note between various cities' Long Count calendars are due to much later political manipulation, and ought to be ruled out of any analysis of its inventors' intentions. He firmly believes that the priests who devised the Long Count aimed it at the future, rather than the past, fixing its "end point" in "Era 2012" rather than choosing to start, as we do, at some important beginning event. The evidence he cites for this is not based on any text, but on his interpretations of Late Formative pictorial monuments, mostly at Izapa.

Note there was no citation to where I took Van Stone to task for his exclusive focus on Classic Period and post-Classic Maya and non-Maya sources of information to make his interpretations (it is my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, pp. 243-244). I never said that such later expressions should be "ruled out", but pointed out that evidence at the origin of the Long Count would be preferable to ideas found many centuries later and hundreds of miles away. He here conflates my separate observation, regarding Pakal's use of the 20th Baktun at Palenque, that Classic Period kings may have employed unorthodox manipulations of the Long Count tradition to affect their rhetorical statements, and such clever devices don't necessarily represent the original tradition.

I also don't "firmly believe" that the creators of the LC pointed to the future and not the past. What I wrote in that same book (Jenkins 2009) is that: "... the entire site of Izapa provides a coherent picture of a tripartite cosmology that implicates the 13-Baktun cycle-ending (in 2012) as well as its beginning date (in 3114 BC)." (Jenkins 2009:162).

I did indeed describe myself as a "2012ologist". Critics have used this pejoratively, but what I explicitly explained to Van

Stone about this coined term (in an email of May 23, 2008) was:

Since I coined the term "2012ologist" in my 2005 introduction to Geoff Stray's book *Beyond 2012*, and have used it since in a non-disparaging way to mean "those who study the 2012 phenomenon" — including myself, Robert Sitler, and a few others — I'd be interested in what caricatures you refer to (I'm sure we could collaborate and end up with a huge list!). I don't consider writers who simply hijack 2012 as a promotional tool to be "2012ologists" in any serious sense. These include well-known authors in the spiritual actualization field who deftly insert "2012" into their already established raps. Nor are the underinformed pop-New Age writers serious researchers.

The distinction I was trying to make by using the term was separating the serious researchers — most of whom are independent investigators due to the dearth of serious treatment by scholars — from the expected doomsday alarmists and spiritual ascension cultists. (<http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008.html>).

I actually have an instance of me using it in 2003. My email to Van Stone was in response to him writing, in an announcement to Aztlan of his upcoming presentation, that "I hope to convince a few of the "true believers" that the Real Maya (and Aztecs) are far more interesting than the caricatures presented by 2012ologists in the popular press" (<http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-VanStone2008.html>). So we see here that pejorative reflex rearing its head, distorting concepts and terms. He responded and said he would be careful to note my distinction in his writings and lectures, and that "I want you to know that I credit coinage of this term to you in the book I am working on, and I am sorry if I appeared to use your term in any disparaging way." This was a kind gesture, but it didn't actually happen in his book. Its only occurrence is in the quote given above. Given that I explained in my email to him that a 2012ologist was simply those who study 2012, it comes across pejoratively, like "Jenkins, a self-described 'person who studies 2012'..." as if to grant myself such a designation is dubious.

Van Stone goes on to defend his non-origin approach by writing that "written texts convey information *orders of magnitude* more precisely than pictures alone do" and "the Izapa monuments ... possess peculiar, difficult-to-interpret iconography. ... and none preserve a trace of readable text." Van Stone thus gives the impression that nothing of certainty can be said or determined about the Izapa monuments. However, elsewhere in his book he discusses the Creation Myth statements on several of the Izapan stela, as if he had never previously asserted that they didn't merit serious attention. The thumbs-down was clearly constructed as a critique of my approach, which he doesn't fully understand, since he wrote: "For an exemplary careful and reasoned interpretation of Izapa's iconography, see Guernsey 2001 & 2006. For a divergent, much more fanciful one, see Jenkins. The divergence could hardly happen if the pictures carried readable inscriptions." Van Stone fails to realize that the works of Guernsey he cited barely mentioned the Izapa ballcourt

monuments and doesn't consider astronomical orientation. Her work with Kent Reilly on the "cords" and Seven Macaw as the Big Dipper *actually supports my previously published idea that the movements of the Big Dipper in the north were tied, in the minds of the Izapan skywatchers, with the movements of the sun north and south along the eastern horizon.*

Van Stone's attempt to cite an actual source from me fails ridiculously, and is presented in the context of my work being "divergent" and "fanciful": "For a divergent, much more fanciful one, see Jenkins." See Jenkins? What, knock on my door? Where's the pub year, let alone a page number? It's as if scholars like Van Stone can't bear to actually acknowledge my publications, or they are just utterly lazy in their scholarship. Furthermore, as iconographers who I have cited and based my several unique interpretations on clearly understand, Izapa's iconographic pictures, motifs, and themes provide consistently readable statements. A theme I have identified and emphasized is deity sacrifice as a prerequisite for period-ending renewal. Van Stone places too great an emphasis on written text (which, as epigraphers of hieroglyphic writing know, suffers from great ambiguity) and unfairly dismisses iconography. It could be argued that simple iconographic statements are *less ambiguous* than a more articulated and crenellated hieroglyphic inscription that juggles phonetic, ideogramic, local "dialect", variations in syntactical inflections of meaning, and syllabic consideration.

The additional factor that makes my work unique is that I incorporate a more complete field of evidentiary data, namely archaeoastronomical orientation and regional topography. The individual monuments and the monument groups are meaningfully oriented to astronomy, and many of the monuments and their motifs clearly reflect and symbolize that astronomy. So, in regard to the non-divergent and non-fanciful Creation Myth interpretations of scholars that I've cited and concur with, my work *is built upon and extends* (not diverges from) previous scholarship. But since my work is the most complete and in-depth treatment of Izapa cosmology, calendrics, astronomy, regional topography and iconography, my work necessarily breaks new ground and expresses new interpretations. All of these ideas are well documented and argued, and none of my arguments and evidence is ever cited by scholars like Van Stone, whose dismissals are just under-informed, knee-jerk, and presumptuous.

That's it. Two references to me (p. 20 and pp. 152-153), apart from my 1998 book in the bibliography and my name in a long list in the Acknowledgements. However, the Galactic Alignment that is the centerpiece of my work is critiqued over three pages (10-12, without reference to my name or work! He mentions or depicts several of the uniquely diagnostic features of my 2012 alignment reconstruction, including the Dark Rift feature and a "37-year" (actually, 36) alignment window. He also adapts his several "sky chart" depictions of the galactic alignment from a website cited to: "www.artideas.com - Why2012." This website no longer exists, but when I first did my review of Van Stone's book I found it and noted that it used my sky-charts from my 1994 "How and Why" of 2012 article. So, this seems another work-around employed by Van Stone, to avoid citing my work — or even mentioning it in a 3-page critique of the core centerpiece of my work. Amazing.

He concludes, in a larger font: "This is *not* a rare, nor a special alignment. It is as common as Christmas, and has been

going on a lot longer" (Van Stone 2010:12). This is an utterly ridiculous assertion and is contradicted by his own presentation. He employs the same tactic of omitting the "solstice" criterion that other astronomers have used, yet uses the solstice criterion in his other descriptions. Utterly bizarre, and confused. In fact, in 2008 or early 2009 Van Stone had his brother, apparently better versed in basic astronomy, contact me for explanations. As usual I provided detailed explanations and descriptions, but the Van Stone filter had a field day and resulted in the misleading dismissal we see on page 10-12.

It should give the un-biased reader pause — a very long pause — to note that the occurrences of my name and the attempted citation to my work (discussed above) do not associate me with the galactic alignment. The "galactic alignment" phrase also occurs on page 152, where Van Stone asserts that "the Maya prophets tell us nothing about galactic alignments, transformations of consciousness ...". The Maya "prophets?" What about Maya astronomers and scribes? What about Lord Jaguar's birthday parallel to 2012 which exploits the galactic alignment, and which I discussed in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story?* (and which Van Stone read in late 2009).

Incredibly, the name Van Stone associates with the galactic alignment is popular writer and 2012 late-comer Greg Braden, who Van Stone quotes (without proper attribution) on page 2: "The rare celestial alignment of our solar system, our sun, and our planet with the center of our galaxy—an event that will not happen again for another 26,000 years." Although useful in general contexts, like a back cover or jacket flap, this kind of description is pretty vague.

Also on page 2, we have a bullet list of "some of the events that are suppose to come together on the winter solstice, December 21, 2012" and find one of two mentions in the book to the Dark Rift: "On that morning, the **Earth and Sun will align with the "Dark Rift" near the Galactic Center.** This event last happened about 25,800 years ago." Again, we have here a completely wrong definition of the era-2012 alignment because it claims it happens "on that morning," explicitly leaves out the "solstice" criterion, and suggests the alignment only happens on 12-21-2012.

Van Stone's second, and last, mention of the Dark Rift (not including its depiction in the sky-charts) is on page 81: "The Crocodile also represents the Milky Way, as we shall see below, with the "dark rift" near the galactic Center as its jaws." And in Van Stone's discussion on page 81 he illustrates Izapa Stela 25, with the caiman as the Milky Way and its mouth as the Dark Rift. Following Schele, this is an idea I also embraced in Izapa iconography and astronomy, and it is important to my reconstruction of Izapa's tripartite cosmology, which also addresses the related serpent/toad/caiman monster mouth forms on Stela 11, Stela 6, and others. Why then does Van Stone identify my Izapa work as "divergent" and "fanciful"? He dismisses the ideas I employ and then reiterates them as if he thought of them first (we see this, for examples, in his comparative depiction of the crab mouth carving and Stela 11 on page 93 and in the angled double-headed serpent bars representing the MW-ecliptic cross: "To confirm our cosmic interpretation, note that some World-Tree-Sky stelae portray the ruler holding the Serpent-bar at what appears a casual angle. I believe this represents a relatively accurate depiction of

the actual angle at which the Ecliptic and the Milky Way intersect (about 60°)" (p. 87).

He claims I only interpret iconography, which he believes is not real writing and is therefore ambiguous (such prejudice!), but I in fact used (Jenkins 1996, 1998, 2002, 2009) archaeoastronomical alignments, the Creation Myth/ballgame symbology, throne symbolism and king-making rites, and referenced academic perspectives on Izapan iconography—as he also does on page 81! And I communicated these things to him in 2008! Van Stone is good at disparaging while appropriating. A new word for Merriam-Webster's Dictionary: plagiocorioration.

Regarding the correlation issue, on page 121 he manages to not only ignore my emails of 2008 (he wrote "I lean toward the original GMT, based on evidence and arguments presented by Dennis Tedlock and Bob Wald..."), but concludes with a slightly denigrating jab to "those who see significance in the Maya Calendar's ending on a winter solstice" and therefore "unsurprisingly ... prefer the original GMT as well." He elsewhere invokes astrologers who like solstices, casting a general pall of pseudoscience over the topic, much like his buddy John Hoopes does. Really. The scholarship is wanting.

A word must be included here regarding a passage in Van Stone's IAU essay (2011), where he offers the extraordinarily bold insinuation that previous scholars (including himself, Coe, Schele, Thomson, and Carlson) have already previously entertained the 2012 alignment. Read and wonder:

I take this pose [Maya king holding the serpent bar] to represent literally the Ecliptic as it crosses the Milky Way galaxy. In Mayan languages, the words for 'snake' and 'sky' are homophonic (*Kan* in the north, *Chan* elsewhere), supporting the identification of serpent with sky. This 'X' spot in the sky, near the Galactic center, will be occupied by the sun as it rises on 21st December 2012. **The coincidence of this solar alignment with the winter solstice has fueled the fire of speculation that the Maya aimed their Long Count (see previous chapter, pp. 183–185; Thompson 1950; Schele et al. 1993; Coe & Van Stone 2006) to end on this date.** (p. 186-187, bolding added for emphasis)

What? It would seem odd to insert a string of citations involving five scholars to merely support what "the Long Count" is. The pp 183-185 of the "previous chapter" Van Stone alludes to is the one he co-authored with Carlson, and those pages don't contain any discussion of the idea that the "coincidence of this solar alignment [sun at the X marks the spot] with the winter solstice" "fueled the fire of speculation" that "the Maya aimed their Long Count [citations are listed here]... to end on this date." In fact, nothing in the article alludes to this. Rather, we see Carlson ending his foreword to the piece with:

Finally, a word of warning for anyone who is interested in exploring these topics as an amateur or professional far from his field of expertise. Of the hundreds of published 'books' that deal with the 2012 phenomenon by name, perhaps four have some scholarly validity. [very probably referring to Van Stone, Aveni, Restall & Solari, and Stuart] The rest range

from speculative pseudo-scholarship and new-age fantasy to utter rubbish. *Caveat emptor.* (Carlson & Van Stone, 2011, p. 182).

Van Stone's badly worded passage can be easily misread to mean that the cited scholars were actually thinking about "The coincidence of this solar alignment [the 'X' spot of Milky Way and ecliptic occupied by the sun on 12-21-2012] with the winter solstice." That's the galactic alignment. But NONE of those scholars, not even Schele, were onto that or even acknowledge it. Obviously, Van Stone must be citing them for some other reason, but this kind of loose construct and bad syntax is emblematic of what is so problematic in Van Stone's book. Similarly, we read in the subsequent passage: "The discussion whether the Maya pitched their Long Count to 'end' on a solstice in 2012 is entirely the product of modern speculation. This article examines what they tell us themselves: the scant evidence we have of actual ancient Maya attitudes toward the 13.0.0.0.0 'creation' and 'end' dates."

Well, my work is not rooted in speculation. It's an interdisciplinary synthesis of relevant evidence. In the passage, Van Stone refers to his book as an "article", meaning that the book was built upon his previous FAMSI essay of late 2008, in turn expanded from a Power Point presentation he gave in mid-2008. His 2010 book was self-published under his own press name. Critics have lambasted my own self-published books and booklets (and undiscerningly dismiss my five other published books as merely "popular trade" books), yet they not only give Van Stone a pass but have hailed and endorsed his book (despite the poor writing quality, many lapses, and editorial errors). It does contain some good points and observations and interesting play-by-play of personal communications between scholars, but its misleading problems utterly out-weigh its contributions — unless it is laudable to reframe the narrative and craft work-arounds to acknowledging and accurately discussing and citing my own pioneering work on 2012 (even while echoing some of my own observations and prior discoveries). —end

d. Stanley Guenter

From Update2012.com:

Stanley Guenter, archaeologist and epigrapher. As previously described in the Freidel entry, he and Stan Guenter co-created a damning presentation for a Pseudoscience class that flailed my work:

<http://www.update2012.com/response-to-freidelMay.html>.

That was created in late 2008 or early 2009, possibly in the wake of my public encounter with Aveni at the Tulane "2012" conference (February 2009).

I vaguely was aware of Guenter by 2008, as I'd seen a few of his posts to Johan Normark's blog. By happenstance I met him in Antigua in the summer of 2008; we were both speaking at conferences in town. My encounter with him is recalled here (Part 3):

<http://www.update2012.com/Demonstration-for-Guenter.pdf>.

Also in this essay, we can read the exchange/debate between us that took place on Normark's blog in early 2012. It's really

revealing of Guenter's irrational and circular persistence in trying to mitigate me, invoking a grab-bag of UFO references that had nothing to do with our conversation. The link above can be augmented by another exchange on Normark's blog, from mid-June of 2012, regarding the Xultun inscriptions. It's a unique exchange that briefly involved me responding simultaneously to Smith, Stuart, Normark, and Guenter: <http://www.update2012.com/XultunJune17-2012.html>.

This was some two years after the lengthy debate that occurred publicly online, wherein Guenter was similarly circular and aggressive. My exchanges with him in that debate are documented and summarized here: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>, pp 205-206.

Here is an extensive three-part stand-alone essay that is worth reprinting in this appendix:

How Science Works, and How It Doesn't
(A revealing dialogue between Stanley Guenter and
John Major Jenkins)

3-2012, Compiled 8-27-2013, two notes added 1-16-2014

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

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

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

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

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

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

John,
we've had our run ins before, and it should be no surprise that I find your "scholarship" lacking again. I just looked through your "A Reassessment of Date Ambiguities on Tortuguero Monument 2". No surprise that you're trying to pull data out of the Tortuguero monuments. Unfortunately, your article is rather sloppy (you cite my paper with Marc Zender in the text itself as merely Zender 2000, for example) and it is more than apparent that you are no epigrapher. This is not a problem; even non-professionals can do good work. But when your work isn't good, it merely highlights why you are not a professional. You rely far too heavily on Gronemeyer's drawing and analysis, in order to come up with your alternative reading. The fact is, the text is far too badly eroded for any date to be clear here. What you (following Gronemeyer) take to be a 5 tun indicator looks nothing like it to me. There are two very distinct glyphs for a 5.0.0 Period Ending (Naah Ho'tuun in Mayan) and a 15.0.0 Period Ending (Wi' Ho'tuun in Mayan). There is no generic glyph for 5 tuun Period Ending, that could cover either possibility, and the glyph in question on Stela 2 doesn't look like either one. Simply because it has a bar in front doesn't make it a Period Ending glyph. In fact, all of the glyphs in the fourth circle on Altar 2 are probably lunar glyphs from the Supplementary Series. The actual haab date probably fell in the extremely eroded fifth circle. I don't consider this date decipherable, to be honest, and it is rather amusing to see you spend so much energy trying to pull out an alternative date, and demonstrating your lack of epigraphic knowledge so clearly in the process. It is amusing to see you try to pull out of this hideously eroded inscription a reference to your favorite position for the birth date on Tortuguero Monument 6. It is no different than the UFOlogists insisting that a grainy photograph of some lights in the sky support their ravings about Roswell. Sorry, but bad data, in no matter how great a quantity, does not support other bad data. Those don't form reliable facts. All that you have shown here, John, is that you are without a doubt a pseudoscientist, and not a reliable scholar.

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

Stan, good to hear from you and thank you for reading my reassessment of the ambiguities in the TRT Monument 2 inscription. Actually, your presumption that I was casting about for evidence or support for my 2012 work is incorrect. I have been working through many texts sequentially, and my attention was drawn to certain texts that contain apparent "scribal errors" in order to make proposed date reconstructions work. Using the same criteria of analysis employed in the reconstruction of dates, I wanted to test for other possible date interpretations. The date currently suggested for Monument 2 (9.14.0.0.0) requires a scribal error in the Haab numerical position. I explored other possible interpretations. One of these is based upon what appears to be a bar in the position where the stone-binding occurs. I cited other examples of "5"-tun stone-bindings that relate to both 5-Tun and 15-Tun period endings, one from the west side of the Palenque Temple XIX platform inscription, and one from TRT Mon 6 itself. I was not concerned with the glyph itself, as you seem to believe, but I

accepted Gronemeyer's reading of its general shape as being supportive of a stone-binding event. This and the apparent Ajaw glyph in the Tzolkin position supports a period-ending date. As I explained in my essay, the vertical bar was suggestive of a 5-Tun period ending, and this led to me exploring other period-ending beyond Katun endings. The date I located, 9.14.5.0.0 also requires a scribal error, but it is at least on par with the interpretive strategy of Gronemeyer. I was then surprised to find that this date falls on 12 Ajaw 8 Kankin, which I had already proposed as the best candidate for Lord Jaguar's birthday (Nov. 28, 612 J). My findings were based on my direct eyeball-to-glyph scrutiny of the eroded DN at E4 on TRT Mon 6, when I visited the museum in March 2011. Stan, have you studied TRT Mon 6 in person? In regard to TRT Mon 2, I then suggested that if we could revisit the poorly drawn glyphs on the hidden dorsal side, we might find better evidence for one or other of the proposed date reconstructions. I'm well aware of the ambiguous nature of these eroded sources of data, that is why "date ambiguities" is in the title of my essay. I suggested a way that one might secure clearer evidence, if there is a DN on the dorsal side. Not sure why you have a problem with that, Stan, and instead begin mudslinging, invoking UFOs, and inaccurately judging my intentions and efforts.

Added by John Major Jenkins at 18:38:

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

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

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

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

Actually, I cited those two inscriptions as examples that a 5-Tun stone-binding could refer to a 5-Tun period ending or a 15-Tun period ending, but my examination of 15-Tun period endings did not result in matches with the possible Tzolkin-Haab positions. And, the Monument 2 glyph at A4ay is NOT totally eroded and unreadable. Gronemeyer sees enough in the shape to suggest a stone-binding statement, AND it occurs

directly after the Haab position, where we would expect it to be. Previous investigators (including Gronemeyer) assumed the period-ending would be a Katun ending. I pointed out that the bar form within the A4ay glyph-block MIGHT indicate a "5" and thus a 5-tun stone-binding marker. Again, you see nothing here, whereas the careful scrutiny of Gronemeyer, previous investigators he cites, and myself see something (a possibility). To me, that possibility then suggested taking a look at 5-tun period-endings that may match the Tzolkin-Haab positions. A scribal error is required in all scenarios, and thus the ambiguities. Thus result the several date alternatives, which may be resolved by a look at the dorsal side.

Sent by Stan Guenter on March 6 at 19:30

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

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

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

And neither can you. You have the audacity to lecture me on doing epigraphy and proper scholarship, even going to the point of rhetorically asking me if I have ever studied Tortuguero Monument 6 in person. Coming from someone who wasn't even aware of Monument 6 and its 2012 date until just a few years ago, after writing a number of books on the subject (and while real epigraphers were very aware of the 2012 date on the monument in question – it is published in Linda Schele's 1982 *Maya Verbs* book, after all) – this is extremely rich. For your information, John, I first studied Monument 6 with my own eyes in 1997, when I was working on my first archaeological project in the Maya area, in eastern Tabasco. So I had plenty of opportunity to study the inscriptions of the region, and when Marc Zender joined us at the University of Calgary, and got a job as epigrapher at Comalcalco, he and I had numerous, long discussions on these monuments. The only thing about Monument 6 that surprised me when Dave Stuart published his reading was that you 2012ers were so blissfully unaware of it beforehand. If any of you did real scholarship you should have found out about that decades ago. That you didn't speaks volumes about your quality as "scholars". Monument 2 doesn't read the way you wish it did, and neither does Monument 6, and you are not going to be taken seriously, not because of a conspiracy against your work, but simply because your work is of such poor quality and your statements are demonstrably false.

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

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

I have made my photographs freely available, some of which also clarify the glyphs around P4. Despite the long awareness

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

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

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

Added by John on March 6 at 20:08:

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

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

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

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

Stan, in your first post of 7:34 a.m. from March 6, you wrote: "In fact, all of the glyphs in the fourth circle on altar 2 are probably lunar glyphs from the Supplementary Series." Firstly, your terminology does not utilize the accepted terms: altar 2 is Monument 2 (it certainly cannot be categorized as an "altar"); your "fourth circle" refers to cartouche A4. But that's okay, you may be working from memory and I respect the work you've done on the glyphs. However, it is very unlikely that A4

contains lunar Supplementary Series data, as you suggest. It is a short text narrative and therefore would be sparse in its citation of supplementary material, much like TRT Jade 1. Following Gronemeyer, who cites Grube, it is more likely that after the A1 ISIG cartouche, there is a dense 4-block cartouche (A2, similar to an example from TRT Monument 1) that contains the Baktun, Katun, Tun, and Winal place values of the Long Count. Then, in Carouche A3, we see a 2-block construct which clearly contains a Tzolkin notion in the lower place; the upper place would therefore be the remaining Kin level of the Long Count. A4 should thus follow with the Haab position, and it does, but directly before the Haab we instead see another block which Gronemeyer deduces, correctly I believe (because of other similar examples), to be a god from the 9-day night cycle. Then comes the Haab position, as expected after the Tzolkin place value in A3, which sure enough conveys a numerical value (as a Haab should) — an “8” or possibly a “13”). In the lower portion of A4 we find 2 blocks, which Gronemeyer interprets as being a stone-binding marker followed by an eroded glyph that should, in this typical semantic construct, be the identification or “name” of this monument, which is “owned by” the person named in A5, most likely the “Lord of Tortuguero.” All of this makes perfect sense in terms of Gronemeyer’s analysis and logic, which draws from recognized semantic constructions (following Grube and other examples from the Maya corpus), and which I agree with. There is no room or reason for the lunar SS data as you suggest.

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

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

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

I already pointed out to you that the none of the glyphs in the fourth circle qualify as a 5 tun period ending marker, neither of the Naah Ho’tuun or Wi’ Ho’tuun variety. Thus there is no reason at all to favor your alternative date. That is the important thing to consider, as it renders your entire post moot, especially since you still have to posit a complete and blatant mistake in

the Ahau coefficient of the tzolkin, which would make this the most egregious example of a mistake I am aware of in Maya calendrics. Given the lack of any proof for the haab you need, or the PE marker you thought you saw, your argument fails and fails spectacularly. No epigrapher is going to support you on this.

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

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

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

exchange to take a look and tell us if they see four glyph-blocks within A2 (just click on the PDF link above to see it).

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

—end of exchange

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

An important addendum must be added. Guenter did not respond to my final post (above). However, the thread continued three months later with a post by Jim Smith. Johan Normark and Jim Smith went back and forth a few times and then I noticed the continued thread, and posted my comments. It was at this time that I decided to organize and present my dossier on Jim Smith, primarily from research I had done a year-and-a-half earlier. I posted the link to the PDF of this dossier, but Normark deleted it following pressure from Jim Smith. I received an angry email from Jim Smith (the user of many aliases) and, within the same day, I also received a threat from another email address/name (one that I recognized from the previous year during the exchange with Jim Smith/Tom Brown) that simply exclaimed: “I am going to destroy you!” I suspected this was from the irate lunatic Jim Smith, whose secret motivations and stealthy behavior I had just exposed with my dossier. I left for Mexico that day, for the First Izapa Round Table Conference. We stayed at a hotel with spotty internet, I was swept up into the conference’s activities, and I therefore did not check my email for 4 or 5 days. When I did, I observed a series of emails from Jim Smith demanding my responses to his accusations. It unfolded like a monologue, a bloated and self-aggrandized energy vampire who was not getting the food/response he desired, until he ended his monologue with a huff of displeasure. In any case, this addendum to the thread of March 2012 unfolded in June of 2012. It can be read in full here:

<http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/02/16/2012-jenkins-is-being-misunderstood-again/> and is reproduced below. Since Normark deleted my link to my dossier on Jim Smith’s unethical and secret attack methods, I have re-added it below (in large font).

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

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

Actually, I do not, and never have, had any interest in debating Jenkins. In the thread that you cited above (<http://the2012deception.net/?p=101>), I wanted to hear straight answers to the simple questions that I asked him. Two years later, he apparently still has none.

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

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

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

By: **Johan Normark** on June 15, 2012 at 04:50:

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

By: **John Major Jenkins** on June 15, 2012 at 04:57:

Ah, Jim Smith, the deceptive liar with many aliases. As you probably don't know, I have tracked your various user-names and identities on many sites, including Amazon, Wikipedia, Youtube, and elsewhere. The entire dossier is being prepared for publication. It began with my lengthy replies, "straight answers", to your critiques in early 2010, which you could not accept, nor were you able or willing to sustain a rational and cordial dialogue on Maya astronomy and other traditions. You would just start slinging invectives, go away, and attack again later with the same talking points that I'd already responded to and clarified. Then came your Youtube screeds, your 2012Hoax posts, Wikipedia disinformation, and so on. Get a life. Your

small-minded critiques of other people's deeper and more sincerely lived truths, such as my friend's, that can't be resolved in your little linear brain reveal your petty, sad, and pathetic heart. But we expect that from fundamentalists, so no surprise there. Note that you're using this thread in an inappropriate way, just like you used Amazon and Wikipedia — you didn't even respond to the content of the thread. You just troll around the internet like a bottom feeder looking for places to plant your toxic and misleading lies. What are you, 12?

By: **Johan Normark** on June 15, 2012 at 05:06:

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

By: **John Major Jenkins** on June 15, 2012 at 05:17:

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

By: **Johan Normark** on June 15, 2012 at 05:27

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

what you want, does that not make you a liar?

drove his subsequent sabotage campaigns is this:

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

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

at 14:07:

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

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

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

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

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

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

at 20:02:

Hello Mr. Normark,

By: **John Major Jenkins** on June 16, 2012

at 14:03:

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

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

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

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

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

By: **Johan Normark** on June 15, 2012 at 20:18:

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

By: **Jim Smith** on June 15, 2012 at 20:36:

Agreed.

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

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

October was an extremely busy month. Having just returned from Brazil in late September followed by a presentation event in Boulder, Colorado, in October I gave a presentation in Los Angeles, then traveled to Honduras for TWO premieres of the documentary film that features my work, *2012: The Beginning*, followed immediately by a flight to Winnipeg, Canada, for another premiere showing and a presentation. I then returned to Fort Collins and attended the Hollerween Music Festival where I was to do a reading (from my spoof piece:

<http://alignment2012.com/Survive-the-Non-Apocalypse.pdf>). All of this occurred before October 28, after which I was drawn into helping a friend acquire a printing press in Denver, and then investigating and saving from being scrapped an old newspaper press in Kansas. In November I did the Red Ice interview, another radio interview, a webinar with producer Shannon Kring Buset, and a presentation in Fort Collins on November 16, after which my wife of 13 years announced that she wanted a divorce. Within four weeks she was moving out, while I was at a conference in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Despite Jim Smith claiming, in his June 2012 post to Normark's blog, that he "withdrew" from 2012, he continued his email harassment and uploading of false information about me even into 2013. He made some comments to a Maya piece written by Greg Schwartz on the "21st Century Blues" blog in January, slandering me once again by name. I somehow ran across this and posted a reply. Schwartz questioned Smith, found him to be a lying weasel, and I agreed to write a "2012 in Retrospect" piece for Schwartz's site. It was posted on his "21st Century Blues" blog:

<http://21stcenturyblues.wordpress.com/2013/02/07/2012-in-retrospect-by-john-major-jenkins/>. Schwartz added an end comment regarding Jim Smith's attempted posts, which were vile and venomous. (Unlike Johan Normark or Bill Hudson on his 2012Hoax website, Greg Schwartz exercised a discriminating awareness and questioning assessment of Smith and quickly determined, with no help from me, that Smith's motives and statements were personally vindictive and factually false). Here's an excerpt of Schwartz's comments:

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

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

This critic had such a venomous and vindictive tone in his assertions that John was a "snake oil salesman" that it led me to question him on his motives and why he had such particular contempt for John, as opposed to all the real snake oil salesmen and corrupt deceivers in this crazy mixed up world? The man dodged my query several times before one last message in which he insisted I not contact him again. That was fine by me, as his odd obsession led me to speculate whether he was just a kook or possibly something more sinister. I certainly wouldn't put it past the New World

Order power brokers to employ disinformation agents tasked with shooting down any research that could possibly give the good people of humanity some hope that a transformative era of positive change could indeed be afoot (I ran into a couple of these types in cyberspace during my UFOlogy research in 1997 when I was working on my X-Files spec script.)”

– end of excerpt

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

Part 3. The Guenter Files

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

Little did I know, but at this time Guenter was collaborating with David Freidel to craft a “pseudoscience” college class which featured a Power Point presentation and a clear denunciation of me and my work. Guenter was actually teaching this class in Texas by 2008 or 2009, and Freidel

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

<http://update2012.com/ResponsetoVillasenor.html>).

As for Guenter, I didn't see him around later that evening in Antigua, and I didn't hear from him again until he participated in the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion (about my SAA presentation on the astronomy within Tortuguero Monument 6), in late 2010. Here, Guenter was in full-fanged attack mode. But his straw-man methods and *ad hominem* strategies were easily exposed. This should have been a defining moment in my defense of, and the respectful reception of, my work. But although the debate was sponsored by scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*, and the transcribed proceedings are posted on that organization's website as a 206-page PDF, no subsequent scholar writing on 2012 has dared to cite it, apparently because it reveals too much about the evidence for my arguments as well as the irrational and unprofessional strategies of mitigation employed by “professional” scientists and scholars (**Note:** MacLeod mentioned it in the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* essay published in Germany in mid-2012). I had invited them all to participate and then sent the PDF to many who opted not to. In my postscript to the 3-week-long debate/discussion, I summarized the efforts of Guenter thus:

Unyielding criticism came from Stanley Guenter. In the debate process several very interesting things were revealed about Stanley's methodology and stance toward my paper. Stan's very narrow filter of allowing only explicit and tangible evidence results in his oft-repeated mantra “there is no evidence.” But with that same filter you can mitigate a large proportion of the amazing work done by many Mayanists and ethnographers reconstructing indigenous knowledge systems. He himself claims that these other Mayanists are “wrong, demonstrably so.” Stan admits his bias against archaeoastronomy, and constantly rejected my

deductions. Why? Because deductions are based on indirect evidence, or different types of evidence which he doesn't class as "real" evidence, and cannot be allowed through his filter. I then quoted Stan himself indulging in deductive reasoning in a passage from his Palenque essay, revealing a double standard in the application of his rule. Oddly, through cleverly caveat-wrapped linguistics he also rejected actual facts that were presented in my paper, such as the astronomy connected with December 21, 2012 (it's a solstice.) This underscores what should be considered a rather large problem in Stan's treatment of my paper.

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

Stan has produced and used in his classroom a Power Point presentation that David Freidel also has used, which he sent to me in May 2009. In it, almost every single point of reference to me and my work was factually incorrect. I immediately sent my comments and corrections back to Freidel and Stan, expecting a reply, but there was none. (It is here: <http://www.update2012.com/response-to-freidelMay.html>.)

Just a few days ago I asked Stan if he had incorporated my factual corrections into his presentation, and he said he had made some changes. I invite him to send me his revised Power Point presentation so I can check it again for continuing errors. Bottom line: the many definitive declarations in Stan's critique should be regarded as highly suspect due to his demonstrable misrepresentation of my work in the past. In addition to that, many of his critiques simply assert a need for explicit evidence, and don't engage the full content of information presented. I responded clearly to his critiques, which can be found in the discussion.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Then, as of Gronemeyer and MacLeod's *Wayeb* no. 34 monograph (August 2010), scholars began publishing papers on 2012. Many of them were reactionary debunking pieces, addressing millennial madness psychology, the "2012 phenomenon," or the false doomsday meme. The papers written by scholars that offered interpretations or suggestions as to how the ancient Maya may have conceived of 2012 were extremely few and were published in three anthologies of 2011 and 2012:

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

Two essays and a review of Gelfer's anthology also appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* journal (MacLeod & Van Stone; Whitesides & Hoopes; review of Gelfer's anthology). I believe all of these were published in the year 2012 but certainly not before 2011. (**Note:** I

received a PDF of that journal shortly after composing this essay in August 2013; my critique of the Whitesides & Hoopes article will appear in a forthcoming issue of that journal, with their response, while my queries to Van Stone remain unanswered.) Also, there was Hoopes's review in *Archaeoastronomy Journal* no. XXII. There are other articles here and there, by Krupp (2009), Hanegraff, Defesche, and notably Sitler's 2006 piece and his updated piece of 2012 (both in *Nova Religio*) but they all largely address "the phenomenon" of 2012 with very little mention of what the ancient Maya might have believed about 2012. Along these lines, there are some comments by scholars in the documentary film *2012: The Beginning* (2012).

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

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

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

JMJ: Maya scholars came late to treating 2012 seriously as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought (as documented in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*). The Tortuguero monument, as of 2006, forced a serious consideration. My focused work on this topic, going back to the 1980s and generating eight books and hundreds of essays and interviews, with presentations in both academic and popular venues, has for the most part not been accurately treated. Ironically, as we now have some scholars recently interpreting how the ancient Maya thought about 2012, we find the same ideas I published years ago being repeated (namely, astronomy and an ideology of period-ending renewal). The "hoopla" in the popular marketplace is to be expected, and I have offered critiques of that arena for over twenty years (see <http://Update2012.com>), as summarized in my chapter in Dr. Joseph Gelfer's anthology *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011).

I'm concerned that Maya Studies – having reluctantly been forced to address 2012 by the mainstream attention to it – will possibly, after 2012 passes, return to avoiding the deeper currents of Maya spirituality and the more

challenging aspects of reconstructing ancient Maya astronomy. The 2012 topic has apparently been largely an annoyance, notwithstanding the new breakthroughs in understanding Maya astronomy and the two "2012" inscriptions.

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

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

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

<http://www.alignment2012.com/13th-Baktun-Completion.pdf>.

John Major Jenkins. August 27, 2013

<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com> ▪

<http://www.johnmajorjenkins.com>

<http://www.alignment2012.com> ▪

<http://www.update2012.com> ▪

John@Alignment2012.com

e. My review of Barbara MacLeod's & Mark Van Stone's "Great Return" essay, and my response to the stated invitation / challenge:

John Major Jenkins. August 13-16, 2014

This essay by MacLeod and Van Stone was written in May of 2011, and was revised after August of 2011 for publication and release by mid-2012, in the German journal *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*. It won the award offered by the editors of that journal, for the best paper on the “2012” topic, and was published alongside an essay by John Hoopes and Kevin Whitesides (which might perhaps be considered the runner-up for the prize). I reviewed the Whitesides/Hoopes essay in the January 2014 issue of *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*.¹ My critique-review was approved by the editors and their reviewers with only a few minor changes added to my original submission. My review of the MacLeod/Van Stone article, presented here, was written with similar attention to documentation and argument. I offer my review for the small community of scholars and writers who are interested in moving the 2012 discussion forward. The authors stated they were “amiably skeptical” about my 2012 alignment reconstruction,² but were open to being “persuaded”. I have a rather simple logical response which I offer in Part 2 of my review, and summarize at the end.

I’d like to focus on the most important launching-off point for how we can go to the next step with understanding how the ancient Maya understood 2012. The “Great Return” essay is like a platform and the authors offer some open questions as to what their findings might imply. In particular, there is the question about the relationship between Classic Maya beliefs about 2012 (which they largely focus on), and the pre-Classic origins of the Long Count. Their open minded invitation to be “persuaded” that the pre-Classic creators of the Long Count anticipated the “alignment of the Solstice Sun with the Galactic Equator” occurs in note 3 on page 19 of their essay. Firstly, it is wonderful and rare to have the galactic alignment (which is the centerpiece of my reconstruction work) acknowledged as real astronomy and accurately defined. Their definition is congruent with how I’ve defined and discussed the galactic alignment since the mid-1990s, emphasizing that it is the *solstice* Sun that aligns with the Galactic Equator. Long ago I emphasized the accurate definition that *it is the December solstice sun aligning with the Dark Rift/Crossroads along the Galactic Equator in Sagittarius*, as that highlights the astronomical feature of the Dark Rift that I argue, in my work that draws from archaeoastronomy and iconography, was important to the creators of the Long Count cosmology (at Izapa).

¹ See my summary of this curious episode (Jenkins 2014b), “Deceptive Scholars Refuse to Correct Factual Errors in Their Peer-Reviewed Study”: <http://update2012.com/Scholars-Refuse-to-Correct-Errors.pdf>.

² Which is my proposal that the creators of the Long Count, in the pre-Classic Period, intended the 13-Baktun period ending (13.0.0.0.0, December 21, 2012) to target the rare precession-caused alignment of the December solstice sun with the Galactic Equator in Sagittarius (Jenkins 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998).

Footnote 3 on Page 19 is a statement that addresses my work, and I can clarify several items. I read an early draft of this paper in August 2011, and it contained a slightly different version of this footnote. In the final published version, we find a late addition to the first sentence of the footnote, citing a personal communication from astrologer Ray Mardyks, made to one of the authors. The first sentence of footnote 3 reads: “The Galactic Alignment and associated theory was proposed and popularized by writer and Maya researcher John Major Jenkins (1998), though Raymond Mardyks (p.c. 2010) also claims credit for its origin.” This statement begs correction. First of all, my “2012 alignment theory” is unique and unprecedented because it documents the evidence for how the ancient Maya embedded the galactic alignment into their core traditions, including the ballgame, the Creation Myth, and king-making rites. The Dark Rift in the Milky Way is an important key, and I’ve argued the case and cited evidence that the Classic Maya and pre-Classic people at Izapa symbolized the Dark Rift as a “portal” and “birth-place” concept related to mouths, birth canals, and the goal-ring. Another unprecedented key to my work is my correct calculation of the Izapa ballcourt’s alignment to the December solstice sunrise azimuth. None of this can be mapped backward onto the work of astrologer Ray Mardyks, who didn’t research Izapa, and to state that he claims credit for the origin of the galactic alignment and “associated theory” reveals a confusion as to the wide gulf of difference between my work and his ideas.

Since this compromising bit of rhetoric (a p.c. from Mardyks) was not part of the original essay, and gives the false impression that I modeled my work on the ideas of Mardyks, I inquired and discovered that Van Stone was the author who added this. I asked if he could supply the p.c. email of 2010 that he based the statement on. For nine months Van Stone has not been able to send me the relevant p.c. email; disclosure would be important in regard to Mardyks because he has established a track record of being unreliable, of lying, of misrepresenting my work and his own early work. In fact, he has tried to blackmail me, has harassed me over a period of 15+ years, and has spread disinformation about the galactic alignment which certain scholars have eagerly adopted.³ In my 1998 book I acknowledged Mardyks along with other thinkers, science historians, and astrologers who were aware of the galactic alignment in the 1980s, 1970s, and 1960s. None of them were engaged in reconstructing what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, or with showing how the Maya symbolized the galactic alignment in their traditions.

If Van Stone could disclose the personal communiqué we could determine the nature of the cited claim. Curiously, in my efforts to discuss this with Van Stone, during which he has not been able to produce the relevant email, he stated the following:

³ For example, in an email thread to which I was privy Mardyks asserted that the galactic alignment was astrology. John Hoopes, also on the thread, gratefully said “thank you” and has used this as a means of debunking the galactic alignment, because for Hoopes astrology is pseudoscience. See “Hoopes-Mardyks Collaboration on Galactic Alignment Disinformation”: <http://update2012.com/Hoopes-Mardyks-Collaboration.pdf>.

I will try to locate the particular e-mail I got from Ray M. that you requested. But I have to admit, it's like looking for a needle in a manger. The attached screen shot covers just five months of his messages to me (the boldfaced ones I never even read, so I can eliminate those). But you can see he wrote to me A LOT at that time... And I recall that he claimed to have originated every interesting idea about 2012 and the Maya, including, I think, that the Izapans invented the calendars... (email to me of 11/30/2013)

For Mardyks to claim to have “originated every interesting idea about 2012” — including Izapa! — should be a huge red flag for any discerning scholar, as to his credibility. Van Stone recognized this problem, in stating:

“Anyone who has had more than casual contact with him knows he's a loony. A vindictive, unfunny loony.” (email to me of 12/5/2013)

My email response to Van Stone encapsulated the contradiction we have here, regarding why Mardyks’ dubious “claim” (against my discoveries) was worth reporting in their essay:

Hi again,
You sent me the screen shot of all the emails to you from Mardyks. I scrutinized them and was trying to help identify the ones most likely to involve the "personal communication" that you cited in your Anomalistik article. As I mentioned, there are three emails from Mardyks to you that are grouped together with the subject "The 2012 Story". As I write my review, I'd like to be accurately informed regarding what Mardyks actually communicated to you.

