

Appendix 3: Verbatim Filed Complaints and Emails

Appendix 3 to *Ivory Tower, House of Cards: How Scholars and Their Publishers Violate Science* by John Major Jenkins (2017).

The primary documents of the Experiment (as reported in *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*) will be collected here. This is the evidentiary meat of the book, and some of this is quoted in the main narrative of the book. These documents consist of verbatim, uncensored, unredacted, copies of 1) my official complaint filings to NASA, the AAUP, and the several university presses; 2) likewise unedited copies of correspondence with the various scholars, press directors, policy committee members, NASA scientist and administrators; 3) links to recordings of phone calls and audio excerpts of presentations. Covered here are the five primary components of the Experiment (Chapter 3) as well as Chapter 4 (“Ultimate Cognitive Dissonance”).

Table of Contents:

1. Anthony Aveni, University Press of Colorado, the AAUP
 - a. Timetable of communications
 - b. First round of emails with the Director of the University of Colorado Press, Darrin Pratt
 - c. Complaint with Aveni’s errors sent to Pratt
 - d. Second round of emails with Pratt (May 2015)
 - e. Email queries sent to AAUP Committee for Member Standards and Policy
 - f. Cover letter with Complaint files forwarded
 - g. Ensuing emails and phone calls, through change of committee chair and members
 - h. Exchanges with Peter Berkery, October 2015
Time: 10 months (19 years since first exchange in 1996)
2. David Morrison, NASA, and the NASA Communications Policy Office
 - a. First Complaint Request sent, re Morrison’s comments on the NASA website, sent to David Weaver, director of the NASA Communications Policy Office
 - b. Ensuing emails and phone calls with the Office
 - c. Second phase: email contact with Morrison, and I send him my Second Complaint Request, re his comments in his presentations
 - d. Ensuing emails and phone calls to Morrison and the others, with no response
 - e. Timetable of communications
Total time spent: 7 months (6 years since his first posts)
3. Ed Krupp, Griffith Observatory, *Sky & Telescope*, The Beckman Center
 - a. Final letter sent to Krupp during correspondence in the 1990s
 - b. Emails with Krupp, 2015
 - c. Cover letter for package of writings sent by mail
 - d. Corrections and questions sent, with invitation to respond
 - e. Confirmation of Receipt
Total time spent: 16 years (19 years since 1996)
4. John Hoopes, University of Texas Press, Wikipedia, *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*
 - 4a. How it Started: Hoopes’s Refusal to Answer a Simple Question
 - 4b. Hoopes Makes the Maya World Age Doctrine a New Age 2012 Mythology
 - 4c. Calling out Hoopes, July 2011
 - 4d. Hoopes Evades Discussion on Whitesides’ FB Page
 - 4e. I Response to Hoopes’s Questions, March 2011
 - 4f. Hoopes’s Mayanism (from *The 2012 Story*)
 - 4g. Mayanism Prison Hoopes (2014)
 - 4h. 2011: Complaint filed with University of Texas Press, re AJ Vol. 22
 - 4i. Ensuing emails with AJ editor John B. Carlson (Hoopes cc’d)
 - 4j. My *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* review of the Whitesides-Hoopes article
 - 4k. Ensuing email exchanges with Hoopes (and Whitesides elsewhere)
 - 4l. My Response to their Response (August 2014)
 - 4m. Annotated Summary with links to others items
Total time spent: 6 years (16 years since first Aztlan communiqué)
5. John B. Carlson, Robbins Museum, *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, University of Texas Press, Univ. of Colorado Press
 - a. Article proposals & queries to Carlson and AJ, 1994-1997
 - b. Emails with Carlson, re his Robbins Museum talk in 2010, and related emails
 - c. Transcribed Excerpts from Carlson’s 2010 Talk
 - d. Cordial Email with info links and query, sent to Carlson in 2012
 - e. Email sent to Carlson in June 2015, re Milbrath and his UP of Colorado article
Total time spent: 21 years
6. Susan Milbrath, University of Colorado Press (Clemency Coggins, John B Carlson, Anthony Aveni, Ed Krupp)
 - a. Exchange with Milbrath in IMS newsletter, 2007-2008
 - b. Email exchange with Coggins
 - c. Cover letter with review of the anthology, sent to editors Milbrath and Dowd
 - d. Ensuing emails with Milbrath
 - e. Report sent to University of Colorado Press director Darrin Pratt
Total time spent: 18 years since first exchange w/ Milbrath
7. Other Files:
 - a. My review of Michael Coe’s 9th Edition of *The Maya*
 - b. My 1995 review-essay of Houston & Stuart (1994)
 - c. Letter to Robert Hall (1994), sent to Carlson in 1994
 - d. Letter to Linda Schele (1994)
 - e. Correlation essays