In a related matter, in your recent email you said that "Anyone who has had more than casual contact with him [Mardyks] knows he's a loony. A vindictive, unfunny loony." Well, I'm sure you probably understand that he is particularly vindictive toward me, right? (I have **hundreds** of emails I could send you.) Do you think a vindictive loony (with a demonstrable track record for lying) would be a reliable source?

I hope you can clarify something. It would seem that with the dozens of emails he sent to you by the end of 2010, as your screen shot shows, you would have had plenty of experience with him to know that he was a "vindictive loony" by the end of 2010. And that was before the Anomalistik piece would have been written. Consequently, I'm a little confused as to why you would have thought some claim he made in an email was reliable, and worth reporting? Since such assertions were coming from a person you believed to be a "vindictive and unfunny loony," why would you insert that into the revised version of your article? (It doesn't appear in the version I received from Barb on August 30, 2011 — yet it appears in the final published version). Any clarification you can offer will be appreciated. Best wishes, John [Jenkins] (email to Van Stone, 12-15-2013)

I renewed my contact with Van Stone through the first half of 2014, but he was always busy with school or summer travels. As of August (now 11-2015) I still don't have the relevant p.c. email from Mardyks, but it would be moot anyway, since he is

a proven liar and his claim to have originated my 2012 alignment reconstruction is completely baseless. Yes, he mentioned the galactic alignment (not using that phrase) as early as the late 1980s, but that's just a fact of astronomy that could have been deduced from the 1930s edition of the *Norton Star Atlas*.⁴ That's not the same as the evidence and argument and reconstruction of authentic ancient Maya beliefs that I laid out in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (with early publications on it going back to 1994).

But a question remains as to why a claim from an unreliable and vindictive liar, or “loony”, which had the effect of calling into question the original and pioneering nature of my work on 2012, would have merited inclusion. Well, I'm sorry to say, but it's part of an undiscerning reflex that seeks to downplay, counter, or mitigate my work.

Ironically, that same footnote 3 on page 19 continues with supportive observations about my “contributions” and this very issue of being “a target of debunkers.” This material was in the earlier draft, and I suspect it was written by MacLeod (even though the pronoun “we” is used):

In fairness to Jenkins, we recognize (1) that his work has developed in a more scholarly direction over time (p.c. 2009, 2010);⁵ (2) that he has an excellent grasp of the phenomenon termed “the precession of the equinoxes” and associated astrological ages,⁶ and has never said that the Alignment falls only on the Winter Solstice of 2012— though early enthusiastic statements might suggest this and many 2012ers mistakenly believe this; (3) that he has made some important contributions to Maya studies; (4) that having taken his inspiration from Schele et al in *Maya Cosmos* (1993) he has made no greater leaps in the iconographic / astronomical interpretation than they, but takes far more heat because he is a popular author, an advocate of shamanic practice and entheogens, and a target of debunkers; and (5) **that to our view, it cannot be either proven or disproven that the alignment of the solstice sun with the Galactic Equator (technically, per the IAU, the Equatorial Plane of the Galactic Reference System), could have been anticipated by the creators of the Long Count; all we can do is be amiably skeptical until persuaded otherwise.** (MacLeod

⁴ Jenkins (2013): “Notes on Various Editions of *Norton's Star Atlas* and the Galactic Alignment of Era-2012”:

<http://alignment2012.com/Notes-on-Nortons.pdf>

⁵ I appreciate this acknowledgement and through time, one can certainly improve. However, *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998) is more thoroughly documented and cogently argued, as a scholarly study, than many PhD dissertations I've read. Scholars might have problems with only a few sections where I step back and speculate on larger implications, and Chapter 23 where I take the reader on an imaginative initiatory trip around the Izapa monuments (which was identified as such).

⁶ I prefer “doctrine of World Ages” to avoid a Western projection of what “astrology” means onto a Native American cosmo-conception that is better expressed as “non-dual.” Regarding methods for tracking precession, I discovered and articulated a previously unknown method using the New Fire ceremony and the Calendar Round “World Age” tradition that utilized the precession-caused shifting of the annual sun-Pleiades alignment into convergence with the solar zenith-passage date at a given latitude (Jenkins 1998).

and Van Stone 2012:19; item 5 emphasized for the following discussion).

I am grateful to the authors for these observations which generally do accurately frame my work and efforts over time, and acknowledge that I've made contributions. In item 5, the construct suggests they are willing to be persuaded that the contested scenario can be proven or disproven. This conceptual construct is problematic, because a demonstrated proof or disproof does not involve persuasion, merely the acceptance of a logically demonstrated fact-based case. The truth is that very few reconstructions of ancient paradigms can be proven or disproven conclusively. However, open-minded and rational skeptics can, theoretically, be persuaded to accept a *most likely* scenario. In my discussion that follows in Part 2, I'll assume that it is unrealistic for a *definitive proof* to be presented (we don't have definitive proofs for the vast majority of historical and cultural reconstructions that gain consensus among scholars), and that a *persuasive logical argument for the most likely scenario* is how to move forward.

The statement that I am an advocate for entheogens and shamanic practice requires a correction. Due to the undiscerning abuse of entheogens by some users, I've been careful to provide a caveat when I've discussed my own shamanic explorations with these psycho-integrator plants. For example, in *The 2012 Story* (2009:401), after recounting an experiment I conducted in an isolation tank in 1984, I stated that "I don't advocate LSD use or suggest this experiment should be repeated." I even used the explicit phrase "I don't advocate...". In fact, I've consciously distanced myself from the platform of "advocacy" that others have, in no uncertain terms, adopted (O'Leary, McKenna, Pinchbeck, Hancock) because I'm not interested in being a crusading advocate and my personal life and beliefs aren't relevant to the scholarly work of reconstructing ancient Maya cosmology. It's an opening for *ad hominem* attacks, which in fact started happening in mid-2010 — despite my published caveat in my 2009 book. This doesn't mean that I disavow my own uses of medicinal plants, and I have spoken openly of my belief (congruent with the scientific literature on their qualities) that they can facilitate creativity, healing, introspection, and problem solving.

More important academically, and less personally, is that my studies of Mesoamerican shamanism and the archaeological and iconographic evidence at Izapa resulted in me pointing out that the pre-Classic Izapans were using psychoactive mushrooms and the vision-producing DMT entheogen extracted from toads (e.g., Izapa Stela 6). These are possibly some of the "contributions" I have made to Maya studies that MacLeod & Van Stone were alluding to in their article, as quoted above, although my pioneering work at Izapa was off the docket of consideration in their article.⁷

Part 2: The Most Likely of Two Scenarios

I could write a very long review, but I want to focus on point 5, bolded in the quote above. It connects with two concluding

⁷ Jenkins (1996, 1998, 2002, 2009). Also: <http://alignment2012.com/summary-of-my-work-on-izapa.pdf>.

questions that are raised on page 45. I'll quote the full passages on page 45 for the appropriate context:

Before we leave Tortuguero 6, it behooves us to briefly mention the possibility of an intentional sidereal interval between the king's birth date and the 13.0.0.0 date. While *Bahlam Ajaw's* birth date can only be reconstructed to within five days due to a damaged Distance Number coefficient, that date would nonetheless have also placed the Sun at the Dark Rift very close to the December 21, 2012 position.[50]⁸ There are, incidentally, two other dates in this text which fall—sidereally speaking—within a day or two of the above pair, and for these, there seems no rationale at all.⁹ Our position[51], and that of Grofe (personal communication, 2010, 2011) is that the Maya of Tortuguero likely had the astronomical sophistication not only to notice that the 13.0.0.0 date would fall on the winter solstice, but that this solstice would fall within the Dark Rift somewhere past the midpoint of the solstice Sun's slow transit.

This raises two questions: (1) did the Maya tweak the king's birth date? And (2) does this demonstrate that the Preclassic creators of the Long Count set the 13.0.0.0 date intentionally? Our answers would be: (1) Possibly, because they contrived certain other dates, but it still seems a stretch, and (2) No; it would be illogical to invoke hindsight as proof of original intent. (MacLeod and Van Stone 2012:45).

I'll get to the two questions that were raised in a moment.

The understanding that Bahlam Ajaw's birthday must fall within a 5-day range resulted from some careful scrutinizing by MacLeod, myself, Grofe, and possibly others in late 2010. Earlier statements by Gronemeyer (2004, 2006) and Gronemeyer & MacLeod (2010) assumed a 14-day range. But there really isn't enough space for the needed extra place-register to fit. Some concurrence was achieved on this during the *MEC-Facebook Discussion* (December 2010) that is alluded to in note 50.¹⁰ Then, in March of 2011, I visited Tortuguero Monument 6 in a closed museum in Mexico and examined the physical evidence near the broken Distance Number that generates Bahlam Ajaw's birth date. There was

⁸ Footnote 50 reads: "Proceeding from this discovery by Michael Grofe, John Major Jenkins (2010) presented a paper at the annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology on the astronomical implications of the monument, including these four dates and other dates related to Jupiter. An energized, sometimes heated online discussion took place thereafter which brought to the table a number of disagreements—not only between Jenkins and academic Mayanists, but significantly, between academics—on the subjects of precession, pseudoscience, and archaeoastronomy. One view—amid a wide spectrum—seemed to marry these all together. One of the authors took part, as did Michael Grofe." See Appendix 1 for a discussion of this footnote.

⁹ Actually, as discussed in my work (2009) and in the 2010 *MEC-FB Discussion*, the building dedication of Dec. 6, 510 AD (which is one of those dates with the sun at the Dark Rift) provides a metaphorical "fire entering" of the sun alighting the cave/sweat-bath of the temple; i.e., symbolic of the sun entering the Dark Rift.

¹⁰ Jenkins (compiler, intro, and notes) (2011). Online: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf> and also on the MEC website.

indeed physical evidence that the DN should be “10” and therefore the birthday would be November 28, 612 AD (Julian, in the 584283 correlation), which falls on 12 Ajaw in the 260-day Tzolkin calendar. This is the first day in the allowable 5-day range, and is only one day off from an exact Sidereal Year parallel to December 21, 2012. My deduction and evidence-based observation, from a direct eyeball-to-glyph examination, were supported by other uses of the 12 Ajaw date on Tortuguero monuments, notably a jade staff ornament dated to a solstice period-ending date (9.10.7.0.0, Dec. 17, 639 AD) that fell on 12 Ajaw, some 4.2 years before Bahlam Ajaw took office in 644 AD. My report was published online in June 2011 and sent to the authors and other scholars, including my close-up photos (the most detailed and high-definition photos of the monument available) of the controversial eroded P4 glyph near the 2012 date.¹¹ I also presented my argument that November 28 was the best candidate for Bahlam Ajaw’s birthday at *The Great Return* conference in Copan, Honduras (Dec. 18 – 23, 2012), where MacLeod and Michael Grofe also spoke.¹²

We read, in the quote above, that MacLeod and Grofe hold the position that the Maya scribes and astronomers at Tortuguero “likely had the astronomical sophistication” to notice that 13.0.0.0 in 2012 would fall on a solstice (an accurate Tropical Year calculation) *and also that* “this solstice would fall within the Dark Rift somewhere past the midpoint of the solstice Sun’s slow transit” (a Sidereal Year calculation). We are dealing here, of necessity, with a *likelihood*, and that’s fine. This kind of reconstruction work can rarely be resolvable to absolute proofs. Given the evidence, it seemed eminently reasonable to MacLeod and Grofe (footnote 51 omits Van Stone from concurring with this position) that the Classic Period Maya at Tortuguero were aware of the future galactic alignment (and by necessity could thus calculate it, in both Tropical Year and Sidereal Year terms). And MacLeod and Grofe also used, in their assessment, the relevant naked-eye identifier (the Dark Rift) that was the key, for me, back in the early 1990s, that allowed the pursuit of the question to be reasonable and within the realm of known Maya concepts.¹³

However, Grofe¹⁴ and MacLeod/Van Stone (p. 19) have stated that it doesn’t therefore follow that the *originators of the*

Long Count were aware of the galactic alignment. We see this in the “two raised questions” that immediately follow in the quoted passage. To reiterate, the authors asked: “(1) did the Maya tweak the king’s birth date? And (2) does this demonstrate that the Preclassic creators of the Long Count set the 13.0.0.0 date intentionally?” Their (MacLeod & Van Stone’s) answer to the first question is “Possibly, because they contrived certain other dates, but it still seems a stretch.” The lingo here is a little unclear. They seem to prefer a more likely scenario that his birthday was not manipulated, because to do so would be unusual and unexpected. If the “stretch” is too much then the congruence between his birthday and 2012 would be based on his real birthday, and that’s fine. The parallel was then exploited for its rhetorical power. Grofe (2012) has stated that this circumstance, along with other similar examples from the Maya corpus of inscriptions, is completely understandable as kings liked to craft powerful statements regarding their intimate connection to the calendrics of the Creation Mythos. This is also a position I articulated and shared with scholars in February of 2009, in comparing the respective strategies of Janaab Pakal of Palenque and Bahlam Ajaw. I also explained this to Ed Barnhart in an email exchange of July 2010.¹⁵

MacLeod & Van Stone’s very important response to the second raised question is: “No; it would be illogical to invoke hindsight as proof of original intent.” Okay, this needs to be looked at carefully. In the quote we see that “proof” is being required to “demonstrate” a *pre-Classic* intention in setting the 2012 cycle-ending date to the galactic alignment (which the Tortuguero astronomers are admitted to be “likely” aware of). Instead of incongruently requiring “proof” on one side of the argument and only requiring a “likelihood” on the other, we can acknowledge that “likelihoods” are the best that can be entertained. (As previously mentioned, absolute proofs are almost never possible in virtually every reconstruction effort of this kind — including the work of epigraphers who make deductions based on sets of phonetic, linguistic, and syllabic possibilities.) So, let’s correct the lopsided application of the need for “proof” versus “likelihood” and reframe the question: “Given that it’s *likely* that the Tortuguero astronomers knew about (and could calculate) the future galactic alignment of era-2012, what is the *likelihood* that the more ancient creators of the Long Count also were aware of it, and fixed the 13-Baktun cycle ending in the Long Count to it?” This question can be answered by looking at the two possible scenarios (below).

As an aside, I’m having difficulty, I confess, understanding who would be invoking “hindsight.” Is this catch-phrase intended to mean that one cannot retroactively apply a likely later knowledge onto an earlier cultural substratum? That seems my best guess as to what this is intended to mean — like, to say “when I was 50 years old I knew that I would one day die” does not logically mean that “when I was 7 I knew that I would one day die.” It must be like saying “Jenkins (or fill in the blank) believes that if the Tortuguero astronomers knew about the galactic alignment, then that proves that the creators of the Long Count must also have known about it.” If that’s what the catch-phrase is intended to convey, then I’ll

¹¹ <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/T6Monument.pdf>. My better photos invited minor corrections to the existing line drawings, but were not used or cited by scholars.

¹² Jenkins (2012): “Echoes of the Galactic Alignment Through the Maya Classic Period.” Audio of the presentation: <http://www.alignment2012.com/WS320253.WMA>.

¹³ No one had previously made this connection between the galactic alignment and the Dark Rift, with the possible exception of Dennis and/or Barbara Tedlock. In a conversation with Dennis in June or July of 1994 (at the Naropa Ethnopoetics conference in Boulder, Colorado), he either was previously aware of the galactic alignment (with or without the Dark Rift association) or he immediately understood my description of it, but objected that it was problematic because it could not be directly observed (the sun obscures the background features). D. Tedlock loosely and dismissively refers to the galactic alignment in his interesting book *2,000 Years of Mayan Literature* (2000). My review: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

¹⁴ Grofe (2011, *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXIV, released after stated pub date in August 2012). Grofe also stated this position in the documentary film *2012: The Beginning* (2012).

¹⁵ <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Email-exchange-Barnhart-Jenkins.pdf>.

have to insist that is not my position. My position derives, rather, from a logical understanding of the relative merit of two possible scenarios, and I invite the authors, and Michael Grofe, to choose which one of the following seems most likely to them — or provide some other scenario or argument against my approach.

Okay. A logical consideration of the “likely” position (adopted by MacLeod & Grofe), resulting from the evidence at Tortuguero, generates two scenarios. Let’s take a look from the reasonable vantage of which one would be the *most likely scenario*.¹⁶

Scenario 1. The astronomers of Tortuguero *were not* basing their knowledge or calculations on an older knowledge embedded into the Long Count tradition. They accidentally “discovered” the fortuitous and accidental placement of 13-Baktun cycle end-date and exploited the coincidence that it happens to fall on accurate astronomical alignments within both the Tropical Year and the Sidereal Year. That the solar position of this two-part (tropical and sidereal) alignment coincides also with the Dark Rift feature and the Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic — two powerful concepts within Maya Creation Myth symbolism — is also a total coincidence, and the Tortuguero scribes must have invented the idea that it would be meaningful to associate Bahlam Ajaw’s birthday with such celestial features. There was no Maya tradition already in place that such astronomical features were associated with Creation Myth and period-ending concepts. Got it? *All of this requires one to assume an extreme unlikely quadruple coincidence of circumstances*, for the Tortuguero astronomers to have only “locally” discovered and established the future galactic alignment as being important. I’m trying to think of a good analogy to drive home the extremely unlikely nature of this scenario. Maybe this works: you play the lottery with Abraham Lincoln’s birthday numbers, and you win the jackpot. That’s very very very very unlikely. You didn’t contrive Abe’s birthday numbers, and logic dictates that you probably knew about them before you played the game. That’s not a perfect analogy, but something like that.

Scenario 2. The creators of the Long Count, around 50 BC or perhaps even earlier, established the 13-Baktun cycle ending to fall on their calculation of a future solstice date positioned reasonably well (quite accurately) at the Dark Rift/Crossroads. This proposition is not without support from a variety of evidence-based positions, and in fact the first part of it (the solstice placement criterion) was briefly entertained by Edmonson (1988). The full scenario requires an awareness of the precession of the solstices (and equinoxes), which can be addressed with three points: 1) archaeologist Marion Popenoe Hatch argued that the Olmecs became aware of precession around 1200 BC, based on archaeological evidence at La Venta. 2) Hatch cites archaeological evidence that the pre-Classic people of Takalik Abaj (a sister city to Izapa during the pre-Classic period) were adjusting stone pointers to account for precession. 3) Hipparchus did not require telescopes or

advanced equipment to notice and calculate precession around 128 BC; he was using star position data recorded over a 140-year period and the data itself, as Neugebauer showed, supported a quite accurate value for precession (although Hipparchus loosely stated his results, probably to conform to the general Greek notion of a “Great Year” lasting 36,000 years). In addition to these factors, I’ve pointed out that, at Izapa, the Group B gnomons and Izapa’s latitude point to solar zenith-passage dates, thus to August 12, and the Group F ballcourt points to the December solstice (December 21).¹⁷ These two dates, evident in the cosmological tradition at Izapa, are the bookends of the 13-Baktun cycle — its *first* and *last* days within the Tropical Year.¹⁸ I’m not arguing *proof* here; these items are merely suggestive pieces of evidence, showing that we do have some evidence to support the likelihood of one of the scenarios. A supportive attitude toward the other scenario illogically assumes that *extremely unlikely coincidence* should be the safe default position of the skeptic.

So, the definite “No” and the objection via the catch-phrase that “hindsight does not prove original intent” is assumed to have merit (and perhaps it would if this were a simpler scenario), but when the two *actual scenarios* are laid out, as I have done above, the choices become much more stark and rationality favors the *more likely scenario* that the creators of the Long Count embedded their knowledge of a future galactic alignment into the structure of the Long Count, such that the 13-Baktun cycle end-date would position the solstice sun (meaningfully symbolic of a “First Father / Solar Lord” concept) at the Crossroads (meaningfully symbolic of a “cosmic center / throne” concept) and the Dark Rift (meaningfully symbolic of a “birthplace, mouth, portal” and, in the ballcourt symbolism at Izapa, of the “goal-ring” concept). That’s a pretty rich stew of accidentally meaningful symbolic and positional correspondences, where the alignment happens. All of this would have to be extraordinarily coincidental, not to mention *fortuitous* for the rhetorical fortunes of Bahlam Ajaw seven centuries later, for it *not to have been intended* by the originators of the Long Count.¹⁹ The situation strongly suggests that Bahlam Ajaw *did* employ hindsight, of a sort — recollecting or possibly even reviving a half-forgotten ancient knowledge — to exploit an already existing, long established, tradition. I’m open to the conversation that can unfold from my simple observation, and am also open to hearing viable alternative scenarios (if there are any) *that embrace all the*

¹⁷ See also Sitler (2012) for a reiteration of my observation (originally from Jenkins 1998).

¹⁸ For another consideration that argues for intention, related to a suggestion by Susan Milbrath, please read Part II of my letter here: <http://alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html>.

¹⁹ The logic of my position on this has not been commented on by those I’ve shared it with. It was an important concluding observation in my chapter for the Benfer /Adkins anthology (first draft October 2010) and is also presented in my 2012 book *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy* and in an excerpt on <http://JohnMajorJenkins.com> (“Quadruple Coincidence of Intentional Embedding?”). It seems to me that the “No” response to the question results from not having logically thought out the implications of accepting the likelihood of the awareness of the future galactic alignment at 7th-century Tortuguero.

¹⁶ MacLeod (2011:234, *IAU* Vol. 7 no. 278) recognized and used the approach of identifying the most likely scenario (rather than limiting investigations and interpretations to absolute proofs).

contexts and facts. The only coincidence in Scenario 2 is that Bahlam Ajaw was born near a direct Sidereal Year parallel to the 2012 period-ending date. Or, possibly, his birthday was manipulated — which itself suggests that his rhetoricians were planning on exploiting an already existing tradition.

As an ancillary consideration, we have a similar situation in GI's birthday on the Tablet of the Temple of the Cross at Palenque (Grofe 2012). This shows they had the ability to calculate an accurate solar position within the Sidereal Year, going back to 2360 BC, utilizing the *same solar position that the 2012 period-ending falls on*. There are numerous other examples of placing the sun at the Crossroads/Dark Rift position, all of which add the weight of implausibility to the coincidence position (Scenario 1). It's probable that after MacLeod/Van Stone's paper was finalized, in late 2011 or early 2012, Grofe's work (2012) would have contributed significantly to their views on the galactic alignment question, not to mention the inclusion of the astronomy of the new "2012" inscription, from La Corona, which was announced after their paper was finished.²⁰

Conclusion

There are many significant contributions in this essay, and I've largely limited my focus on an unexplored area where forward movement and discussion is most compellingly possible. I have provided an argument to persuade the skeptic toward seeing how it logically follows that, in all likelihood, the creators of the Long Count intended the 2012 alignment (given that one accepts that Bahlam Ajaw's scribes in the 7th century were likely aware of it and using it in his political life-biography). One hopes that the *persuasive argument* will not be required to *demonstrate* an absolute *proof*, but that *the most likely scenario* will become the default position, rather than an insistence on adhering to the extremely unlikely alternative scenario, as some kind of safe skepticism.

Bahlam Ajaw's awareness of, and use of, the future alignment (which MacLeod and Grofe consider "likely") is rather important, because it begs the question as to whether his astronomers discovered it accidentally (and it had no basis in the origins of the system) or if he was drawing clues from an older tradition to build his rhetorical text, based on his birthday. Again, the two scenarios, logically considered, lead on one hand to an extremely unlikely convergence of quadruple coincidences, or on the other hand to a more plausible scenario that the creators of the Long Count were aware of the Tropical Year and the Sidereal Year, and projected forward to a future date of alignment that would anchor their system. (It should be noted that "the system" is not just astronomical in nature—it nicely incorporates Creation Myth, ballgame, and king-making themes and symbols within a World Age doctrine connected to ceremonial practices of deity sacrifice and renewal.) The

²⁰ See my three essays at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>, MacLeod's comments on David Stuart's blog (July, 2012: <http://decipherment.wordpress.com/2012/06/30/notes-on-a-new-text-from-la-corona/>), and MacLeod's comments during my presentation at the Copan "Great Return" conference: <http://Alignment2012.com/MacLeod-Abyss12-19-2012.pdf>.

"future anchor" scenario does not obviate the possibility that during the nascent defining of the Long Count time periods and sub-periods that the early thinkers (astronomers, shamans, scribes, calendar-makers and priests) constructed an interval that would also target, back-calculated from the future solstice date, a solar-zenith-passage date in the distant past (August 11-13). I suspect this was the case, for, at Izapa, solar zenith-passage dates and the December solstice date are prominently evident. (My "Three Cosmic Center" model for understanding Izapan cosmology was presented in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*.)

Appendix 1: A Discussion of Footnote no. 50

Footnote 50 reads: "Proceeding from this discovery by Michael Grofe, John Major Jenkins (2010) presented a paper at the annual meetings of the Society for American Archaeology on the astronomical implications of the monument, including these four dates and other dates related to Jupiter. An energized, sometimes heated online discussion took place thereafter which brought to the table a number of disagreements—not only between Jenkins and academic Mayanists, but significantly, between academics—on the subjects of precession, pseudoscience, and archaeoastronomy. One view—amid a wide spectrum—seemed to marry these all together. One of the authors took part, as did Michael Grofe" (MacLeod & Van Stone 2012:45).

In the brevity of academic papers, the full context of discussion often gets left out. I greatly appreciate that the authors mentioned my *SAA* presentation of April 2010 that followed from Grofe's discovery of Bahlam Ajaw's birthday astronomy. That discovery actually happened during email exchanges Grofe and I were having in February of 2009, as I've recounted elsewhere (see footnote 10). The key was my Copan Stela C essay (*IMS*, December 2000, also in my book *Galactic Alignment 2002*), which itself followed from a strategy of investigation I employed in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998:134) and that I presented to Linda Schele in a letter of May 1994.²¹

The authors also allude to an energized and "sometimes heated" debate that followed from my *Society for American Archaeology* paper. This was the "MEC-Facebook Discussion" of November-December 2010, an experimental public peer-review of my *SAA* arguments. It was suggested by Dr. Ed Barnhart at the *Maya Exploration Center* after an informative and cordial email exchange we had in July of 2010, and was approved by the scholars on the board of the *MEC*. I personally invited all my scholarly critics and detractors; only a few responded and participated. The subject was, specifically, my *SAA* paper which was a "read paper" already written (April 2010), which I formatted with the slides I had used, so reviewers could read it.²²

²¹ Duplicated and discussed in: <http://alignment2012.com/HOWWHY1994-2014.pdf>

²² Jenkins (2010): "Astronomy in the Tortuguero Inscriptions": <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/Astronomy-in-TRT-SAA.pdf>.

Fortunately for a demonstration of the selective, circularly persistent, and *ad hominem* tactics employed by my academic critics, Stanley Guenter participated.²³ The results were striking, the process was exhausting, and it was all transcribed into a 206-page document, published online by the MEC and on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website. MacLeod and Grofe took part; Hoopes, Freidel, and Van Stone and other scholars who were invited did not. Regarding this debate, I'm not sure what is meant in their statement (MacLeod & Van Stone 2012:45) that "One view—amid a wide spectrum—seemed to marry these all together" [the "subjects of precession, pseudoscience, and archaeoastronomy"]. My summary statement capped the 4-week-long event, and was written on December 19, 2010.²⁴

Appendix 2: Additional Comments, Briefly

On Page 20 the authors take a breath and address two considerations, acknowledging that "for modern people," understanding the 2012 phenomenon "serves several ends." One is the human desire to understand other human cultures on this planet, and that "is a good thing." The second consideration is that "Most importantly, the end is indeed near." We've exceeded the planet's carrying capacity, concentrated wealth has increased exponentially ... and 2012 is a vector or "popular metaphor" for this discussion. The authors muse that "focusing attention on our folly may yet inspire real solutions to it." It is reasonable and understandable for investigators and cultural observers (i.e., citizens of planet earth) to address this unavoidable aspect of the 2012 topic. I have done so, as a free-standing or detachable aspect of my reconstruction work. However, my own critics have focused on this aspect of my writings and identify it as a contestable expression of the marketplace's "invented mythology" — that ancient Maya wisdom can save us from our own self-created delusions and destruction. But here we have prize-winning scholars enunciating the same, quite reasonable, consideration, without the blow-back that I've experienced. This underscores the double-standard that has often been applied to the wide-spectrum of treatments in my writings, from astronomy to spiritual teachings to creating a sustainable future to shamanism, indigenous rights, and appeals for personal and social change and transformation.

The double standard also occurs in the proper citing of my own contributions and publications, which have often anticipated the writings of other scholars by many years. Scholars will often cite "p.c." communications with their colleagues for ideas and explanations, so it's not a matter of always needing to cite peer-reviewed publications. For example, in footnote 8 on page 21 we find a discussion of the calendar correlation question. The authors wrote that "We owe clarification of the following data to Michael Grofe (personal communication 2011)." However, in early 2008 I was in email communication with Van Stone and the correlation issue came up. On May 27, 2008, I sent him a lengthy email, which is

²³ <http://www.update2012.com/Demonstration-for-Guenter.pdf>.

²⁴ <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>, pp. 202-206.

reproduced here: <http://alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html>. I succinctly and clearly explained the various correlation issues, and cited my article in the *Institute of Maya Studies* newsletter (March 2008) for additional support. These were the same issues addressed in footnote 8. Van Stone and I continued our email exchange through 2008. At the bottom of the footnote Van Stone claims to have been informed in a 2007 p.c. from Robert Wald about Floyd Lounsbury's 2-day shift proposal in the correlation question, saying the data wasn't as exact as Lounsbury asserts. Well, I discussed this in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, and in an analysis of Lounsbury's data in an essay I wrote and posted online in 1995: <http://www.alignment2012.com/fap9.html> (mentioned in the email to him). Van Stone did not seem to be informed of this 2-day error issue when I was in communication with him in 2008 (see Appendix 3 for a brief discussion of Van Stone's book of 2010).

Also in footnote 8 we find a description of my proposed "36-year" alignment zone, and the "womb" and "mouth" attribution for the Dark Rift region that I have argued for and emphasized in my work as keys to understanding how the ancient Maya thought about 2012. The idea is here simply credited to "some interpreters" and "others." I very often find that, despite my exchanges with scholars, when it comes to actually citing me for the ideas and discoveries and frameworks of discussion that I've put forward and often pioneered in my work, they just become general property cited to "some researchers believe." For example, in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* I provided citations and arguments for the Dark Rift being thought of as a birth place and the nuclear bulge region of the Galactic Center as a womb. Those ideas are either derided or accepted as if they'd been known all along, offering a no-win situation for the originator/identifier of the ideas.²⁵

On page 25, the angled serpent bar (Fig. 3) as the ecliptic is an idea I also discussed, in *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, following and extending the work of Linda Schele to incorporate the "cosmic center" cross-form throne symbolism (as at Izapa).

The description of the galactic alignment at the top of page 26 needs clarification. There seems to be a conflation of perspectives that may have resulted from the dual authorship of the essay. My own published work could have been cited for succinct clarity, but it gets lost in the murk of these descriptions. Note 16 refers to an idea I wrote about in the 1990s, which supposedly is the subject of "continuing debate" (if I stated that $2 + 2 = 4$, I'd have my detractors).

In footnote 17 on page 27 we read: "We have little direct evidence that they [the pre-Classic people] valued solstices as checkpoints...". This is certainly from Van Stone, who tenaciously clings to this talking point. We have the December solstice alignment of the ballcourt at Izapa, which I was the first to calculate and publish (1996, 1998),²⁶ and Izapa stands

²⁵ See Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

²⁶ The history of wrong statements about the Izapa ballcourt's alignment is rather fascinating. The BYU archaeologists never state it, and their maps can easily be misinterpreted due to vagueness in accounting for the 7° magnetic deviation. This is why Laughton (p.c. 2001) thought my solstice alignment discovery was not correct. In *The Mesoamerican Ballgame*, citing Lowe et. al (1982), Pierre Agrinier

above any other pre-Classic site as the likely origin place for the Long Count calendar cosmology.²⁷ Izapa is only mentioned once, briefly, in the article (on page 28), where the dates for Izapa's stelae are limited to 100 BC to 100 AD. The correct archaeological dating of this is clear in the literature — the oldest stelae at Izapa are dated to 400 BC, and since many depict Hero Twin episodes, they antedate the “First Father / One Hunahpu” scene on the San Bartolo murals. Izapa usually gets short shrift as a very early, if not the earliest, location for Hero Twin myth scenes.

The authors cite Carl Callaway (2011) for a “like-in-kind” concept that I’ve enunciated since 1995 (my book *The Center of Mayan Time*), in which it is reasonable to expect that the 2012 period-ending would echo the 3114 BC period-ending, stated in the inscriptions as “the completion” of a 13-Baktun period. The pertinent extract from the Callaway quote is: “Era day acts echo what will happen near the close of the next 13 Bak'tun period in the year 2012... Past is very much prologue.” In my work I referred to “Era day” as “Creation day” (which I think followed Schele’s use), and I saw it as applicable to both 3114 BC and 2012 AD. The authors likewise use the same “Creation” day term on page 30. Top of page 32, the “cardinal points” might actually be the solstice-equinox horizon points, as that kind of directional cosmogram was evidently of interest to the Maya, as I discussed in *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998).

Regarding “Modern Maya leaders and calendar-keepers” (page 36), my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* discussed them in several chapters, including Victor Montejo and the Baktunian Movement and I also discussed the work of Jennifer Harbury, Robert Sitler and Garrett Cook (2000). The first eight years of my work with the Maya (1986–1994) was largely concerned with traveling in Central America, service work in Maya communities, delivering relief supplies, and writing journalistic exposés on death squads and the socio-political challenges of the modern Maya. But Robert Sitler’s many years of devotion to Maya causes, and his ability to make fast friends in Maya communities and speak their language, has surely given him intimate insight into the Maya world.

Regarding Guenter’s quote on page 37, I questioned (in my Benfer/Adkins essay and on Stuart’s “Maya Decipherment” blog) the accuracy of suggesting that the Palenque scribes believed Pakal “would reign again” (like the “return” of King

(1991:193) states Izapa’s ballcourt is aligned 10S of East (a 100° azimuth, which is 14° in error). Aveni & Hartung (2000) got it right, but then in Aveni’s book (2009:54), he states the Izapa ballcourt’s alignment 48° in error (see my essay at: <http://www.update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>).

Another issue is the misleading notion that the Izapa ballcourt is post-Classic, which seems derived from the fact that activity occurred there in the post-Classic and other monuments were relocated there, speculated as occurring in the late-Classic. This late dating, for its construction, is a fallacy and is not even congruent with BYU’s own C-14 data; See Jenkins (2011), “Dating the Construction of the Izapan Ballcourt”: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/dating-the-ballcourt.pdf>.

²⁷ I’ve written (Jenkins 2009) that while the underlying cosmology was formulated at Izapa, it may have been calendar makers at nearby Takalik Abaj who inaugurated and first carved the Long Count.

Arthur) in 4772 AD. Rather, as I discussed in my 2011 book *Lord Jaguar’s 2012 Inscriptions* (sent to MacLeod in September 2011), a more Maya concept would be that he was expected to be invoked into supernatural manifestation on that far-future period-ending date. The practice of invoking departed ancestor-kings is already attested in Maya royal ceremonies; we just have to deduce that it would have been equally likely for a living Maya king to expect that he could be invoked, after his death, for a future reappearance—a concept that apparently has not been previously considered by scholars.

Appendix 3. Brief Survey of Comments in Van Stone’s 2012 book (8-20-2014)

Van Stone’s *2012: Science and Prophecy of the Ancient Maya* (2010) was elaborated from a 2008 Power Point presentation, originally posted online on FAMSI in late 2008. It’s gone through several iterations and was officially released in book form in early-2010. My copy is dated May 11, 2010.

Although I’ve already reviewed the book (<http://www.Update2012.com>) it’s worth revisiting in a concise way to observe how Van Stone has treated my work. We can do this by searching through the text for his references to key items from my work, such as “Izapa”, “galactic alignment”, “dark rift”, “solstice”, “Milky Way”, and my name, “Jenkins.” In a nutshell, despite our lengthy earlier email exchanges (in 2008) he avoids connecting my name with the concepts that are diagnostic of my pioneering work.

I’ve decided to link this as a separate treatment, as it grew larger than I anticipated, and I should keep this review more concise and on point. My recent survey of comments in Van Stone’s 2010 book is linked here:

<http://www.Update2012.com/Survey-Comments-Van-Stone.html>

Brief Synopsis of My Logical and Persuasive “Most Likely” Scenario Comparison

- First, we must entertain *most likely scenarios*, not a requirement of absolute proof.
- If we accept that it is *likely* that the 7th-century AD Tortuguero astronomers knew about the future alignment of the solstice sun with the Dark Rift / Crossroads on 13.0.0.0.0 in 2012, then it logically follows that the creators of the Long Count *most likely* intended to target that alignment with the placement of the 2012 period-ending, at the inauguration of the Long Count calendar (in the pre-Classic).
- Why? Because the alternative explanation is that the convergence of at least four different coincidental circumstances accidentally occur on the 13.0.0.0.0 date which falls arbitrarily in 2012; the Tortuguero astronomers accidentally noticed it during their astronomical ruminations and decided to exploit the accident of the

future alignment's occurrence on a big period ending, which accidentally involves important astronomical features involved in Maya Creation Mythology.

- There is evidence that the pre-Classic people at La Venta and Takalik Abaj were aware of and adjusting for the precession of the equinoxes. Evidence at Izapa points to a recognition and use of dates within the Tropical Year (August 12 and December 21) that are the first and last days of the 13-Baktun cycle.



email to Barb, August 26, 2014:

Thank you again for your clarifications on Lagunita Stela 2. I also thank you (and Mark) for your comments in your *Zeitschrift* piece, which fairly summarized my role in the 2012 discussion. I think the essay is a very very important piece, but I want to focus on an aspect of it that I think provides an opening to move the discussion forward. Only recently have I been able to read through and digest this revised and published version. I hope you'll have the time to consider my response, which is pretty straightforward.

You and Mark wrote (p. 45):

"Our position[51], and that of Grofe (personal communication, 2010, 2011) is that the Maya of Tortuguero **likely** had the astronomical sophistication not only to notice that the 13.0.0.0.0 date would fall on the winter solstice, but that this solstice would fall within the Dark Rift somewhere past the midpoint of the solstice Sun's slow transit.

This raises two questions: (1) did the Maya tweak the king's birth date? And (2) does this demonstrate that the Preclassic creators of the Long Count set the 13.0.0.0.0 date intentionally? Our answers would be: (1) Possibly, because they contrived certain other dates, but it still seems a stretch, and (2) No; it would be illogical to invoke hindsight as **proof** of original intent."

(Note 51 disclaims Van Stone agreeing with the position held by you and Grofe.) This quote follows up on your earlier comment (footnote 3 on page 19) that:

"...to our view, it cannot be either **proven or disproven** that the alignment of the solstice sun with the Galactic Equator ... could have been anticipated by the creators of the Long Count; all we can do is be amiably skeptical until **persuaded** otherwise."

The two quotes go between a desire for "proof" versus allowing for a likely or persuasive position. I think we agree — especially in reconstructing ancient beliefs and paradigms — that it is unrealistic to expect that definitive proof can be marshaled for the vast majority of positions that have become consensus. Scholars routinely settle for "most likely" interpretations. So, "proof of original intent" can't realistically be expected, especially based on something as indirect as "hindsight". I'm not invoking hindsight. Rather, based on the

"likely" scenario that "the Maya of Tortuguero had the astronomical sophistication ... to notice that the 13.0.0.0.0 date would fall on the winter solstice", I'm offering a logical comparison of the two possible consequent scenarios (regarding the pre-Classic awareness of the future alignment). I'm also open to other possible scenarios, apart from the two I present, but I haven't thought of any.

So, if you're ready and willing, I can send about one page that lays out the persuasive argument as to the most likely scenario. I've been chewing on this for several years; time and attention have kept it on the sidelines. But since you've invited a persuasive argument, I have one. :) Best wishes,

John

She replied and said to send it: <http://Alignment2012.com/two-possible-scenarios.html>. No response as of 6-2016; Grofe declined responding to the same invite.

My Response to the Invitation/Challenge: Two Possible Scenarios

(Note. Given the resistance to responding, I distilled my response to the challenge to a concise statement, below. I also recorded an MP3 audio reading of this, and sent the link, trying to make it as easy as possible for MacLeod and Grofe to grasp my point. I persisted into 2015, seeking a response, but after ignoring my requests both finally begged off engaging the logic of my response to their challenge. *And that is where the most productive of all 2012 conversations has left off.* I was invited to persuade and show the most likely interpretation; I did so in a concise and cogent way. But the conversation ended, dangling, revealing how the two most open-minded scholars decided to close down the investigation by requiring a double-standard in which some can offer an evidence-based *most likely scenario*, whereas I must provide 100%, absolutely unassailable, *proof* — as if we were dealing in mathematical equations).

My position derives *from a logical understanding of the relative merit of two possible scenarios*. I invite readers to choose which one of the following scenarios seems most likely — or provide some other scenario or argument. As previously discussed, MacLeod & Van Stone (2012:9, 45) allude to both a desire for "proof" vs. an allowance that *likelihood* is the best that can be expected. So, let's have parity on both sides of the equation and reframe the question: "Given that it's *likely* that the Tortuguero astronomers could calculate and knew about the future galactic alignment of era-2012, what is the *likelihood* that the more ancient creators of the Long Count also were aware of it, and fixed the 13-Baktun cycle ending in the Long Count to it?" A logical consideration of the "likely" position held by MacLeod & Grofe (MacLeod & Van Stone 2012:45), which resulted from the evidence at Tortuguero, generates two scenarios. Let's take a look from the reasonable vantage of which one would be the *most likely scenario*:

Scenario 1. The astronomers of Tortuguero *were not* basing their knowledge or calculations on an older knowledge embedded into the Long Count tradition. They accidentally

“discovered” the fortuitous and accidental placement of 13-Baktun cycle end-date and exploited the coincidence that it falls on accurate astronomical alignments within both the Tropical Year and the Sidereal Year. That the solar position of this two-part (tropical and sidereal) alignment coincides also with the Dark Rift feature and the Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic — two powerful concepts within Maya Creation Myth symbolism — is also a total coincidence. Or the Tortuguero scribes must have invented the idea that it would be meaningful to associate Bahlam Ajaw’s birthday with such celestial features. If there was no prior tradition that these celestial concepts were important, then it originates with the Tortuguero scribes and we’d expect traceable dispersion emanating from Tortuguero. All of this requires one to accept *extreme unlikely convergences of multiple coincidences*, for the Tortuguero astronomers to have only “locally” discovered and established the future galactic alignment as being important.

Scenario 2. The creators of the Long Count, around 50 BC or perhaps even earlier, established the 13-Baktun cycle ending to fall on their calculation of a future solstice date positioned reasonably well at the Dark Rift/Crossroads. This scenario is not without support from a variety of evidence-based positions, and in fact the first part of it (the solstice criterion) was briefly entertained by Edmonson (1988) and the Brickers. The full scenario requires an awareness of *the precession* of the solstices (and equinoxes), which can be addressed with three points: 1) archaeologist Marion Popenoe Hatch argued that the Olmecs became aware of precession around 1200 BC, based on archaeological evidence at La Venta. 2) Hatch cites archaeological evidence that the pre-Classic people of Takalik Abaj (a sister city to Izapa during the pre-Classic period) were adjusting stone pointers to account for precession. 3) Hipparchus did not require telescopes or advanced equipment to notice and calculate precession around 128 BC; he was using star position data recorded over a 140-year period and the data itself, as Neugebauer showed, supported a quite accurate value for precession (although Hipparchus loosely stated his results, probably to conform to the general Greek notion of a “Great Year” lasting 36,000 years).

In addition to these factors, I’ve pointed out that, at Izapa, the Group B gnomons and Izapa’s latitude point to solar zenith-passage dates, thus to August 12, and the Group F ballcourt points to the December solstice sunrise azimuth (December 21). These two dates, evident in the cosmological tradition at Izapa, are the bookends of the 13-Baktun cycle — its *first* and *last* days within the Tropical Year.

I’m not arguing *proof* here; these items are suggestive pieces of evidence, showing that we do have some evidence to support the *greater likelihood* of one of the scenarios. In addition, a supportive attitude toward Scenario 1 unreasonably assumes that *extremely unlikely coincidence* should be the safe default position of the skeptic. The definite “No” and the objection via “hindsight does not prove original intent” would have merit if this were a simpler scenario, but when the two *actual scenarios* are laid out, as I have done above, the choices become much more stark and reason favors the *more likely scenario* that the creators of the Long Count embedded their knowledge of a future galactic alignment into the structure of the Long Count,

such that the 13-Baktun cycle end-date would position the solstice sun (meaningfully symbolic of a “First Father / Solar Lord” concept) at the Crossroads (meaningfully symbolic of a “cosmic center / throne” concept) and the Dark Rift (meaningfully symbolic of a “birthplace, mouth, portal” and, in the ballcourt symbolism at Izapa, of the “goal-ring” concept).

That’s a pretty rich stew of accidentally meaningful symbolic and positional correspondences, where the alignment happens. All of this would have to be extraordinarily coincidental, not to mention *fortuitous* for the rhetorical fortunes of Bahlam Ajaw seven centuries later, if it *was not intentionally targeted* by the originators of the Long Count. The situation strongly suggests that Bahlam Ajaw *did* employ hindsight, of a sort — recollecting or possibly even reviving a half-forgotten ancient knowledge — to exploit an already existing, long established, tradition. I’m open to the conversation that can unfold from my simple observation, and am also open to hearing viable alternative scenarios (if there are any) *that embrace all the contexts and facts*. The only coincidence in Scenario 2 is that Bahlam Ajaw was born near a direct Sidereal Year parallel to the 2012 period-ending date. Or, possibly, his birthday was manipulated for the purpose of highlighting the sidereal parallel to 2012. — John Major Jenkins. August 27, 2014.

f. Review of Michael Grofe’s 2003 article

Did the Creators of the Long Count fix their 2012 cycle-ending to the Galactic Alignment?

John Major Jenkins. © June 7, 2014

Note: This is an expanded excerpt from my unpublished *Summary and Guide to the Work of Michael Grofe* (n.d., written in 2014).

At the 25:27 mark in the documentary film *2012: The Beginning*, Dr. Michael Grofe stated that:

“John Major Jenkins has proposed that the Maya intentionally placed the end of the Long Count on December 21, 2012 because of this alignment with the galaxy.¹ I don’t think we have enough evidence to suggest that the creators of the Long Count actually intended that.”²

I believe we certainly do have enough evidence to *suggest* this possibility. And, in addition, I believe the *evidence* we can discuss makes this a *probable* proposition — more probable

¹ Of course, this a short-hand styling of the alignment and the Long Count; the Long Count doesn’t “end” in 2012. I don’t believe so and neither does Grofe, it’s just a cursory way of referring to it.

² The interview was conducted in early 2011, when Grofe may not have been fully cognizant of my arguments based on the Izapa evidence. At the suggestion of Barb MacLeod I composed a concise treatment of my Izapa work, and sent this to Grofe and MacLeod in early 2012. Michael responded within a few months, and I responded to his questions and comments in June of 2012. There were some fundamental misperceptions about the nature of the evidence, which I re-emphasized in my email response to him:

<http://update2012.com/Grofe-response-my-Izapa-summary.pdf>.

than the alternatives, which is the name of the game in reconstructing ancient paradigms. We can't expect absolute proofs, and discussions with both Grofe and MacLeod indicate that they understand that "the most likely scenario" is the best we can hope for (at this point). This is a general truism not just with the controversial 2012 topic, but also with epigraphic decipherment, deducing ancient beliefs, interpreting iconography, and reconstructing mercurial aspects of ancient societies.

My discussion below compares the various scenarios and argues why an intentionally calculated placement to the alignment in 2012 is *the most likely* scenario. We certainly have enough evidence to *suggest* the possibility, which in fact Grofe already explicitly offered in 2003. I begin with Grofe's own suggestion, based on evidence he examined on bone fragments from Tikal, in his 2003 essay which is freely posted on *The Maya Exploration Center* research page³ (the Director of which is Dr. Ed Barnhart).

Part 1.

My review of Grofe's essay "Calculations of the Tropical Year and Precessional Cycles: Two bone fragments from Tikal Burial 116," June 2003. Posted at the *Maya Exploration Center*.

In this essay, Grofe shows his early interest in exploring evidence that indicates the ancient Maya were tracking the Tropical Year and the precession of the equinoxes. In his Introduction, Grofe writes that "The intervals indicated on these fragments reveal important connections to periods that facilitate the calculation of the true tropical year and the 26,000 year cycle of precession, both of which appear to be strongly suggested by the structure of the Long Count" (Grofe 2003:1). Grofe's interest in identifying *the Mesoamerican methods and perspectives* in observing and calculating astronomical phenomena is shown when he notes that modern investigators are "challenged to attempt to understand a way of reckoning time which exists outside the Western tradition, often preceding and exceeding the calculations of the West" (2). Because it honors and seeks to understand Maya perspectives, such an approach can obviously produce meaningful results, in contradistinction to methods of interpretation and critique which impose non-Maya assumptions and filters.⁴

Grofe summarizes Teeple's work in identifying Tropical Year constants in the Maya dates. By this, I refer to the number of days that separate two Maya dates in an inscription. The two dates are often conceptually linked in the narrative and thus it isn't a question of randomly casting about for two dates that will exhibit a Tropical Year constant (the Tropical Year is not

³ http://www.mayaexploration.org/pdf/TikalBurial116_Grofe2003.pdf

⁴ These filters can include the requirement that the Maya were employing Western astronomical concepts and methods, as asserted by Aveni (2009) and Krupp (2009) and Larsen (2011). (This is the cMd bias discussed by Gerardo Aldana.) What gets filtered out is an awareness of the indigenous Maya methods and strategies in representing and calculating astronomical phenomenon. For my responses to Aveni, Krupp, and Larsen, see Jenkins 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2011b, and 2012).

an even number of days; it equals approximately 365.24219 days).

Grofe discusses the incised bones found in the tomb of Tikal's ruler Hasaw Chan K'awil, noting that "Two of these bones contain information which may help us to understand how the Maya and their predecessors were able to perform such an accurate calculation of the tropical year" (Grofe 2003:4-5). Notice he includes the "predecessors" of the Maya, meaning the pre-Classic during which the Long Count was created. He finds that two stated dates on the Tikal bones are separated by an interval that equals *260 days less than 52 Tropical Years*. This period is roughly close to the 52-Haab Calendar Round cycle, and the intervals seem to be concerned with calibrating relations between the 360-day Tun, the 365-day Haab, and the Tropical Year. Grofe then speculates on relatively simple methods the Maya could have employed to correct for errors accumulated over larger periods of time.

Grofe turns to three other dates recorded on the incised bones (Miscellaneous Text 26 from Burial 116). Here we find Grofe's early recognition of what is now called the "3-11 Pik" formula, which Barb MacLeod has elucidated as a device used by Maya kings that effectively relate them to "stations" of time fixed by precessional calculations.⁵ The "3-11" Pik formula implies 11 Baktuns multiplied 3 times, or 33 Baktuns, and calculating from the 3114 BC Era Base we see, after this time period transpires, "the position of the Haab' falling on the winter solstice, 132 days after the second zenith passage on August 11" (Grofe 2003: 9). In other words, the formula allows for a long-range calculation that bookends the solar zenith position within the Tropical Year (August 11, the 13-Baktun Era Base in 3114 BC) and the December solstice (the important Tropical Year station of the 13-Baktun era-ending date in 2012 AD). As Grofe summarizes: "It appears that the creators of the Long Count system, and those who noticed the 33-B'ak'tun pattern were intending to determine when the date 4 Ahau 8 Cumku would reach the point of the winter solstice" (10).⁶

Grofe notes that "33 B'ak'tuns appears to be the relevance of 3-11-pih" (10), but this 33-B'ak'tun period is a conceptual mid-point because, as Grofe writes: "What is more interesting is the length of time being measured. 13,200 Tuns [33 B'ak'tuns] is exactly one half of a precessional cycle of 26,000 years"⁷ (10). What happens is that, over this full interval of 66 B'ak'tuns the sidereal position of the Era Base (which is also a station in the Tropical Year, being a solar zenith-passage date) will return to its original position. Grofe writes that "coordinating the long cycle of precession – the longest observable astronomical cycle

⁵ See MacLeod (2008). Online with her permission: <http://Alignment2012.com/3-11PikFormula.html>.

⁶ The implication for my reconstruction work is obvious (Jenkins 1998), if only that this 3-11 Pik evidence shows that the ancient Maya were utilizing the same astronomical concepts that my "2012 alignment reconstruction" requires they were. Which means that my conceptual framework for what the ancient Maya were actually thinking about is not as "far-out" as many critics have asserted. It is, however, far beyond what many critics assume the Maya were capable of. But that is an issue deriving from the knowledge base of the critics rather than with any inherent flaw in my arguments or the evidence I've assembled.

⁷ 66 Baktuns is actually 26,021 Tropical Years, but with such large periods the slight difference is moot.

– with the drift of the Haab’ from the tropical year” was “apparently the intention of the creators of the calendar system” (10). As an aside, I would add that using the sidereal position of the Era Base date of a solar-zenith passage *as a Tropical Year anchor to measure precessional shifting* is conceptually equivalent to using the sidereal position of the December solstice to do the same.⁸ This all indicates the method and the ability required to position the solstice sun at the Dark Rift/Crossroads on 13.0.0.0.0 in 2012 AD.

Grofe entertains difficulties with his reconstruction, such as the fact that small calculation errors accumulate over such large periods of time. However, the errors are “certainly slight given the vast expanses of time being dealt with” (11). He notes that the solar zenith intervals implicate the 15° N latitude and the sites of Izapa and Copan.⁹ Grofe offers a matter-of-fact reading of the assembled evidence:

“We also see the specific calculation of the cycle of precession within these cycles, which apparently was intended in the inception of the Long Count. The 66 B’ak’tun cycle implied in the bone fragment of Hasaw Chan K’awil accounts for an exact measurement of one precessional cycle. Curiously, this is also implied in the Long Count system of 13 B’ak’tuns, in that five cycles of 13 B’ak’tuns gives 65 B’ak’tuns, or 26,000 Tuns, exactly one B’ak’tun less than the 66 B’ak’tun cycle...” (11).

As a curious side note, the last item Grofe noted (that five 13-Baktun cycles roughly equal one complete precessional cycle) is a fact that Frank Waters noted in his 1975 book *Mexico Mystique*. It is a singular piece of information from Waters that I cited in my 1989 book *Journey to the Mayan Underworld*, which got me thinking about the precessional basis of the Long Count at that time. With the 3-11 Pik formula, explored not only by Grofe but also by MacLeod (2008), Loofer, Grube, and others (see Grofe 2003 for discussion), we have something like a confirmation that Waters’ original insight from the 1970s was on target, despite the fact that Waters has been dismissed by critics as an instigator of “2012 mythology,” a “mystic” or merely a “novelist.”¹⁰

Finally, Grofe concludes by reiterating how the level of astronomical knowledge evident in the Maya inscriptions may be challenging to an establishment that holds to “non-Western histories” and “Eurocentric” biases:

“...it appears highly likely that the ancient Mesoamericans devised an ingenious system with which to track and observe the cycles of nature and the cosmos. That they succeeded at this much earlier than Europeans, or even earlier civilizations in the West, may come as some surprise and a definite challenge to the Eurocentric bias against non-Western histories, traditions, and sciences. There is much more to understand regarding the operations of this system, and the meanings of this knowledge to those who recorded it. Yet, what appears in the system of the Long Count is an unparalleled understanding of the workings of the earth as it relates to the heavens, and the human realm as it relates to the entirety of time” (12-13).

The implications of Grofe’s position in this 2003 essay are clear from his own words. Since MacLeod went further, in 2008, in confirming and expanding the 3-11 Pik formula I don’t think that anything here can be retracted based on mistaken information.¹¹ But in 2003, “2012” and the related astronomical basis of my theory about 2012 were not on the radar for most scholars. Between 2008 and 2012 a great deal of critical mitigation has been thrown at 2012 and my efforts to discuss the related Maya astronomy.¹²

Consequently, it’s possible that Grofe, given the abusive critiques that have been heaped upon anyone who suggests the Maya were aware of precession, would prefer to state some of his observations in this essay more carefully. However, his later essays indicate that he embraced and utilized the same methodological approach of this essay, and the results, as we will see, are even more striking and confirming of the ancient Maya awareness of the Tropical Year, the Sidereal Year, and the precession of the equinoxes.

Part 2.

More evidence that allows us to suggest that the creators of the Long Count intended to calculate and target the astronomical alignment of era-2012.

Grofe appropriately ends his essay (“Measuring Deep Time: The Sidereal Year and the Tropical Year in Maya Inscriptions Oxford IX Archaeoastronomy”, conference paper, IAU Vol. 7 no. 278, released July 2011)¹³ without exploring the deeper implications of his findings, which he writes relate to politics, astrology, and cosmology. It is appropriate because these areas require arguments, speculation, and informed surmising. Such

⁸ Thus both the Era Base date and the Era cycle-ending date (in 3114 BC and 2012 AD) are implied as intentional artifacts of the Long Count. I’ve noted for almost two decades now that the three Group B solar zenith gnomons at Izapa indicate the solar zenith-passage date referential to Era Base hearthstone symbolism (thus, to 3114 BC) and the Group F ballcourt aligns to the December solstice sunrise azimuth with a solar deity rebirth and enthroning symbolism (thus to 2012 and the Maya Creation Myth).

⁹ With Izapa being the active site during the pre-Classic period when the Long Count was formulated.

¹⁰ “Mythology” being used as in “lie” or a “fiction”; see Whitesides & Hoopes (2012) and my corrective review of their essay (Jenkins 2014). See also Stuart (2011) for the dismissive attitude toward Waters.

¹¹ Grofe cited his 2003 essay in his “Copan Baseline” piece (SAA 2010), which is in press as of 2014. [Published 3-2015]

¹² There are exceptions, including Gelfer (2011), the *MEDIA FACEBOOK Discussion* (see Jenkins 2011), and Grofe’s and MacLeod’s essays. But the efforts of critics who seem to be ideologically opposed to reconstructing the deeper levels of ancient Maya astronomical knowledge have gone hand-in-glove with a vapid mass media and pop marketplace that repeatedly portrayed 2012 as a doomsday and my own “solstice-galaxy” alignment reconstruction as a doomsday device (see, e.g. Ron Miller’s *Is the End of the World Near?*, Lerner 2011), despite my endless efforts to invite rational dialogue and clarify.

¹³ https://www.academia.edu/3894959/Measuring_Deep_Time_The_Sidereal_Year_and_the_Tropical_Year_in_Maya_Inscriptions

work is necessary, and does not rely on the “random guessing” type of speculation, for there are other sets of evidence that can be integrated into the overall methodology. For example, the question of whether or not the 13-Baktun period ending in 2012 was intentionally placed by the creators of the Long Count can be explored through three different lines of argument.

First: Given the solstice placement of the 13-Baktun period ending according to the 584283 correlation, and given the very close factual congruence of the solstice sun’s position with the Crossroads of the Milky Way & the ecliptic (one of the locations alluded to in Grofe’s analysis), we are confronted with accepting a highly improbable double coincidence, if we want to maintain the assumption that the creators of the Long Count, ca. 50 BC (during Izapa’s heyday), DID NOT intend to locate the end of the 13th Baktun on December 21, 2012. The argument concludes that *intention* is more likely. This is a simple argument, one that is compelling by way of the sheer unlikelihood of the only other alternative (a double coincidence).

It should be pointed out here that the 20 Baktun ending exploited by K’an Bahlam at Palenque, in amplifying his father’s status, is first and foremost calendrical, not astronomical. It is thus not something explicitly and empirically embedded into the structure of the Long Count, as is the galactic alignment that is coordinated with the 13th-Baktun period ending. The astronomical aspect of the Palenque usage, discovered by Grofe, which is part of the Temple of the Inscriptions narrative, connects the sidereal position of the sun on Pakal’s death date with the 20th Baktun anniversary of his accession AND with the calculated date of September 4, 1588 AD (referenced with its tzolkin-haab position prior to the future 12th Baktun ending). These machinations are impressive yet are clearly contrived after-the-fact, as if demonstrating an astronomical association was important to Pakal, but they are dependent upon the purely calendrical 80th Calendar Round anniversary. I’ve suggested that Pakal was imitating and co-opting Lord Jaguar’s life-strategies. That Pakal’s death date may have been manipulated to serve this purpose is suggested by the fact that his death date in the 260-day calendar is the same as Lord Jaguar’s death date (6 Etznab). Lord Jaguar died just over 4 years before Pakal. (Etznab, Flint Knife, suggests perhaps an intentionally timed auto-sacrifice.)

Given that Lord Jaguar’s Monument 6 was dedicated in 669 AD, long before the rhetorical narratives about Pakal’s divinity were constructed by his son, K’an Bahlam, I have suggested that a *co-opting of Lord Jaguar’s calendrical and astronomical strategy of amplifying his status* occurred at Palenque. The threat for Pakal’s dynasty would understandably derive from the need of the region to reassert its power and status, after the defeats by Calakmul around the time that both Pakal and Lord Jaguar were born (early 7th century). An additional threat posed by Lord Jaguar’s rivalry may come from Pakal not having a direct lineage to the earlier dynasty of Palenque, namely Ahkal Mo’ Naab, and the possibility that Lord Jaguar *did* have a direct male lineage.¹⁴ Yet another threat may have come from

the possibility that Lord Jaguar achieved a highly effective rhetorical statement, with TRT Monument 6, regarding his inborn association with Creation Mythos astronomy connected to 2012, *the power and efficacy of which springs from 2012 being a real artifact of the ancient calendar tradition.*

While the 20th Baktun ending was very possibly *not* an intended artifact of the system, Pakal and K’an Bahlam exploited it effectively as counter-propaganda to Lord Jaguar’s claims. We should acknowledge two things: Pakal was not as effective in asserting powerful victories in the region as Lord Jaguar was. The first recorded efforts of Pakal come around the 9.11.0.0.0 date in 652 AD, which followed directly after Lord Jaguar’s four war victories in the 640s. Second, Lord Jaguar’s impressive biographical monument, TRT Monument 6, was dedicated in 669 AD, at least a decade before the inscriptions at Palenque were commissioned. It is reasonable to suspect, given the ambitious assertions of Lord Jaguar, that Pakal and his son would want to construct an even more glorious legacy-narrative. But they couldn’t use 2012; Lord Jaguar had claimed it. In fact, it would be best to ignore that date and construct rhetorical strategies around something bigger — why not the 20th-Baktun period ending? The effectiveness of that date lies in the coincidental congruence of it with Pakal’s accession date (within 8 days anyway). If that didn’t work, they could have found something else at 40 Baktuns, 65 Baktuns, whatever worked. The astronomical item of congruence prior to the 12th Baktun identified by Grofe could easily have been contrived and presented as an additional supportive circumstance that was noticed by the calendar priests, mimicking Lord Jaguar’s own astronomically-based claim. (Actually, Lord Jaguar’s narrative also contains calendrical and numerological parallels.)

Second: In my reconstructed Izapan Calendar Round (Jenkins 1996, 1998), we can find a nice calendrical congruence between the CR and the LC in reference to the period-ending date in 2012, but not the zero date in 3114 BC. With a basic transform (of dropping zero counting and shifting the year-bearer system used) back-generated from the Tikal CR, the hypothetical Izapan CR allows for December 21, 2012 (13.0.0.0.0) to fall on 4 Ahau 1 Kankin (not 3 Kankin). This could be seen as evidence (along with the solstice position) for a future projection rather than a back projection. The 8 Cumku Haab position of the 3114 BC date cannot be made to conform in a reconstructed hypothetical Izapan Calendar Round. The need for this consideration derives from the Tikal CR not being attested until almost 300 AD, and the idea that the LC may have been designed to be congruent with an original CR system. If so, it only works if the period ending in 2012 was the anchor for the system. The heliacal rise of the Pleiades on the equinox ca. 3114 BC is a rather vague parameter that cannot be reduced to the level of accuracy exhibited by the 2012 date’s placement of the solstice sun on the galactic equator, for which we have a roughly 40-year window.

Third: evidence from Izapa. The ballcourt alignment points to

¹⁴ Lord Jaguar cites a lineage founding rite in 510 AD with a visiting lord named Ahkal K’uk who may very well be the Palenque king Ahkal Mo’ Naab (ruled 501 to 524 AD). An even earlier founding rite,

in the 4th century AD and linked to Lord Jaguar’s era, is cited by Lord Jaguar, which seems to indicate that Palenque and Tortuguero share the same dynastic origin.

December 21. The Group B pillar gnomon alignments and the 15° N latitude evoke the August 11-13 solar zenith passage. I've discussed this many times over the years it counters the assertions by critics that "there are no dates at Izapa." It is found in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, which is dismissed by most critics as completely worthless and filled with nonsense. Those scholars who see any value in it are largely mute due to having been warned, either explicitly or tacitly. At Izapa, the archaeoastronomy and iconographic references to the World Age doctrine of the Creation Myth provides for their recognition of a 13-Baktun period between 3114 BC and 2012 AD. Perhaps some day critics will honestly and accurately treat my work at Izapa.

In all of this, it is interesting to note that my interpretations of Izapa astronomy, regarding how the purported creators of the Long Count thought about 2012, is clearly reflected in the Classic Period text from Tortuguero that contains the 2012 date.¹⁵ My work on Izapa astronomy led to my "2012 alignment thesis," however, that occurred before I was aware of the TRT monument's 2012 reference. I must be a good guesser or a psychic or just plain lucky, or perhaps my work had simply identified the same astronomical complex of ideas that later manifest at Tortuguero. A purely evidence-based argument for intention exists in the use, at Izapa, of the solar zenith-passage dates (one of which is the LC Era Base date, August 11-13) and the December 21 solstice azimuth (in the Group F ball court). I was the first to publish the observation that the ballcourt aligns with the December solstice sunrise azimuth, and Maya scholars resist acknowledging my contribution.¹⁶

Thus, the tropical year positions that define the beginning and end dates of the 13-Baktun cycle (one a solar zenith passage and one a solstice) are featured at Izapa. Creation myth imagery surrounds the archaeoastronomical monuments at Izapa, indicating that Izapa cosmology associated these dates with Creation events. I have argued, and Carl Callaway recently affirms, that 3114 BC and 2012 AD are both vectors for Creation mythology themes. In my argument, this perspective derives from the "cosmic center" concept that can be associated with both August 11 (zenith) and December 21 (Crossroads). My argument also integrates the Creation Myth episodes and deities on the Izapan monuments in a way that no other Izapa researcher has done. It will certainly take some other scholar to creatively co-opt and reiterate my ideas before they are ever acknowledged. (Despite an entire concise chapter on Izapa in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment* and three detailed essays for free on my website Alignment2012.com beginning in 2000.)

¹⁵ And the La Corona 2012 text reflects Lord Jaguar's strategy; see my three essays at *The Center for 2012 Studies* website: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

¹⁶ Van Stone avoided it in his 2010 book and points to Aveni (despite our email discussions of 2008). Aveni himself criticizes my work and doesn't mention it in his 2009 book on 2012, probably because it reveals his concurrence with the key to Izapa's 2012 astronomy that I calculated and published independently, and earlier than him.

Part 3.

Excerpt from my essay for the Benfer & Adkins archaeoastronomy anthology,¹⁷ taken from my write-up on my website <http://johnmajorjenkins.com>.

Here is an excerpt from an essay I wrote largely in mid-2010, and finalized in early 2012. The astronomical evidence on Tortuguero Monument 6 strongly suggests that Lord Jaguar (b. 612 AD) was aware of the alignment of the December solstice sun with the Dark Rift / Crossroads on December 21, 2012 (13.0.0.0.0). The question arises as to where this knowledge came from, and if the alignment was embedded into the structure of the Long Count when the Long Count was invented (more than 2,000 years ago). If it was not, then Lord Jaguar's astronomers must have "discovered it" accidentally, and the fact that it coordinates with a great period-ending in the calendar must be a mind-boggling accident or coincidence (which they saw fit to exploit in a classic *legitimizing* narrative of kingly power, despite it being in this scenario an unorthodox, accidental, and non-traditional artifact).

In fact, as I summarized in my essay, it would be a quadruple coincidence. If reason (aka, being reasonable) is a value, we are confronted with a choice between an accurate knowledge of precession during the pre-Classic versus an almost impossible to swallow quadruple coincidence. Actually, we know through Marion Popenoe Hatch's work that the Olmec at La Venta (ca. 1000 BC) and the inhabitants of Takalik Abaj (pre-Classic) were both adjusting for the precession of the equinoxes. So, I'm not quite sure why the idea that the creators of the Long Count knew about precession (by ca. 40 BC) is not more reasonable than defaulting to a quadruple coincidence. Such a line of logic is probably distasteful to the scholars who continue their efforts in denying that 2012 had any meaning for the ancient Maya, which explains why the publication of my essay is currently in a holding pattern [and is now officially blocked]. Here's the excerpt:

Since the early 1990s, I have offered careful definitions and discussions of this alignment process. The Milky Way's mid-line is a very precise celestial marker that astronomers call the "galactic equator." The body of the sun is one-half of a degree wide. With such basic parameters defined, the precessional shifting of the position of the solstice sun will take slightly over 36 years to fully move through the galactic equator. Astronomer Jean Meeus (1997) and Rutherford Appleton Laboratory astronomer Patrick Wallace (Jenkins 2002: 249-256; Jenkins 2009: 145-146) have both calculated the dating of the alignment process. Summarizing these calculations, and applying the duration of the sun's precessional shift through the galactic equator, I identified a minimum range for the alignment running from 1980 to 2016 AD (Jenkins 2002, 2009). In order to avoid the misconception that the alignment happens only on and

¹⁷ The debacle surrounding the blocking of the publication of my article by one reviewer (while it was considered worthy of publishing by at least six other scholars) is revealing of the contempt and animosity for my presence in the 2012 discussion, despite *being a pioneer of it* and my earlier interpretations being echoed and explored (much later) by professional Maya scholars.

precisely on December 21, 2012 (an irrational notion because precession is a very slow process), I have referred to the alignment as occurring in “era-2012” (Jenkins 1998, 2002, 2009).

Despite confused assessments offered by NASA astronomers (Morrison 2009; see summary in Jenkins 2009: 230-235) and a general distortion of the entire topic of 2012 astronomy in areas of academic treatment as well as in the popular marketplace (see Jenkins 2009: 99-113, 245-260; 2011d), the so-called “galactic alignment” under question is, properly understood: 1) a fact of astronomy and 2) occurs within a temporal range that includes the 13th *Bak’tun* period ending of December 21, 2012. Some critics (Krupp 2009, Larsen 2011) have suggested that the slight discrepancy between the actual year of the alignment (precisely defined) and the 2012 period-ending date of the Maya (a difference of some 14 years), is a problem for my reconstruction. However, such a critique requires that the ancient Maya astronomers could have made an absolutely precise calculation in the precession of the equinoxes projecting forward over 2,000 years (the earliest Long Count date known is from Chiapa de Corzo, dating to 36 BC). I’ve anticipated these critiques in treatments published long ago (Jenkins 1998) and reiterated recently (Jenkins 2009; 2011d; 2012; see also response to critics at Update2012.com).

In regard to Bahlam Ajaw [Lord Jaguar], the future alignment on 13.0.0.0 and its parallel to his birth date astronomy **was either an extraordinary, albeit useful, coincidence or the 2012 alignment was an already ancient knowledge**. Was the fact of the alignment of the solstice sun and the Milky Way in era-2012 *intentionally* embedded into the structure of the Long Count at its inception? How is it that the 2012 alignment factors so nicely into so many Maya concepts, dates, and traditions? We may want to entertain coincidence, but then **we have a striking convergence of four unrelated lines of coincidence: 1) The date of the 13-*Bak’tun* period ending in 2012, which 2) coincidentally falls on a solstice which also 3) coincidentally happens within a narrow “alignment zone” of precession and 4) occurs at sidereal features (the Crossroads and the dark rift) that are central to the Maya Creation Mythology**. The congruence of the solstice sun’s alignment with the Crossroads on 13.0.0.0 in the Long Count suggests either **an incredibly unlikely quadruple coincidence that was accidentally noticed by the Tortuguero astronomers, or that the alignment’s association with the 2012 period ending was embedded into the structure of the Long Count when that calendar was devised in the pre-Classic period (Jenkins 1995, 1998, 2010)**.

(The bold-face was added for emphasis.) Also from my website, a concise write-up and comparison of the two options:

Intentional Embedding or Quadruple Coincidence?

Posted on [July 31, 2013](#) by [admin](#)

Parsing out the two scenarios (see previous post [above] for the context).

Scenario number 1. The astronomers and scribes associated with the court of Lord Jaguar are working to craft his rhetoric of power. All kings need this. He is a reformer and within months of his accession to rulership in 644 AD he launched his first war campaign. He then proceeded to kick butt at lightning speed over the next five years, vanquishing four regional kingdoms. He restored the region to a semblance of its former glory, before the two wars that decimated neighboring Palenque decades earlier. In these victories, Lord Jaguar defined himself as a transformational agent, a vehicle of power and renewal. His persona was not unlike the Hero Twins who vanquished the Lords of the Underworld to pave the way for a new Era with the resurrection of their father, One Hunahpu. And in late 649, Lord Jaguar was bestowed with a priestly honor as he reframed his role as king, embracing the duties of sacrificial priest while performing a version of the Creation Myth.

By 669 AD a Katun had elapsed since his year of victory. He was approaching his 57th year and it was time for his reign and his victories to be documented in a powerful rhetorical statement. His rhetoricians knew that they must try to relate his personal life to the larger framework of the Creation Mythos. They considered his accession date, his birthday, and other circumstances of his personal identity. They noticed that when he was born the sun was positioned at the Crossroad of the Milky Way and the ecliptic, at the entrance to the Dark Rift. They saw this as significant, because those features just happened to be part of the ancient Creation Myth.

They continued randomly casting about for tidbits of useful rhetoric. The Long Count calendar was sometimes useful. They projected forward to look for things, to the end of the 10th Baktun, some 160 years into the future. Nothing much. So they projected to the ends of the 11th, 12th, and 20th Baktuns, and so on. Finally, they noticed something about the astronomy of the future end of the 13th Baktun. It was just a happy coincidence that the number 13 was involved. Because the astronomers had recently perfected an ability to calculate the Sidereal Year and the Tropical Year, Lord Jaguar’s scribes and priests could calculate the sun’s position on the future 13th Baktun ending, 13.0.0.0 in the Long Count. To their utter amazement, they noticed that the sun was positioned in the exact same position as it was one Lord Jaguar’s birthday! This was a Sidereal Year calculation. Moreover, they also calculated that it would be the date of the solstice turnabout in winter. This was a Tropical Year calculation.

They wondered at the amazing coincidence of this part of the sky being involved in a rare astronomical alignment, since that part of the sky was important in their Creation Myth and yet there was absolutely no tradition about this alignment being known to the ancient creators of the Long Count. They had accidentally stumbled upon a perfect rhetoric narrative for Lord Jaguar’s victories.

The Long Count had been being followed for over 700 years by this time. A 13th Baktun ending had already been written about by the priests of Copan, far to the south. But that was the previous 13th Baktun ending, some 3800 years earlier. Somehow, the Copan priests decided that a 13-Baktun period was important in the Long Count, even though there was no tradition about it. Well, “whatever”, thought Lord Jaguar’s priests. They may have ruminated as follows: “It is astounding

that we have just accidentally discovered such a rare alignment with the new knowledge of the astronomical cycles that we have recently perfected, and that it occurs on the solstice, and at the Crossroads of our ancestor's Creation Myth, and on the future 13th Baktun ending, that also corresponds to the astronomy of Lord Jaguar's birthday. Such an astounding coincidence of many different threads must be a gift from the gods."

That was scenario number one [which I consider to be incredibly unrealistic and improbable]. **Scenario number 2** is that within the lore and ancient knowledge preserved by Lord Jaguar's priests, it was known that the future 13th Baktun would have those alignment characteristics, because the placement of that date within the structure of the Long Count was intended by the creators of the Long Count. It may be that Lord Jaguar was born close to the same alignment, and that his birthday was fudged slightly for the rhetorical narrative. Or perhaps he was born on the correct day and for that reason he was seen to be divinely selected and was preferentially nurtured to take on the needed role of reformer. That would be the only coincidence, or near-coincidence, in this scenario, compared with four coincidences in the first scenario.

It perhaps took the eventual, and inevitable, near congruence of a king's birthday with the mythologically potent solar position of the Dark Rift / Crossroads, throughout hundreds of years of the Classic Period, for the ancient knowledge to be finally stated in a rhetorical narrative of a king and preserved for posterity. Once the cat was out of the bag, the narrative complex was used in various ways in other narratives, for example on the tablet from Palenque's Temple of the Cross (ca. 690 AD). Which scenario sounds more reasonable to you?

Conclusion

We certainly do have enough evidence to *suggest* that the ancient creators of the Long Count system intended to target 2012 *because of the rare alignment within the precession of the equinoxes that culminate in the years around 2012*.

Furthermore, Lord Jaguar's 2012 inscription strongly suggests, thanks to Grofe's discovery of the birthday parallel, that the 7th century Maya were aware of the future alignment and used it in the Monument 6 rhetorical text. Given this, we are confronted with considering how Lord Jaguar and his associates came to know this. Was it an odd accidental discovery? If so, we have to accept an extremely unlikely quadruple coincidence of separate circumstances in order to maintain that position.

The alternative position is that the knowledge was already embedded into the Long Count at the time of its inception, many centuries earlier. This is, from a rational point of view that has fully considered the implications of the two positions on the matter, the *more likely scenario*, unless one is irrationally committed to Coincidentalism. I cannot imagine other possible explanations, although I have tried and I am open to suggestions. They will be *suggestions*, as is the suggestion that 2012 was an intentional precessional calculation. All suggestions should be rooted in the evidence, which my interpretation of Izapa cosmology is. As far as I can tell, it is the most likely possibility and I have yet to hear

informed and cogent counter-arguments and alternative explanations.

g. Various Others

This final, eighth sub-heading, of *one* appendix to my book *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*, could be expanded into a full-scale book, and still not exhaust covering all the rationally problematic articles, blog statements, and interview blatherings committed by various scholars and scientists who took it upon themselves to critique 2012 and/or my work. I've had much to say elsewhere about such bizarre, biased, and malicious venues as Johann Normak's *Archaeological Haecceities* blog and Bill Hudson's 2012Hoax website, Van Stone's radio interviews, the 2007 dissertation on 2012 by Defesche, Robert Sitler's updated follow-up article in *Nova Religio* (2012), the articles of Michael Grofe, and my various reviews of the popular literature — some of it written by degreed researchers. Much of this can be found, free online, at Update2012.com.

In this section I will focus on six books (one of which came to my attention just recently), a dialogue with a Dartmouth scholar who critiqued my work, three conference presentations by Maya scholars, and my dossier on alias-using cyber-stalker Jim Smith. And, best of all, my Foreword to Geoff Stray's 2005 book *Beyond 2012*. The list:

1. *2012 and the End of the World* by Matthew Restall and Amara Solari (2011)
2. *Apocalyptic Fever* by Richard G. Kyle (2012)
3. *21 December 2012: End of the World?* by Dr. P. Pathak and Krishna Kumari (2009).
4. *The Living Maya* by Robert Sitler (2010) — and his 2012 article *Nova Religio*
5. Dialogues with Vincent Malmström (and various astronomers) on my work
6. Barb MacLeod at *The Great Return* conference, December 20, 2012
7. Michael Grofe at *The Great Return* conference, December 20, 2012
8. My Foreword to Geoff Stray's 2005 book *Beyond 2012*.
9. Comments on Defesche's 2007 Master's Thesis on the 2012 Phenomenon
10. Response to Isabel Hawkins' critique of the galactic alignment at the panel discussion and showing of the film *2012: The Beginning* in September 2012 (at The Tech Museum of Innovation Lecture Series)
11. My Review-Essay of *Archaeoastronomy and the Maya* (eds Gerardo Aldana y Villalobos and Ed Barnhart, Oxbow Books, 2014)
12. Dossier on alias-using cyber-stalker Jim Smith

As can be seen, there's a lot here. But some of the items will be treated very briefly.

1. *2012 and the End of the World* by Matthew Restall and Amara Solari (2010)

Penn State scholars Matthew Restall and Amara Solari produced *2012 and the End of the World* in early 2011 —

nically timed for unrolling in the 2012 marketplace. The subtitle is “The Western Roots of the Maya Apocalypse.” The text covers 132 pages, and a “Sources and Suggestions for Further Reading” explains and cites the quotation sources in eight pages. The dust-jacket for the hardback has an endorsement from Anthony Aveni on the back, who lauds the book for taking readers “to the historical roots of the 2012 myth.” Thus, like Hoopes and other clueless critics, Aveni prioritizes a viewpoint on 2012 that it is all a “myth” invented in modern times, and there is nothing we can do to reconstruct and understand what the ancient Maya thought about it. Restall & Solari likewise largely follow suit, and Aveni is clearly their unquestioned maestro on these matters — a fatal error of allegiance considering the deeply flawed nature of Aveni’s 2012 book, on factual, conceptual, and ethical grounds.

Some preliminaries. Here’s a favoring review of Restall & Solari’s book which I will quote from below:

<https://notevenpast.org/2012-and-end-world-western-roots-maya-apocalypse-2011/>. Here are eight text-filled slides from one of their presentations, which are useful in providing unvarnished indicators as to their assumptions:

<http://www.slideshare.net/Christiana150/2012-and-the-end-of-the-world>. The authors reference my “2012ology” term in their book, and use it frequently. My clarifying page on my intention in coining this term is here:

<http://www.alignment2012.com/2012ology.html>.

The best way to begin my review will be to share the email exchange I had with Matthew Restall and Amara Solari in March of 2011 — soon after their book was released. As usual, I initiated contact. I was never contacted by them while they wrote their book, and was not familiar with them. I was cordial but pointedly clear in addressing several shortcomings in their book, not least of which was their allegiance to Aveni’s error-riddled book (*2012: The End of Time*). Here’s my email:

Dear Matthew Restall and Amara Solari, March 21, 2011

I just became aware of your recent book on 2012. The forthcoming “Transfiguration of Space” [conference anthology] looks very interesting — is it out yet? Thank you for the several kind references to my work, and for frequently grappling with my reconstruction of the astronomical underpinnings of the Long Count and the 2012 date. I’d like to send you Grofe’s corrections to Aveni’s factually inaccurate assessment of his 2007 PhD dissertation on precessional intervals in the Dresden Codex; it’s unequivocal. It’s about 2 pages excerpted from an essay I’ve written, to be published this year in a book anthology that Michael Coe has written the introduction for.

As you may know, my presentation on the astronomy of the dates on Tortuguero Monument 6, presented at SAA in St Louis last April, was the subject of a lengthy debate and discussion hosted last December by Ed Barnhart and scholars at The Maya Exploration Center. Have you read this? The complete PDF compilation is available at the “online publications” tab on the *Maya Exploration Center* website. It contains comments by Grofe and MacLeod, scholars whose work Aveni distorted and dismissed in his “rather brilliant”

(your words) treatment of evidence for precessional knowledge among the ancient Maya. Although this particular round of presentation was very recent, their work was also summarized in my book *The 2012 Story* (Oct 2009). In fact, it was disappointing that my corrections to several misapprehensions by Aveni were not reported in your book as viable rebuttals and also that his entire presentation at Tulane neglected to discuss the solstice placement in 2012 — until I brought it up in the Q&A section.

As an aside, the overall premise of your book is that there is no evidence that the Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012, and that the doomsday-2012 association is generated almost completely by our own culture projecting its apocalyptic fantasies and nihilistic tendencies on the 2012 date. Between 2001 and 2004 I did a series of conferences in which I explored prophetic philosophies and this very same position has been a hinge-point of my response to the incessant doomsday noise, and why there is such an association.

Anyway, mostly I’d like to invite a cordial discussion on recent and ongoing work on some of the items you treated in your book. These are very exciting times in understanding deeper layers of Maya astronomy, and methodologies which have logical traction but which seem obscure to astronomers trained in the methods of Western astronomy. I hope that certain factual corrections that I can offer can also be factored into your presentations and talks on this topic. This is my attempt to avoid further complications down the road, as a result of larger piles of misinformation getting created by scholars referencing and reinforcing each others’ mistakes. For example, Aveni states that I use Stela 25 as evidence for the galactic alignment. He did this also in the Tulane 2009 conference, which I mentioned and corrected on page 250 of my book *The 2012 Story* (2009). I sent the correction to him by email but he has continued to allow excerpts of this section of his book to be reprinted in various magazines as well as foreign translations (in Mexico). That’s very irresponsible, and must reveal a commitment to disseminating polemically compromising falsehoods. Aveni’s strategy of mitigating my contribution by propagating falsehoods is shared by other scholars, whose factually inaccurate assessments of my methods, findings, and intentions have been documented and responded to (see <http://Update2012.com> and elsewhere).

As you should have noted, my discussion of Stela 25 on pages 158-162 of *The 2012 Story* does not state that it represents the alignment; rather, it presents a north-south dialectic that is reiterated in the overall orientation of the site of Izapa. On Stela 25, the astronomical loci of this dialectic are the polar (“northern”) Big Dipper constellation and the “southern” nuclear bulge of the caiman’s head. It is not a “sky map” of the sort that Aveni suggests and dismisses. In regard to Aveni’s accusations of Gnosticism, I also addressed this in chapter 6 of my book; he manifestly misunderstands what gnosis is, clings to a flatland bias of scientific materialism, and also conflates the religions labeled Gnosticism with the Perennial Philosophy — despite my lengthy, clear, and

cogent discussion of the distinction in my books (please read my comments on pages 252-253 of *The 2012 Story*). By the way, I think my positions would have been better served if you had used full-sentence or full paragraph quotes, rather than two- or three-word clauses clipped and assembled in your own sentence construct.