50 sections total.

1. Anthony Aveni / Darrin Pratt, University Press of Colorado / AAUP

- a. Timetable of communications
- b. First round of emails with University of Colorado Press director, Darrin Pratt
- c. Complaint with Aveni's errors sent to Pratt
- d. Second round of emails with Pratt (May 2015)
- e. Email queries sent to AAUP Committee for Member Standards and Policy
- f. Cover letter for the forwarded Complaint and Pratt emails, sent to the AAUP
- g. Ensuing emails and phone calls, through change of committee chair and members
- h. Exchanges with Peter Berkery, October 2015

Item 1a. Timetable of communications:

- 1. Correspondence 1996
His review of *Maya Cosmos* 1996
Invitation 1997
Aztlán Lloyd Andersen 1999, precession
His changed opinion not added to *Skywatchers* in 2001
His Izapa ballcourt alignment piece 2000
NYTimes piece 2007
Exchange 2008
SAA 2007/2008 comments
2012: Science or Superstition – late 2008
Tulane Feb 2009 / B. T.'s comment "bully and a bullshitter" /
He tells me about his Izapa ballcourt calculation; I look it up
His book October 2009 / promo article
My book October 2009
My review / the Grofe error
Whiteside Amazon review / J. Smith attacks
Grofe-Aveni exchange / correction
Letters from two Aveni students (2010)
Invitation to the MEC-FB discussion (Dec. 2010)
Grofe's correction (2011, 2012)
My comments in Gelfer, 2011
The Benfer debacle 2012-13
Aveni's comment on my Benfer article (late 2013)
Unanswered emails 2014 (re: my Benfer piece, Grofe, my
Gelfer piece sent, my ZfurAnom piece sent, Izapa ballcourt,
Xultun)
- 2. 1-7-2015. Query to Darrin Pratt
1-8-2015. Sent errors to Pratt / UP Colo.
Feb 2015. Decision / emails w/ Pratt
May 2015. Query re: Milbrath book, sent to Pratt
May 2015. His response, and Aveni revised edition released,
further exchange
May-June 2015. Queries to AAUP
July 9, 2015. Complaint filed with AAUP
July 16. No response, query. Susan Patton acknowledged
receipt
August 20, call Patton, she's on vacation.
August 26, called Kyla Madden, left message. No response

August 30, called Kyla Madden, left message. No response
September 5, ditto, then response: material was sent to the new
chair of committee, Leila Salisbury. She confirms receipt.
September 10. Response is allegedly forthcoming.
September 29, 2015. Decision: A 67-word denial and no action
is necessary.

- There were several episodes with Aveni prior to my formal
complaint sent to UP Colorado and the AAUP in 2015:
- 1. Exchange in 1996 and invitation to receive my book, 1997
 - 2. Aztlán discussion w/ Lloyd re Aveni, precession, my book,
June 1999
 - 3. The *NYTimes* pieces (2007), followed by the Milbrath
exchanges in IMS in which I mentioned Aveni's critique.
 - 4. The MacLeod-Grofe-Jenkins dialogue of mid-2008, with
revealing comments on Aveni, and my simultaneous email
exchange with Aveni (April 2008).
 - 5. The Tulane event, documented in my 2009 book.
 - 6. My review of Aveni's article promoting his book (11-2009).