Regarding the belief that my theory argues for and requires absolute precision (or "any precision at all" as you wrote on page 125), I also addressed this in my book as well as in a response to Milbrath and Aveni that appeared in the *Institute of Maya Studies* newsletter in early 2008, which I cited and provided an online link to in my end notes. I'd be happy to send you the link to the PDF of this. These several items fuel your conclusion that my solstice-galaxy 2012 alignment work was "debunked" and that accurate precessional calculations by the Maya were "not possible" (pages 125-127); yet each one of Aveni's assertions that you faithfully echo are based on either false assumptions or factually incorrect summaries.

I'd very much like to engage further discussion of MacLeod's work and Grofe's work, and can arrange to send you PDFs or excerpts of their previous and forthcoming work. As well as mine. By the way, Matthew, did we meet in Mexico during the conference there in January 2009? You look familiar. Are either of you going to the Austin Meetings next week? Please do not take my inquiry as a contentious debate; let's move forward on gathering facts, correcting mistakes, and rationally investigating new developments in understanding ancient Maya astronomy. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

[P.S.]: Are you interested in reading and commenting on the corrections to Aveni's flawed assessment of Grofe's precessional research, which I mentioned above?

Restall responded for them both, cc-ing Solari, the next day:

From: restallmatthew@gmail.com on behalf of Matthew Restall [mxr40@psu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 11:30 AM
To: John Major Jenkins
Cc: als66@psu.edu

Subject: Re: Inquiring about your book on 2012, from John Major Jenkins

Dear John Major Jenkins, thanks so much for your long, engaging message. We tried to be respectful to all those whose writings on 2012 we drew upon and discussed, so we're glad that you noticed that.

Yes, we're always interested in reading more on the topics surrounding our 2012 book, and on improving our understanding of the issues. The astronomical dimensions of the subject are especially tricky.

We're both slammed with non-2012 work tasks right now, but we'll reply more fully when we can. With best wishes,

Matthew & Amara

p.s. no I was not in Mexico in January 2009!

Some months later, I emailed them again with a more pointed query as to whether they could acknowledge Grofe's correction to Aveni's errors and if they would register an errata in any future editions of their book. But I had no response. I tried again a few weeks later; no response.

When I've spoken or written about the Restall/Solari book in the past, I focused on what I perceived to be the bottom-line of their assessment of my work. And that was their citing of Aveni's critique of the precession question, via his comments on my work and Grofe's work in his 2009 book *2012: The End of the Time*. Restall and Solari called Aveni's critique "rather brilliant" (p. 43) and thereby consider my arguments on precessional knowledge in the pre-Classic period, as a central consideration in the formulation of the Long Count/2012 calendar, to be debunked. The rather extremely large problem with this bottom-line conclusion in their book, is that Aveni's assertions and assessments of Grofe's work, and my work, were factually flawed. This came out very quickly as Grofe communicated with Aveni, in late 2009, and Aveni acknowledged his mistake. But it took almost two years before Grofe published his correction, and another four years before Aveni offered a correction (partial and back-handed) in the revised eBook version of his book. I communicated Grofe's correction to Restall in 2011 and 2012, but after an initial brief exchange (see above) he, and Solari, refused to respond to my emails.

Having sketched that, Restall & Solari come pretty close to offering an accurate summary of my work before registering their critiques of it. As is clear throughout my present book, very very very few scholarly critics were willing or able to do this. So, I'd like to give some carefully considered attention to the comments of Restall & Solari, as there are serious conceptual and factual problems with them.

They introduce me on page 1 in the context of websites that assert "2012 is real" and "you can survive" (pgs.14-15). The emphasis here is on writers who believe that "2012 will herald the dawn of a new era" and thus "[t]he end of the world, it seems, is not all bad." They provide an unattributed quote from me that conveys the "end" as really being a beginning, a "new chance to recreate our world." Wherever this quote came from it certainly is a misleading way of introducing my work. It is not found in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, from which they draw other unattributed partial quotes. So they are creating a pastiche of generalized statements — a mash-up drawing from websites, interviews, or book jacket — mixed with other statements intended to be more concise and cogent, but not fully quoted as complete arguments or thoughts.

Next, they segue seamlessly, in the very next sentence, to a website called Chichen2012.org (as if the quote from me came from this site and I am somehow associated with it), which encourages "Chichen Kids" to upload pictures and participate in the 2012 fun — and best of all, it's free! This kind of bizarre conflation of my purported position with "come join us" pop-marketing appeals is diagnostic of the reflex of scholars to misportray my place in the discussion. It's sloppy and possibly unintentional, but the way these narratives are crafted function to reinforce the feeling among clueless skeptics (who can't follow my arguments) that 2012, and my work, is a joke. In

fact, these passages in their book are placed, on page 2, under a silly 2012 “Bizarro” cartoon by Dan Piraro. (Savage #1, holding the Aztec Calendar Stone: “I only had enough room to go up to 2012”; Savage #2: “Ha, that’ll freak somebody out someday.”)

On page 3, Restall & Solari write: “Somewhere at the heart of all this “2012ology” (to borrow Jenkins’s invention) are the Maya...”. Well, it’s nice they credited me correctly with coining the term “2012ology,” but this fact was lost on many reviewers of their book, who spotlight their use of the term as a pejorative container much like Hoopes’s “Mayanism.” For example, a detailed review by Christie Flannery states: “Restall and Solari provide an interesting discussion of pre-conquest Maya texts, including the famous but poorly understood Long Count calendar and “Monument 6” that form the basis of the present-day “2012-ology,” as the authors call it, which anyone interested in the approaching end of the world will want to read” (<https://notevenpast.org/2012-and-end-world-western-roots-maya-apocalypse-2011/>). Restall & Solari do, in fact, present Tortuguero Monument 6 as being the unfortunate focus of dubious doomsday and “descent of the gods” ideas in the marketplace. Such, apparently, is 2012ology. (The “descent” reading of the text, courtesy of David Stuart & Stephen Houston, was long ago corrected.)

In their subsequent summary of the approach and content of their book (page 4) the authors take the fatal mis-step that most of the media outlets did — a contrived polarized framework between 2012 as a doomsday (in their words, “2012 as the end”) versus 2012 as a “New Age utopian dawn.” You see how that works? Where is there room in this polarity for my work, which offers a reconstruction of ancient Maya beliefs? Not much room. Instead, at best I will be force-fitted into the “New Age utopia” file — never mind how that totally misses the point of my work, as an evidence-based reconstruction of ancient Maya beliefs. The bottom line is that no honest critic should characterize my interpretation of ancient Maya period-ending beliefs as being a “New Age utopia.” I certainly don’t, in my own statements on the matter, and the conflation is accomplished only by superficial and inaccurate paraphrasings of my work while shoe-horning it into an idiotic, dualist framework.

As the authors introduce Izapa and the origins of the Long Count calendar, it gets slightly better. Now they attempt to summarize my work, even offering some quotes. However, all the quotes are unattributed, so I had to dig around for where they might occur in my writings, in order to assess the actual context of those quotes. (The 8-page “Sources” section at the end of their book is somewhat helpful.) They depict Izapa Stela 25, and cherry-pick some quotes which are only partially relevant to Stela 25.

They paint me as “the dean of the spiritualist branch of 2012 predictions” (15). This seems like an attempted compliment, but is quite misleading. A “spiritualist” is one who consults ouija boards and channels departed spirits. The branch of “2012 predictions” is an area of the discussion I’ve looked at with a critical eye, observing that most of it comes from “predictators” — those spouting definite statements of “this or that will happen.” Ridiculous b.s. I don’t make “predictions,” spiritualist-style or otherwise. In a very qualified way, I’ve argued that there is a type of “prophecy” for 2012, embedded in

the Maya Creation Myth, in the sense that the egomaniacal Seven Macaw deity was expected by the Maya to appear at the end of a World Age cycle. I’ve interpreted this doctrine (found in the primary document of Maya Creation Mythology, the *Popol Vuh*, as well as on painted ceramic vases) as applicable to any era-ending dynamic, including 2012. That’s not my prediction; that’s an evidence-based interpretation of ancient Maya religious doctrines. It seems that Restall & Solari follow Aveni’s lead here (as they often do, cozying up to an authority figure), in characterizing me as a “spiritualist.” It’s a term that Aveni has also used, along with “Gnostic New Age prophet”, “Y12er,” and other gems from the bully-bullshitter playbook. Their derogatory and unscientific accusation is clear.

The second half of the sentence by Restall & Solari that pegs me as a “spiritualist” asserts that I “claim” that:

“Izapa’s monuments ‘allow us to decode the secrets of Mayan sacred science’; the site is ‘the origin place of the 2012 calendar and the 2012 prophecy’.” (p. 15).

They’ve done something very clever here. I don’t know where the first quote comes from; it’s not in my 2009 book. It may be on my website, but I highly doubt I would have associated Izapa with a “Mayan sacred science.” My distinct work with sacred science principles occurred before my Izapa work and is rooted in the mathematics and associated philosophy of the number 260. This was all explored in my 1994 book *Jalox Kexoj and Phi-64*, reissued and retitled in 2000 as *Mayan Sacred Science*. There is one convergence point between that earlier work and Izapa, involving the Trinity Principle evident at Izapa (the three cosmic centers, which can be analogized to the three sacred science principles I identified at the core of the 260-day Tzolkin calendar).

So it may be, depending on what I was intending to elucidate, that I might associate Izapa with some indirect relation to sacred science principles, but that certainly was not a central tenet of my Izapa work, which reconstructs an astronomical knowledge at the site along with an associated World Age doctrine, or spiritual teaching attending period-endings. Namely, that deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal. Basically, my interpretation is rooted in the well understood symbolism of the Mesoamerican ballgame as the rebirth of the sun, symbolized by the rebirth of a deity. This obvious analogy, which is actually echoed by other scholars, is suppose to be an indication of my over-fertile imagination that doesn’t do good science.

The second quotation is accurate — I do see the larger Izapa-Isthmian civilization as being involved in the formulation of the Long Count, the Hero Twin Creation Myth narratives on Izapan monuments expressing a “prophecy” for 2012 (of a type), as I explicated above. I should, however, call attention to a fine-tuning of my understanding of the calendar’s origins, making a distinction between the underlying cosmological insight (an awareness of the future galactic alignment) compared to the successful calculation of it (which quite likely occurred some decades or even centuries after the cosmological model was understood, and perhaps even was consolidated at a site other than Izapa, perhaps nearby Takalik Abaj). My adjusted perspective is found in my 2009 book:

Their awareness of this future alignment requires that the Izapans knew about the precessional shifting. We know that the earlier Olmec at La Venta and the people at nearby Tak'alik Ab'aj were aware of precession.³³ Izapa encodes a cosmology associated with this future convergence. They knew it would happen, as the positions of the solstice sun and the dark rift slowly drew closer. It may have taken some time to perfect the Long Count system and target the 13-Baktun cycle's end date on the future alignment accurately, but they easily could have deduced the general direction of the motion long before that "materialization of time."³⁴ (Jenkins 2009: 156).

Unfortunately, their subsequent paraphrases of my work, although probably well intentioned, are inaccurate and misleading. They state: "Jenkins argues that one set of buildings (the structures that archaeologists call the Group F ballcourt) are aligned to the sunrise and sunset of the solstices; that the structures display galactic creation imagery (such as a solar deity paddling down the Milky Way in a canoe); and that Stela 25 encodes a cosmic map" (15). The terminology they've used indicates that they pulled this assessment from Aveni's book. For example, "galactic creation imagery" is a vague phrase found in Aveni's book. The Creation Myth scenes on the Izapa ballcourt monuments include the rebirth of the solar deity (on the front edge of the throne, west end of the ballcourt), the raising of the vertical pillar by a Sky Lifter deity (middle of the south wall), the solar First Father paddling the canoe (middle of the north wall), and the demise of Seven Macaw (Stela 69 and Stela 60, east end of the ballcourt, which is the prelude to the culmination of the Creation Myth with the resurrection of the father of the Hero Twins, signaling the dawn of the next World Age in the myth).

The other problems with the picture Restall and Solari have painted are many. Stela 25 is not located in the Group F ballcourt, and I don't characterize it, or consider it to be, a "map." I wouldn't emphasize this if Aveni and the authors didn't worry this trope to death, asserting that the Maya didn't draw sky maps and so on. Their point is utterly irrelevant to my discussion of Stela 25. That carving, currently displayed in the Tapachula Regional Museum where I've studied it on many occasions, does depict two celestial features in the sky, which are placed in opposition to each other — the polar Big Dipper versus the nuclear bulge of the Galactic Center, with the Dark Rift as the mouth of the Milky Way caiman. That's not a "sky map" in the Western way that Aveni requires, and I don't consider it to be a picture of the galactic alignment, as Restall & Solari, parroting Aveni, assume. Rather, as my actual printed words indicate, I see it as depicting a cosmological dialectic between movements in two opposed parts of the sky, in the north and south, both of which can be understood as being "creation centers" having an associated deity. In my 1998 book I interpreted the seasonal movements of the two centers as being tied together, partially suggested by the rope tying the caiman to the bird, and my interpretation was later echoed (without credit to my prior articulation of it) in a 2001 essay by Guernsey-Kappleman & Reilly ("Paths to Heaven, Ropes to Earth").

There's more. The Izapa ballcourt is *not a "set of buildings"*; it is an alley-way between two low platforms and there are

carved monuments on both ends of the lengthwise axis of the court (the throne monuments opposite Stela 60 on the eastern end). There are also monuments in the middle of the long side-platforms which demarcate the ballcourt. Their sentence states that the "buildings" are "aligned to the sunrise and the sunset on the solstices." This is misleadingly vague, and is clearly pulled straight from Aveni (2009:50-52). My work specifically identified, based on evidence, that the lengthwise axis of the ballcourt's narrow playing field was intentionally aligned to *the December solstice sunrise*, and that was the horizon of interest to the Izapans. The reason why is rooted in the topological, monumental, and orientational evidence. Basically, it's rooted in archaeoastronomy and a methodology of "environmental determinants" that I cited, in my 1998 book, to the work of Isbell (1982 — see source at <http://alignment2012.com/bibbb.htm>).

To be specific, the high mound to the west of the ballcourt obscures and therefore obviates the usefulness of a *sunset* orientation; the six seating stones above and behind the throne (on the west end of the ballcourt) as well as the god-head on the front of the throne, provides *the evidence for which direction* of the ballcourt's orientation is important. It is the *eastward* direction, to the *December solstice sunrise* azimuth. You don't find this explicit point in my work acknowledged in Aveni's book, and that's why you likewise don't find it in Restall & Solari. They are paraphrasing a secondary source, and are thus importing into their assessment Aveni's own errors and murkiness. They have not cognized the argument and evidence *from my own descriptions of it*, and instead rely on the pompous, inaccurate, and vague dismissals of Aveni.

After that sentence, which I quoted in full above, they launch more deeply into discussing Stela 25 (which, again, is found far away in Group A, not in the Group F ballcourt). They summarize the scene of the Hero Twin shooting the bird deity, concluding that "the Hero Twin had to shoot Seven Macaw— also called the Principal Bird Deity by scholars—in order to usher in the transition from one world creation to the next." Yes, that's pretty good, and they might now be expected to start understanding my argument. But they could have more accurately called this a "World Age" or a "World Age creation," but they didn't. You see, there's an avoidance of using the more accurate terminology that reflects my own words, which in turn honors the fact that the Mesoamerican people had a "World Age doctrine." For some reason this concept is anathema to many Maya scholars.

In concluding their discussion of Izapa Stela 25, they state that I believe that:

"The result of all the Izapa evidence, says Jenkins, is a "dateless reference to an astronomical scenario" that points to the moments of Creation, both at "era-3114 BC" and at "era-2012" (Restall & Solari 17).

This sounds like a total non-sequitur given what they just sketched about Izapa Stela 25. It comes out of nowhere and "what I believe" will seem to the reader like an unfounded leap of imagination. Restall & Solari skipped summarizing the evidence that serves as the basis for my observation of two "dateless references" at Izapa. The huge problem is that Izapa Stela 25 (in Group A) is not the foundation of this alleged

“belief” of mine, which is actually an evidence-based interpretation drawn from the archaeoastronomy and iconography in Groups B and F. They’ve crafted a clever baffle which can support their later statement that I often ignore “the basic rules of evidence and argument followed by Mayanists” (p. 134). But it is Restall & Solari who lazily skipped the rules of evidence and argument, since they neglected to present the evidence that is the basis of my interpretations. They saved face with a lazy work-around by leaping ahead and stating “the result of all the Izapa evidence...” but they didn’t even present *the relevant* Izapa evidence. Again, those little partial snippet quotations are unattributed but they are found in a discussion in my 2009 book. Let’s take a look at the full argument and evidence. First, my concluding paragraphs that Restall & Solari drew the truncated quotes from:

What we have then, in the ballcourt at Izapa, is a dateless reference to an astronomical scenario that points to era-2012, the end of the 13-Baktun cycle. Similarly, in Group B we have, as described above, a dateless reference to era-3114 BC, the beginning of the Long Count’s 13-Baktun cycle. In a startling display of intellectual *contretemps* and selective application of logic, scholars happily accept the latter scenario but quickly reject the former. One argument is that no demonstration of precession knowledge is evident. However, precession is present as an identifying characteristic of both scenarios. So, again, scholars make it a problem for one scenario but not the other.

With the inclusion of the zenith center monuments in Group B, it becomes apparent that Izapa integrated the ideas connected with three different cosmic center regions: zenith, polar and galactic. This fascinating situation suggests that Izapa truly was an origin place of much greater importance than it has been previously accorded. The tripartite framework evident in the three main monument groups also has a corresponding meaning in terms of the three deities associated with those centers, whose roles and functions often overlap in that they are all regents of their respective cosmic centers. I believe that confusing cross-identifications between deities could probably be sorted out if we acknowledge this foundational template (Jenkins 2009: 161-162).

But this summation did not just come out of nowhere. Let’s read the paragraphs that preceded this summary:

Several monuments at Izapa are iconographic depictions of the era-2012 alignment. The ballcourt throne, Stela 67, and Stela 11 are the best examples. One scholar criticized this as being a dateless interpretation of iconography. A double standard is evident in this critique, however. Over in Group B, there are three pillar-and-ball monuments. Scholars, including Linda Schele, Prudence Rice, Karl Taube, and Matthew Looper recognize these as the three hearthstones of Creation. Anywhere they are found, even if no dates are associated with them, they are recognized as symbols of the astronomical Creation Event that transpired in 3114 BC — the setting in place of the three hearthstones of Creation in the constellation of Orion. The nearby cross of the Milky

Way and the ecliptic, above Orion in Gemini, is recognized as a player in this mytho-cosmic construct, since crosses symbolize the idea of source and center. (The Gemini Ak-turtle glyph is an essential feature of the scheme, which the Maize God is born from; the Maize God and the Sun God are related.)

The way that the Creation Event astronomy is defined reveals that a precession-specific era is implied, since it is observed as significant that the turtle constellation and Orion passed through the zenith at sunrise on August 11, 3114 BC. Now let’s look at the other side of the sky, where the other cross formed by the Milky Way and the ecliptic is located. This cross, symbolizing (like the other one) a cosmic source and center, is very near the dark rift in the Milky Way. This important eschatological feature is portrayed as a frog/caiman mouth at Izapa, most notably on Stela 11. By analogy it is the seating cleft in the canoe on the iconographically similar Stela 67 (Jenkins 2009: 160-161).

So, the three Group B pillar-and-ball gnomons are iconographic pointers to the astronomical situation diagnostic of the 3114 BC Era Base. After I deduced this during my early research on Izapa I was happy to discover that Maya scholar Karl Taube also deduced this, who I mention above. That’s a “dateless reference” to the Creation Mythology & astronomy which is known, from other Creation Texts, to connect with 3114 BC. Similarly, by the same principle, the Group F ballcourt monuments, and the ballcourt itself, comprise a dateless reference to the astronomical situation of the next Era Base, in 2012 AD. But Restall & Solari leapt from an unrelated Stela 25 discussion to my concluding overall interpretation, which in such a fact-skipping presentation might seem unwarranted. But it’s true — critics complain there are “no dates” at Izapa, yet we have orientations and carvings that point to the solar zenith-passage (thus, to May 1 and August 12) as well as to the December solstice (December 21). Thus, we have “dateless references” to the sun’s astronomical position on both the 13-Baktun period’s “first” day and the cycle’s “end” date — August 12, 3114 BC and December 21, 2012 AD. These are rational deductions a few iterations beyond where lazy, short-sighted intellects have dared to tread, but they are evidence-based rational deductions nonetheless.

In their chapter titled “They Deserve Better Than This” the authors generously provide an epigram, quoted from my 2009 book:

“...2012 has gained the status of an icon, a cultural symbol, to be used and often abused for purposes that have nothing to do with its origins and the intentions of its creators.” (p. 60)

Yes, I’ve been critical of the marketplace distortions of 2012 for longer than most, providing early critiques of the 2012 phenomenon in my book early *Tzolkin* (1992/1994). The subsequent paragraphs in my book (p. 60 *ff*) elaborate on my comment:

It’s important to hold up a mirror to what is happening in the 2012 discussion, which I’ve observed gaining steam for two decades, and identify this one overarching circumstance. Doing so will help us understand why the 2012 discussion is

such a mess and difficult for newcomers to navigate. And yes, gaining a good working knowledge of the Maya calendar system takes some commitment and study. But by sweeping the Maya source of the 2012 topic under the carpet, the way has been cleared for a smorgasbord of under-informed writers and market-driven hypesters to pillage 2012 on their way though to the next trendy topic. The solution? Well, it's simple: ask the four questions and go right to the heart of the 2012 calendar. We'll undertake this first, and later we'll look at the wider implications of the 2012 cultural meme (a meme is an idea-complex that takes on great meaning and spreads).

Approaching the thing itself, it must be said, is not necessarily easy. Not as easy as spinning out clever designer interpretations, recycled doomsday prophecies, or relabeled ascension techniques. What is really at stake, and what will be meaningful after 2012, is the accurate recovery of a lost paradigm, a forgotten cosmology. The problem is that the answers to the four questions are, on one level, not that clear cut. The precise "when and where" of the origins of the Long Count are not laid out in some hieroglyphic text. On the other hand, investigators of 2012 ("2012ologists" as I've called them) should be willing to work harder than that. After we've made some informed deductions about the Long Count's purpose and origins, we will be able to identify some very clear answers.

The authors proceed to discuss Tortuguero Monument 6. They avoided discussing Michael Grofe's discovery of the astronomical parallel between the first and last dates on that monument, which I summarized in my 2009 book:

...what Michael found really nails it to the wall: Balam Ajaw was born between Nov 28 and Dec [2nd] AD 612 (one of the dot-and-bar sections is eroded), with the probability being for [November 28]. [Note: I've corrected the dates based on subsequent analysis and publications by myself, Grofe, and MacLeod] This means, importantly, that he was born when the sun was precisely in the dark rift. These hierophanies did not go unnoticed in the Maya world. Wars were timed with Venus movements, eclipses had their auguries, and we've already seen that the dark rift was depicted in the iconography in specific ways involving birth and transformation themes. Balam Ajaw's birth, and therefore his identity, was seen to have a special connection with the Creation events—not those of 3114 BC as at Quirigua and Copan, but those of the future cosmogenesis event, in 2012. That sounds reasonable enough, but the smoking gun lies in recognizing the only reason why this would be so. And that is, because the astronomical configuration of his birth was analogous to *what they knew* would be happening in 2012: the solstice sun in the dark rift. The key that makes the 2012 scenario unique is that it involves the solstice sun, but the parallelism was clearly compelling enough for Balam Ajaw to claim a special relationship with 2012, and the deity connected with it, Bolon Yokte K'u.

Michael found further support for the above precessional calculation elsewhere in the text from Tortuguero Monument 6, which mentions another date on an exact winter solstice on 9.10.17.02.14, as well as another pair of dates separated by

137 years, 9.03.16.01.11 and 9.10.15.01.11, which place the sun in the exact same sidereal position, while the tropical year has shifted by two days.

Dr. Aveni, in his talk at Tulane, said there was no evidence that the Maya made forward projections in their calendrical calculations and rituals. This is abundantly untrue, the best example being how Pakal, the king of Palenque, noted a special connection he had with a 20-baktun cycle ending, one that comes to pass in the 48th century AD. He found it useful, as a political stratagem, because it just so happened that the date of his own coronation (his ritual birthing as king) fell on the same day in the solar year that this far-future cycle ending will fall on. He, like his contemporary Balam Ajaw, cast himself into the narrative of creation to increase his status in the eyes of his subjects. Both used their own "birth" event as a connection point to the cosmological birth of a large period-ending, understood to be a World Age birth. He may have done this as a copycat to what Balam Ajaw did, also perhaps one-upping the Tortuguero king by using a larger cycle of 20 Baktuns.

Instead of covering this material, Restall & Solari discuss the events around the scholars releasing the fact of the 2012 date's existence on Tortuguero Monument 6. David Stuart, for example, knew about it since at least the mid-1990s, but never offered it up for discussion until it was forced upon him by Sitler and Stray, in April 2006. That is, indeed, *evidence* of the "closed shop" in academia. The very fact that a 2012 inscription existed — hidden for years by specialists-in-the-know — was enough to blow the lid off of all the many years of denial by scholars. Yes, 2012 was indeed a true artifact of ancient Maya thought. And the additional evidence on Monument 6, in terms of the text and the astronomy of the thirteen dates (see my SAA presentation in 2010), have provided smoking gun support for the astronomical and ideological components of my work.

On page 30 the authors state:

"...we mentioned the theory that the Long Count was by its very nature "predictive" — that its cycle was determined by its end date, not its start. The theory was proposed by a few Mayanists decades ago, and 2012ologists such as Jose Arguelles and Jenkins have made it a foundation stone in their entire 2012 positions. However, it is not widely accepted among Mayanists today, as there is no evidence to support such a theory; it is an intriguing speculation, but not one supported by any other text or image among Maya sources."

Again, large problems here. First, the specific info on scholars who proposed this "theory" "decades ago" is, correctly stated, as follows. First, Terence McKenna appears to have considered (in a talk in Ojai, California organized by Jean Houston in 1985: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YfpKSdBMzrY>: mark 49:55) the teleological (or predictive) function of the Long Count calendar, anchored to the future date of the "December solstice" in 2012. In his 1988 book titled *The Book of the Year* Munro Edmonson mentioned that Victoria Bricker told him that December 21, 2012 was an accurate solstice. Based on this, Edmonson concluded it would be highly

unlikely that this was a coincidence, and suggested that the creators of the Long Count must have been able to calculate a future position in the Tropical Year with great accuracy. This would not be a “prediction,” but a calculation. In the space of a few sentences Edmonson suggested that the Tropical Year Drift Formula (1507 Haab = 1508 Tropical Years) may have been used to target a far-future solstice date. (A Haab = 365 days; a Tropical Year = 365.24219 days). This was not something that Edmonson (or Bricker) ever revisited.

My own work had independently recognized, while being aware of and studying the calendar correlation question for five years (1986-1991), that December 21 was a solstice, and I finally concluded that it was indeed the correct placement of the cycle ending. I had already suspected it was the correct date placement, based on the Tzolkin placement recorded by Barbara Tedlock in her 1982 book *Time and the Highland Maya* (which I first encountered in late 1986). To anyone, including myself, such a congruence does indeed seem beyond coincidence, or can at least be treated as an opening to further investigation. Then I discovered Edmonson’s book (ca 1991), which helped to affirm the correlation for me.

As I got deeper into thinking about 2012, I realized that a future Tropical Year calculation was not enough to explain 2012 as a *World Age* cycle-ending. Something else had to be going on. Soon, precession and the galactic alignment were fully understood, and I could then easily see how the astronomy of the galactic alignment was embedded in the Creation Myth, ballgame symbolism, and king-making rites. This had no precedent in McKenna, Arguelles, or even Edmonson, although today Edmonson remains credited on Wikipedia for the precession-based galactic alignment in 2012 / Dark Rift connection. These are the categorical distinctions that 2012 observers like Restall and Solari need to try to understand. A general speculation that the 2012 period-ending was a teleological target may have occurred to many people; McKenna and others used 2012 in such a way. Edmonson devoted a few sentences to it, never to return. It was not a “theory” for him.

Finally, when Restall & Solari state that there is “no evidence” for thinking that 2012 was an intentional future calculation — that is completely false. The date itself, falling on the solstice, is suggestive evidence. There is, as I stated and they quoted, “a great deal of evidence.” Izapa’s archaeoastronomy, ballgame symbolism, the Creation Myth, the 3-11 Pik formula, etc. Another of which is a proper understanding of Tortuguero Monument 6 (see the discussion of the article by MacLeod & Van Stone and my “Two Possible Scenarios” argument).

They next provide a back-handed qualified compliment by alluding to my early observation that the 2012 date was connected by a Distance Number, in the Monument 6 inscription, to a building dedication at contemporary Tortuguero (in 669 AD). This provided a meaningful analogy between a building dedication (a type of birthing ceremony) and a worldrenewal “birth” in 2012, via the well-known Maya analogy between “house” and “cosmos.” Simple, elegant, obvious. But Restall & Solari dismissively stated:

“The point [my point], broadly speaking, is valid and interesting, but sometimes a building is just a building” (Restall & Solari 2011: 30).

See how that works? Just invoke coincidence and move on. My point was not a “broad” point, but was applicable to, and supported by, the *specific* case of the Tortuguero Monument 6 inscription. It can also be said that, no, within the Mesoamerican consciousness, a building *is always resonating with all its other conceptual analogues* — building, house, temple, body, mountain, cosmos. All meanings are, always, co-existing. A building is sometimes a building? Yes, sometimes — when perceived by a desacralized flatland non-Maya eye limited by a jaundiced consciousness reduced by a materialist outlook. I’m not appealing here to some obscure “Gnostic” vision, but merely suggesting that Western brains might try to perceive the subjects of their study — even if only abstractly or theoretically — in a way that is congruent with the Maya worldview. It’s clever for foolish scholars to invoke such a dismissal — “sometimes a building is just a building” — and it appeals to our own deeply engrained non-Maya predispositions (a nervous laughter that conceals our blind spots) but such a perspective misses the mark and merely gives us permission to not engage the challenge of appreciating and understanding non-Western cosmologies and worldviews.

Later in the same chapter, they craft a seamless but wholly misleading segue between Arguelles’s “galactic synchronization” and my work. This is a clever trope also used by Krupp, Campion, Hoopes, and other critics, intended to make it seem like my work was derived from, as a continuation of, Arguelles’s ideas. This is way off the mark. They write:

It’s culmination [of the transformation], or galactic “beam end,” will be on December 21, 2012; the Maya calendar, he claims, was aligned to predict and anticipate the galactic convergence. During the 1990s John Major Jenkins picked up this thread and explored it in great detail; his 1998 *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* was the first book in this exploding genre of literature with the year 2012 in the title (43).

Again, it seems like they are trying to give me some credit for something, but this sequence of events and alleged influence is not accurate. In my process of discovery, which I’ve honestly recounted in writing many times, my realization about the astronomical fact referred to as “the galactic alignment” or “the solstice-galaxy alignment” came through my readings, in 1985 and 1989, of Terence McKenna’s 1975 book, which pointed me to *Hamlet’s Mill* (1969) and was augmented, finally in 1993, by consulting the diagrams in *Norton’s Star Atlas*. I was, of course, aware of Arguelles’s books in the late 1980s and early 1990s, but his “galactic synchronization” (see his, and Brian Swimme’s, definitions of it in *The Mayan Factor*, 1987) are mystically obscure and have nothing to do with the precession of the equinoxes, or with anything an investigator of Maya cosmology might take seriously. It did occur to me later that Arguelles may have been trying to language the precession-based galactic alignment, but when I asked him about this during the conference in Glastonbury, in 1999, he said no, he learned of the galactic alignment (in contrast to his galactic synchronization idea) around 1989. It seems, rather,

that his idea was a visionary outgrowth of the Photon Belt idea current in the mid-1980s writings of Barbara Clow and Barbara Marciniak. Contrary to Restall & Solari's assessment, it should be clearly noted that Arguelles' concept *does not predict an alignment*, but our *departure from* the "beam" in 2012, by which time we are suppose to have adopted the "time codes" of the Maya calendar. Otherwise the 12:60 of mechanical time would continue to rule the world. These were not threads that I did, or would even try, to "pick up." In fact, I critiqued them and exposed the flaws.

The authors do emphasize, perhaps in distinction to Arguelles, that my work is rooted in the precession of the equinoxes (p. 43). But then this comes under fire in their presentation. Consequently, they assert that "Mayanists argue that there is nothing in ancient or colonial documents to suggest that they recorded or tracked it [precession]." This was manifestly a false statement, especially since I provided a summary of the precessional work of two Mayanists — Grofe and MacLeod — in my 2009 book. My 1998 book contains an entire appendix that assesses scholarly considerations of precessional evidence in the academic literature (Brotherston, Severin, Hunt, Aveni, etc). But instead of acknowledging these things they invoke Aveni's "rather brilliant summary of the evidence", citing to pp. 100-106 of Aveni's book — precisely where he commits several errors in assessing my work and Grofe's astronomical work. So, "rather brilliant?" I think not. "Very botched" is more accurate.

They no doubt had Aveni's critique of 2012 and precession in mind when they wrote that "the 2012 myths based on misinterpretations of astronomical patterns" had been "successfully debunk[ed]" (p. 114). Most tellingly, citing and quoting from Aveni's 2009 book as support for their own conclusion: "We have already discussed earlier the possibility that the Maya knew of precession *and debunked the idea* that they could have known with any precision when it would occur—let alone predicted that the earth, sun, and the Milky Way would align in 2012. Aveni concludes..." (emphasis added, Restall & Solari 2011: 125). And the rest of that paragraph betrays their utter misunderstanding of what I've actually argued for in my work, and instead they emphasize "2012 prophets" who use the galactic alignment to predict doom or enlightenment.

With their fragmented foundation on my Izapa work, the authors launch into their thumbs-down conclusion about my 2012 alignment reconstruction at Izapa (p. 44). Their comments are hung upon Izapa Stela 25, which I previously explained was not the relevant evidence upon which my deductions and interpretations are based. They claim my work is not persuasive and is purely speculative. This statement is extremely disingenuous. I am not a fool; I never would have pushed so hard to dialogue with scholars on my interpretations if they were merely speculative. My early presentation at the *Institute of Maya Studies* in 1997 presents the evidence that underlies my work. The problem is that many scholars ignore the facts I present and the logic of the deductive interpretations I offer, which are based on an interdisciplinary net of relevant evidence. For example, Restall & Solari never mention the specific orientation of the Izapa ballcourt, the symbolism of ballgame, the throne and several other monuments in the ballcourt (they only mention the canoe god on Stela 67), or the

overarching model of three cosmic centers — all of which bolsters my argument.

They ultimately disagree with my interpretations, but they are certainly based on *evidence* at Izapa. I've laid out my arguments as such, in a clear sequential way, and these authors have simply been too lazy to engage them directly, instead largely parroting Aveni. They have certainly tried harder than other critics, but they either don't understand some of the astronomical and calendrical processes involved, or just ignore much of what I've presented. They have certainly neglected to discuss much of the evidence that underlies my interpretations of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya.

There is more in their book that I could comment on and clarify, but this review has already gone long. And it's exhausting. I'd like to conclude by clarifying their perception of my critique of Maya scholars, as a "closed shop." I think everything I've documented in the present book, and the three appendices, provides overwhelming evidence to justify such an attitude — and much more that is much more objectionable. My issue is not with scientists or scholars who know how to do, and functionally practice, good science and scholarship. Not in the least. That's what I ask for and value, and that's how I have striven to present my own work. And still, they write: "Jenkins is not a professional academic, he rails against such scholars" (134) No, I recognize and value reputable, honest, and reliable scholars. I rail against "professional scholars" who violate the principles of good science and scholarship — and I've documented many cases in this book.

I value good academic work, logical deductions, and solid arguments, and aspire to improve my own arguments and writing abilities. I am open to, and have repeatedly invited, the dialogue and debate process. What I've found is that many Maya scholars involved in this 2012 topic have been utterly, disgustingly, maliciously, sub-standard in their professionalism and ethics, insistently ignoring (as Restall & Solari said *of me*) the "basic rules of argument and evidence," unbiased critique, peer-review integrity, and error correction — unable to acknowledge evidence when I present it (such as my Izapa ballcourt alignment discovery, which I was the first to publish but which Aveni, Van Stone, and others wiggle around crediting me for). Dishonesty, lying, evasions, malicious *ad hominem* disinformation endlessly repeated even after being corrected — it is THAT which I rail against. I've documented it all here with direct quotes, evidence, and facts.

I think Restall & Solari tried to be fair, and they did a better job than most. They were considerate to recommend my books for further reading on page 134, if only for some "perspectives on 2012ology" (whatever that is supposed to mean). Compare that send-off with my synopsis for my 2009 book, *The 2012 Story*, when I pitched it to Tarcher/Penguin in mid-2008:

Synopsis

An authoritative and definitive look at an enigmatic and often misunderstood topic from a 2012 "insider"— an author with over twenty years of experience studying Maya traditions and working with the Maya people. When and where did the early Maya devise the calendar that gives us the cycle ending in 2012? How did scholars come to rediscover and reconstruct this calendar? How has the 2012 idea been interpreted by popular writers, what controversies

and intrigues dance around the topic, and what do scholars, the modern Maya, and independent researchers currently have to say about it?

Drawing from extensive correspondence, travels among the Maya, and his experience playing a pioneering role in the reconstruction of the ancient Maya's 2012 cosmology, author John Major Jenkins is uniquely qualified to guide us through the 2012 labyrinth. With clarity, fairness, and a thorough familiarity with the eccentric personalities involved in the 2012 story, Jenkins explains recent breakthroughs, clears away the debris of misconceptions, and guides us into the heart of a fascinating and timely subject. Here, finally, we have a comprehensive overview presented with depth and insight, inviting us to see 2012 from the viewpoint of the tradition that first put it on the map, as well as to consider the larger implications of 2012 for modern humanity at a crossroads.

And why not sample my entire Introduction to the published book:

Writing this book was an immense undertaking that had to accommodate new developments in the ever-shifting features of a quickly evolving field. Because of its curious crescendo in our immediate future, and therefore unlike any other topic, 2012ology ("twentytwelvology") has been growing exponentially with a unique set of issues and attractions. This accelerating growth of interest in the public arena is driven primarily by urgent doomsday scenarios spun out by the mainstream media and opportunistic writers. And yet the date is not simply a new-fangled gadget invented by the marketplace. It is, in fact, a true artifact of the authentic Maya's Long Count calendar, which has suffered the cut-and-paste cosmologizing of wannabe wizards, pocket-protector prophets, and celebrity showmen. This heady stew is all stirred up in the Google cauldron, making a dangerous potion for the unsuspecting newcomer. As you step into this ever shifting discussion it will be helpful to have some historical background and a guiding survey of who has been saying what. This is part of what this book offers.

I've been investigating Maya culture since 1985, and have written many research-oriented books and articles on Maya calendars and cosmology. My first two books were self-published travelogues peppered with historical facts and comments on the Mesoamerican worldview. I quickly became fascinated with various unresolved enigmas, including the 2012 cycle-ending date. My 1992 book, *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies*, presented my work on the Venus calendar found in the Dresden Codex, one of the few surviving Maya books. My 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* broke new ground on identifying why 2012 was important to the ancient Maya, offering a new reconstruction of ancient Maya thought. Key questions were posed: When and where did the early Maya devise the calendar that gives us the cycle ending in 2012? Why did they place this cycle ending on December 21, 2012, and how did they think about? These questions led me to discoveries and conclusions that integrated the domains of astronomy, mythology, prophecy, and spiritual teachings.

I found that a rare astronomical alignment culminates in the years leading up to 2012, when the position of the solstice sun will be aligned with the Milky Way galaxy. This solstice-galaxy alignment is a rare occurrence, happening only once every 26,000 years. It can be called a "galactic alignment" and was perceived by ancient astronomers as a shifting of the position of the sun, on the solstice, in relation to background features such as stars, constellations, and the Milky Way. Based on evidence in Maya traditions and key archaeological sites, it became overwhelmingly apparent to me that the future convergence of sun and galaxy was calculated, with good accuracy, by the ancient Maya and the cycle ending date in 2012 was chosen to target it. Without going into any further questions and complexities, this situation means the ancient Maya had astronomical abilities at least on par with their contemporaries in other parts of the world including Greece, India, Babylonia, and Egypt.

Importantly, I noticed that the astronomical features involved in the galactic alignment were key players in Maya cosmology and Creation mythology. These connections were not free floating opinions based on imagined associations that had no real relevance for the ancient Maya. In fact, the evidence was there in the academic literature itself. I was merely stitching all the pieces together. The solstice sun, the Milky Way, and a curious feature that lies along the Milky Way called the dark rift, were utilized in the sacred ballgame, king making rites, the calendar systems, and the Hero Twin Creation myth. These real connections anchored the galactic alignment firmly within known Maya concepts and traditions. In my studies I quickly focused my attention on the early Maya site called Izapa, which scholars suspected as being involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar. By 1994 the results of this approach had revealed Izapa as a critically important place for understanding how the Maya thought about the galactic alignment in era-2012. Furthermore, the astronomy was woven together with spiritual teachings, conveyed as mythological dynamics in the Creation myth on Izapa's many pictographic monuments.

Astronomy, the calendar, and the Creation Myth were facets of the same cosmology. Beliefs about cycle endings, especially the big one in 2012, were represented in these traditions and revealed how the creators of the Long Count thought about 2012. It was not perceived as some dramatic doomsday apocalypse, as our modern media repeatedly prefers to portray it. Instead, the creators of the 2012 calendar utilized sophisticated spiritual teachings intended to facilitate a process of spiritual transformation and renewal. This was clearly big news, given that, in the mid-1990s when I made these discoveries, scholars had said nothing about 2012 and the doomsday interpretation was on the rise in the popular media. For me, the years after my first trip south of the border in 1986 were filled with exciting discoveries, continuing travels, field investigations at Maya sites, living and working with the modern Maya, meeting remarkable people, writing and teaching.

Through the years I've been invited to contribute articles to anthologies, speak at conferences, attend irresistible events, and conduct radio and T.V. interviews. Naturally, some of these were well produced but others were ill conceived and I've learned a lot about working with conference organizers and documentary producers. Throughout the aforementioned

wonderland of opportunities and farragoes my goal of finding a suitable publisher for a book telling the definitive 2012 story remained elusive. When the 2012 bug started to bite the mainstream press and many more books started to appear, I noticed that authors and the media were pulling the 2012 topic in predictably weird directions. For example, one prominent trend has involved slowly, and almost imperceptibly, divorcing the 2012 icon from its Maya roots. Another enlists 2012 into serving the dubious cause of fear-based doomsday scenarios populated by alien gene splicers, invisible planets, searing solar flares, and menacing asteroids. The vast majority of this unbridled superstorm of alarmist and hype-driven marketing ploys was problematic. I realized that I was in a unique position to offer clarity and discernment so I got to work, building from scratch a new book that I envisioned to be the definitive 2012 story.

Chapter 1 presents the indispensable discoveries and academic work that over many centuries has led to an astonishing picture of ancient Maya civilization. How did explorers come to rediscover the lost cities of the Maya? How did scholars come to reconstruct the calendar systems? How did breakthroughs and biases help and hinder the process? And going further back in time, how and when did civilization in Mesoamerica develop? The material covered in Chapter 1 could easily have been expanded into a book of its own, telling the story of fascinating rogues and colorful characters who discovered and explored the jungle temples of ancient Maya civilization, reconstructing an entire worldview beginning with the barest of fragments. Since my goal was to write one book rather than a ten-volume series, I instead have summarized the most notable events and as a result many interesting episodes and characters have been left out.

Distilling the endless information down to its alchemical essence, I've highlighted certain themes that I believe define the remarkable ongoing process of recovering the lost knowledge of the Maya, America's most persistently mind-boggling civilization. One of these themes is the important place occupied, time and again, by the independent outsider. Quirky, eccentric, dealing genuine insights and controversial fancies, they have been the triggers and the mainstay of real progress. Visionary philosopher Terence McKenna said in one of his talks:

“What we need to celebrate is the individual. Have you not noticed (I certainly have), that every historical change you can think of—in fact any change you can think of, forget about human beings—any change in any system that you can think of is always ultimately traceable to one unit in the system undergoing a phase state change of some sort. There are no group decisions, those things come later. The genius of creativity and of initiation of activity always lies with the individual.”²

The efforts made by these upstarts to transcend status quo biases inflicted by degreed gatekeepers wielding their own limiting brands of logic and decorum can be observed time and time again. Usually the truth eventually came through, even though it was often reviled and marginalized for decades and the trailblazers themselves died without due acknowledgment.

I count myself among the autodidacts, the self-taught perpetual student fueled by passion and a sense of mission. The early independent Maya researchers had little to work with. Things have sped up since the days of Förstemann, Goodman, and Bourbourg, and I expect the next decade will see many unexpected breakthroughs in how we understand Maya astronomy, the hieroglyphic inscriptions, and the much maligned and misunderstood 2012 date—including, as we will see, new evidence that supports my reconstruction of the original intentions behind the 2012 date. Even after the 2012 party is over, the work will continue.

Another theme is 2012's wide appeal. By this I mean it is of interest to scientists, New Age spiritualists, novelists, survivalists, evangelizing model makers, and the mass media—although, it must be said, its millenarian aspect finds particularly fertile soil in the United States. Whether manifesting in negative or positive aspects, 2012 nevertheless has *meaning* in virtually every domain where it appears. This situation calls into question critics who declare, with a surprisingly smug certainty, that 2012 is a hoax or completely meaningless. I've observed and directly experienced this treatment and have dialogued with those who inflict it, so I feel obligated to report the following: In academia as well as in the skeptical popular press, 2012 is rendered meaningless to the extent that it is misunderstood. This is an interesting equation. If a prejudice exists that 2012 is meaningless, then a myriad creative ways to misunderstand it can and must be implemented. One overarching misunderstanding is endlessly repeated: that the Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012.³ If you look at the Maya doctrine of World Ages, the hieroglyphic inscriptions that relate to 2012, and the Creation Mythology (the *Popol Vuh*), you find nothing of the sort. These misconceptions have currency because access to good information on 2012 has been either seriously limited or buried under the endless bric-a-brac of the spiritual marketplace. Discerning books and websites, including my own, are out there and have been for years, but they must compete with formulaic attention-grabbing marketplace products which are almost always sensationalized and riddled with errors.

I found it challenging to review, for this book, the many distortions and misapprehensions that have clogged the 2012 marketplace. I felt it would be important to clarify, for the record, the facts of the matter and have assessed materials from theories, models, so-called prophets, and visionaries. The real stories that underlie many of these authors and ideas are filled with ironies, debacles, and exposés, and I happen to have had the insider's view of all these tell-tale goings-on in the tortured topic of 2012. I offer my carefully considered overviews and assessments on the best known theories connected to 2012, and provide these candid critiques as a guide for unwary wayfarers on the road to 2012. Much of what is connected to 2012 is misleading and panders to fear and paranoia. Delving into this messy situation will, I hope, be made easier with some well placed sardonic humor and wry wit. One thing I've learned from twenty years in the 2012 game is that humor is absolutely necessary if one hopes to survive the 2012 superstorm of surreal scenarios that are flooding the discussion. Surprisingly, we'll find that an unwillingness to investigate the 2012 topic *rationality*, which is diagnostic of many misconceptions in the popular literature, also infects academia. A critical survey of

the “modern Maya calendar movement” and its relationship to academic treatments will be a frequent reference point.

Part I was conceived as a nuts-and-bolts chronological survey of the 2012 topic, bringing us up to speed on the facts of the matter. Summarizing the various theories inevitably invites a presentation of my reconstruction work and “galactic alignment theory.” Chapter 4 frames this presentation within the larger issue of how breakthroughs occur, emphasizing that my work is built upon the previous breakthroughs of other scholars working in Maya studies. With new decipherments of hieroglyphic texts, the multifarious ways in which the ancient Maya utilized the concept of the alignment of the solstice sun and the Milky Way’s dark rift (the “galactic alignment”) in their traditions is becoming clearer. I found that the Maya ballgame, king-making rites, and the Maya Creation Mythology encoded the astronomy of the era-2012 alignment, which happens only once every 26,000 years. This galactic alignment is caused by a phenomenon called the precession of the equinoxes, the slow shifting of the positions of the equinoxes (and solstices) in the sky, resulting from the fact that the earth wobbles very slowly on its axis. My end-date alignment theory is now receiving new support from recent findings in academia and after 2012 I’ll continue the work which I’ve pursued since the mid-1980s.

This astronomical alignment has been generally and more compellingly referred to as an alignment to “the galactic center,” a cause for confusion in terms of timing parameters which I will explain and clarify. When the dust settles, I am confident that a paradigm justly identified as “galactic” in scope will become the consensus in academia and college textbooks will include tutorials in hieroglyphic statements involving the dark rift in the Milky Way, precessional concepts and calculations in hieroglyphic inscriptions, and readings of the astrotheological iconography of pre-Classic Izapa.

Over the years I’ve traveled and talked with scholars and writers and will share their views in their own words. The academic Tulane conference on 2012 took place in February of 2009, just in time for inclusion in this book. It was a watershed event, which consolidated closed-minded judgments in academia while paradoxically initiating a new era of scholarly openness (in some quarters) to considering 2012 as the valid artifact of Maya thought that it is. I attended and recorded the proceedings, and my exchanges with scholars reveal the current state of the 2012 discussion in mainstream academia. The first part of the book closes with a concise summary of new discoveries, in the inscriptions and elsewhere, that lend support to my galactic alignment theory while expanding our understanding of 2012 and Maya cosmology in profound and compelling new ways.

My angle of approach to 2012 in Part I is guided by a straightforward, informed and objective assessment. But something is missing. The deeper meaning that New Agers believe 2012 contains is, I venture, an important and valid part of the discussion. It has, in fact, been present for me from the early days of my research. What I’ve noticed is that Maya teachings, including those pertaining to cycle endings, belong to a Perennial Philosophy, or Primordial Tradition, a reservoir of knowledge and spiritual wisdom common in its essential form to all great religious traditions. The inner, symbolic

message of 2012 can have meaning for all humanity.

Approaching 2012 in this way is suspect to Maya specialists, even though it can be undertaken rationally. Comparative mythologist Joseph Campbell, for example, drew from the integrative perspectives of this Perennial Philosophy to show patterns of similarity between widely separated global mythologies. He pierced beyond the veil of surface appearances and culture-specific terminology to see the archetypal level of meaning. Ancient Hindu teachings and Buddhist insights, for Campbell, could thus have spiritual meaning for modern seekers. So too, Maya teachings belong in their archetypal essence to this primordial wisdom, and can speak to us today, or any human being in any era.

One might suspect that this approach to 2012 would have been colonized by New Agers and spiritual seekers, but it hasn’t. The thirst for spiritual insight has not been quenched by the wells plumbed by spiritual writers on 2012, because instead of tapping into Maya traditional wisdom as an expression of the Perennial Philosophy, all manner of inventive models charted in the name of the Maya calendar have instead staked a claim in the spiritual marketplace. The vein of pure gnosis is there, right before our eyes, in the Maya Creation Mythology; we just need to read it with eyes attuned to the symbolic, archetypal, universal content.

Part II ventures into this deeper area of inquiry, and beyond it is the ultimate invitation, for the reader to lay down books and open up their own initiatory conduit into a direct inner experience of the universal gnosis that all spiritual teachings point to. This is no time to insulate ourselves from the profound universal teachings of ancient Maya philosophy. Chapter 12 is dedicated to discussing the importance of this big picture, how we can open to it, how it can be embodied and how its implicit values can be put into practice. We are being called to engage the initiatory sacrifice that the Maya’s 2012 teaching insists is indispensable. Ultimately, this is the only way that anyone will be able to understand, for themselves, what 2012 is all about. It’s an understanding not limited to facts and figures—it is the gnosis of union with the whole consciousness that lies at the root of ego and world. These ideas are centrally important to the universal meaning of 2012, and must be taken seriously. For now we are coming down to the wire; the 2012 date is looming like an unwanted intruder in the dream of Western civilization, urgently screaming that something is very wrong with the way we’ve been running the planet.

These are the big questions, ones that any 2012ologist is required to address. But to my mind they aren’t concerns that will last. Or, I should rather say that the concerns for sustainable worldview and spiritual wholeness will last but their connection to 2012 will expire. After 2012 no one will care anymore about relating the Maya calendar to events in the world or to the importance of spiritual awakening. For mainstream culture it will pass into oblivion while the next trendy topic is lined up for consideration. What will last, in my view, is twofold: the ongoing effort to reconstruct ancient Maya cosmology and the growing indigenous cultural movement that Maya scholar Victor Montejo has called “the Maya Renaissance.” An upwelling of indigenous consciousness defines this renaissance, which I believe heralds a much larger, and much needed, global awakening and renewal. Our entire world needs to have a turnabout in its deepest seat of

consciousness, flipping the values of a self-serving dominator ethic back around to the community-building partnership strategies that were the ideal of indigenous societies. In this regard, the very idea of era-2012 as a time of renewal is exactly what the world, at large, needs to hear.

This book is the culmination of a quarter century of committed and constant research into Maya culture, cosmology, and the 2012 question. It was not written on assignment by a hired novice, as so many recent 2012 books have been. I've invested much time to sort out the wheat from the chaff and offer here a carefully considered treatment of a controversial phenomenon that is as thorough as such a complex topic allows. For many readers it will probably be challenging and enervating. Every reader will find in here things to agree with, and others to disagree with. In a book that deals with a subject of so many labyrinthine layers and perplexing possibilities, that is how it should be; it is, in fact, unavoidable. Be prepared to dive in and get your feet wet. This is what you're in for, and I hope you will find it useful, challenging, and informative.

John Major Jenkins

May 31, 2009

4 Ahau • Long Count 12.19.16.7.0

—end excerpt (Jenkins 2009: 1-10)

The gulf between what I've published, in both peer-reviewed academic and popular venues, and the assessments of scholarly critics, is extremely large. The Restall & Solari book is possibly the most detailed and considerate of all the critiques of my work, but unfortunately it succeeded in maintaining many distorted and incorrect assumptions, based on a superficial treatment of my evidence-based arguments.

2. *Apocalyptic Fever* by Richard G. Kyle (2012)

This is a book that I recently stumbled across. If anything it simply indicates how my work is sampled and summarized. It was written by an academic: Kyle is Professor of History and Religion at Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas. "He has published books on The New Age movement, Millennialism, John Knox and history of popular evangelicalism in the United States" (from his Wiki page). His 2012 book called *Apocalyptic Fever* contains a chapter called "The Great Turning" with a section on the Maya calendar. (See [partial sections on Google books](#).)

Kyle's book is interesting in that it represents the usual way that scholars outside of Maya Studies and 2012ology take a peak into it and cobble together a one- or two-page narrative. The result is typically superficial, as we also saw with Nicholas Campion's summaries. I have stumbled across references to my work in about a dozen other books written by scholars of religion, philosophy, the New Age, and sociology. The suppositions range from inaccurate to ridiculous. Often I'm pegged as a doomsday guy, or an ancient aliens guy, or something to that effect. These degree-holding professional scholars commit basic errors of superficial supposition, unable to grasp even a general outline of what my 25 years work in

Maya cosmology and calendrics has been about, documented in many easily available publications.

Kyle, like many observers, begins with Harmonic Convergence and calls it a movement that remained "submerged" for many years until it exploded in the years leading up to 2012 (p. 331). In truth, while many had a spiritual fling in 1987 with the HC, most returned to their lives and a minority continued in following Jose Arguelles, as he rolled out the Dreamspell Calendar-Game in the early 1990s. As a result of my critiques of the system in 1991-1994, which used its own calendar placement that was at odds with the surviving, traditional daycount in Highland Guatemala, the "movement" became compromised and membership dwindled. The fallout from the Dreamspell calendar cult — disillusioned for various reasons — were swept into Carl Calleman's equally flawed ideology, which rejected astronomy and adopted a cycle-ending "spiritual evolution" date in October of 2011 (rather than December of 2012). I also critiqued and debated Calleman, exposing elementary factual and conceptual errors.

But my educational efforts were overlooked by critics, who often placed me into this milieu of invented "2012 mythology" (Hoopes) or "Maya Prophecy Movement" (Campnion), alongside these other writers, as if we were the main ringleaders in a united front against reason and science. In his "Maya Calendar" section, Kyle cites my books *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* and *The 2012 Story*, and also draws from Restall & Solari's *2012: The End of the World*. Kyle provides a decently accurate intro to the calendar, but introduces 2012 with the typical binary polarity of choices, regarding "either this *will* happen, or that *will* happen." The assumption is deterministic, and this has been a primary flaw in how critics frame the discussion, and consequently misrepresent my work. For rather than note that my work identified a Maya World Age doctrine that requires deity sacrifice for worldrenewal (a non-deterministic framework), I am made to belong to the category of people who believe 2012 *will* "usher in" a utopian New Age — those in pop culture who believe that "Humanity will enter an age of enlightenment" (Kyle 332). This superficial reading misses the main point in my reconstruction work.

Kyle, like Krupp before him, incorrectly quotes my words as 2012 being a "transition from one world to another" (335). This makes me suspect that Kyle drew this quote secondarily from Krupp. The correctly quoted passage reveals an essential difference of meaning: 2012 represented (provisionally) a transition from one *World Age* to another. Kyle's footnote number 45 cites my 1998 book for this passage, and also cites the *Newsweek* piece by Lisa Miller (May 2009), where David Freidel called me a charlatan. This resulted in an exchange with Freidel which he never concluded (after my factual corrections were sent to him): <http://update2012.com/May2009.html>.

Kyle then segues into Nostradamus, Newton, the Bible Code, and the 2012 books of Marie Jones and Lawrence Joseph. Christ will establish his "millennial kingdom," according to Isaac Newton, in the year 2060. This apparently is suppose to have some relation to reconstructing what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya. As usual, the 2012 discussion was directed down other tracks which have nothing to do with the ancient Maya. And so it goes.

3. 21 December 2012: End of the World? by Dr. P. Pathak and Krishna Kumari (2009)

Note. For this section I will excerpt a piece I wrote in early 2014, titled “A Day in the Life of an Unemployed Maverick Cosmologist.”

At the Greeley Public Library, I returned my books and strolled through the book stacks. It was a small, branch library, and they didn't really have a big selection. As I strolled some titles caught my eye — “2012” jumped out. Of course, they would certainly have the standard stupid titles. And they did, all tripe. But none of my four books. One of them I'd never seen before caught my eye, and I pulled it off the shelf: it was called *21 December 2012: End of the World?* by Dr. P. Pathak and Krishna Kumari. Published in India in 2009. A nicely bound hardback.

I opened it to the Table of Contents, and saw a chapter that was titled “The How and Why of the Mayan End Date in 2012 A.D.” Hmmm, wow ... that's the exact same title as my breakthrough article of 1994. I opened to the chapter ... yep, there it is. My article, verbatim, without my name attached to it. It's been on my website for years, properly copyrighted under my name. I flipped to the Bibliography — nothing cited under my name. I flipped through the book and found other sections that seemed to adapt things I'd written on my Alignment2012 website. I noticed that I was mentioned in the Introduction, and in a few other places in the book. But none of my titles were mentioned or cited anywhere. Amazing.

It's 2014, and I'm still discovering these kinds of illegal uses of my work. And it's amazing that a small branch library in Greeley would have purchased this obscure book from India, which plagiarized my work without credit, yet not have any of my own books on the shelves. Wow.

I returned to my ailing car and pushed up the broken window, affixing it with some duct tape. I fished through my pocket and found \$2.90 in change. I'd need to stop by the Kum & Go down the street for some gas to get home, as I was running on empty. I made about \$6000 in 2013, from various odd jobs. I was glad to have that \$180 [in food stamps] for the next month's food ... let's see, six bucks a day. Lentils, rice, potatoes ... maybe some frozen orange juice for a splurge. Yeah, I think I can make it work. It's all just a day in the life of an unemployed maverick cosmologist. From: <http://update2012.com/Day-in-Life.pdf>

4. *The Living Maya* by Robert Sitler (2010) — and his 2012 article *Nova Religio*

Robert Sitler is the rare scholar within Maya Studies who asked me thoughtful questions and engaged in actual conversations with me about my work. In fact, we had email exchanges and at least one phone conversation in 2004, when he was working on a presentation that became his 2006 article for the new religions journal *Nova Religio*. Consequently, his understanding and appreciation for my work deepened. His comments in his 2010 book and his 2012 *Nova Religio* “update” indicate that he considers my work to be a likely interpretation of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya, and his

2012 article in *Nova Religio* likewise offered an updated position based on the recent developments. However, in his 2010 book he claimed to have coined the “2012 phenomenon” phrase (Sitler 2010:11, 185), which is absolutely not correct.

5. Dialogues with Vincent Malmström (and various astronomers) on my work

Note: The best way to present this item is to excerpt the Malmstrom section from my Update2012.com website.

Vincent Malmstrom. I've cited Malmstrom respectfully in my books. In 2003 he wrote a scathing and ridiculous critique of my "[Open Letter to Mayanist and Astronomers](#)" piece which was re-titled and published in the IMS newsletter (2002). It was a 900-word piece, upon which Malmstrom based my entire oeuvre and 2012 alignment theory. The purpose of this piece was to simply point out three or four items of evidence that indicated the ancient Maya thought of the Galactic Center region as a source and center. Namely: the Dark Rift (birth place / emergence place / door to the underworld) and the Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic (crosses denote the "cosmic center" concept in Maya thought). Malmstrom's critique was ridiculous because he never even addressed these items, which was the whole point of my piece. In 2006, after I accidentally discovered his critique, which is posted on the Dartmouth College website, I invited a dialogue, which ended, as usual, after I presented more facts and reasoned arguments: <http://alignment2012.com/Malmstromexchangeon2012.html>.

Various astronomers crafted misleading debunkings of the galactic alignment, usually concluding it wasn't real astronomy or that it doesn't happen in 2012. I had exchanges with the following astronomers:

Louis Strous, <http://alignment2012.com/responsetostrous.html> / <http://alignment2012.com/strous-jenkins.html>.

Stephen Tonkin: <http://alignment2012.com/tonkins-error.html>.

Johns Hopkins astronomer: [Keith??] <http://alignment2012.com/openletter.htm>. (See also my critiques of astronomers Anthony Aveni and David Morrison, at Update2012.com.)

I critiqued the September 2012 presentation of astronomer **Isabelle Hawkins**, who like many critics of my work didn't seem to have actually read my book, and accused me of ignoring things that I did discuss in my book — nay, items *that I introduced into the 2012 conversation!* <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/ResponsetoTechMuseum.pdf>. Audio version of the critique: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/Response-to-Hawkins.wma>. (See in full in Section 10.)

6. Barb MacLeod at *The Great Mystery Conference*, December 2012

The point here is simply to share the presentation description for MacLeod's talk at *The Great Return* conference, at Copan in December of 2012. Event details are here:

<http://www.greatmystery.org/SacredTours/copan2012tl.html>. Archaeologist David Sedat's very important talk, "The Art of Statecraft: How the Maya Regarded Bak'tun Change," is also summarized on that page. My own presentation is also described there. Here is Barbara MacLeod's presentation:

The Great Return: What the Classic Maya Thought About 2012 and Time

with Dr Barbara MacLeod - workshop 20 December, 2012.

The ancient Maya delighted in primordial or mythic landscapes. They were also fascinated with commensurations of calendric and astronomical cycles within vast counts into the past featuring creator gods and lineage ancestors. While there are several shorter Maya time counts leading into the future, only two texts qualify as deep-future counts. These are the West Panel of the Tablet of the Inscriptions at Palenque and Monument Six of Tortuguero.

This is no accident, as these sites were once allies within one lineage. The elegance with which both sites expressed their shared mythology opens a very special door into ancient Maya thought. Dr. MacLeod will lead us through the full narrative of Tortuguero Monument Six, culminating in the 2012 (13.0.0.0.0) date. This story will be tied to deep-past and deep-future narratives at Palenque. We will glimpse the balance between humans and gods, who not only return to major waypoints of the calendar, but who hold the power of life vs. death and prosperity vs. ruin over human societies. What is "writ large" in the texts of Palenque is exquisitely distilled on Tortuguero Monument Six. [But Tortuguero did it first! – JMJ.]

Finally, we will explore the extraordinary iconography of Copán Stela H as testimony to lineage abundance, reciprocity between kings and gods, and the identity of mankind with maize. Therein we will discover the same story and symbolism seen at Tortuguero and Palenque.

Her comments during my own presentation, on December 19, 2012, are also very interesting and relevant:

<http://alignment2012.com/MacLeod-Abyss12-19-2012.pdf>.

7. Michael Grofe at the Great Mystery Conference, December 2012

Michael Grofe also gave his presentation on December 20, 2012:

Deep-Time: Astronomical Symbolism and the Ancient Maya Measurement

with Dr Michael J. Grofe - workshop 20 December, 2012

Maya hieroglyphic texts contain numerous intervals of time that count both backward and forward from a fixed point of historical reference to specific mythological dates, often thousands of years in the past or future. Dr Grofe will consider the evidence that these intervals incorporate precise astronomical calculations of solar, lunar, and planetary movements, with a substantial emphasis on the measurement of the sidereal year and its ability to shift the seasonal position of the sun among the stars over vast intervals of time.

Also of interest: "Copan Stela C: Sun King in the Creation Place" <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Copan-Stela-C-Jenkins2014.pdf>. My presentation, title and description:

Copán and Izapa: Echoes of the Galactic Alignment with John Major Jenkins – workshop, evening of 19 December, 2012

Jenkins' presentation will discuss the importance of the 15° N latitude shared by Izapa and Copán. While presenting evidence that points to a 13-Bak'tun cycle concept at Izapa, whose beginning and end dates were targeted on astronomical alignments. He will also discuss the presence of similar astronomical concepts at Copán, namely on Stela C. The overall picture points to a knowledge and use of the "galactic alignment" astronomy in various forms over hundreds of years. In this regard, clear definitions of the galactic alignment will be offered, highlighting December 21, 2012 (13.0.0.0.0). As an interpretation of how the ancient Maya thought about 2012, the integration of precessional astronomy and an ideology of transformation and renewal will be sketched, as published in John's 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. Finally, if time permits, Jenkins will offer a reading of his composite poetic rendering of six texts from Tortuguero, where the 2012 date was referenced by the 7th-century Maya king Lord Jaguar.

Link to the audio of my presentation:

<http://www.alignment2012.com/WS320253.WMA>.

Link to "A Journey to the 13th Baktun Completion":

<http://alignment2012.com/13th-Baktun-Completion.pdf>

8. My Foreword to Geoff Stray's 2005 book *Beyond 2012*

Into the Beyond (Laying the End to Rest)

John Major Jenkins

Writings on 2012 have multiplied exponentially over the last five years. As we draw closer to 2012, interest focusing on that enigmatic, co-opted, perplexing, date will be growing. It is a true and multi-faceted vector for all kinds of ideas. The plethora of writings on it are a phenomenon in itself, and while the discussion of Year 2000 centered largely around Y2K, which proved to be as much a phantasm as many of the much more wacky millennial ideas, there is as yet no discernable loci of the 2012 discussion.

It is for this reason that the Dire Gnosis website has been valuable to the ongoing discussion. Since 1998, Geoff Stray

has collected and organized a wide spectrum of writings, reports, dreams, sci-fi and non-fiction studies on the 2012 theme. Although the center of the discussion has yet to be discerned, at least the voices are now assembled under one roof. Stray has been unbiased in what he has allowed into the pavilion of purview. He is a true pioneer, the first 2012ologist who has sought to collect, survey, contextualize, and comment on the wide spectrum of manifestations related to 2012. Because of his familiarity with all things 2012, he is our best guide into the labyrinths of kaleidoscopic creation and consternation that typify the inner landscape of 2012-land.

While his pavilion has been open to all, Stray has used common sense and discerning analysis to critique the contributions, such that basic errors in theories have been identified, always involving internal inconsistencies in the theory itself, rather than by reference to a set of preconceived doctrines of what 2012 “really” means. I appreciate this quality in Stray’s book on 2012, because it allows us to categorize the wide spectrum of writings into fiction and non-fiction, trace the inter-relationships and discern, sometimes, the shared sourceings between different contributions. A bit of order has thus been given to the chaos of creativity that 2012 has spawned.

Stray clearly leans in a certain direction when it comes to his own views—views that have been distilled, it should be said, from his immersion in the field of ideas—but it is possible to give allegiance to one’s own preferential viewpoint while retaining objectivity in assessing all others. And Stray has done this. Another admirable quality evinced by Stray is essential for continuing the conversation on 2012: open mindedness. We can all strive to practice this virtue, as it is clear even in this incipient phase of the birth of 2012ology that many views are going to be mutually contradictory, irreconcilable with each other, and thus ‘unity in multiplicity’ may be the ultimate teaching to emerge from our passage through 2012. Open mindedness, rather than meaning the uncritical endorsement of everything, thus takes on the connotation of an inclusive mentality that can embrace contradictory views (even while retaining one’s own perspective).

The creation and nurturance of that state of consciousness, that transcendent viewpoint, may initially seem to simply be a prerequisite of furthering serious discussion on 2012. However, such a meta-view may indeed coalesce as a supremely important emergent property from our collective dance with 2012. The “lesson” distilled is simple: *higher perspectives are needed to resolve problems and conflicts*. And in that speculation we glimpse that something may lay beyond 2012—beyond it in time and space, and beyond it in our own minds. In other words, there can be a ‘beyond 2012’ if we mentally create the space that can embrace that possibility, in effect transcending the apocalyptic nihilism that defines modern civilization and pollutes modern consciousness. And transcendence does not escape or deny that which is transcended, but includes it in a higher vision. We may all come to agree that 2012 is not a final end, which is a notion that seems to be one of the largest and potentially most counter-productive assumptions about it.

This book is called *Beyond 2012*. How are we to go beyond 2012? Is there anything *beyond* 2012? What is the intended meaning of this phrase? Stray tells me “the title intends to impart optimism to the subject, decreasing anxiety that the end

of the world is approaching, since it turns out that many of the catastrophe theories are inherently faulted.” And so *Beyond 2012* takes the courageous position of clarifying and simplifying the 2012 discussion by winnowing out theories of dubious merit. The 2012 discussion shows that people tend to gravitate towards one of two positions—that 2012 represents a catastrophic end or it represents a new beginning (in some sense). These are difficult questions to resolve as they touch upon profound meditations on death and immortality, vast cycles of time, and ancient insights into human consciousness that are just recently coming to light. Could it be that our own educational institutions and our own civilization’s preconceptions have left us ill-prepared to deal with such profound questions? We, the denizens of the Kali Yuga, the age of spiritual darkness, are struggling to embrace profound higher wisdom, and thus our own transformation does indeed seem to be the prerequisite for any clear understanding of what “the end of time” means. Getting beyond 2012 is about transcending preconceived biases and limitations born from Western civilization’s limited worldview.

The 2012 date itself is specifically an artifact of the Mayan calendar. It is not a New Age creation of any particular author; it is a reconstructed artifact of the Mayan Long Count calendar tradition. Why the ancient calendar makers ended their 13-Baktun cycle on the date we call December 21, 2012 has been an open question. I believe that date was intended (by its creators) to target a rare alignment between the earth, our sun, and the center of our Milky Way galaxy—a factual astronomical alignment that takes place only once every 26,000 years. My research follows academic principles of argument and documentation to arrive at this surprising synthesis and reconstruction. After subsequent research, this knowledge of a rare “galactic alignment” also appears to be the centerpiece of other wisdom traditions from around the globe. As such, while the emergence of the 2012 date into contemporary thought is traceable to Mayan calendric tradition, the inner wisdom of 2012 is universal. We might even say that 2012 is emerging as an archetype of the end times, and thus resonates with the universal human questions about death and immortality. This avenue of association rightfully opens up 2012 to entire categories of approach that have little to do with my cosmological reconstruction, or even with Mayan culture *per se*. Having said this, we must also honor Mayan genius in what is, above all, a profound and advanced cosmological model of human development that uses the Galactic Center as its evolutionary centerpiece.

Human beings, by their different natures and preferences, will gravitate to different categories in this discussion, revealing the relative merit they see in each approach. For some, my archaeo-philosophical resurrection of a lost Galactic Cosmology may seem hopelessly inaccessible while dream visions catalyzed by *Salvia divinorum* reveal more interesting data on what 2012 is “really” about. Truth can appear relative—related to one’s own position—and that egalitarian principle must be held high, to uphold freedom of expression and belief. But it must also be noted that some of the theories surveyed in *Beyond 2012*—especially in their more recent iterations—gratuitously toss in 2012 to lend superficial support to a theory that otherwise has nothing to do with Mayan calendrics or recognizable Mayan beliefs. These cut-and-paste

cosmologies, such as the new connection between Planet X and 2012, indirectly attribute to the Maya ad-hoc theories that are poorly supported and that, in fact, espouse beliefs counter to Mayan tradition. This is a marketing ploy, plain and simple, to co-opt the awe and apocalyptic punch that 2012 has gained within popular consciousness. It's like name dropping, and name dropping doesn't mean you know anything at all about the person named.

And so some of the theories presented here unfairly latch onto 2012, basically as a marketing ploy, while others are dealing head on with the real issues of the Mayan intention behind 2012. Adhering to the latter approach, I base my reconstruction of the true intention behind the 2012 date on examining the early Maya site that formulated the 2012 calendar. This early Mayan site, which experienced its heyday some 2,100 years ago, is called Izapa. In this I am alone among academics and popular writers alike, and my work has therefore generated unique conclusions that are nevertheless backed up by archaeological, iconographical, calendrical, mythological, and astronomical evidence. And so we have two extremes of the spectrum: on the one hand the carefully argued reconstruction of authentic (although up until now, forgotten) Mayan traditions, and on the other hand the spurious concoctions of ad-hoc ideas that threaten to inject modern distortions into ancient wisdom. Many of the ideas presented in *Beyond 2012* fall somewhere in between, into an intriguing domain of deeper mysteries and higher faculties, of shamanic visions, alternative science, resurfacing traditions, and recovered histories. This domain is worth exploring.

Shall the 2012 discussion be open *only* to scholars and academics? I don't think so. More to the point, what can we expect from academic social commentators as the 2012 discussion becomes louder and better known? For this we can look to a recent end-point date that was essentially similar to the 2012 date.

Boston University's Center for Millennial Studies was a focus for Year 2000 dialogues. Founded in 1995, they quickly began soliciting for papers on the millennial theme in cultural beliefs, with a special interest in Native American beliefs. In 1999, they rejected my submission outlining the galactic alignment thesis, even though the minimal alignment zone of thirty-six years (1980 – 2016) embraces Year 2000 (see chapter 23 in my book, *Galactic Alignment*). My book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* came out in 1998, which clearly laid out the thesis in rigorous detail, but although Year 2012 and Year 2000 both fall within the galactic alignment zone, my offer to send this book for review was refused. [Note: some editing occurred in the U.S. edition of Stray's book]

The oversight was compounded by the Institute's director, Richard Landes, categorizing 2012 as a New Age topic during an interview with National Public Radio's Terry Gross (Fresh Air, December 16, 1997). He propagated mistaken notions about the 2012 date when he said, "there's a Mayan calendar that gives us information up to 2012, and then after 2012 it stops." He goes on to say that a sector of New Age thinkers have thus adopted 2012 as their favorite doomsday point, which is true, but Landes fails to emphasize that 2012 is a real artifact of Mayan calendar tradition, and the associated World Age doctrine never predicts a final end, but always a transformation. This particular interpretation is not my own,

but is available in basic books on the Maya. Landes also mentioned the Harmonic Convergence of 1987 in relation to the 2012 end-date, which reveals that he was relying heavily on ideas in Arguelles' *Mayan Factor* and related manifestations. Since the Center for Millennial Studies is still, as of 2004, a funded research think-tank, one can only hope that more serious research on 2012 will be assessed with an open mind.

The 2012 discussion is already formulating itself as a widespread, grass-roots, popular movement—much more so than Y2K / Year 2000. Such widespread interest may itself be the antidote to official myopia. If a university think tank emerges to conference on 2012, scholars should refer to *Beyond 2012* as a guide to the multiple theories on 2012. Since the material runs the gamut from inner dream visions to serious PhD-level studies, academics and social commentators will not be able to toss everything here into an easily dismissed bin of New Age fantasy. I support and encourage serious discussion of 2012, and the current level of the discussion—in quality and cogency—must be raised. *Beyond 2012* does this with admirable comprehension and comprehensiveness, inviting us all to engage with this topic in deeper ways. And, again, the keys, exemplified by Stray, are open-mindedness and discernment.

And so let us go to the next level in the evolving discussion. Let us have conferences and symposia, think tanks and yahoo email groups and café salons. Let us write treatises and poetry, songs and equations. Let us visit Chichen Itza, Izapa, Egypt, and inner planes of higher wisdom. And let us reconvene in 2013, when we are beyond 2012, and talk about what accompanies us unscathed through the eye of the needle, the sun door at World's End, the *ginnungagap* between the Ages, the eschatological symplegades, the still-point threshold crossing—the nexus between death and rebirth.

Vincit omnia veritas: Truth Conquers All.

John Major Jenkins

1 Chicchan, 12.19.11.3.5 (April 12th, 2004)

[Note: I've explained elsewhere how the first draft of my Foreword contained the phrase "the 2012 Phenomenon", which Stray also uses in his book. It was part of a section that got excised from the final version for space reasons.]

9. My Comments on Defesche's 2007 Master's Thesis on the 2012 Phenomenon. November 2015

The title of Sacha Defesche's Master's Thesis-essay is "The 2012 Phenomenon: An Historical and Typological Approach to a Modern Apocalyptic Mythology." I've been aware of this work for five years or so, and noted many problems with it during my first read. Due to the avalanche of academic distortions that I was processing, I didn't do much about it at the time, though I've mentioned it a few times in my writings.

Defesche's piece is frequently cited by other scholars as a reliable assessment of 2012 literature and ideas, and it is presented as building upon Robert Sitler's earlier essay of 2006, which also uses "the 2012 phenomenon" in its title. As recently as 2015, Kevin Whitesides favorably cited Defesche's

2007 work in an essay for the “new religions” journal *Nova Religio*. In 2014, Whitesides & Hoopes reiterated that they perceived Defesche’s thesis paper of 2007 as “the second” use of the “2012 phenomenon” phrase, after Sitler (2006), ignoring its use in Geoff Stray’s 2005 book (*Beyond 2012*) and other references I cited in my corrective review-essay of 2014. (See my essay in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (2014) and my subsequent rebuttal at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.)

These are unfortunate problems in how scholars have distorted the record on the sequence of discovery, in defining the 2012 phenomenon, in ignoring my earlier and ongoing critiques of the 2012 literature, and in accurately assessing 2012 writers and theories — particularly, my own. For example, Defesche first mentions me under the Chapter 2 heading “The Birth of an Apocalypse”, totally misrepresenting my work. False though it is, the association is made absolutely crystal clear when he then writes: “In this thesis, I will distinguish three important bibliographical sources of this apocalyptic narrative” and he lists Terence McKenna, José Argüelles, and myself.

When he comes to summarizing my work he cites my 1998 book (*Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*) and states “This book does not contain much new information” (24). This is a ridiculous and totally false statement. There are many new ideas, deductions, interpretations, and discoveries in that book. I calculated and was the first to publish, in my 1998 book, the Izapa ballcourt’s alignment to the December solstice sunrise. My entire “zenith cosmology” reconstruction is unprecedented in the literature; my model of “three cosmic centers” within the cosmology of Izapa is unprecedented; my model of shifting centers as people migrated southward is unprecedented — I could go on and on.

Defesche’s bizarrely inaccurate perception of my work is further exposed when he states that my book was “the first publication to mention the apocalyptic significance of 2012” (24). What? And how is this? Because, according to Defesche, it is “explicitly (in its title)” (24). The only appropriate rebuttal to this bizarre assertion is “OMG.” The word “cosmogogenesis,” in my book’s title, must be what he’s referring to. But this word was selected precisely *to avoid an apocalyptic connotation*, because that’s not what my work is about. The word reflects what I had found in the evidence: a doctrine of period-ending worldrenewal (world=cosmos; renewal=genesis/rebirth). Cosmogogenesis = worldrenewal. This does not imply or require an apocalyptic reading. If Defesche was unclear on this point (regarding the definition of words) he could have read my discussions in the Introduction to my book, separating “end of world” language from the cyclic “World Age” concept that I found in the Maya material and therefore advocate.

With these two first mentions of my work, in a completely false way associating it with apocalypse narratives, it becomes clear that it’s going to largely be a waste of time to thoroughly review Defesche’s thesis-essay. But I will mention a few other things. On page 25 Defesche correctly deduces the sequence by which Terence McKenna came to understand the demonstrable relevance of the galactic alignment within Maya traditions — it was largely through his encounter with my work in the early 1990s. But then Defesche skips over all of my arguments and evidence to select some speculations at the end of my book, which have a religious or spiritual flavor. This is the classic

approach of those who seek to mitigate — target the casual speculations offered after the hard-core evidence and scholarly deductions were offered (e.g., see Part IV, the Izapa section of my book).

On page 26, Defesche tries to associate me with the “psychedelic and prophetic rhetoric” (of McKenna and Argüelles) by stating “recent developments” in my work “suggest that Jenkins is placing more emphasis on the role of psychoactive substances”⁷⁷ (especially the psilocybin mushrooms) in ancient Mayan culture” Defesche 2007:26). As support for this he cites (footnote 77) my 2007 essay I wrote for the Reality Sandwich website (reprinted in the *Towards 2012* anthology of 2008, edited by Pinchbeck & Jordan). This was not a “recent development” in my work. The ideas in that piece were drawn from my 1998 book (replicated in a 2002 conference paper, cited in my essay). I presented evidence that psychoactive substances were used at Izapa, which leads unavoidably to a consideration of cosmological worldviews that arise from such use (thus the heading “Psychedelic Cosmologies” in my 1998 book — Jenkins 1998:197).

Following up on the sequence of McKenna’s explicit recognition of 2012 being associated with the Maya calendar, Defesche mixes up his citation and therefore gives the impression that McKenna wrote about this in the 1975 first edition of *The Invisible Landscape*. Maybe this is just unclear writing, but there is also an incorrect source citation. On page 18 of his thesis-essay, Defesche provides a quote from Terence McKenna, regarding his speculation that a shared use of psychoactive mushrooms (he and the Maya) may have somehow pointed him to “December 22, 2012.” The implication of Defesche’s narrative seems to be that Terence was aware, in 1975, that the 2012 date was found in the Maya calendar. This is false, although it may result from unclear writing, as it’s possible that Defesche himself believes this. Defesche (2007: 18, n. 50) cites the 1993 revised edition of *Invisible Landscape* (1975) for this McKenna quote, and he makes it unclear whether or not the quoted passage was in the original 1975 first edition. But the real problem is that the passage is not found in *The Invisible Landscape* at all, in either edition — it’s in *True Hallucinations* (1993:200). This error is not without consequence in misleading readers and effectively confuses the correct sequence of events. If you want to read Defesche’s thesis-essay in full, it is posted on his Academia.edu page.

Along with other conceptual errors and bizarre assertions as described above, and occurring throughout his thesis-essay, Defesche’s work is quite unreliable, and does not provide a factual and conceptually accurate portrayal of the 2012 phenomenon. Much like David Morrison’s comments on his NASA blog in 2009, Defesche mis-portrays my work as the first expression of the Maya calendar apocalypse-in-2012 narrative. It’s quite possible that Morrison’s assertions, on the NASA blog and then in many presentations he gave at academic venues through 2012, were based in his reading of Defesche’s 2007 thesis-essay. In 2014 and 2015, it took me many months of phone calls and emails to get these statements removed from the NASA website, which wrongly asserted that I was the origin-point of the 2012-Maya calendar doomsday notion. Defesche’s essay would benefit from major revisions. And yet it’s the document that awarded him his Master’s

degree, being approved by Woulter Hanegraff at the University of Amsterdam in 2007. Such is the undiscerning and nepotistic nature of the Ivory Tower. And, as mentioned, Defesche's 2007 thesis-essay continues to be favorably and uncritically cited by other scholars (as recently as Whitesides' *Nova Religio* article of 2015). Specifically, scholars who believe that it is a reliable source worthy of citing (e.g., Kevin Whitesides, 2015, and Whitesides & Hoopes, 2012 and 2014), should exercise greater caution and discernment. [In 1-2016 Whitesides and Defesche commented on my Facebook page about this review; Defesche disclaimed being a scholar and Whitesides deflected.]

10. Response to Isabel Hawkins' critique of the galactic alignment at the panel discussion and showing of the film 2012: The Beginning in September 2012 (at The Tech Museum of Innovation Lecture Series)

John Major Jenkins. June 5, 2013

[Audio reading of this review is here \(.wma file, 13 minutes\)](#)

I wish that Isabel Hawkins would have based her comments about my work on my actual published words rather than suggesting that I was evading the astronomical "facts." As with many of the critiques of my work by "professional" scholars, she didn't draw from what I've actually stated and did me the disservice of assuming and asserting a negative characterization of my motivations.

She begins by calling the galactic alignment a "prediction." This is a misleading term, since the galactic alignment is an astronomical occurrence and the challenge of the ancient Maya would have been to *calculate* it. By using "prediction" she frames the discussion in terms evocative of "prophecy" and "predicting" future events. The dating of the galactic alignment would have been a calculation, not a prediction. You don't say: I predict the sun will rise at 6:34 am tomorrow morning. You would calculate that occurrence, based on some knowledge of the astronomy involved.

Addressing the astronomy, Hawkins illustrated the wide span of the Milky Way and then, taking this as her main criterion for what the galactic alignment is, she then notes that it takes something like 400 years for the solstice sun to precess through the Milky Way. Her claim is that "he [me, John Major Jenkins] doesn't want to say '400 years' because that kind of diminishes the significance of this" (33:36). This is a factually wrong assertion, and is a negative characterization of my motivations. She clearly intends to imply that I skirt around and avoid facts and the larger complexities of the topic, which is a tactic of mitigation employed by other under-informed debunkers.