Item 1b. First round of emails with the Director of the
University of Colorado Press, Darrin Pratt

January 5, 2015
Dear Mr Pratt,
I hope you can help me understand the policy of the University
Press of Colorado, regarding errata — that is, factual
corrections identified in your peer-reviewed books?
Specifically, not just typos but mis-statements and factual
corrections? What is your process for rectifying such errors in
the published record? Do you typically deal with these in a
second printing, or a later edition? I will greatly appreciate
your assistance, and Happy New Year! Best wishes,

John M Jenkins

January 6
Hi John,
We would typically issue the errata as a sheet that is inserted in
existing inventory plus correct in future printings. I presume
you have an error that you would like to suggest a correction
for in one of our titles?

Best,
Darrin

January 6
Dear Darrin,
Yes, several actually. There is, of course, the principle of errors
needing correction, for the published record. More so, these
particular errors have impinged upon the reception of my own
work, and at least one of them has been cited by other scholars
as an erroneous precedent for dismissing my work. There's
been a consequent chain of difficulties.

I appreciate you hearing my concerns. I am happy to provide
specific quotes and page citations and documentation on the
needed corrections. My own books typically have had typos or

other things corrected in a second printing. However, as I mentioned these mistakes are of a more substantial nature. The critical question at this stage is: Has there been any substantial corrections made to a second printing or edition of Anthony Aveni's 2009 book *2012: The End of Time*?

I hope we can address and resolve the situation smoothly. By the way, I used to review books for Colorado Libraries magazine, back in the 1990s. Did University Press of Colorado titles. I live up by Loveland now. Best wishes,

John M Jenkins

January 7

Dear John,

No, no second printing or edition of Anthony Aveni's 2009 book, *The End of Time*. As far as that book is concerned, it pretty much stopped selling after the world didn't end on December 21, 2012. I highly doubt we will reprint the book for that very reason: it was about a specific moment in time that has now passed. New interested readers are now almost non-existent.

Best,
Darrin

January 7

Darrin,

It seems then that Aveni himself didn't contact you in 2011 with an important correction that he had privately acknowledged?

Since the book doesn't sell anymore, how can we effectively correct the publishing record, regarding the several factual errors that had, and continue to have, deleterious repercussions?

I'm sure that the book was purchased by libraries — especially many university and college libraries, given its "officially sanctioned" academic publisher status — and will remain on those shelves indefinitely as a respected resource. (As a historical episode, we should expect that "2012" will be of some interest to future Mayanists, historians, and researchers; much ink is still being spilled over less notable events in history.)

It doesn't seem that an errata sheet in the pages of the books that remain in stock would be very effective. Do you have a place for corrections on your website? Or is there some other way that needed corrections to academically published books get registered? Best wishes,

John

January 7

Hi John,

I'm sure we can figure something out. Could you send the corrections along for me to take a look at?

Best,
Darrin

January 8

Darrin,

I certainly hope so. I'm attaching a word document. The errors are conveniently listed and cited on the first page. In my list I focused on explicit factual errors, and they could be re-phrased as an errata. In addition, it would be great if you or an assistant could read the extended narrative, which explains and supports the corrections and my other points. The narrative story drives home the problems better than the simple list.

This would be less of an issue if four scholars (in one trade book and two peer-review journal articles) did not cite Aveni's flawed assessments as a means of dismissing my work. I've added these sources at the end of the file; I think we could add another article written by John Hoopes (IAU Vol. 7, no. 278, 2011).

My unusual journey as an independent Maya scholar has brought me to the point of publishing a "review-essay" in a peer-review journal last year, with another being shopped around. The one publication was achieved with some difficulty. To have false statements about me and my work published in Aveni's book under the approval of an AAUP university press harms my publishing and teaching opportunities. Apart from this, simply on principle these errors should be corrected.

Thank for your consideration of these items and for wanting there to be a solution. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Note: I attached my "Aveni Errors" document, which is my official Complaint File, to the above email. Please see the next item (Item IIc) for the complete file, and continue with the ensuing email exchange below.