In FACT, in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (p. 113-114) I wrote: **"In the most generalized scenario, the spatial parameters of this solstice sun-Galaxy alignment can be expanded to include the moment the solstice sun first began to conjunct the eastern edge of the Milky Way, which was something like 450 years ago. The temporal range of the alignment, depending on how we define conjunction, can therefore be on the order of 900 years."** I then go on to discuss the more narrow criterion of the Dark Rift in the Milky Way, which is a key feature of the Maya Creation Myth, and the even more narrow "galactic equator." The galactic equator,

with the solar ecliptic, defines a quite precise *crossing point*, the Crossroads in the Maya Creation Myth, which is relevant to actual Maya concepts and thus how the Maya were likely conceiving and calculating the galactic alignment. With this criterion, combined with the precise middle-point of the body of the sun, we can discuss a very precise alignment, which resulted in the theoretically precise calculation of Jean Meeus (1997), also alluded to in my 1998 book. But even with this, I questioned the likelihood of making, and the possibility of making, such an absolutely precise calculation and point out that the sun itself is one-half of a degree wide. It will therefore take approximately 36 years for the solstice sun to precess through the galactic equator / ecliptic crossing point.

In FACT, I defined these various parameters, going back to 1994, and was the first to openly introduce and discuss their varying merits. (The description of the galactic alignment by Terence McKenna was quite vague; the statements by astrologer R. Mardyks were also vague; the discussion by astrologers James Royle and Daniel Giamario were quite good, which I cited in my 1998 book; and of course Meeus used a precise astronomical definition but he did not discuss an error range for his calculation nor did he address the varying ranges depending on the visual features used.) Because of the careless and low resolution treatment of my work by critics like Hawkins, my full consideration of the complexities of the discussion and the focus I brought to bear on what is relevant to reconstructing how and why the ancient Maya astronomers were employing the astronomical features involved in the galactic alignment, is made muddy and unclear. My 2002 book called *Galactic Alignment* (still in print, widely available online) also goes deeply into the parameters and the ranges.

So, we have a very large alignment range, and a very concise alignment range, depending on how the criteria are treated. Based on the astronomical features and their varying parameters, and wondering about the veracity of the more concise alignment zone (reducible to approximately 36 years) a rational question can be posed: *could the Maya calculate precise sidereal positions of the sun over long periods of time?* Well, apparently the answer is yes, which Michael Grofe has demonstrated in his work, and which he cogently summarized in the 5 minutes that was given to him to speak. He spoke after Hawkins (beginning at 35:20).

It turns out that the sidereal position of the sun at the Crossroads, although varying over the centuries in relation to the seasons, can be identified in Maya inscriptions as being repeatedly of interest. In era-2012, this alignment of the sun and the Crossroads happens on the December solstice. During the Maya Classic Period, it happened 16 – 26 days before the solstice. Rather than being a way to mitigate the relevance of the galactic alignment in era-2012 (which is what Hawkins does), these changing reference points provide a way to track and confirm the Maya's interest in such an alignment, indicating their ability to track and calculate the changing dates of the alignment (changing, that is, in relation to the solstice).

One example of this, identified by Dr. Michael Grofe and published by him in 2011, involves the birthday of the Maya Triad Deity named GI, recorded on the Palenque Temple of the Cross Tablet as November 8, 2360 BC (J). This is a date of the sun's alignment with the Crossroads (some 61 days before the solstice in that era of precession), which is reiterated in the

imagery of the Sacred Tree with the GI god-head at its base, depicted in the carving. Lord Jaguar's birthday, Tortuguero Monument 6, and Copan Stela C are other examples. Investigations along these lines have already been pursued and published (for example, in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, my presentation at the *Society for American Archaeology* (April of 2010), and Grofe's IAU article (July 2011) and his article in *Archaeoastronomy* Vol. XXIV, and many essays freely available since 2010 on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>).

Hawkins would no doubt be interested in these studies, and I would be interested in discussing them with her. However, other scholars who have broadcast incorrect notions about my work and the galactic alignment, when informed of the facts and the research, have almost universally either disappeared and refused to continue (or begin) the conversation, or have found semantically clever and irrational ways to dig themselves deeper into their commitment to mitigation. That's not science.

Isabel Hawkins also suggests that my use of the term "era" is an obliquely evasive way that I allude to a 400-year period for the alignment, but this too is factually incorrect. She stated: "Major Jenkins, I noticed his language, he says that it occurs during the *era* of 2012, he didn't say [nodding to the picture indicating the 400-year period], he said the *era*. Okay, yes, within this 400-year period, but he doesn't want to say '400 years...'" (33:28) (her emphasis).

As I've explained in numerous places in my published books since the late-1990s, *the 36-year range* is what I refer to with "era-2012." My introduction of this "range" was intended to address the improbable popular perception that the alignment could possibly be boiled down to one day (or even one year!) and to correct the erroneous notion that something dramatic "is going to happen" on the cycle-ending day, December 21, 2012.

Hawkins then goes on to say that "these are all things that are quite immaterial" (33:41) anyway, and that we should be directing our attention "away from the doomsday prophecies" and the "particulars" (33:55) of the galactic alignment. What she does here is to cleverly conflate my work with doomsday, which also is misleading to her audience, and factually false. She never stated that my work is *not* about doomsday. Almost two decades ago I showed that the period-ending doctrine in Maya cosmology, which would apply to 2012, is about renewal. This position is now reiterated by scholars, as of late 2010.

Finally, after dismissing the galactic alignment, Hawkins then reverses her tone and acknowledges Maya astronomical "prowess," as a segue to introducing "daykeeper Don Roberto" (Maya Spiritual Guide Roberto Poz, father of Ixquic Poz) and "Doña Maria," as holders of oral traditions (they sit on her left and right). It's good that she acknowledges the modern Maya and the survival of the 260-day calendar; this is something I've advocated, defended, and worked for since 1986. In the film shown that evening, Shannon Kring-Buset's *2012: The Beginning*, we see the modern Maya expressing their belief in cyclic time and renewal in 2012. (My advocacy for the renewal position on 2012 was criticized by Maya scholars for many years until some of the more progressive scholars took a look at the evidence and began reiterating this interpretation, now confirmed by the Maya.) Reconstructing the lost astronomy and understanding the spiritual teachings around period-ending

renewal are not mutually irreconcilable approaches; in fact, I have integrated the two in my work.

Unfortunately, I wasn't invited to give a presentation at this event - I could have easily explained and clarified things in person. But that's how these sessions have typically been set up. I didn't even know this presentation had been posted online (in November 2012) until I stumbled across it yesterday (June 4, 2013).

Notes:

Time code citations (e.g., 33:55) are referenced to the minute/second location of the quotes within the Youtube presentation:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VJOf7Wvxwy0>.

[Shannon Kring-Buset](#) also addresses the panel and audience (beginning at 11:30).

About John Major Jenkins:

http://johnmajorjenkins.com/?page_id=16

Isabel Hawkins: <http://cse.ssl.berkeley.edu/isabel/>

Michael Grofe:

http://www.mayaexploration.org/staff_grofe.php

2012: The Beginning: <http://www.2012thebeginning.com/>



Note. Like other books which glanced at the 2012 topic, Appendix 5 in the book *1491* by Charles C. Mann (second edition, 2011) also relied heavily on flawed scholarly consensus and the Restall & Solari book (which parroted the flaws of Aveni's 2009 book). The chain of effects of academic sloppiness and malfeasance is astonishing to witness. Although his summary of the Maya calendar systems is accurate, his account of Tortuguero Monument 6 and the origin of the doomsday-2012 notion is inaccurate.

He concludes, along with 2012 meaning-deniers David Stuart and Stephen Houston, that there is no Maya knowledge (or "wisdom") embedded in the 2012 date; it is a fallacious projection of Western ideas. This is ironic, since Mann's otherwise fascinating and magisterial work celebrates the underappreciated contributions of Native America wisdom, science, and traditions in the Western Hemisphere. If he would have performed non-biased research into the 2012 literature he would find that 2012 represents, at the very least, an impressive ability of early Maya astronomers to calculate the Tropical Year with great accuracy, not to mention the Sidereal Year (and thus, the *precession of the equinoxes*). A recognition of this could have been a nice concluding capstone to Mann's book, congruent with the rest of his book, but instead he fell in line behind the biased delusions of scholarly ego politics and demonstrably flawed scholarship. JMJ. 3-16-2017.

11. My Review-Essay of *Archaeoastronomy and the Maya* (eds Gerardo Aldana y Villalobos and Ed Barnhart, Oxbow Books, 2014)

John Major Jenkins. © May 2015

Preamble

This anthology of writings consists of expanded essays based on presentations given at the *Society for American Archaeology* (SAA) conference in April of 2007 (in Austin, TX). It has a focus, as the title indicates, on Maya archaeoastronomy. A foreword by volume co-editor Ed Barnhart describes the circumstances of the conference and the long road to publication. Co-editor Aldana provides a lengthy history of the study of Maya astronomy and archaeoastronomy, including debates about its assumptions and methods in the 1990s and culminating with a curious mention of the “debacle of 2012” which, according to Aldana, “demonstrates a guilt by association that facilitates the marginalization of the field” (Aldana 10).¹

I’ll discuss various aspects of the volume’s chapters. This is a review *essay*, not merely a *review* which in scholarly publications is often limited in scope and word-count. As I critique the chapters I will offer specific comments on the content, arguments, and ideas presented, followed by a discussion of the implications that will range over a wider spectrum of related matters.

I have a great interest in the topics explored in this anthology,² the allegedly “new” ideas proposed, and the

¹ It is not clear what is meant here. Aldana participated in the debate about my work on Tortuguero astronomy, which relates to archaeoastronomy and 2012, and he offered an experiment intended to challenge my findings; I responded by pointing out an insurmountable fallacy in the non-randomness of his allegedly random experiment. Consequently, it’s not clear if the “debacle of 2012” lies in my 2012 interpretations that are rooted in the evidence of archaeoastronomy, or in the fallacious, circularly persistent, baseless and unsupported assertions that are leveled against it and which appear to have traction to the extent that university-level publishers refuse to acknowledge and correct demonstrable errors in the statements made by their academic authors. I refer here to the debacle involving the University Press of Colorado refusing to acknowledge and correct factual errors committed by Anthony Aveni in his 2009 book *The End of Time* --- including his mis-statement of the Izapa ballcourt’s horizon alignment, using my perceived religious persuasion as a foundation for his critique of my work, false citations, and the false premise (the variable rate of shifting stars, which doesn’t in fact apply to my model) underlying his critique of my reconstructed precession-tracking model, as encoded into the Calendar Round/New Fire tradition at Chichen Itza, by which the sun and the Pleiades align, via precession, with the zenith. (This debacle was documented in 27 emails with the press’s director in early 2015). At least five errors, all denied by author and publisher, with a refusal to offer any form of errata, including in the supposedly “corrected” eBook released in May of 2015, four months after the discussions occurred. Now THAT is certainly a debacle.

² My seminal work on reconstructing two ancient precessional cosmologies in Mesoamerica (*Maya Cosmogonies 2012*, 1998) drew largely from archaeoastronomical evidence at several sites, including Izapa and Chichen Itza. The approach I adopted in analyzing the site of Izapa (including its orientations, surrounding topography and astronomy, and carved monuments) was one of assessing a wide array

evolving methods and language being used in the field of archaeoastronomy. I’m also interested in the motivations, conceptual biases, and critiques of the field’s detractors (there are some modern scholars who don’t even believe that archaeoastronomy is a valid field, e.g., Stan Guenter, see Jenkins 2011), as well as the often unsupported and irrational assertions made by professional scholars against the precession of the equinoxes (which most of them don’t understand the mechanics of), against their prejudiced concept of what 2012 is (influenced by the doomsday-marketplace), and against a related World Age doctrine in Maya thought (but seen to be a non-Maya concept because they conflated it, in their imaginations, with a detestable “New Age” rhetoric --- see, e.g., Aveni, Hoopes and Whitesides & Hoopes). As such, it is easy to document instances of attempted or successful blocking of the publication of certain ideas by certain researchers --- ideas which, if published on schedule as planned, would have preceded the 2014 publication date of the anthology being considered here.

For example, there is the article I prepared, based on my 2010 SAA presentation, for publication in a planned anthology edited by Robert Benfer and Larry Adkins, to be called *Archaeoastronomy in the Americas*. Originally scheduled for a 2011 release, then pushed back to 2012, it hit a road block with an ultimatum forced upon their pre-arranged university press of choice (the University Press of Florida), by an anonymous “peer-reviewer”, forbidding the anthology from being published *if it included my chapter*. This chapter, based on my 2010 SAA presentation, remains unpublished to this day (in May of 2015), even though it went through an extremely rigorous public peer-review pounding sponsored by *The Maya Exploration Center* in late 2010.³

Consequent revision, refining, expansion, and editing of my SAA paper, suggested and approved by the anthology’s editors, aided by feedback from a half-dozen other scholars, forged a well argued and documented 9000-word chapter on the astronomy of Tortuguero which had profound implications for understanding ancient Maya precessional awareness and the rhetorical motivations of Maya kings in relating themselves to

of “environmental determinants”, employing an interdisciplinary approach and citing to Isbell (1982), Aveni (1981), the BYU archaeologists who studied the site, and iconographers.

³ In a similar and more revealing example, I published a corrective critique of an essay by scholars Whitesides and Hoopes (2012). During their consideration of my piece, they attempted to stonewall and derail the already approved publication of my piece in the peer-review journal (*Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*) by requesting I send them, as a pretext for their considered response, all of my writings as listed on my website --- with some being poetry, biography, or experimental fiction going back to the 1980s. They somehow connived the journal editors to agree this was a reasonable request. In the end my critique and their response was published (in 2014), immediately upon which the authors managed to poison the thoughts of the editors with some communication that caused them to chastise me and warn me that they would block my name within the alliance of European professional journals. In their invited response Whitesides and Hoopes refused to acknowledge any of the clearly supported and documented errors I had pointed out. See <http://www.Update2012.com>. Whitesides even backslid on a citation error that he had acknowledged to me in a previous email. This is a reactionary anti-2012 academia at its most broken worst.

alignments within the shifting of precession --- including the much misunderstood one in era-2012 (the “solstice-galaxy alignment” or “galactic alignment”). These interpretations of mine, linking precessional astronomy to the rhetorical interests of Maya kings (which I had articulated in my 1998 book) is most closely related to the suggestions asserted (with little in the way of supporting citations, argument, or evidence) in the chapter by Mendez & Karasik, who as members of the MEC were invited to participate in the previously described debate/discussion of late 2010 (see Jenkins 2011). Even though my expanded essay has yet to be published, it was based on my read SAA paper of April 2010 which, along with the 12 slides I used, was formatted as a PDF and posted verbatim on the MEC website in late 2010, as a precedent for the critical review and comments that unfolded over the 4-week-long online debate. Barnhart was the moderator; Aldana and Grofe were contributors. It remains there today as a cite-able separate resource, alongside the entire 206-page transcribed debate which ran to 92,000 words (posted in early January of 2011).

My pioneering work of the 1990s argued for several ideas that are, in fact, taken up and explored in the anthology of 2014. For example, the idea that the pre-Classic creators of the Long Count were aware of the precession of the equinoxes and were motivated, in the formulation of the Long Count, by calculating precession.⁴ (This fact is required, but not stated, in the proposal asserted by Mendez & Karasik.) Another idea explored in many of my works is one addressed by Mendez & Karasik (both of whom I met in Palenque, in late 2006) --- that Maya rulers liked to relate themselves, for power and prestige, to Creation Myth deities in collusion with alignments determined by the precession of the equinoxes, particularly one that occurs in era-2012. (This idea is seen, for example, in my analysis of the throne-sitting king, as a shamanic ballplayer and facilitator of the rebirth of One Hunahpu, on the throne positioned at the west end of the Izapa ballcourt, which faces down the lengthwise axis of the ballcourt to the December solstice sunrise and the future alignment in precession --- the so-called solstice-galaxy alignment --- converging over that horizon). What Mendez & Karasik identified is based in precessional shifting, but as a methodology is astronomically different than what I reconstructed (more on this later). Nevertheless, their interpretive framework is similar to what I’ve proposed for the site of Izapa, as well as for the Tortuguero king, Lord Jaguar (Jenkins 1997, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012).

As I read this and other chapters in the anthology, I immediately see how some of these “new” proposals reflect and fit into an astronomical paradigm that I am very familiar with and have elucidated and published, in my various publications, since the early 1990s. With a desire to communicate clearly and unify different terminological tendencies of different researchers, I seek to clarify, question, and find common ground in how we perceive and language the unique features, perspectives, and methods of Mesoamerican

⁴ Contrary to what remains stated as fact on Wikipedia and elsewhere, Edmonson did not originate or ever state this idea, and he also did not use the Dark Rift as a sidereal target for 2012 astronomy. He, being clued in by V. Bricker, only noted the solstice occurrence in 2012, which suggested an awareness of the Tropical Year.

archaeoastronomy. Especially in regard to reconstructing ancient precessional knowledge in Mesoamerica, I have suggested and advocated for an interdisciplinary approach that features archaeoastronomy and recognizes the ideas on carved monuments and the evidence provided by environmental surroundings (including horizon topography) as relevant and readable “texts” (see Jenkins 1998 and <http://alignment2012.com/mayan2012statements.html>, March 2006). So, in essence I agree with the concerns and suggestions offered by Aldana in his Preface and Postscript.⁵

Note: The following section is a brief sketch; my critique of certain issues are clear enough without going into greater detail. Critiques of all the contributors may be written later.

Reviews of Essays by Green, Mendez & Karasik, Grofe, and Milbrath

My treatments of the contributions of these authors will comprise a forthcoming Part 2 to this essay, following (and depending on) successful communications with the various authors. For now, a brief comment can be made about the very interesting essay by Alonso Mendez & Carol Karasik titled “Centering the world.” Anthology co-editor Ed Barnhart tells me that this piece, and the ideas within it, were “mostly Alonso’s brainchild, though Carol did play a role in the research as well as the writing.” Here are my initial thoughts:

The issue with the Mendez & Karasik essay is, if we accept their proposal as possible, how then do we reconcile it with the other astronomical model proposed for 2012, which in fact rests upon more solid evidence and argument than their own proposal does? Both involve precession, but different modes of tracking precession. Well, we don’t have to reject either one in favor of the other, as if this was an either-or binary choice. Their zenith-nadir tracking model can be seen as a variant, or perhaps a Classic Period transformation, of the zenith-as-center paradigm I identified at Izapa, which belongs to a two-part precession-tracking paradigm that was integrated, as I’ve reconstructed it, at Chichen Itza in the 9th century.

With the contributing insights of Mendez & Karasik, although only loosely asserted, we see that Pakal at late-7th-century Palenque may have anticipated the need for, and the rhetorical efficacy of, asserting himself as the ruler who would integrate the zenith center and galactic center paradigms (associated in my work with astronomy in 3114 BC and 2012 AD). My model, already in place since the mid-1990s, helps us understand the idea proposed by Mendez & Karasik in a larger context in which Pakal’s efforts make better sense. But to accept this integration, we need to first accept my 2012 alignment proposal as well as my three-cosmic-center model that I reconstructed at the site of Izapa, and argued was

⁵ Despite my 1998 book being cited and critiqued in dozens of scholarly articles and books on 2012, my approach and findings have never, not once, been accurately described or characterized. The key archaeoastronomical discovery I made, and first published --- that of the Izapa ballcourt’s aligned to the December solstice sunrise azimuth --- was mentioned in only one publication, and inaccurately, in Aveni’s 2009 book (he mistakenly described it 48° in error).

integrated at Chichen Itza (Jenkins 1998). Also, their paper would benefit from some editing and more concise languaging of the concepts and connections.

Note: I was consumed by life challenges and didn't complete my ambitious review of every contributor. See my 5-4-2015 email to Grofe and 5-6-2015 to Barnhart, and my Postscript at the end, for more comments on this anthology. Related items are given below as appendices.

Appendix 1: Emails with anthology co-editor Ed Barnhart

Hi Ed, 5-6-2015

I've been reading with interest the essays in *Archaeoastronomy and the Maya* (2014), which you and Gerardo Aldana edited. First off, congratulations on bringing the 2007 SAA papers into publication after a long and winding road. I appreciated your narrative of the events with Aveni during that conference, Powell's challenge to Aveni and Grofe's correction to Aveni. If I recall correctly, it was either SAA 2007 or SAA 2008 that Aveni was overheard slandering me and advising his minions to not refer to me by name (or something to that effect). Was that 2007 to your recollection?

Anyway, I'm trying to wrap my head around the essay by Mendez and Karasik. Since you co-authored the related article with them (and Powell) I suspect you are intimate with their arguments and the contents of this other piece. It's the one called "Centering the World: Zenith and Nadir Passages at Palenque." And I suspect that you rather than Gerardo Aldana would be the relevant editor to offer my query to. I am assuming that you are open to critical feedback, and that there is some process of errata correction? For a second printing or at least to channel feedback to the authors?

I note that Mendez and Karasik are MEC members. In fact, I met them both at Palenque in late 2006, just a few days after I performed my field measurements at Izapa with my "azimuth gnomon instrument." (Results confirmed my earlier published solstice calculation from 1996 & 1998:

<http://www.alignment2012.com/izapa-solstice-2006.html>.) If I recall correctly, in my conversation with Mendez he seemed to think that the ballcourt at Izapa did not align to the solstice sunrise azimuth but to zenith or nadir sunrise azimuth (can't remember which, but in any case both of those are empirical wrong). I recall having lunch with Carol at Panchan.

I have a few corrections to, and observations about, the piece by Mendez and Karasik. The piece struck me more than others because of the bold assertions made regarding Pakal, precession of Orion, and 2012. As co-editor of the anthology, will you be able to receive and comment on my review? I can keep it brief, about a page. I'm assuming this is part of the publication process --- i.e., the follow-up to official publication being critical review and editorial adjustments/corrections. I could also contact Mendez and Karasik directly, if I could dig up their emails, but I feel this is the more appropriate channel. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Hi John,

I would be happy to receive your comments, but the replies should probably come directly from the authors. It was mostly Alonso's brainchild, though Carol did play a role in the research as well as the writing. I don't think they'd mind me sharing their emails:

carolkarasik@hotmail.com / butzchan@gmail.com

Thanks for taking the time to read our book!
Regards, Ed

Five months later I contacted Ed Barnhart again:

Hi Ed, 10-26-2015

Hope you are well. Hey, your calendar cover photo looks familiar ... the designers at Inner Tradition used the same viewpoint to try to convey the idea of galactic alignment, for my 2002 book of that title --- the galactic center between the two pillars of the inverted serpent column seemed, to them, to fit the bill.

I was wondering if you tried to pitch your 2014 anthology to the University Press of Colorado? (Darrin Pratt, etc). They just published an anthology on Mesoamerican archaeoastronomy and cosmology edited by Milbrath & Dowd. Seems they are interested in the cutting-edge stuff --- if you did, why didn't it go through? Did it have to do with Tony "the bruiser" Aveni revoking his support for the project, as you sketched in your preface?

John

Hi John, 10-27-2015

Long time no see. Actually, our original contract was with Colorado and Darrin. It dragged on for a long time (mostly my fault) and then when it finally got through peer review there were a lot of requests to edit certain papers. We felt like it was the reviewers imposing their views on us and we didn't want to do it. So, we broke with Colorado and went with another publisher. Aveni had nothing to do with it, but he did bail on us for the summary.

Regards, Ed

Dr. Edwin Barnhart / Director, Maya Exploration Center
3267 Bee Caves Rd
Suite 107-161
Austin, Texas 78746
www.mayaexploration.org

Ed, 10-27-2015

Well, I'm still here. It's been a difficult year with my wife dying of brain cancer in March. Together for 16 years, she was by my side through the many struggles and victories. It was distressing for her to witness my work, and me personally, being eviscerating unfairly and inaccurately, by "professional scholars" such as Freidel, Aveni, David Morrison at NASA,

David Stuart, Ed Krupp, John Hoopes and, well, the list is very long. Imagine the suffering of a dying loved one being compounded by the behavior of arrogant jack-asses hell bent on "destroying me" or "taking me down" (actual quotes).

The way this seems to work is for the ethically compromised perpetrators to distort and reframe the narrative. Gerardo Aldana did this, in how he described the debate that you and the MEC set up to discuss my SAA presentation of 2010. Aldana wrote:

“One intervention into this debate [about Maya astronomy] was enabled by the Maya Exploration Center. Their website hosted a discussion forum allowing anyone to jump into the conversation with questions, comments and concerns regarding interpretations of "2012." --- from his Google Group for Maya Cosmology, ca. early 2011

Intervention? Enabled? Notice how he avoided framing the discussion in any way that reflects how you actually introduced it:

"November 24, 2010. Maya Exploration Center
Please join us in a discussion of the paper John Major Jenkins presented at the 2010 Society for American Archaeology, entitled "Astronomy in the Tortuguero Inscriptions". We at MEC have reviewed it and find his observations on the ancient astronomy very solid. His interpretation of the associated texts has drawn more debate within our ranks. What do you think? It's posted on our website."

Ed, I'll always be grateful that you set this up. The behavior of Aldana and Guenter illustrated something very clear about how my work was being maliciously attacked with the sole purpose of muddying it, destroying it, and eliminating me from the discussion. Aldana, you might recall, had a problem even directly addressing me. I emailed him a few months ago about his comment, in the anthology you co-edited with him, regarding how "2012's association with archaeoastronomy" (which can only come from my Izapa alignment work) has compromised the standing of archaeoastronomy, via "guilt by association." No response, and that's how it goes. Moo-ha-ha-ha; you see, that was my intent all along, to destroy archaeoastronomy by interpreting the Izapa ballcourt monuments based on the ballcourt's alignment to the December solstice sunrise azimuth — an alignment that Aveni states 48 degrees in error in his 2009 book.

In any case, that debate provided a peer-review of my SAA paper *orders of magnitude* beyond what many peer-reviewed papers have had to endure. This is relevant because I was revising and expanding my SAA paper for inclusion in an ill-fated archaeoastronomy anthology, to be published by the University of Florida Press and edited by Benfer and Adkins. My paper benefited from comments by Grofe and MacLeod, from Benfer and Adkins, and from the entire MEC debate. It went through six revisions until final submission in early 2012. It was conceived as a companion piece to Grofe's article on the Copan Baseline, to appear in the same anthology. But a

malicious anonymous peer-review said there was no remedy for the anthology if my paper, and Grofe's paper, were included.

Benfer was protective of reviewer anonymity, but he did say that the reviewer was able to go directly to the University Press of Florida and forbid them from publishing the anthology if it included my piece. Grofe was offered inclusion, but he opted to publish his paper with Carlson's *Archaeo Journal* (2015) — with all previously included citations to my work surgically removed.

So, Benfer's final word in late 2013 was that he had to protect the anthology and not include my paper. He said it was the most unfair decision forced on him of his career. Yes, to say the least. So here we are, five years later and my valid and well argued work from SAA 2010 languishes. A 9000-word many-times revised essay that went through rigorous peer-review and was expected to be passed through. Censored by ONE hooded, academic Inquisitor. In comparison, I've seen many many papers published in peer-reviewed anthologies and journals that are full of errors, bias, loose arguments, and bad logic. I wasn't pursuing this for personal gain or acceptance or "legitimizing" --- it was about the work, the ideas, which are cast down mainly, I believe, because bullies and bullshitters like Aveni control the field.

I'll always be grateful to you for facilitating the MEC debate; it revealed much and yet passed into oblivion, as far as I can tell. Best wishes,

John

Hi John, 10-28-2015

I'm so sorry to hear about the passing of your wife. Heartbreaking. Condolences.

You are quite welcome for what little I did to help you defend your ideas. You know that I believe that everyone who wants to have a civil discourse should be included in academic discussions and those who flight it are really just scared of being challenged.

2012 was three years ago now, and my hope for you is that you can find a way to move past it. You've got a creative mind and tireless spirit that could be invested in much more positive pursuits than rehashing a fight that's long over. The vitriol is no good for your soul. The truth is that your books sold better than most every other book on the subject of 2012, including Aveni's and Stuart's. Whether your critics like it or not, you and your theories will go down in history as an important part of the 2012 debate. I hope that you can find a way to move on and find a new pursuit, in either a related or completely different field, and exchange all the anger for a new passion.

Sincerely, Ed

Appendix 2. My email to Kristian Azyndar explaining Michael Grofe's edits to his *Archaeoastronomy* XXV piece (released in March 2015).

Subject: Grofe's piece of 2012 compare to his piece of 2014
Date: 4-22-2015

We can compare the two versions of Grofe's "Copan Baseline" piece --- the final version submitted to Benfer's doomed anthology in April 2012 versus the one published in Carlson *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (a revision done in mid 2014, possibly as late as early October).

Here is material evident in the final version submitted for Benfer's anthology (April 2012), but which was cut from the recently published version, an entire block of text running over several pages:

...This sidereal position of the sun appears to have a particular significance relating to the Milky Way as a celestial caiman, and John Major Jenkins notes that on the east side of Stela C, Waxaklajuun Ubaah K'awiil appears to embody a vertical caiman, whose jaws face downward around his legs (Jenkins 2002, this volume). Several scholars have identified the repeating iconography of inverted caiman trees as representative of the Milky Way (Kelley 1989; Freidel, Schele and Parker 1993), with the dark cleft in the Milky Way above Sagittarius as the recognizable mouth of the caiman. Like the Orion Hearthstones, this dark cleft is a feature identified by the contemporary K'iche as the xibalba be, the 'underworld road' (B. Tedlock 1982:181).

On the east side of Stela H, we find the recognizable image of the solar/Venus deity known as GI (**Fig. 14a**), the first-born deity from the Palenque Triad (Berlin 1963). Here, the skeletal portrait of GI is depicted with his typical headgear—what Merle Greene Robertson (1974) labeled the "Quadripartite Badge", a sacrificial burning bowl emblazoned with a K'IN sun sign and containing a stingray spine bloodletter, a spondyllus shell and a cross-bands symbol (**Fig. 14b**). Significantly, the image of the skeletal GI wearing the Quadripartite Badge is frequently depicted emerging from the rear end of what Stuart refers to as the Starry Deer Caiman (**Fig. 15**), a creature he and Susan Milbrath (1999) associate with the Milky Way (Stuart 2005:70–72). In addition, the *k'in* bowl itself is found in the sign for 'east', where it reads **EL**, meaning 'rise, come out', and Stuart suggests that the Starry Deer Caiman symbolically consumes the sun at night, and in the morning, the sun is reborn in the east (ibid: 167–68). Indeed, Stuart cites Tate (1992:66), who observes that monumental representations of the Starry Deer Caiman orient the rear end with the skull and *k'in* bowl toward the east. However, it is quite likely that the rebirth of the sun from the body of the Milky Way Caiman relates to a specific sidereal position of the sun in its yearly cycle of symbolic death and rebirth.

Linda Schele (1976:17) first proposed that the rear of the Starry Deer Caiman containing the Quadripartite Badge represents the death and rebirth of the sun on the winter solstice. Milbrath (1999:281) concludes that the rear end of this creature represents the winter solstice sun in Sagittarius, in the very place where the ecliptic crosses the Milky Way. Given the

identity of the Starry Deer Caiman as the Milky Way, the placement of the sun in the center of the widest part of the Milky Way on the dates of both Stela C and Stela A in Copán seems to reflect the imagery of both the caiman on Stela C, as Jenkins proposes, and the skeletal GI with his Quadripartite Badge on Stela H.

GI is clearly related to the reborn sun, yet there is also a direct parallel between GI and Ehecatl-Quetzalcoatl, as both appear to relate to the planet Venus (Kelley 1965). Elsewhere (Grofe 2009a), I have demonstrated additional associations between GI, Ehecatl-Quetzalcoatl, and Hunahpu from the *Popol Vuh*. Each of these deities is related to a mythological complex that involves Venus and solar self-immolation, fish and water bird transformation, and rebirth after several days in the water. Various forms of this narrative refer to the retrieval of bones to form humanity and the eventual rebirth of the Maize God, identified as the father of Hunahpu in the Classic period (Taube 1985). Milbrath (1988) notes that, in Central Mexico, Venus-Quetzalcoatl was reborn after passing through the fertilizing waters of the Milky Way. Similarly, Stela A mentions the exhumation of Butz' Chan's bones together with the strengthening of the bones and blood of the sun. Thus, it appears that the imagery of the rebirth of GI in the Milky Way served as a mythological template for the rebirth of Butz' Chan as both the Maize God and his grandson, Waxaklajuun Ubaah K'awiil, as described on Stela A and Stela H.

The Palenque Temple of the Cross records the specific mythological birth date for GI in the distant past as 1.18.5.3.2, 9 Ik 15 Keh. This fell on October 19, 2360 BC (Nov. 8 Julian), and this date corresponds to a nearly identical sidereal position of the sun in the Milky Way as it appears on the dates of both Stela C and Stela H in Copán. Given the acknowledged association between GI and the Milky Way between Sagittarius and Scorpius, it is quite possible that the Palenque astronomers intentionally calculated this sidereal position of the sun for his birth date, and this is further supported by additional evidence for calculations of the sidereal year among the ancient Maya. Further evidence for sidereal year calculations can be found in deep time intervals from Palenque and multiple other sites in the Classic period. These texts include Naranjo Altar 1, Tikal Stela 10, La Corona Panel 1, Tortugero Monument 6, and several examples from Copán, all of which I will be describing in detail in a future publication. The sidereal year is an independent measurement, separate from the rate of the precession of the equinoxes, which changes slowly with the variable length of the tropical year. Nevertheless, comparing the accumulated difference between a calculated tropical year value and the sidereal year yields a calculation for precessional drift. The sidereal year of approximately 365.25636 days remains quite constant over thousands of years, reflecting the orbital period of the earth relative to the stars (Capitaine, Wallace and Chapront 2000). Therefore, I maintain that it is possible to find supporting evidence for the intentionality of sidereal year calculations by the presence of paired dates on a single text that place the sun in approximately the same sidereal position over intervals greater than one hundred years in length. These shorter intervals can then be compared with longer deep time intervals, often in the same texts, to determine if they also provide whole multiples of the resulting sidereal year value, as calculated by the Maya.

Elsewhere (Grofe 2007), I have demonstrated that several deep time intervals in the Dresden Codex appear to correspond to precise calculations of the sidereal year, placing the sun in the same sidereal position over thousands of years of time using a sidereal year value very similar to the currently measured interval. In addition, both Barbara MacLeod (2008) and I (2003) independently noticed that the 3-11 Pik interval of 25,980 days, mentioned in multiple texts throughout the Classic period, closely corresponds to one day of precessional drift between the sidereal year and the tropical year. Calculations of the sidereal year may have been facilitated by the use of celestial star risings, such as the first appearance of the Orion Nebula, in tandem with specific days in the tropical year. Therefore, long-term usage of the Copán baseline could have enabled such measurements of the sidereal year.

Tortuguero Monument 6 and the Completion of the Current Era

Jenkins (1998, this volume⁶) first noticed that the sun will appear in the sidereal position where the ecliptic crosses the widest part of the Milky Way between Scorpius and Sagittarius when the Long Count again reaches 13 bak'tuns on the winter solstice in 2012 AD. Regardless of whether this was an intentional sidereal calculation made by the originators of the Long Count system, it appears that this sidereal position of the sun was highly symbolic, and recognized in the Classic period. From the concluding passage on the right flange of Tortuguero Monument 6, we find the one text that clearly mentions the date of the completion of 13 bak'tuns on 4 Ajaw 3 K'ank'in. The left flange of this T-shaped monument is now missing, but the first readable passage includes a distance number that counts from the birth to the accession of Bahlam Ajaw, the subject of the remainder of the text (Gronemeyer and MacLeod 2010). Erik Boot (pc. 2009) suggests that the left flange likely contained the Initial Series corresponding to the birth of Bahlam Ajaw. If this surmise is correct, this would effectively pair his birth date with the concluding future date of 13.0.0.0.0, 4 Ajaw 3 K'ank'in on the right flange of the monument.

From the distance number that counts from the birth of Bahlam Ajaw to his accession, the coefficient of days is eroded, with only one bar visible, and a remaining width of space enough for two more bars (Fig. 16). I found that this constrains the position of Bahlam Ajaw's birth to within a nine-day range, with a distance number from 1.11.11.6 to 1.11.11.15.⁷ Using the 584283 GMT correlation, his accession interestingly occurred on 9.10.11.3.10, 1 Ok 3 Kumk'u, February 7, 644 (2/4 J), nearly identical to the tropical year position of Ruler 12's accession in Copán, which closely corresponds to the February nadir at Copán's latitude. Tortuguero is far north of this latitude, though it is possible that this date was regarded as important throughout the Maya area. Counting backward from this accession using the reconstructed distance number, we reach a nine-day range from 9.8.19.9.15, 7

Men 3 Kank'in, November 25, 612 (November 23, Julian) to 9.8.19.10.4, 3 K'an 12 K'ank'in, December 5, 612 (December 2, Julian). What I found most interesting about these dates is that they each fall within a maximum of five days from where the sun will again be on 13.0.0.0.0, 4 Ajaw 8 Kumk'u, December 21, 2012 AD.⁸ Thus, the paired dates of Bahlam Ajaw's birth, and the completion of the next 13 bak'tuns suggest an intentional sidereal parallel, and a calculation of the sidereal year, and this is further supported by additional paired dates within the text.

Tortuguero Monument 6 also contains a number of other dates that place the sun in conjunction with the Milky Way between Sagittarius and Scorpius (see Jenkins in this volume for a further discussion). I found that two of these dates place the sun in the exact same sidereal position, separated by an interval of exactly 139 'tuns, on 9.3.16.1.11, December 7, 510 (December 5, Julian) and 9.10.15.1.11, December 9, 647 (December 6, Julian). These dates further suggest the calculation of the sidereal year in the context of the paired dates of Bahlam Ajaw's birth, and the completion of 13 bak'tuns.

Lastly, one of the first events mentioned in the text on Tortuguero Monument 6, in block E10-F10, describes the first "flint-shield" event in preparation for Bahlam Ajaw's first war campaign. The text specifically states **nu-pu TE'-ja ta AYIN** (Fig. 17), which MacLeod reads as 'lances were joined at Ayiin' (Gronemeyer and MacLeod 2010:47). Ayiin translates as 'caiman', and the hieroglyphic image of the caiman in the text resembles the Milky Way caiman, with the crossed bands in its eye. The imagery of crossed lances recalls the crossed spears and jaguar shield on the Palenque Tablet of the Sun, which I believe to be related to the moon and eclipses (Grofe 2007:160; Mendez, Barnhart, Powell, and Karasik 2005). I subsequently noticed that the date on which the Ayiin event takes place on Tortuguero Monument 6 corresponds to 9.10.11.9.6, 13 Kimi 14 Sek, June 2, 644 (June 1, Julian), and this follows only three days after a visible lunar eclipse on May 30 (May 27, Julian), precisely in conjunction with the Milky Way between Sagittarius and Scorpius, where the sun appears on Bahlam Ajaw's birth, and at the completion of 13 bak'tuns. A lunar eclipse such as this could theoretically enable Maya astronomers to determine the sidereal position of the sun when it is in this position exactly one half-year from the date of the eclipse. Thus, it is not necessary to directly view the sun in conjunction with the Milky Way in order to understand its sidereal position.⁹

As I have discussed elsewhere (Grofe 2009b), the deity Bolon Yokte' K'uh prominently appears as the subject of the final passage about the completion of 13 bak'tuns. In a future publication, I will be exploring the mythological and astronomical references within this text, and the relationship between Bolon Yokte' K'uh and the Milky Way caiman. It is quite possible that Bolon Yokte' K'uh is equivalent to Bolon Ti K'uh from the Postclassic Yucatec Books of Chilam Balam. In

⁶ This refers to my Benfer piece, ultimately blocked from publication in late 2012. I clarified to Grofe that the Dark Rift was also an important Creation Myth key that made my proposal unprecedented.

⁷ This was clarified during the MEC Debate to a five-day period, and on my visit to study Tortuguero Monument 6 in March 2011 I found evidence to support November 28, 612.---JMJ

⁸ Grofe doesn't state it, but his discovery emerged during discussions with me in February 2009, during which my published work on Copan Stela C (Jenkins 2000, 2002) inspired what to look for.---JMJ

⁹ This is a very important insight by Grofe; adding more support to my thesis.---JMJ

the Chilam Balam of Maní, Bolon Ti K'uh raised up the celestial caiman into the sky following an eclipse, thereby causing the flood at the end of the previous era. But in so doing, Bolon Yokte' K'uh prevents the caiman from destroying the world, and he forms the earth from its body (Craine and Reindorp 1979:117-18; Velasquez 2006:6-7).

In a Central Mexican parallel version of this story from the *Histoire du Mechique*, the gods Tezcatlipoca and Quetzalcoatl tear apart the monstrous caiman goddess Tlaltecutili by transforming themselves into two serpents. One half of Tlaltecutili's body becomes the earth, while the other half is lifted into the sky (Garibay 1965:108; Taube 1993:36-37). Similarly, in the *Historia de los Mexicanos por sus pinturas*, Tezcatlipoca and Quetzalcoatl then transform into two trees that lift the sky. They then made the Milky Way as a road across the sky on which the two met and traveled, and on which they were seated. Tezcatlipoca is then said to have transformed into Mixcoatl, the "Cloud Serpent" deity of the Milky Way itself. As this being, he lit the first fire using flint stones in the form of three sticks 'with a heart', thus providing fire to humanity (Garibay 1965:32-33; Miller and Taube 1993:116).

Yet another version of this pan-Mesoamerican story of the division of the celestial caiman and the drilling of the first fire is represented in the text from Temple XIX in Palenque, where GI himself is the primary agent of this division in a pre-Era mythological event (Velásquez 2006; Stuart 2005). In a related pair of images of the Celestial Caiman from the subterranean vaults in House E of the Palace in Palenque, we find the image of the sun in the center of the body of the caiman in one example (**Fig. 18a**), and an image of GI and a deer lighting a fire in the center of the back of a two-headed version of the caiman (**Fig. 18b**). Comparing these images with the Celestial Caiman from Copán Altar 41 (**Fig. 15**), we find a foliated triangular design taking the place of the fire and the sun in the center of the Caiman's body. Within these stories, we can see possible references to the imagery of the Three Hearthstones of Maya cosmology, which returns us to the subject of the Copán baseline.

As discussed above, the dark cleft in the Milky Way above Sagittarius appears to represent the mouth of the Milky Way caiman, which, in its northeast-southwest orientation, forms an inverted caiman tree (Freidel, Schele, and Parker 1993). This identification is supported by the iconography on Copán Stela C, where the caiman's jaws point downward (Jenkins 2002). However, this same sidereal position in the Milky Way appears to relate to the rear end of the caiman, where we find the skeletal GI. I think that these positions can be reconciled if we see the Starry Deer Caiman as the entirety of the Milky Way, with its mouth as the dark rift, and its body as the Milky Way, wrapping around the entirety of the celestial sphere, with its rear end in the position of the galactic bulge between Scorpius and Sagittarius.¹⁰ If so, then we would logically see the Three Hearthstones in the center of the caiman's body, as suggested by Copan Altar 41, where the first fire was drilled to ignite the sun at the beginning of the current era, as shown in the images from House E in Palenque. ---end

¹⁰ Another very important observation by Grofe (which was deleted from the published version).---JMJJ

Kristian, note that this cut block deals most closely with the items related to my work. **The cut block begins with the first sentence in Grofe's article that mentions my name, and runs through six Jenkins name references, including two acknowledgements of my discoveries, citing to two of my publications.** The final paragraph in the cut block contains a citation to my 2002 book (4th from last sentence of the cut block) and discusses my discovery on Copan Stela C. Then, the published piece continues with the "Copan Baseline and Metonic Cycle" section, as in the earlier version.

All sources for my work were cut from the bibliography:

Jenkins, John Major. 1998. *Maya Cosmogonies 2012: The True Meaning of the Maya Calendar End-Date*. Santa Fe: Bear and Company.

—. *Galactic Alignment*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions International. 2002

Also, Grofe references a work of mine "in this volume" a few times, which *would have been* my companion piece in Benfer's anthology; but of course that piece got unfairly censored and has never been published. Benfer was forced against his wishes to remove it, which he said was "the most unfair decision in his career." (The academic publisher said they would not publish the anthology with my piece included.)

The end result is a total surgical redaction of all references to my name and publications. (A mention of my discovery that the dedication date on Copan Stela C was an alignment of the sun and Dark Rift/Crossroads remains (Grofe 2012-13: 73), but it occurred right before the first sentence that cites me (see above), which was removed with the cut block, so that my discovery is *stated* but *not cited to me*).

Let's recall that Grofe's Copan Baseline piece began with a presentation he gave at SAA 2010, to which both he and I were invited by Bob Benfer by an email invitation (in mid-2009) [see Appendix 5]. We then both presented in the same archaeoastronomy panel. After that, Benfer invited us both, again simultaneously by email, to contribute expanded essays to his planned archaeoastronomy anthology. Grofe and I discussed our pieces as being companion pieces. I even asked Grofe if he might consider co-authoring mine with me, but he declined. I read two early versions of his essay and offered some comments, feedback, and typo corrections. The new thing in the published piece is Grofe's Acknowledgement section:

"I would like to thank Barb MacLeod for her ongoing support and feedback and her willingness to collaborate and entertain new ideas and to generously share her years of experience. Special thanks to Ed Barnhart and the Maya Exploration Center for providing the funding for my research and travel to Copan, without which this article would not have been possible. Thanks to John Carlson, Shannon Kring Buset, Flavia Cueva, Bob Benfer and Gerardo Aldana for their support, invitations, and collaboration during the

research and development of this article. I am likewise grateful to Martha Macri and Matthew Looper for their sustained support and feedback. Thanks to the Carnegie Foundation for the generous usage of Sylvanus Morley's original drawings. Finally, I would like to thank my Copan field students and colleagues who helped with measurements and photographs, and from whom I derived much of my inspiration: Isabel Araujo, Satish Bhatnagar, Denise Brown, Gopal Elluru, Krystan Felt, Karlee Finch, Desislava Pavlova, Jonathan Rushing, Jim Sievers, Liz Sivell, Mirabel Wigon, Amanda Wright, Gary Young, and the Ch'orti' children of La Pintada. Any errors contained within this article are solely those of the author." -end

That's it in full. Now, Michael is usually generous and fair with his acknowledgments. The conspicuous absence of my name adds weight to the notion that Carlson REQUIRED, as an ultimatum/condition, that no references to me or my publications could be made. Michael met Shannon because I suggested to her that she invite Barb and Michael to be interviewed in her planned documentary, which we were discussing by email in late 2010 --- before Shannon even knew about them. He met Flavia through the subsequent conference, which was an offshoot of the documentary. ---end email to KA

Appendix 3. Emails to Grofe regarding his edited *Archeoastronomy XXV* piece

4-27-2015

Dear Michael,

I read with interest your Copan Baseline essay, published recently in *Archeoastronomy Journal* 25. I was curious as to how it might be edited after the debacle with Benfer's anthology. I'll be brief, and I've been chewing on this for five days, but I really need to clear my plate of these kinds of things as they arise.

Kudos for some solid contributions and corrections to previous academic assumptions on the baseline alignment --- really a great addition to your oeuvre. I've offered comments in my previous reading of the earlier version of your paper, so I won't reiterate them here. Instead, I feel a strong need to ask you for some clarification on what motivated the deletion of all references to my work --- a total of six text references as well as two sources from the bibliography.

I feel this is a fair and reasonable question given the background we shared on the dual presentation of our pieces at SAA 2010 and the cross referencing to each others articles we prepared for the Benfer anthology (which ended with the censorship debacle). I can suspect two possible scenarios (see details below) --- one being that Carlson gave you an ultimatum, or a strong suggestion. I have a hard time believing they were casual or accidental deletions. It seems, rather, that there could not be any mention of me or my work. I say this because I note that I wasn't mentioned in the Acknowledgments, even though I supplied you with the PDF

for the Bricker/Aveni 2014 article last September, in the weeks during which you were finalizing your article.

I can't begrudge any author as to who they feel is important, but c'mon, you have to understand why this seems strange. I don't need validation by way of an acknowledgement, it rather suggests to me a prohibition from Carlson. (Or, perhaps, your own internalization and application of the previously sent memo.) You are usually fair and rather thorough, and it seems odd that such a tangible and helpful contribution, which you in fact used, was overlooked. Not to mention the entire 3-year-long journey/ordeal we experienced with SAA, the resulting MEC-FACEBOOK debate, and Benfer's planned but blocked anthology. I'd appreciate an honest reply. Sincerely,

John

If you care to read the entire rationale behind the two likely scenarios I've deduced, based on prior experience and the present evidence:

1) Given the unfair assessment of both of our chapters for the Benfer anthology, which we perceived as being intimately related to my presence (and your citations to my presence) rather than any inherent flaws in the scholarship of the pieces, you may have decided to eliminate all references to me in order to not incur the wrath of subsequent peer-reviewers, editors, and publishers. This would of necessity also need to extend to excluding me from the Acknowledgements section, even though I supplied you, last September, with the Bricker-Aveni (2014) essay (which you cite in your piece) in the weeks during which you were finalizing your essay (email of 9-29-2014). As you'll recall, following Benfer's invite to us both of our written chapters grew out of Benfer's SAA 2010 archaeoastronomy panel. We were frequently cc'd together on communications with Benfer, and we probably exchanged more than two dozen emails on various facets of the writing and revisioning of our papers up through the very disappointing censorship debacle, despite Benfer's best intentions, in late 2012 and 2013. Not to mention the MEC-FACEBOOK discussion of late 2010 which served as a test cauldron for our evolving papers. (I know that inspired some revisions in my paper.) I think all that might have merited a nod of recognition, as being part of the evolutionary process of the long journey of your essay to publication, but of course I can't begrudge the free choice that an author has regarding who they consider important. Nevertheless, the absence is conspicuous.

(On November 11, 2010, in one of my first emails responding to Shannon (who you included with Flavia Cueva in your Acknowledgements), I wrote: "Shannon ... People to interview: Michael Grofe, Barbara MacLeod, Mark Van Stone, myself, Sven Gronemeyer. Barbara Tedlock? Tat Rigoberto. This is the real information on 2012." She wanted to, and did, interview Calleman and others of like mind, but I think my early influence directed her thoughts into more productive and accurate sources of information. She then contacted you and Barb. That got the ball rolling and led to *2012: The Beginning*, the Tech Museum conference w/ Isabelle Hawkins, and *The Great Return* conference at Copan, during which you did some

investigations of the Baseline. This breakthrough with Shannon in 2010 was, you may recall, after five years of going around in circles with Hans at Warren Miller films, which you and Barb endured for two of those years. I came to Shannon's attention through my previous tour and stay (in 2007) at Flavia's Hacienda in Copan as well as my 2000 appearance in Bente Milton's documentary on Native Americans.)

2) A second possible scenario. Given how the editor of *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (John B. Carlson) previously requested that references to my name and work be muted, if not eliminated, from the Vol. 24 chapters by yourself and others, the second likely scenario is that Carlson gave you an ultimatum, or condition, that you needed to abide by in order for your paper to be published in his Journal. Although this seems shocking, it would be consistent with his previous behavior. This scenario has some traction because the largest editorial change in your paper was the excision (surgical redaction?) of several sequential pages, beginning with *the first sentence* in your earlier version *that mentions and cites my name and work*. All of the six references to me and my work are contained in that lengthy redaction, the last of which is in the last paragraph that was cut. I find that to be fairly telling regarding the rationale behind the elimination of that lengthy section, and the consequent deletion of my books from your bibliography.

There were several points in your lengthy conclusion in which you grappled with the possible implications of your findings for precession knowledge in the pre-Classic, when a reference to my pioneering work of the 1990s would have been relevant, and which would have accurately framed, for the published record, my early well-documented and argued articulation of such possibilities/probabilities. For example, you added the Mendoza & Karasik 2014 reference to support the notion that there was an awareness of the sidereal year and precessional drift by the mid-7th century, but you deleted previously cited reference to my own work which argues for this (e.g., my 2010 SAA paper or my 2011 IMS presentation, or any of my *IMS Explorer* articles). Regardless of your inner intentions and sympathies the oversight is congruent with, and *helps*, the anti-JMJ agenda in academia that seeks to mitigate or eliminate me within the narrative of discovery. As such, somewhat incredibly, we still have within academic publishing, to this very day in 2015, a complete lack of proper and accurate contextualizing and acknowledgment of the early work I did on the challenge of reconstructing ancient precessional cosmologies in Mesoamerican traditions. As you may recall, my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* reconstructed two different precession-tracking systems used in ancient Mesoamerica.

I perceive some other circumstances that could fuel further deductions and speculations, but I'd rather simply ask for your honest clarification. I really don't intend this to be contentious or upsetting for you. This is a reasonable query, and it will bring to conclusion our shared hope-filled effort that began exactly five years ago at the 75th SAA in St Louis. Although I understand and sympathize with the limitations and restrictions you must consider as you publish, and the survival strategy of

acquiescing to the anti-JMJ climate among your gate-keeping colleagues, I really hope you can help me understand which of the scenarios I've deduced is closer to the mark, or if there is another explanation I haven't considered.

p.s. On page 59, Fig 4, the translation "11 Katuns" (right column, third from bottom) looks to be "16" in the association glyph. Similarly, 8 Keej just above that looks to have two bars in the associated glyph coefficient.

5-1-2015

To Michael:

just a point of clarification --- in my lengthier comment I was unclear when I wrote: "...but you deleted previously cited reference to my own work which argues for this (e.g., my 2010 SAA paper or my 2011 IMS presentation, or any of my *IMS Explorer* articles)." By his I meant that *in addition to* your deletion of refs to my work you had previously included, there are numerous other cite-able essays of mine that you might have cited, such as the ones listed (e.g., you cited your own *IMS Explorer* article as a viable published source, and I wrote a half-dozen or so cite-able articles for *IMS Explorer* in the ten years leading to 2012).

5-3-2015 From Michael to John

Redacted. 830 words

5-4-2015 (contains comments on the 2014 anthology edited by Barnhart & Aldana):

Dear Michael,

Thank you for the clarification of Carlson not explicitly instructing you to remove references to me and my work. As I mentioned, this seemed a reasonable inference due to his previous behavior. I wasn't looking to rehash previous issues. What I'm focusing on is present and ongoing issues. Unfortunately, these often have deep roots in previous unresolved issues. So, it may seem like I'm stuck on previous issues or "wounds", as you say, but they are really the same passive-aggressive mitigation issues and dismissive attitudes that continue to manifest in the work of Maya scholars. They are flawed, selfish, and mean-spirited perspectives that I am continually trying to address on rational, factual grounds, as well as an appeal for people to behave like human beings. The main issue is that I expect my work to be treated accurately and honestly by professional scholars. It is not simply "unfair" that this largely hasn't happened --- it's unprofessional, unethical, and bespeaks a sub-standard scholarship. A travesty, as you said.

I should clarify, again, that when I posted on my website your review of my Izapa piece, I considered that to be a professional exchange, not a personal one. Due to some of your honest observational asides within it, it fell into a gray area and so I apologized and at your request I removed it. That was a misunderstanding, not a breach of trust. You and Barb had both expressed an interest in assessing a concise write-up on my Izapa work (in late 2011), so I prepared that. If you want a

breach of trust, re-read how you threw me under the “popularized proposal / sensationalized interpretations” bus, citing Aveni and Van Stone as critiques against my work (in your 2011, IAU piece, p. 218). The difference is that my innocent mistake was easily deleted, whereas yours is in the published record for all eternity. And if you think what Van Stone’s and Aveni’s critiques of my work have any validity at all --- from a purely rational and factual viewpoint --- and are worth citing, you are very mistaken and I’ll be happy to clarify.

It doesn’t make chronological sense when you say that you decided to apply the treatments from the cancelled Benfer piece to your chapter in the previous *Archaeoastronomy* 24 volume. Our Benfer chapters were finalized by April of 2012, peer-reviewed over several months, and then we got the surprising thumbs down on December 17, 2012. Your *Archaeoastronomy* 24 chapter was published in August 2012 (though given a 2011 pub date in Carlson’s back-engineering). You would have had to have had your Archaeo piece done several months before this, around the time that the final edits to our Benfer papers were due. Although the process with Benfer was taking a long time, we were still hopeful at that time that it was moving forward.

This chronological problem also pertains to you not mentioning my tangible contribution in your acknowledgments. You wrote: “I was also frustrated by the trust issues we dealt with last year regarding your posting my private correspondence, and I wasn’t in the mindset of thanking you at that moment when my final paper was accepted by *Archaeoastronomy*.” However, I had sent you the link, and you became aware of, my offending essay (my response to your critique of my Izapa work) on October 25. That was when we hit a wall, and you were suddenly upset. Eight days earlier, on **October 17**, you wrote: “...it [the Copan Baseline piece] is now coming out in the January issue of *Archaeoastronomy* [in 2015]. I got it back from the reviewers last month and they were all very positive. I got to say everything I wanted to, and to update it a bit. I put in my final revisions and got the copywriter version last week, and **just sent in my final edits this morning!**” So, *you finalized your Copan Baseline piece when we were still in appreciative communications*, and just several weeks after I had helpfully sent you the Bricker-Aveni PDF. This is the kind of thing that makes me crazy, because I am cursed with actually remembering the details, and given the evidence it just starts to seem that people are lying to me. The timing does not make sense.

The probable truth is that you had internalized the strategy, dictated by dicks, to not mention me or my work. You don’t need Carlson to request this (again). You have basically accepted the mean-spirited command barked out by Aveni at two SAA’s in 2007 and 2008, to the effect that JMJ must not be mentioned. You have accommodated yourself to the broken and “unfair” system, and in lieu of speaking out against it, you indirectly enable and support it. That’s really sad. You say you aren’t in a position to help with these problems, but you are (were) really the only one who might. You have just chosen not to do so. Heil Aveni.

I wasn’t aware that you were solely obeying a request of Benfer’s that “he had asked me to tie my chapter together with yours in the edited volume, which is why I added these discussions to the original paper.” I see where I stand now in

your cosmology; I had thought the integration and cross-referencing of our papers was something we had conceived as a strategy of mutual validation. Such hubris of mine to imagine that our conversations were something they weren’t.

But putting all of this aside, I can offer professional critiques of ongoing publications, including yours (except for the fact that my knowledge and experience are totally disrespected). I was surprised to discover Maya correlation and cosmology pages erected by Aldana on Google, which you are part of it. No one ever told me about this, or invited me to participate, even though it apparently grew out of the MEC-FACEBOOK debate. Doesn’t look like it went anywhere, but Aldana’s comments in the introduction are quite interesting:

“One intervention into this debate [about Maya astronomy] was enabled by the [Maya Exploration Center](https://sites.google.com/site/glyphastro/research). Their website hosted a discussion forum allowing anyone to jump into the conversation with questions, comments and concerns regarding interpretations of “2012.” In turn, one provocative point was raised that questioned why some academic voices were legitimate and others not. Wouldn’t it be possible--and even desirable--the reasoning went, that more voices be invited into the conversation, rather than shutting them out?”
[\[https://sites.google.com/site/glyphastro/research\]](https://sites.google.com/site/glyphastro/research)

Aldana’s perception of the actual events is totally skewed, and you can see from his choice of language and terms that he is condescending and contemptuous. Rather than “enabling” a free-for-all conversation, Ed invited me to more-or-less co-moderate a debate/discussion specifically about my SAA paper --- which relates to evidence for Maya precessional astronomy. The people I invited to participate were scholars and scientists, including Aldana. Others also found out and jumped aboard. Aldana and I happened, at the time, to be wrapping up an email exchange about his anti-GMT correlation paper, in which he became irate when I pointed out the evidence for tzolkin continuity and other things that his approach overlooked. He accused me of making so much money that I was unwilling to debate (WTF?), that I was upset over the “loss of the GMT”, and the GMT was “wrong”. Then he entered the MEC debate, armed with a malicious desire to put me down. He never could directly address me in the MEC debate, as if I was some kind of detestable filthy outsider. What an arrogant elitist! And then his little cleverly designed but deeply flawed experiment. I pulled off a miracle in co-moderating and compiling the 92,000-word marathon, and in handling vicious attacks from Guenter and Mardyks as well as ten simultaneous conversations. This was a “peer-review” for my SAA/Benfer chapter orders of magnitude beyond what most refereed journal essays must endure --- and I was never thanked or congratulated and the piece has never been cited. Where it’s linked on the MEC website, my name is spelled wrong. Aldana’s statement (above), in his exclusive Google club, must have been composed in the wake of the MEC thing, and reveals a classic performative contradiction. An appeal to include the “outsiders” while never shooting me an email that this thing was being set up. I’m sure if I pitched him my correlation essay (<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/2012center-note18.pdf>) he’d either reject it or maliciously deconstruct it

with his loquacious polysyllabic mental gymnastics in which he says precisely nothing.

Continuing with Aldana's passive-aggressive wordsmithing, I note his comment about 2012 in his intro to *Archaeo-astronomy and the Maya* (2014) --- another publication that no one told me about. (I guess I might as well just roll over and die.) He wrote: "Twenty years later archaeoastronomy still cannot be said to have settled these questions. The debacle of 2012 demonstrates at least a guilt by association that facilitates the marginalization of the field" (page 10). Any thoughts on what he might mean by this? Last month I gently emailed him -- my first contact with him since 2010 --- with cordial thanks for his insights and efforts, and asked for clarification on what he meant by this passage. No response. So much for communication channels; that was released last Fall and the shit keeps getting piled on. It's the intellectual equivalent of people in the woods not bothering to take responsibility and clean up their own pollution.

I have observations about the Mendez & Karasik article; it is built largely on unsupported assertions. There are many unanswered questions that arise in the mind of any thinking reader of it, and, to be frank, it is poorly written and offers ambiguous descriptions of the astronomy and calendrics. The calendric sling-shot to Muwan Mat's birth pre-3114 BC to a tzolkin-haab repetition of Pakal's birth in 2006 is certainly interesting, and could be languaged and explored more clearly. It isn't explicitly marked as such in the texts, and is therefore an implied inference, less cogent than much of the Tortuguero inscription. But nonetheless compelling given the extreme unlikelihood of it being coincidence (a reasonable consideration which we should be willing to acknowledge in my argument for a pre-Classic targeting of 2012, unless the double-standard against my work is to be maintained in the face of increasing cognitive dissonance). Their overall interpretation of Pakal's intention is curious; it's like they lifted my interpretation of Lord Jaguar's motivations and just applied it to Pakal. But if we entertain their proposal, despite the problems with the plodding azimuth rise shifts of the belt star, we must reconcile it with Lord Jaguar's use of the DR/XRDS astronomy of 2012. And it *can* be reconciled, as two inflections of two different World Age tracking strategies. What we then have is a return to considering my "Zenith Cosmology and Galactic Cosmology" reconciliation model, one of the MANY things proposed and argued, with good evidence, in my 1998 book.

The Harold Green essay sucks up to Aveni's 20-day horizon thing (and cites the mistaken Copan baseline info that you've corrected) and seems to assume that a site with no internal evidence for horizon observations (building orientations or iconography within Chocola) is more compelling than a site that does (such as Izapa). His argument is built completely on the mere circumstance of Chocola's location and does not adduce any internal archaeoastronomical evidence within the archaeological site that they were looking eastward. Of course, they probably were, but he offers a thin gruel as far as evidentiary basis for *intention* goes. It is certainly not as compelling as the archaeoastronomical, topographical, and iconographic evidence within the site of Izapa (which Green

overlooks in favor of critiquing Malmstrom's work) that proves an interest in the solstice horizon, the zenith center, and the northward horizon over Tacana volcano --- and also demonstrates how they were thinking about those zenith and horizon locations. Maybe if I constructed a bunch of inscrutable charts with lots of impressive numbers, and made baseless assertions like those who actually get published, my Izapa work would be better received. Sincerely, John

5-4-2015. Michael to John
Redacted. 1430 words

To Michael 5-6-2015

Yes, there is a big difference between me posting on my obscure website, and then quickly deleting, your critique of my requested Izapa research (using your actual words verbatim), and your semi-accurate paraphrasings of my apparently dubious work within your peer-reviewed essay that will be on record and cite-able for modern critics and future historians for all time. You seem to think that the former is a more serious and damaging breach of trust than the latter. I don't. We'll just have to agree to disagree on that. [from JMJ]

Appendix 4. 2007 SAA Conference Papers, Abstracts

April of 2007, SAA in Austin

<http://www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/Meetings/2007%20Abstracts/Abstracts2007.pdf>

Aldana, Gerardo (UCSB) [143] Maya Astronomy as an Oracular Science: Thoughts on the Philosophical Underpinnings of Indigenous Sciences. Ancient Maya astronomy has been investigated from various methodological approaches over the last century, most of which have revealed technical localized practices. While the rigorous focused recovery of the practices and elements of Maya astronomy are necessary for assembling the larger intellectual endeavor, we must also keep in mind that any such assemblage is dependent on underlying epistemologies, which are precariously subject to interpretation. In this paper, I propose a few epistemological principles, including a Mesoamerican desire for stochastic accuracy in prediction, that, along with corroborating interpretive evidence, makes a case for a Maya oracular astronomy.

Anthony F. Aveni is listed as discussant.

Barnhart, Edwin L. (Maya Exploration Center), Powell, Christopher (Maya Exploration Center), Mendez, Alonso (Maya Exploration Center) and Karasik, Carol (Maya Exploration Center) [143] Solar Alignments in Palenque's Temple of the Sun. Since 2001, the authors have been taking sunrise photographs within Palenque's Temple of the Sun during equinoxes, solstices, and zenith passages. What they

have revealed is that on those dates beams of sunlight crosscut the structure's interior architecture, narrowing as they pass through columns, medial walls, and doorways, until they are ultimately thin rays of light striking directly into the temple's interior corners. Named the Temple of the Sun years ago due to the iconography on its interior panel, the observations reported in this paper clearly support its association to the sun.

Green, Harold H. (Independent Scholar) [143] Implications of Solar Observations of the Eastern Horizon at Chocóla, Suchitepéquez, Guatemala. Observations made from Mound 1 at the Preclassic site at Chocóla, Suchitepéquez, Guatemala of sunrises at the eastern horizon reveal a solar horizon calendar where zenith and nadir passage appear to be the key reference poles, and the winal midpoints between zenith passage and equinox and between nadir passage and equinox appear to have been marked anciently by prominent peaks on the horizon. These observations may have important implications for the origin of the 260-day sacred count, the significance of the 360-day (tun) count, a new interpretation of later-constructed E-groups, and possibly the origins of Maya political organization.

Grofe, Michael (U.C. Davis) [143] Glyphs G and F: An Astronomical Interpretation of the Cycle of Nine. The majority of the glyphs in the Supplementary Series record information concerning the movement of the moon, while glyphs G and F record a repeating cycle of nine days that has thus far not shown any discernable astronomical utility. Four of the nine forms of Glyph G contain numerical coefficients that suggest some form of counting. As the idealized starting and ending point of the cycle, glyph G9 appears to represent a solar eclipse. This paper proposes that Glyph G was used to predict both solar and lunar eclipses by tracking the position of the moon relative to the lunar nodes.

Mendez, Alonso [143] see Barnhart, Edwin L.

Mendez Toporek, Alonso (Maya Exploration Center) and Karasik, Carol (Maya Exploration Center) [143] Centering the World - Astronomical Alignments at Palenque. Over the last six years the authors conducted solar observations during zenith and nadir passage at Palenque. The importance of zenith and nadir is reflected in the dramatic solar alignments of the Temple of the Cross, Inscriptions and Palace. Zenith and nadir passages also resonate in the hieroglyphic texts, from the creation event to the succession of Palenque rulers. The interrelationship between astronomy, myth and history suggests that divine kingship was bound by the movement of the sun. By timing royal events to pivotal solar stations, the ruler gave potency to his role as the axis of space and time.

Milbrath, Susan (Florida Museum of Natural History) [143] The Maya Venus Almanac. The Venus almanac is well documented in the Postclassic Dresden Codex. Venus imagery is linked to warfare in the codices and Postclassic murals. Earlier evidence of the almanac is seen in Maya imagery related to Tlaloc, the year-sign, and sets of five and eight in visual arts. The Classic and Terminal Classic Maya linked military campaigns to the cycle of Venus events, recording

such events in militaristic imagery and inscriptions referring to "Star Wars." Ultimately, Teotihuacan may be the origin point of this basic cycle integrating an eight-year solar period with five Venus cycles and 99 lunar months.

Sprajc, Ivan (Scientific Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts) [143] Teotihuacan Architectural Alignments in the Central Maya Lowlands? During recent surveys in southeastern Campeche, Mexico, numerous formerly unknown archaeological sites, including major centers, have been recorded. The orientations of the most prominent buildings largely belong to the so-called 17° family, widely spread throughout Mesoamerica. Since the observational calendars corresponding to this alignment group in central Mexico seem to have been an elaborate version of simpler antecedents, suggested by the orientations in southeastern Campeche, and considering the latter are incorporated in several Late Preclassic buildings, the origin of this alignment family is likely to be sought in the Maya area, rather than in Teotihuacan, as has been commonly held.

Appendix 5 Invite from Dr Robert Benfer in 2010 and what happened three years later

John Major Jenkins. February 2014

After successfully presenting my paper on the astronomy of Tortuguero Monument 6 at the 75th meeting of the *Society for American Archaeology* in April of 2010, I was invited by archaeologist Dr. Robert Benfer to submit a chapter to an anthology on archaeoastronomy that he and his colleague, Dr. Larry Adkins, had a green-light for publication with the University Press of Florida. He wrote that my material was an "obvious choice" for inclusion. His email was sent in August of 2010:

From: Bob Benfer [bob.benfer@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2010 1:06 PM
To: kahib@ix.netcom.com
Subject: Invited chapter
August 19, 2010

Dear John, I'm pleased to tell you that University of Florida Press writes that they will offer an advance contract for a book titled "Archaeoastronomy of the Americas." I as editor and Larry R. Adkins as co-editor invite you to submit a chapter. This project derives from the symposium that I organized for the St. Louis SAA meetings last April and so the paper you presented in the symposium would be an obvious choice. Florida wants the book to come out in early 2012 and asks that we submit the final manuscript by February 11.

Their timeline gives us very little leeway. To meet the deadline, Larry and I will need your chapter by October 1. We apologize for the short time frame, but we are determined to present Florida a clean, well-edited manuscript at the point of submission. To do that we need all papers in hand well before the holidays. Here is the time table: August 26, submit full title

of your paper (and names of all authors). November 15, receive your chapter with the editors' comments. December 1, submit your revised chapter including the high resolution figures to the editors. January 15, editors will contact you about any final revisions. February 11, editors will submit final manuscript.

I have attached a copy of the Guidelines of the Press, which are quite detailed and must be followed to the letter. We hope to keep substantial copy-editing changes to a minimum.

Among the text programs acceptable to Florida, the editors prefer Word and would like you to use that program if at all possible. Please note the somewhat

unusual style for the references cited, and the extensive requirements pertaining to preparation of illustrations.

Please let me know no later than August 26 whether you are interested in submitting a chapter. Larry and I look forward to a successful book. Our introduction will

try to do justice to the individual contributions and suggest their linkages. The book will show that resurgent investigations in archaeoastronomy indicate a richness of historic and prehistoric materials that have not been generally appreciated. An appendix will provide guidelines for archaeologists and ethnographers who may want to investigate other regions and times.

With best wishes,

Bob

Robert A. Benfer, Jr.

Professor Emeritus Department of Anthropology
University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211
<http://rcp.missouri.edu/bobbenfer/index.html>

I gladly responded and wrote my paper, an expansion of my SAA presentation, and submitted on time in early October. Meanwhile, Dr. Edwin Barnhart and I had had an email exchange inspired by my paper, in which he expressed his critiques of my paper and my overall thesis about the astronomy of 2012 and Tortuguero. This email occurred in July, and went well, resulting several months later in his proposal, approved by the scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*, that he facilitate a public debate/discussion about my SAA paper. He would post it for all to view on the MEC website, and I would invite scholars (including long-time critics of my ideas). In essence, this would provide a moderated public "peer-review" process in which I could respond to objections and counter-arguments, and "workshop" my paper and the presentation of my arguments.

This was useful for me producing a revised draft of my submission to Dr. Benfer, for as it turned out in the publication process of his anthology, he offered some feedback on my paper and suggested I could tighten it up and reduce the size. It was originally 12,000 words and including every possible argument and line of evidence I had worked out. Constructive feedback from the MEC Discussion also contributed to tightening the argument and focusing only on the solar alignments. I consequently did tighten the presentation but decided to retain the Jupiter alignment because it reflected a similar alignment on the death of both Lord Jaguar and 18 Rabbit from Copan, and this was an important part of the argument for a larger trans-regional theme in Maya cosmology.

Well, the point of this brief note is to share what happened with my essay for the Benfer & Adkins archaeoastronomy anthology. We can fast-forward right to the final email received from them, in October of 2013. The subject heading was "Terrible News", and included the observation that "I regard this as the most unfair decision of my life." The decision was forced upon them by the "astronomical reviewers":

Dear John,

It is with the greatest regret that we write that **we must remove your paper from the proposed book, despite the fact that we believe it has great merit. However, I, my co-author, and another astronomer have all been told by most of the likely astronomer reviewers that they would not accept a book with your chapter in it.** Keeping it will make it unlikely that any of the authors will benefit from their work.

I propose a way that your work can achieve the attention it deserves. Publish it in PLoS. Do you know that online journal? It has a terrific impact factor. The reason is, they review papers only for methodology but do not permit reviewers to reject a paper, because they disagree with the author or the hypothesis, which is to say they reject ad hominum criticisms. Although they request \$1,500 per paper, they usually wave that for those who do not have a department to pick up the tab. If you are willing to rewrite it in a slightly different style, for which you can check their Authors page, please list me as a reviewer. I would suggest some of the other glyphers as reviewers and especially Michael Grofe, but not anyone formerly from Tulane.

I hope you will consider PLoS. You will see that papers published there are widely picked up by the popular press too.

I regard this as the most unfair decision of my life, one that is made only because to do otherwise jeopardizes the other 10 authors. I hope you can forgive me. And move on to a better venue, like PLoS. Focus your paper a bit more as providing evidence for Maya knowledge of procession---look up Grofe's work and cite it as he has additional evidence. I think you will have a very good chance of seeing it accepted and then widely cited.

In any case, thank you for the privilege of knowing your work.

Warm regards,

Bob

Robert A. Benfer, Jr.

Professor Emeritus
Department of Anthropology
University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211
<http://rcp.missouri.edu/bobbenfer/index.html>

This email is not without precedent. In fact, I was surprised that they were still trying to get my paper included, because the previous December (in an email I got at 4 a.m. in Tapachula, on December 17) I was informed by Benfer that a reviewer

had, in the “peer-review” process, asserted that both my paper and Grofe’s were “unscientific” and there was no possibility of redeeming them. **No specific problems were identified.** That Grofe was included in the slap-down was curious. Both of our papers were designed to be complementary, in presenting evidence that the Maya were calculating and tracking the Sidereal Year, using astronomical features central to my “2012 alignment reconstruction.” Grofe’s paper was somewhat oblique in this regard, focusing on his breakthrough reading of the Copan baseline. His paper, too, was an expansion of his SAA presentation from 2010.

Meanwhile, Grofe and I, with Barb MacLeod and David Sedat, spoke at the Copan “Great Return” conference (Dec 18-23, 2012). After the holidays, in January, Grofe and I queried with Dr Benfer in an effort to understand what the problem was. There was ONE astronomer-reviewer who gave the thumbs down. Well, that shouldn’t necessarily be a deal breaker. But that ONE astronomer-reviewer contacted the University Press of Florida and exerted some kind of authority in telling them *they could not or should not publish anything that included our papers*. So, there was clearly a fairly pointed and aggressive effort to block the publication of our papers.

As I remind, I’ll point out that my paper had already received editorial feedback and suggestions from the anthology’s editors, as well as from the unique “workshopping” and debate over my SAA paper in the *MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion* of December 2010, which contributed to my revised submission (many of the contributors were asked by the editors to reduce the size of their submissions and tighten the presentations). After receiving Benfer’s disappointing email, with the clear indication that one reviewer succeeded in blocking publication, for reasons that actually had nothing to do with the merit or quality of my paper, I decided to do an experiment. I sought out three professors who had done peer-review. They were not “friends” of mine, nor were they fans. I asked for honest feedback and whether they thought it had serious problems. All three said it was a well-written and well-argued piece on a complex subject, and one said that the content was consistent with what was promised in the Abstract, which is what he looked for in papers.

Later, another scholar who has done extensive peer-review said that “peer-review approval” was largely a joke and didn’t often have much to do with the quality or merit of the paper, but usually involved “shoring up the orthodoxy.” In other words, the peer-review process was often invested in boosting the status quo perspectives, providing an assembly line for career-required publication of papers, rather than being open to breakthrough work that would be threatening to the orthodoxy. Case in point is the simultaneous rejection of Grofe’s paper, along with mine. Grofe himself was very surprised, as he’d had papers published in numerous professional journals and such a flat-out rejection, with no good explanation, was highly suspect and strongly suggestive of ego politics.

As it turned out, once I was eliminated from the process, and some conversations behind the scenes occurred to which I was not privy, Grofe was told that his paper would be allowed and was asked if he wanted to go forward in that way. That’s why the final email from Benfer above (October 2013) does not

mention Grofe’s paper, as had occurred in December of 2012.¹¹ Benfer and Adkins were stuck in the middle of the highly unethical mafiosa tactic of at least one scholar-reviewer who, as far as I was able to discreetly gather, may have been connected with Tulane University [or might be an archaeoastronomer from California]. Grofe kindly inquired whether I would have a problem if he went forward. No, of course not, because the breakthrough work needs to go forward, even though we had both presented in the same section of the 2010 SAA conference and our chapters for Benfer’s anthology were conceived as being complementary.

In another experiment, that I pursued after October of 2013, I asked Anthony Aveni if he might read my paper and offer feedback. I did this to check if Aveni was the peer-reviewer, and also to see what kind of critique he might offer. This would theoretically be indicative of any problem that any attentive and informed reviewer might have with my paper, and Aveni is considered to be a very high-level Mayanist archaeoastronomer. He eventually responded and said that his main critique was that I did not consider the possibility that coincidence was the explanation for the astronomical “match-ups.” Well, the problem here is that my paper was designed to repeatedly reference the coincidence option, and I did so explicitly four or five times, progressively ruling it out due to the sheer weight of accumulating evidence. So, Aveni’s problem seems to be a hallucination of something that he believes *was not* in my paper, **which actually was**. I politely responded and pointed out, with quotes, the four or five places where I addressed coincidence. No response. And so it goes. And so it also goes with other scholars who are blinded by prejudice and bias. If Aveni could commit such a blunder in assessing the actual content of my paper, it’s not surprising that some other astronomer-reviewer could do the same. But, again, these things don’t appear to be accidental or innocent mistakes. They are rooted in a failure of academia to perform its function, and the failure of professional scholars to behave professionally, as their mandate as “scientists” requires.

In retrospect it’s clear to see that my work, and anything associated with me, must be mitigated. I managed a very challenging response to multiple comments from scholars during the *MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion* in December 2010, and exposed the unprofessional and skewed tactics thrown up by two scholar-critics. The next month I presented my Lord Jaguar research at the *Institute of Maya Studies* in Miami, a video of which quickly went up on Youtube. By March of 2011 I examined the Tortuguero “2012” inscription in person in Villahermosa, Mexico, and produced a report with close-up

¹¹ As it turned out, Grofe was wary of the tainted process and eventually published his paper in the *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. 25 (ed. Carlson). Released after delays in March of 2015, with a “2012-2013” publication date, Grofe’s paper was stripped of all references to my name and books. In the original version there were at least six relevant citations to my work, with two of my books in the bibliography. Meanwhile, I wrote and published an article called “Lord Jaguar’s 2012 Sacrifice: Astrotheology and Magical Invocations in a 7th-century Maya Inscription,” based on my censored Benfer chapter, in *Clavis: The Journal of Occult Arts, Letters, and Experience*, Vol. 3, released in November 2014.

photos --- the best produced up to that time of the two eroded sections of the inscription --- which I made available on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website in June of 2011. At this point I was still hopeful and working to communicate with scholars about the unfolding work. But in June and July of 2011 I was broad-sided by several attacks and distorting characterizations of me and my work, courtesy of Maya scholars.

First was John Hoopes' piece in *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Volume XXII, which had been released in March or April of 2011; I discovered it in June as it was freely posted on Mark Van Stone's website. (It was posted there because Hoopes's "review" had lavished Van Stone's book with praise while ignoring its many errors. Hoopes ignored Van Stone's errors while constructing false charges against me, including the insinuation that I had plagiarized my 2012 galactic cosmology work from astrologer Dane Rudhyar.)

Second was David Stuart's book, released in May or June, which didn't engage one argument or piece of evidence I've used in my work but, instead, registered flippant and opinionated dismissals, including the assertion that I didn't feel a need to engage with scholars because my ideas were spiritual convictions (sort of like faith-based beliefs). This was particularly wrong, paradoxically, since I had initiated a very careful and civil conversation with him by email several years earlier, which he ended when I pointed out that he himself, in his 2005 book on Palenque, had stated that Izapa Stela 25 depicted the Starry Deer Crocodile who represents the Milky Way. (This contradicted his assertion on the Aztlán list that there was no astronomy at Izapa, and thus his own duplicitous stance was exposed.) Sorry, Dave. But facts should trump your personal efforts to mitigate 2012.

A third item that came to my attention at that time was the book by Matthew Restall and Amara Solari, released earlier that year. They claimed my galactic alignment work was "debunked" due to Aveni's "brilliant" critique (in his 2009 book) of the precession of the equinoxes and Grofe's work. But Grofe and I had both noted Aveni's flawed reading of Grofe's work; Restall & Solari were merely parroting Aveni's flawed assessment, moreover calling it "brilliant." I contacted Restall, around April or May of 2011, asking if he could respond to a quick question. He said sure, but he didn't have much time (the common excuse for scholars who spew disinformation and do not want to correct their errors). I sent him the correction to Aveni and asked if he could incorporate this important correction in his upcoming interviews and presentations (of which a few seemed scheduled). No response. A few months later, when Grofe's correction to Aveni was published in the Cambridge IAU anthology (July 2011), I sent Restall that; no response. Several months later I sent both Restall and Solari (whose email address I finally located) and asked if they were planning on incorporating the correction into the various interviews and presentations that they (at least Restall) were continuing to do. No response. In fact, Restall basically appropriated my "2012ology" term, but used it in a less inclusive sense of being a study of the millenarian phenomenology of prophecies. This was not unlike Hoopes's "Mayanism" construct, which he has used synonymously with "the 2012 phenomenon," both being used misleadingly and incorrectly from the vantage point of how both of those terms were originally used by the people who coined them. For these

scholar-critics, 2012 is not an authentic artifact of ancient Maya thought (despite the new smoking-gun evidence from Tortuguero Monument 6).

In August 2011 I received the paper from MacLeod that she wrote with Van Stone, for the *ZfurA* contest, which they won. Despite MacLeod's effort to say something accurate about my decades of work on 2012, Van Stone's voice still came through strong, with various contemptuous allusions and jabs at "galactic" waves. This was sort of the last straw in harboring any hope for scholars --- all of whom were, from my perspective, late-comers to the 2012 topic --- to accurately treat my work and the astronomy associated with 2012. They don't have to agree with it, but if they're going to critique it and comment on it, they should accurately represent what it is. NONE of them have, even the few who might be considered sympathetic and/or ideologically open-minded about my findings. Off the record, they might speak more freely but on the record, in published papers, they knew (and I knew) that they should steer wide of seeming to agree with me that 2012 could have been an astronomically motivated date. If they did briefly allude to the possibility, a caveat would follow. Even my best ally has added caveats to distance himself from seeming to be collaborating with me or agreeing with me --- even though his stated distinctions express my own long-held positions (see my "Copán Stela C: Sun King in the Creation Place," dated October 10, 2014 at *The Center for 2012 Studies*).

I was finishing my book *Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions* (released in September 2011), but found time to write a long critique-review of the MacLeod-Van Stone piece. It was frustrating, as I was really counting on MacLeod for more explicit and open support, at least around the ideas I knew she was in agreement with. She did her best, but it seemed the system was stacked against clearly portraying my work, and acknowledging that many of the emerging ideas about 2012 were already enunciated in my work long ago. For example, that 2012 would logically be a "like-in-kind" echo of the 3114 BC "Creation" date --- both being described as the "end" of a 13-Baktun period. (This idea can be found in my review of Stuart & Houston (1994), [posted on my website in 1995](http://alignment2012.com/fap11.html): <http://alignment2012.com/fap11.html>, in the first paragraph of the "Onwards to the Monograph" section). Since Carl Callaway came to enunciate the same idea, credit from MacLeod goes to him. Colleague cronyism was still happening. I sent a very brief summational version of my review to MacLeod, as I knew that my lengthy emails were too much to handle --- I mainly wanted to register a couple of factual corrections I had noticed. And later, in 2013, when I read the published version, I noted that those corrections were entered. But of course I didn't appear in the Acknowledgments.

In July and August I tried to rectify Hoopes's charge of plagiarism against me, which was unsupported and baseless. Hoopes refused to respond to my queries and deleted me from his Facebook friends list, so I contacted the publisher of *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (University of Texas Press). A hilarious exchange with the editor, John B Carlson, then ensued, and guild protectionism was in full-fanged mode. It's amazing how totally irrational and prickly scholars can be when they are wrong and refuse to acknowledge simple

corrections. Well, they know they are playing dirty, and they know they are wrong, ethically and factually. They don't expect you to kindly request an errata be made --- that used to be standard procedure. They are invested in mitigation and defamation.