January 8

Hi John,

I will review soon and get back to you.

Best,
Darrin

Eleven days elapse and Mr Pratt sent me an update:

January 19

Hi John,

Still working my way through this and wrapping my head around the factual errors you are asking us to address. I'm about to be out of the office for the better part of two weeks, though, and I wanted you to know that my response may therefore be delayed a bit further. Sorry for that.

It is on my to-do list though.

Best,
Darrin

January 19

Darrin,

Thank you for the update. There should be no ambiguity in the errors that I chose to address. I selected factual errors and emphasized how some of them were parroted and cited by other scholars, to the detriment of my work and misrepresentation of my religious persuasion. There are six, listed on the first page, with a seventh discussed at the end of the file.

I'm sure your sales data confirm that there are over 600 library holdings listed on Worldcat for Aveni's book — the vast majority on the shelves of college, technical, and university libraries. I'm not sure what the standard procedure of academic publishers is for setting the record straight, or for officially acknowledging the needed corrections. You mentioned an errata sheet inserted into as-yet unsold copies. But as we previously discussed, the current very low sales of the book makes this a not very good solution.

I suppose the first step would be to simply acknowledge the errors, to establish an agreement that there is a problem, and then go from there. Given the clear factual bases of the errors, is this something you can do, or are you having to run it by others, or perhaps even Aveni? I think the errors are transparently clear, and easy to confirm. I don't know how else to frame a discussion of the situation, except to say that these factual errors should be acknowledged and corrected. If a phone call would be better, let me know. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

January 19

Hi John,

I understand your point of view here, but you are asking me to trust that these are indeed factual errors. I'm a publisher, not an expert on these particular matters. Issuing an errata before I understand an errata is, in fact, necessary, would be premature. Because these are not minor typos or things that fall within the rubric of the publisher's expertise, this requires a bit of additional work on my part. And that does mean checking in with people who know more than I do.

Best,
Darrin

Thirty days pass, and Pratt sends me his unwavering assessment in 167 words:

February 18, 2015

Dear John,

After discussing this with valued advisors, I do not believe that issuing an errata sheet for Anthony Aveni's *The End of Time* is warranted. What you describe in your Word document detailing the purported factual errors may or may not, in fact, be errors. Certainly the author does not agree that he is in error on these points, other than one point I believe he has already confirmed with and that he is in the process of correcting.

Scholars disagree about minor and major issues all the time, and the usual scholarly way to handle this is to write your own

article refuting the claims with which you disagree. In my opinion, and those of my advisors, that would be the correct process for the errors you identify here, rather than issuing an errata.

I know this is not the answer you wanted to hear, and I am sorry for that. Hopefully you will be able to find a venue to communicate your disagreements with Dr. Aveni.

Best,
Darrin

February 20

Darrin,

There are parts of your email that are contradictory and ambiguous, and I really need some clarification. We already agreed that an errata sheet would not be a meaningful solution. I might next suggest, noting your assurance that "we can figure something out" (email of Jan. 7) that you simply issue a statement, to me, that could serve as an official correction, but you state that the "purported" errors I identified "may, or may not, in fact be errors." So, you are saying that after six weeks you and your valued advisors were unable to determine with any certainty whether or not any of the seven "purported" errors are actually errors (apart from the one I noted that Aveni already acknowledged)? Is this correct?

Were your "valued advisors" legal consul or knowledgeable academic reviewers of the points?

It appears that you sent my list to Aveni for comment. Is this correct, and did he receive my entire file for review? And, just to be absolutely clear, you then state that he "certainly ... does not agree that he is in error on these points" (except for the one previously noted). This is information he conveyed to you after you sent him my entire list, with my fuller explication? Being clear on these points will be helpful as I take your advice and seek correcting the record through other channels. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

February 23

Hi John,

My advisors do not agree that these are errors, so when I said that they "may, or may not, in fact be errors," I meant that I was not in a position to judge between their scholarly opinion and your scholarly opinion. I'm a book publisher. You say Aveni's wrong, he says he's not and other say he is not, but who am I to judge? Nevertheless, the fact that this is not clear cut from my point of view does not argue for issuing either an errata or official correction.