Ironically, in contrast to these simultaneously manifesting attacks, it was the Summer of 2011 that I released many proactive papers on the *Center for 2012 Studies* website, and then my booklet *Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscription*. By late Fall several good interviews occurred and my chapter in the Gelfer anthology came out in December. All of these successes (which I was announcing on Aztlán) merely amped up the JMJ mitigation machine. This was clear after the ridiculous exchanges and responses to the books and articles by scholars, up through September 2011. I thus turned to sharing the facts of what was going on, in several articles I wrote. I am not one to dance around exposing incredible injustice and the despicable corruption of people in authority positions. In October and November I wrote articles that appeared in *Mindscape* magazine (Vol. 1, January 2012) and in *New Dawn* magazine (February 2012). I also wrote a review of the Gelfer anthology in January 2012, and another article appeared *The Heretic* magazine around June 2012. ---JMJ. February 11, 2014 (footnote added May 2015)

** ** *

Postscript. This compilation, with five “appendices,” is a bit of a grab-bag. I feel an urgency to organize various pieces of writings and correspondence; this “collection” features an incomplete review of the 2014 anthology, which nevertheless contains some good critiques and observations. For the sake of expediency I've included various related emails I happened to run across while searching for other things in my email account. I don't think these were ever saved anywhere and they were not included in my *Ivory Tower, House of Cards* book (2015). So here they are, preserved for posterity.

There are some important tidbits that contextualize why the 2014 archaeoastronomy anthology (arranged by Barnhart) was derailed by Aveni, who “bailed” out of his promised contribution. Thus Barnhart's anthology, in the pipeline at the University Press of Colorado, hit the wall. The reason was clearly due to Aveni's influence and favored standing at the press, which is now crystal clear due to Darrin Pratt protecting Aveni, and his book, from my corrections (as documented in my book *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*). Here's the nub. Several contributors to Barnhart's planned anthology (namely, Mendez, Karasik, and Grofe) were presenting reconstructed methods the Maya may have employed for tracking precession. But since those methods (they used a zenith-nadir frame) did not emphasize horizon-based astronomy — Aveni's requirement based on his Western astronomy bias — they were deemed inadmissible by Aveni, and Darrin Pratt at the UP of Colorado, not surprisingly, followed him lock-step-in-salute on the matter. (They did have one reference to the precessional-shifting horizon rise-azimuths of a star in Orion, which Aveni apparently disregarded.)

Consequently Barnhart partnered with Gerardo Aldana who had the Oxbow Books connection, and it was finally published

in 2014. The seven years it took for all these shenanigans and delays to be worked out is what Barnhart refers to, in his preface, as the “long and winding road” to publication. Grofe wrote, in his email to me of 5-4-2015 (see above), that his SAA 2007 paper dealt with precession in the Serpent Series of the Dresden Codex, elaborated from his PhD dissertation, but he decided to switch to his Glyph G research because “Aveni trashed my work at the [2007 SAA] conference, along with Mendez and Karasik's, since we all mentioned precession” and thus the anthology was “apparently held up in publication” (with Pratt at the University Press of Colorado). Such were the Aveni-mandated blockades and ego-politics that scholars who were writing about the ancient Maya's knowledge of the precession of the equinoxes had to deal with. It was heresy to side with my unprecedented thesis that 2012 was selected by the ancient calendar makers because of a precession-based astronomical alignment. JMJ. March 29, 2016

A concluding addendum to Appendix 1. A primary anti-JMJ 2012 debunker named Johan Normark is considered to be an academic and nurtured an opinionated trash-talk website called Archaeological Haecceities for a number of years. Because of its derogatory rhetoric it attracted several 2012 debunkers like moths to a flame, including Stan Guenter, John Hoopes, Jim Smith and (marginally) David Stuart. On it, we find many jabs and pot-shots leveled at 2012 writers and theories, including me and my work, with very little actual engagement with my evidence, arguments, and ideas. I'm grateful to Normark for provided that forum because it so clearly illustrates the mind of the biased Inquisitor who masquerades as a skeptic but is nothing more than a confused and insecure adolescent hurling pipe bombs at the object of their hatred, followed by running away like cowards.

It came to my attention in April of 2011 that Normark and a few others on the Graham Hancock forum were spewing misrepresentations of my work. Some on the list (e.g., Morfed and Luke Hancock) defended the rigor I've tried to bring to the complex topic of reconstructing 2012 astronomy and spiritual teachings. The forum moderator named Morfed reached out and asked me for clarification. Although I was traveling in Mexico --- staying at a cheap hostel at that moment --- I happily responded. The thread is on the forum here: <http://grahamhancock.com/phorum/read.php?1,301853,301853#msg-301853>. The page on my website that I updated as a result of the exchange is called “Critique Clearinghouse”: <http://alignment2012.com/critiqueclearing.html>

As an indication that Normark's website was largely designed for 2012 disinformation dissemination and JMJ-bashing, he announced its closure on December 22, 2012. He did, however, produce and publicize an essay, based on a talk he gave in early 2014, which continued to reiterate false and inaccurate information about my work. I reviewed and corrected it here: <http://www.update2012.com/Review-of-Normark-2014a.pdf>

Curiously, Normark's website --- an opinionated and often vile blog frequented by trolls and character assassins --- has been favorably cited by Aveni and the Brickers in one of their recent peer-review essay (on Xultun, 2013 or 14). --- JMJ, 5-24-2016

12. Jim Smith is Tom Brown / pdecordoba / jschiapas / Wikipedia violator / 2012Hoax user

**Compiled and written by John Major Jenkins,
2010, 2012, 2014, 2016**

Jim Smith (apparently his real name) is demonstrably one and the same as all the above people (Tom Brown, pdecordoba, jschiapas, etc). This is a detailed narrative and provides the documentation and evidentiary links; please see the end of this file for a concise bullet-point brief of the same sequence, which reveals who Jim Smith is and how he employs unethical tactics of slander and misrepresentation.

On March 15, 2010, I was contacted by a “Tom Brown” who was using the email pdecordoba@yahoo.com. He announced that he had posted a review of my recent book *The 2012 Story* on Amazon. I read and responded to his review and critiques. An email exchange ensued that ran to early May of 2010. Several things can be said about this exchange:

1. His “review” of my book *The 2012 Story* did not actually treat the contents of that book. Instead, his lengthy and rambling review dealt with my general “2012 alignment theory” as found in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. “Tom Brown” was merely using the Amazon comments section as a billboard for his editorializing critique.
2. In my first email response to “Tom Brown”, and in subsequent ones, I responded to his critiques and questions. Certain clarifications were necessary. Tom Brown did not apparently like my clarifications and qualifications, and he did not respond directly to them. A true dialogue was not possible as “Tom Brown” became increasingly abusive and accusatory.
3. I directed “Tom Brown” to additional writings and sources of information that would help him understand my approach --- that I was concerned with reconstructing what the ancient Maya believed about 2012. He stated that he didn’t care what the ancient Maya believed. I also directed him to my online page, posted since 1999, that provided clear definitions and a graphic display of the galactic alignment process. This also did not seem to satisfy him.
4. As his vehement language escalated, and he accused me of evading his questions, I suggested he re-read my responses, which in fact did address his questions. It became impossible to continue and the exchange ended in early May.

“Tom Brown” disappeared. A Jim Smith then appeared, who posted the following on a forum which proves that he is one and the same as the “Tom Brown” who had contacted me a short time earlier:

From “Jim Smith Chiapas,” on <http://www.bautforum.com/showthread.php/103153-Question-on-redshifts-in-Cruttdenden-s-Binary-Sun-model>:
“Thanks, George, for the info and suggestions (as well as the humor!). By the way, if you ever get the time I'd really appreciate it if you'd look over [my Amazon review](#) of John

Major Jenkins' book *The 2012 Story*, and the two comments I appended to it. I wrote them under the name of “Pdecordoba”, on 2 February 2010. If you see any errors, or have any suggestions, you can contact me at nitac14b@yahoo.com. So can anyone else who's reading this.”

Note that the authorship of the same Amazon review of my book (by “Tom Brown”) was claimed by this Jim Smith, even stating that he used the same username of “pdecordoba” that Tom Brown’s email address contained. Also, his Amazon moniker (pdecordoba) resides in “Chiapas, Mexico.” This ties in with Jim Smith’s other username used elsewhere, of “jschiapas.” See Appendix 1 below for an image from the Bautforum page linked above, where it is apparent that on March 9, 2012, Jim Smith deleted his posts of April 2010, probably in an attempt to eradicate the evidence that he was deceptively masquerading to me as Tom Brown. Fortunately, a senior member had clipped Smith’s above statement, and that survives on the current page linked above (accessed on June 16, 2012). A screenshot of that is pasted below in Appendix 1.

A search of Jim Smith’s stated email address of nitac14b@yahoo.com further clarified his real identity as a “missionary” teacher in Chiapas, Mexico, associated with the name of his wife on the public site called Flixter and the Sovereign Grace Baptist Fellowship in Tullahoma, TN, where apparently his father, James Smith, was a Baptist pastor. A web page called “Clearing up the 2012 Sky” contains a photo of Jim and his wife, and contains the following meta name codes:

```
<meta name="description" content="The missionary work of Jim and xxxxx Smith in San Cristobal de las Casas, Chiapas, Mexico">
```

```
<meta name="keywords" content="Jim and xxxxx Smith, 2012, 2012, 2012, clearing up the sky of 2012, 2012 the movie, the truth about 2012,san cristobal de las casas, Chiapas, Mexico, mexican vacation, paradise, help the needy, who are the poor, who are the hungry">
```

Manchester, TN and nearby Tullahoma, TN phonebook search results are omitted. On related pages (connected to www.theflatironarchives.com) we find another picture of Jim, the Inquisitor with many names, next to his wife and looking glum at a party.

Curiously, in December 2009 Jim Smith posted a review of Anthony Aveni’s 2012 book, on a recently launched (new) web domain named <http://the2012story.org>. This web domain imitated my own domain that I launched some months earlier for the release of my book, <http://the2012story.com>. This begins to suggest the deceptive and crafty strategies of obfuscation and meddling that Jim Smith would be capable of, which future events confirmed. In his review of Aveni’s book, Jim Smith confessed that he was “not knowledgeable about mesoamerican archaeology” but, nevertheless, that he “could confirm that Aveni represents Jenkins’ work accurately and treats his viewpoints respectfully.” In actual fact, Aveni’s comments on me and my work are prejudiced and inaccurate.

Aveni labels me a “Gnostic” who seeks to mystify the Maya (which in his mind mitigates my ability to be rational), and he asserts that I believe Izapa Stela 25 represents the galactic alignment (both assertions are not true, but are useful in his straw-man demolition of my work). So, the problems with Jim Smith’s knowledge-base and ability to accurately assess my work, as well as the veracity of my scholarly critics, are staggering right at the onset, even before he reviewed my book on Amazon.

In a disturbing display of goading acrimony that would come to typify his treatment of me, Jim Smith poses as an “engineer” in San Cristobal (Chiapas) in order to criticize and bait “Jesus Radicals”: <http://forums.jesusradicals.com/showthread.php/new-member-chiapas-1811.html?s=d0f07eab449f3ddaccffe97e065f4376&p=14820>. We begin to see how Smith is an energy vampire.

There are many revealing comments, misunderstandings, and lines of attack in Tom-Brown-Jim-Smith’s emails to me between March-May of 2010. The following example is telling for two reasons: 1) he completely inverts what I actually stated in the article I sent him; and 2) this very same oddly skewed and inverted reading of my views on Cruttenden’s theory was faithfully echoed in an addition to my Wikipedia name entry that was posted a short time later. Let’s take a look. On April 28, 2010, TomBrownJimSmith sent me the following email with the subject line “Why not put your mushrooms where your mouth is?”:

“Thanks for sending me [the link where you praise Cruttenden's book](#) as blazing the way toward a profound new understanding of our solar system, including the "real causes of precession...”

The article in question (linked above) actually called into question several of Cruttenden’s views, and did NOT “praise” Cruttenden’s book for “blazing a new trail.” I began with stating the value that we must be open-minded to new ideas, but as anyone can see who reads the article, I disagree with Cruttenden’s Yuga-timing ideas. And yet I did write an endorsement statement for the book, in which I carefully stated that we should be open to testing and investigating new theories that could result in a new understanding of our world. My published “endorsement” reads:

“There is a revolution underway in how we understand the cosmos – and it is based on ancient starlore and mythology. [Here I am alluding to the revolution started by the book *Hamlet’s Mill* in 1969, which led to my own work and that of others] In this pioneering book, a completely new theory has been parsed out from ancient texts and modern astrophysical data: our sun may be part of a binary star system.”

This “endorsement” is a mere statement of fact. The distinction is clear, but not to TomBrownJimSmith. My response to him, in part, was as follows:

Tom,
First, your subject line sets the stage for a certain level of low-brow antagonism that I will nevertheless side step. What I advocated in my plagiarized piece on Cruttenden's work, is

being open-minded when challenging new theories are presented. It's similar to supporting a person's freedom of speech although you may disagree with what they are saying. As for Cruttenden's theory, I disagree with several points, and I've been on record saying so. I have supported treated it fairly, rationally, and accurately on its own terms. Also, just because you can find a website that debunks something in Googleland doesn't mean that it has definitively been proven untrue. That's pretty undiscerning of you. You are clearly predisposed to being convinced that Cruttenden's theory is incorrect, so that you can cast aspersions on me, and you aren't being objectively discerning or rational in your treatment of me or Cruttenden. This is a common phenomenon, in which debunkers aren't rational skeptics but rather *faithful believers in an opposite*. So, you are an undiscerning fundamentalist whose mind is closed. —4-28-2010.

After this exchange ended, there occurred a series of attempted defamatory posts on my Wikipedia name entry, misleadingly phrased and cited. Most of these were ultimately rejected by the Wiki moderators, but the one about me supposedly agreeing with Cruttenden’s theory (demonstrably unsupported by the source cited on Wikipedia) somehow survived the clean-up and remains there to this day. In any case, this and other examples below provide evidence that the Wikipedia saboteur was none other than Jim Smith.

After May 2010

Jim Smith’s attacks on my name, work, and career, were just beginning. After our initial email exchange ended in May of 2010, a series of unethical, amoral, and intellectually dishonest things occurred in online venues that are all traceable to Jim Smith. I think they are best characterized as slanderous sabotage, committed under attempted cowardly anonymity. In the “Tom Brown” / Jim Smith / pdecordoba / jschiapas baffle, Jim Smith’s tendency to use aliases is already demonstrated.

Sometime after May 2010 the Wikipedia entry under my name, “John Major Jenkins”, began to be infiltrated and compromised with inaccurate, untrue, and misleadingly phrased summaries. The primary, but not the only, attempt at defamation, involved an accusation that I advocated drug use. In my books and articles I have presented and discussed the evidence for the Maya’s use of psychoactive compounds, including little known evidence from Izapa. I have discussed the role of hallucinogens in Old World and Indigenous ceremonies of initiation, and I have openly discussed my own experiences with these substances as being catalysts for spiritual awakening, creativity, and intellectual problem solving. But I have never “advocated” their use; in fact, in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* I explicitly stated that the experimental journeys should not be repeated or attempted. But Jim Smith, via his polemical and inaccurate Wikipedia slanders, asserted that I did “advocate” drug use, and there was a whole section under that heading, of his creation, in my Wiki biography.

I did not discover this until July 2010. I didn’t launch my own name entry on Wikipedia, and I didn’t even know there

was one on Wikipedia until July. Someone else launched it, just like someone else (probably Jim Smith) launched a clone domain of my the2012story.com website. It's not critical to prove that Jim Smith launched my Wiki entry, but it can be shown that he aggressively infiltrated it and violated the Wiki terms of use. He probably engaged in what is called "sock puppetry" (creating multiple member aliases that you control) and perhaps "meat puppetry" (getting other people to collaborate on creating the illusion of consensus in approving various polemically-charged and damaging additions to the entry).

When I dealt with this after returning from travels in August, 2010, the unbiased and helpful Wiki moderators took one look at what was happening on my page and agreed that the page was being unethically abused for the purposes of defamation, mainly by one user. This user, who had mysteriously been backed up by at least one other user, exploded in contempt (in the background discussion pages) when this occurred. This explosion of contempt was similar to what was simultaneously posted on the 2012Hoax website. By Jim Smith. It is not clear if the Wiki abuser quit of his own accord or was blocked from continuing to violate the Wiki terms. But jschiapas / Jim Smith clearly found a new home for his slanderous and inaccurate attacks on me and my work.

On the 2012Hoax page under my name, we find Jim-Smith-style screeds on my alleged "advocacy of drug use," including a play-by-play of the events that had just unfolded on Wikipedia (<http://www.2012hoax.org/john-major-jenkins>). Very interesting, and very telling. This can clearly be connected with the person who had just been ousted from Wiki as an unethical, biased, and irrational member. As can be seen in our email exchange, Jim Smith had sniped that I was a mushroom eater, so given the temporal sequence of events, and the usernames, it's not hard to see that the Wikipedia terrorist and the 2012Hoax terrorist are one and the same: Jim Smith. The fact is that the Wikipedia moderators agreed that Smith's behavior was unacceptable and unethical. By a basic standard of factual responsibility, he should therefore not be taken seriously as an unbiased and rational critic of my work ANYWHERE. But certain websites, such as Bill Hudson's 2012Hoax.org and Johan Normark's Archaeological Haecities, continue to do so. This is because they have a superficial understanding of 2012 and my work, are biased toward rejected all-things-2012, and thus freely offer their platforms to amoral sophists like Jim Smith who are willing to abandon their humanity and craft clever and defamatory polemical narratives which are totally based on lies and misinformation.

William Hudson, who set up and moderates the 2012Hoax site, envisions it as a kind of member-based Wiki-like site. Like Wiki, he too has ethical guidelines against "cherry picking" quotes out of context, indulging in misleading polemics, and so on, but he does not employ or enforce those guidelines without insistent requests that he do so. In mid-2012, after much effort by me in the face of Hudson's evasive responses, regarding the fact that for many years I was identified as a "proponent" of the doomsday-2012 position on Hudson's front page, he finally switched me over to a heading under "author" instead of "proponent." A mild yet decisive victory for factual truth.

However, other posts on Hoax2012.org, explicitly claimed by Jim Smith, continue to be maintained on Hudson's website. You would think that once a member, for example Jim Smith, has been identified as not abiding by Wikipedia standards (as well as engaging in personal axe-grinding with little basis in factual reporting), then *ALL of their posts would be come under scrutiny*. Not so on Hudson's website. Like Johan Normark, he will maintain as many irrational and inaccurate posts about me and other 2012 writers as possible, because it serves his commitment to a low-minded brand of scientific materialism and the eradication of ideologies that they find personally distasteful. While they craft a veneer of scientific principles, there is no science happening there.

After May 2010, Jim Smith was also responsible for at least one Youtube video, which he must have spent some time constructing out of stills and captions taken from my work. It basically reiterated the same critiques sent to me months earlier by Tom Brown / Jim Smith, and which I responded to in detail, to no avail. The person who posted the video(s) is easily traced to Jim Smith.

So, in Jim Smith we have a person who aggressively took it upon himself to attack and attempt to damage my ideas, my career, and my reputation. The psychological reasons for this can only be guessed, but I suspect it has to do with the fragile neurotic personality profile of the pathology-prone debunker type. It can probably be traced to our email exchange of March-April 2010, where I bluntly corrected him about his misconceptions regarding my work. The problem is that he rejected the fact that my effort has been to reconstruct how the ancient Maya thought about 2012. The identified Maya ideas, which are profoundly sophisticated and non-dual in nature, do not make sense to a one-dimensional linear thinker like Jim Smith, so like the inquisitors of old, annihilation of the offending person or ideas becomes the only option. I can only hope that Jim Smith will acknowledge his amoral and irrational agenda against me and will seek professional treatment for his mental problems.

To Summarize:

- In December 2009, Jim Smith reviewed Aveni's recent "2012" book on a new domain called www.the2012Story.org, which oddly mirrors my own previously created domain, named after my book, called www.the2012story.com. In his review, Smith confesses that he doesn't know much about Mesoamerican archaeology.
- In February of 2010 "pdecordoba" posted his review of my book *The 2012 Story* on the Amazon review page for it.
- In March of 2010, Jim Smith contacted me under the alias of "Tom Brown" and requested my response to his Amazon "review" of my book *The 2012 Story* (which was really a general critique of my work based on my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*.)
- I responded patiently and in detail to his many questions and critiques over a six-week period, to May 2010.

- “Tom Brown” did not respond to or accept my explanations and offering for dialogues, and instead escalated his vitriolic accusations; the exchanges ends.
- Jim Smith sends a comment to the [Bautforum](#) that, as pdecorodoba, he posted a review of my book on Amazon; **this confirms that Jim Smith is Tom Brown.**
- Jim Smith then posts the same critiques, which I fully and honestly responded to in detail, in the form of a video to Youtube. This video propagated the inaccurate information and assumptions about my work that I had already corrected and clarified in my responses to Jim Smith (aka Tom Brown) --- and which Tom Brown did not respond to with any attempt to have a rational dialogue.
- In July of 2010 a Wiki member identifiable as Jim Smith posts salacious and inaccurate polemical additions (including a topical heading determined by the Wiki moderators to be irrelevant and below Wiki standards) to my “John Major Jenkins” entry on Wiki. I attempt to correct these posts, but Jim Smith and probably his sock puppet / meat puppet agents immediately delete my changes. The Wiki moderators are contacted (in August), they assess the tracked history of changes, and determine that Jim Smith is not abiding by the standards of unbiased and relevant Wikipedia postings. An angst ridden scream occurs on the Wiki discussions page. The offending abuser disappears.
- Immediately, a person identifiable as Jim Smith posts a play-by-play of the Wiki events on William Hudson’s 2012Hoax.org website, with the exact same accusation of drug advocacy that was rejected by the Wikipedia standard bearers. Hudson uncritically supports, and continues, to maintain, this defamatory and inaccurate misinformation on his Wiki-like member-defined forum.
- Jim Smith continued to find a home for his slanders on other websites, such as Johan Normark’s Archaeological Haeccities. Without apparently realizing that he, like Hudson, was a tool for Smith’s venomous and unethical axe-grinding agenda, throughout 2011 and early 2012 Normark approves and ideologically agrees with Smith’s comments about me and my associations.
- In June 2012, Jim Smith reappears on Normark’s site, after “6 months” of being out of the “2012” game, and wonders why I do not respond to his various critiques, on Normark’s site and 2012Hoax.
- I decide to organize my files on Jim Smith / Tom Brown, an unreliable and unethical commentator on my work whose attempts to malign me personally and professional were below the standards of Wikipedia. And yet, he continues to be abetted by William Hudson and Johan Normark. These events also demonstrate and underscore the unprofessional behavior of those two alleged rationalists.

Thinking back to my lengthy responses to Jim Smith over two years ago, when he was masquerading for reasons unknown as “Tom Brown”, I have composed this narrative and will share it with Jim Smith, Johan Normark, and William Hudson. It documents the pathologically irrational behavior of one 2012 debunker-priest, who was willing to abandon his intellectual

principles and his morality in order to cast slanderous aspersion on me, even after I did attempt to communicate clearly with him. I did not bow to his arrogant, irrational, and under-informed assertions, and therefore in his mind I must be attacked. These people, like Jim Smith, are pathological pariahs; they inhabit all sectors of our society. They need to be exposed even while they take on various disguises in order to deceive. The proliferation of anonymous contributors to member-defined websites like Wikipedia and 2012Hoax.org has encouraged these energy vampires. In addition, uncritical and unthinking yes-men like William Hudson and Johan Normark need to be taken to task, for representing themselves as fact-based defenders of rationalism and scientific rigor, when in fact they are so easily manipulated as tools of morally bankrupt poseurs who whisper in their ears exactly what they want to hear.

Note: My response to Villaseñor and others is posted at <http://Update2012.com>

Appendix 1:

See screenshot image in the online dossier:

<http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>.

From: <http://www.bautforum.com/showthread.php/103153-Question-on-redshifts-in-Cruttenden-s-Binary-Sun-model> (accessed June 16, 2012)

It is apparent that on March 9, 2012, Jim Smith deleted the contents of his posts of April 2010, probably in an attempt to eradicate evidence that he was deceptively masquerading to me as Tom Brown. Fortunately, a senior member had clipped Smith’s above statement, and that survives on the current page linked above (accessed on June 16, 2012); the screenshot above also shows this. I suspect that Google Time Machine would reveal Smith’s original comments in full, which I quote in this document above, repeated here:

“Thanks, George, for the info and suggestions (as well as the humor!). By the way, if you ever get the time I'd really appreciate it if you'd look over [my Amazon review](#) of John Major Jenkins' book *The 2012 Story*, and the two comments I appended to it. I wrote them under the name of "Pdecorodoba", on 2 February 2010. If you see any errors, or have any suggestions, you can contact me at nitac14b@yahoo.com. So can anyone else who's reading this.”

Appendix 2:

After Jim Smith-Tom Brown re-appeared and leadingly wondered to Johan Normark why I hadn’t responded to his critiques, I sent this to the Archaeological Haeccities thread on June 16, 2012:

“To respond to Jim’s and Johan’s interest in why I supposedly haven’t responded to Jim Smith’s previous

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

Ongoing at: <http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/02/16/2012-jenkins-is-being-misunderstood-again/#comment-6129>

Appendix 3:

Here is my first response to "Tom Brown" (Jim Smith) and his Amazon "review" of my book *The 2012 Story*:

From: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>

Subject: RE: A review of The 2012 Story

To: "Tom Brown" <pdecoroba@yahoo.com>

Date: Monday, March 15, 2010, 4:18 PM

Tom,

Thanks for the heads up. On first glance, it's odd, and inappropriate in a review of *The 2012 Story*, that you are quoting from *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. I've opted for simple diagrams as I've learned that obscure astrophysical photo montages are unhelpful for illustrating the alignment. Nevertheless, the astronomical processes are defined and discussed from the two vantages of 1) precise astronomical science and 2) mythological and naked-eye astronomy-based constructs known to exist in Maya star lore. The misunderstanding that critics wield --- especially professional Maya scholars --- is amply demonstrated on the debates at <http://Update2012.com> (May and October updates especially). You didn't mention this website --- it was launched last summer and there are links to it from Alignment2012.com. It is easy to see that Freidel, Stuart, Aveni, Krupp, and other critics are barely even accessing the descriptions and definitions that you chide as being insufficient --- they are in fact critiquing phantom projections of their own biased assumptions about what my work is about. None of them actually address the evidence that I've brought to bear in support of my thesis, and instead wield a myopic brand of sophistry to conclude that the alignment isn't even real astronomy. Imagine that.

Another item that applies to your own critique is that it is easy to pick quotes from my different books that are addressed to different contexts, namely, the mythopoetic descriptions of the conceptual underpinnings of the galactic alignment (which seem poetic, vague, and obscure to the scientist) versus the precise scientific definitions that *I've in fact pioneered in regard to the galactic alignment, openly discussing the ranges and parameters*. In the quotes you compare below [in your Amazon "review" of my work], you've merely isolated the reason why, in my later and more recent writings, I've bent over backwards to not give the impression that the alignment

happens only in 2012. The language used in MC2012, (such as "pinpointed") was not intended to mean one millisecond, or even one day. Within the larger frame of the precession cycle, a decade would be a pinpoint. But yet, in this example and many others, I've adjusted my terminology so that there can be no doubt. Meanwhile, the real information and evidence goes un-addressed --- such as the evidence that the ancient Maya utilized the dark rift as a cognitive and astronomical reference point for the cycle ending in their calendar. That's pretty compelling and simple stuff, and completely ignored by my critics. For example, you didn't mention Izapa or Tortuguero Monument 6, the subject of Chapter 7 in *The 2012 Story*. We can get all angst ridden over semantics with the alignment forever, my friend, but the fact remains that the evidence indicates that the ancient Maya intended December 21, 2012 to mark the rare precession-based alignment of the December solstice sun with the dark rift in the Milky Way. Can you think of a better way to state this? Please share, I've been working at not confusing my die-hard critics for 20 years.

It's also possible at this stage of my career, having written over 15 books and having done hundreds of interviews addressed to different audiences, to find statements that contradict each other. You can do that with Einstein too. No surprise there; that's the nature of ideational thinking and writing; the differences and contradictions will often depend on which set of perspectives one was holding in mind at the time of speaking or writing. These things are common in a large body of work. Your further comments are oddly passive-aggressive, implying that I have not identified why the galactic alignment is a "once-in-a-26,000-year" event. If, by this phrase, you are thinking I mean that it happens on one day, then you are mistaken, and there are ample statements in my work that you've neglected to cite that supply the necessary clarification. It's always amazing to me how some people can be so creative in the myriad number of ways that they can find to misunderstand something, especially if they want to. The galactic alignment is a fact of astronomy; you can see the diagrams and moving images at my page "What is the Galactic Alignment?" Your critique, generally, is similar to the one made by Marcos Villaseñor [with David Freidel], and I'll be posting a response to that pretty soon [it is here: <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoVillasenor.html>]. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

--- JMJ. June 17, 2012.

Update, November 2012. Jim Smith continues to harass and threaten me and interfere with my business-related activities as an author. I suspect that he, under another alias, was the person who emailed me immediately after Jim Smith's failure to reach me in Mexico, that his plan was to 'destroy me!' [see evidence and argument discussed below]. I have been advised and have chosen to ignore his periodic threats since September, and forward all emails directly to my lawyer. His activities in polluting and distorting my Wikipedia name-entry page in 2010 are well documented in this dossier. His continuing cyber-stalker efforts to distort and sabotage my work are likely to continue there, and I will probably need to reference this dossier as I begin the laborious process of correcting and

improving the basic information on my Wiki bio page, which as of November 27, 2012 remains very misleading and distorted.

Update 2016. I've recovered original emails from an old Outlook folder and can report exactly what transpired in mid-June 2012. As previously mentioned, I decided to release my dossier on Jim Smith at that time. I did this first as a post to Johan Normark's ongoing blog discussion, of which I was a part, but Normark deleted my link at Smith's command. So I sent a separate email to several people who were privy to, and supportive of, Jim Smith's deceptive shenanigans:

From: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>
To: Jim Smith as Tom Brown <pdecordoba@yahoo.com>; Jim Smith Chiapas <nitac14b@yahoo.com>; William Hudson <admin@2012hoax.org>; Johan Normark <johan_normark@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2012 4:29 PM
Subject: dossier on Jim Smith

To Jim Smith, Johan Normark, and William Hudson,

I wanted to resolve this through conflict resolution dialogue, but some people are just incapable of reason. As such, Jim Smith's accusations and evasions on the recent posts of Normark's Arch. Haecc. website forced my hand, and I am therefore providing you all with the dossier on Jim Smith's unethical and secretive tactics over the past 2.5 years. What Johan and Bill must contemplate is 1) how they and their websites became a tool for such an unethical and deceptive person, and 2) how in good conscience any posts by Jim Smith can be maintained.

<http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>

I'm open to further discussions of a rational kind. Jim, I don't know why you selected me to be the screen upon which you thought you could immaturely vent your frustrations and anger, but please do some soul searching and grow up. We are all trying to get by in a troubled world, and each have our challenges and difficulties to bear. I responded to your questions two years ago, and then you went covert in your attack plan. It's now on record and documented, so just try to be an adult, and try to practice the principles of tolerance, intellectual honesty, and fair play that you seem to hold high. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

I was leaving for Mexico the next day and informed Normark's blog that I'd be traveling with infrequent internet access. It was an extremely important conference that I needed to prepare for, and left early the next morning. However, Smith was clearly incensed at my dossier of truth and sent the following series of emails from the 18th to the 20th:

From: Jim Smith [nitac14b@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 8:11 PM
To: John Major Jenkins
Subject: Your post on Johan Normark's blog, giving the link to the "dossier"

Mr. Jenkins:

I was astounded to read the following in your post of June 17, 2012 at 21:45, on Johan Normark's blog (<https://haeccities.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/the-819-day-count-at-xultun/#comment-6165>):

"Consequently, considering that I'm leaving for the first annual Izapa Round Table conference in Mexico tomorrow and am now going offline for several days, I will provide the link to the fact-based dossier on Jim Smith. I wanted to resolve this directly via dialogue with you, but you are unwilling to even address me directly. So, this link will now go out to William Hudson, to Johan Normark, and several other places of relevance."

Mr. Normark has removed the link, noting that it potentially endangered my family.

There are no words to communicate the irresponsibility of someone who would endanger my family in this way, then go off for several days to remain offline. Regarding your assertion that you have sent the "dossier" to "several other places of relevance", I demand that you take down that "dossier" and provide a list of those "places" immediately upon your return.
Jim Smith

From: Jim Smith [nitac14b@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 11:22 AM
To: John Major Jenkins
Subject: Fw: Jenkins' post to Normark endangers my family. I want JMJ to read his emails from me.

Mr. Jenkins:

A full day has passed since my last email to you. You have not yet removed the "dossier" from your website. Since you indicated in your post to Normark's blog that you intend to remain offline for several days, giving presentations in an event organized by Maya Conservancy, which lists you as a Board member of its Mexican affiliate, I have sent them the following email.
Jim Smith

----- Forwarded Message -----

[Smith sent this directly to The Maya Conservancy]

From: Jim Smith <nitac14b@yahoo.com>
To: "info@mayaconservancy.org" <info@mayaconservancy.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 9:12 AM
Subject: Jenkins' post to Normark endangers my family. I want JMJ to read his emails from me.

To whom it may concern:

Shortly before leaving to participate in Maya Conservancy's "MESA REDONDA de IZAPA" (currently in progress), John Major Jenkins posted to his website personal information about me that potentially endangers my family. He posted a link to that information on Johan Normark's blog, then announced his intention to remain offline at your event for several days:

<http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/the-819-day-count-at-xultun/#comment-6157>

Normark informed me himself about Jenkins's post, and removed the link. In the last two days, I have sent Jenkins several emails asking him to take down that information. None of those emails have been answered.

Given Jenkins's prominent role in Maya Conservancy (MC), and his irresponsible decision to use participation in MC's event as reason for remaining out of contact, I respectfully ask that MC deliver this message to him personally as soon as possible. I want him to read my emails and take the requested actions.

Please note that in the above-referenced post to Normark's blog, Jenkins said that he would be sending the same personal information to "several other places of relevance". MC's close relationship with Jenkins gives reason to believe that Jenkins has sent that information to MC. If so, I ask that MC inform me within the next three days.

Thank you for your cooperation. I would appreciate the courtesy of MC's prompt reply to this message, which I am also sending to MC via its "Contact" page.

Regards,
Jim Smith

From: Jim Smith [nitac14b@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 5:57 PM
To: john@alignment2012.com
Subject: Fw: Your post on Johan Normark's blog, giving the link to the "dossier"

Mr. Jenkins:

As explained in the email that I am forwarding, your "dossier" on me potentially endangers my family. I am contacting you at this email because you provided it on your website, <http://alignment2012.com/IzapaJune2012.html>, for people who want to participate in the "Extra informal section, with John Major Jenkins: June 22-25", which follows the Maya Conservancy's *Izapa Round Table Conference*.

Judging from the portion that I've quoted from your post to Normark's blog (see the email that I'm forwarding), you apparently intend to leave emails to your <kahib@ix.netcom.com> account unread for at least a week (17-25 June), and to maintain the "dossier" on your website while you enjoy wine, cheese, dinner, and drinks in Mexico with your fans.

Unconscionable. Since you apparently aren't really "offline", I demand, again, that you take the "dossier" down immediately, and send me a complete list of people, organizations, and websites to which you have sent it.

Jim Smith

(the following he attaches and repeats from previous email)
Forwarded Message -----

From: Jim Smith <nitac14b@yahoo.com>
To: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 9:10 PM
Subject: Your post on Johan Normark's blog, giving the link to the "dossier"

Mr. Jenkins:

I was astounded to read the following in your post of June 17, 2012 at 21:45, on Johan Normark's blog (<http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/the-819-day-count-at-xultun/#comment-6157>):

"Consequently, considering that I'm leaving for the first annual Izapa Round Table conference in Mexico tomorrow and am now going offline for several days, I will provide the link to the fact-based dossier on Jim Smith. I wanted to resolve this directly via dialogue with you, but you are unwilling to even address me directly. So, this link will now go out to William Hudson, to Johan Normak, and several other places of relevance."

Mr. Normark has removed the link, noting that it potentially endangered my family.

There are no words to communicate the irresponsibility of someone who would endanger my family in this way, then go off for several days to remain offline. Regarding your assertion that you have sent the "dossier" to "several other places of relevance", I demand that you take down that "dossier" and provide a list of those "places" immediately upon your return.

Jim Smith

From: Jim Smith [nitac14b@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 3:40 PM
To: John Major Jenkins
Subject: Your "dossier" on me

Mr. Jenkins:

Before 5 p.m. today, I will attempt once more to contact you through The Maya Conservancy. Since you have not responded to my previous emails, there is no point in sending any more.

Jim Smith

That was three days worth of emails, during which time I traveled to Tapachula (that's one full day right there), got situated at the Izapa 2012 Conference hotel, met other speakers and participants, did a press conference, surveyed the

presentation room, visited the planetarium, and attended a welcome dinner.

Notice that one of his emails was sent directly to *The Maya Conservancy* (who were co-sponsoring the conference) with the subject line “Jenkins’ post to Normark endangers my family. I want JMJ to read his emails from me.” He seemed to forget that the link on Normark’s site had been deleted. Also, his perception that my dossier threatened his family was a ridiculous fabrication. It seemed that Smith dropped the effort with a suspicious nonchalance; that was like his previous strategy of going away and then attacking me from a different direction (e.g., when he attacked my Wikipedia name-entry page in mid-2010, or created Youtube smears.) So, it wasn’t completely surprising when, almost exactly 24 hours after Jim Smith allegedly gave up his effort of trying to get my response to his complaint about the dossier I put online, I received the following email from one “Owen Lynch.” I didn’t try opening the suspicious zip file.

From: Owen Lynch [featheredvtu05@fnbhutch.com]
To: john@alignment2012.com
Subject: You can't say I haven't warned you now enjoy the consequences.
Sent: Thu 6/21/2012 3:56 PM

Hate to bother you john
I always considered you to be my buddy but after that I'll have to try to destroy you. You ruined my life! Why did you have to put these photos online?? I reported you to the police check the attachment

Attachment: photo.zip (34 KB)

See screenshot of this email in the updated dossier online:
<http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>

This is a threat of personal harm directed to me. Notice the sender refers to “photos” that I posted; I did indeed use screenshots and I satirized a glum photo of Jim Smith I found online. Notice also that the sender writes “but after that...” which clearly indicates something that has just occurred which was upsetting to him. It gets worse. The following isn’t absolutely proven but the various circumstances strongly suggest a conclusion that Jim Smith was behind this email from “Owen Lynch” as well as the following. In the several days following 6-21 (probably 6-22 and 6-23 or thereabouts), my wife dealt with three late-night phone calls. She said they happened a few days after I left for Mexico (on the 18th). She was in bed at night when the phone rang; she didn’t get up to answer and no message was left. A few minutes later it rang again; now she was fully awake but it was late and she didn’t jump up to answer. This time the message machine, which can be heard in the nearby hallway as the message is being left, recorded a voice that, she said, seemed to be faking a scary accent and groaned, “I will destroy you!” --- repeating it several times before hanging up. She didn’t have the presence of mind, it was so scary for her, to save the message or do a *69. The following night this happened again and she was so frightened she left the house and went to stay at her friend’s (or sister’s), I can’t remember. I was at the Izapa conference tour

when this happened and she told me about it later. Notice that this caller used the same phrase that was used in the “Owen Lynch” email, “destroy you.” As to getting my phone number, well, that’s not that difficult online and the town I live in is mentioned on my website and some interviews.

It’s interesting to note that the Owen Lynch message was directed specifically to john@alignment2012.com (so it wasn’t an automated general spam message) and was sent at 3:56 pm. Jim Smith’s final message from the previous day was sent at 3:40 pm; the day prior to that his email was sent at 5:56 pm. These were apparently late-afternoon times that Jim Smith tended to be active online. Also, the threat of reporting me to the police, in the death-threat email from “Owen Lynch,” is something that Jim Smith actually did several months later, sending me the police report number in October.

The Owen Lynch email address username is “featheredvtu05.” “Feathered” is a somewhat unusual word and of course evokes the Plumed Serpent or Feathered Serpent, much like Jim Smith’s alias email address, pdecordoba, echoes Pedro De Cordoba --- the conquistador. Likewise, his other alias jschiapas uses Chiapas --- where he teaches math in a Baptist outreach school for children in San Cristobal de las Casas, Chiapas. The email suffix “fnbhutch.com” redirects to First National Bank in Hutchinson, Kansas, but there is no Owen Lynch associated. This seems to be a hacker-baffle, like the attached zip-file is some kind of virus, an .exe file, renamed. These are easy proxy baffles for the demented hacker type.

If he did this right, he would have set up the proxy email, sent me the email, and then deleted the proxy email root account. There’s no evidence of this email being associated with the name or of ever used anywhere on the internet or the FNB in Kansas, which itself is somewhat unusual. (There’s usually a Google-able trail for emails and usernames.) There is an Owen J. Lynch who is active in sustainable environmental projects around the world, publishing on Maya and other communities. He was educated at Yale and a Catholic university, appears to be about the same age as Jim Smith, and is a Samdhana Institute Fellow. Perhaps Jim Smith borrowed the name of one of his other enemies in order to direct my attention to him, since he was now aware that I could accomplish good detective work online.

Based on these connection points and bits of evidence, my personal view is that Owen Lynch and the late-night death-threat caller who scared my late wife were both none other than Jim Smith. The timing of the email and calls, use of similar phrases, are just too perfect, coming on the heels of Jim Smith being upset at my dossier and then dissatisfied with my non-response while traveling. As I’ve recounted elsewhere, Jim Smith’s bizarre behavior as an archetypal internet troll and cyber-stalker continued through 2012 and even into 2013.

Note: I’ve added the “Update 2016” to this dossier. I have additional notes on Smith’s other activities but this is enough to identify him as a character assassin, an alias-using cyber-stalker and troll. For the dossier online:
<http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>

Note. In June of 2016 I produced three reviews of Aveni's new book, *Apocalyptic Anxiety*, published by the usual academic press --- the University Press of Colorado, directed by Darrin Pratt. Yes, incredibly, there are more errors and shenanigans, astounding feats of academic malfeasance. These three reviews are intended here for Appendix 1, but will be found at the very end of this book, as "Addendum to Appendix 1." The material totals 37,500 words and is the beginning of another phase of dealing with the errors propagated by Aveni and defended by his academic publisher. But we'll see if anything will be different this time, given my chess game checkmate last time around

This concludes **Appendix 1** to *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*.

Appendix 2 provides links to online resources for additional critiques and reviews, and is found on page 156 of the print book. Appendix 3 is at <http://www.Update2012.com/app3-IvoryTower.pdf>

76,890 words

All material in this file is made freely available for the purpose of accurate information on the 2012 topic, which is so often suppressed, and future scholarly research.