I did send the list to Aveni for comment as well, and he did receive the entire file with fuller explication.

Best,
Darrin

February 24

Dear Darrin,

This is not an issue of one opinion against another, or a “point of view.” It’s a question of verifying facts. In my email of January 8, I carefully selected seven factual errors, out of many baseless anecdotal assertions and presumptuous insinuations that Aveni made in his book, which could perhaps be debated from various viewpoints. But I intentionally selected and presented to you factual errors. So, as an example, it should be very easy for anyone, including yourself, to verify one of Aveni’s factual errors. Google “Terence McKenna Invisible Landscape” and you find the Wikipedia page for McKenna (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terence_McKenna). It verifies that *The Invisible Landscape* was published in 1975, not 1971 as Aveni stated, and was a full-length hardback book, not a “booklet” as Aveni stated. So, this is a two-pronged error. But your advisers “do not agree that these are errors” (and neither does Aveni).

You claim you must defer to advisers on these matters. But as a publisher, verifying such publication details, as in the example above, is indeed within your area of expertise. You probably have a publication database, or website, you frequently reference on related questions.

That your advisers were not able or willing to perform two minutes of due diligence to verify this particular error, and have directly misinformed you on this being an error, should be a red flag for you, as the Director of the University Press of Colorado, a member of the AAUP and for 50 years the trusted publishing arm of the University of Colorado. Your academic press is clearly employing fact-checkers and peer-review advisers who are either not doing their jobs very well or are biased.

Do you think you could take 12 seconds to click on that link above, scroll down to the Bibliography heading, and read the publication year of the first edition of the McKenna brothers’ book? Thank you. You must now be wondering if your advisers were mistaken in their assessment of *the other* factual errors I identified in Aveni’s book, correct?

February 24

Hi John,

I was focused on errors of more scholarly significance than the bibliography date for the book/booklet. To me, that particular item is tangential and non-significant compared to other issues you raised, such as your January 8 assertion that “To have false statements about me and my work published in Aveni’s book under the approval of an AAUP university press harms my publishing and teaching opportunities.”

December 21, 2012 has passed, the world has not ended, and, as a consequence, Tony’s book is dead in the water and no longer selling. Ergo there is nothing selling in which to post an errata for a correction of a minor nature like the one you point out, and there is no future printing in the offing that provides an opportunity for a correction. Nor does it seem of such significance that it warrants a statement of correction issued to you, particularly when you are neither the author nor publisher of the 1975 volume.

On the matters of greater significance, whether or not the book contained factual errors is open to debate and should be corrected that way, through debate in scholarly venues.

I’m sorry that you are unhappy with the lack of resolution obtained here, and I hope you will find a scholarly outlet to continue the debate.

Best,
Darrin

February 25

Darrin,

I am not looking for a debate. I am looking for the University Press of Colorado to behave like a professional, responsible, academic organization. The reason I reiterated error #6, and indicated to you how it could be easily proven to indeed be an error, was because in your previous several emails you had stated that your advisers, the author, and you did not agree that there were any certain errors (apart from one Aveni already previously acknowledged). It was a simple demonstration, in one example, that there was indeed an error — and this contradicts your insistent assertions. Now, unlike before, you seem to acknowledge that this is an error. Why was this not acknowledged before?

You are correct in noting that there are other, more serious issues, contained in Aveni’s book. Now that you have acknowledged that I have raised valid issues of “some significance,” let’s review how you have responded to them. After six weeks you sent me 167 words in which you evaded addressing the facts of the matter and declared that none of the “purported” errors could be substantiated by your advisers, and the author (Aveni) also did not agree they were errors. This very unprofessional, evasive, and irrational response prompted me to reflect back to you what you have communicated to me, in the hopes that you would see your contradictions and the patent absurdity of your position.

The most serious error is the fact that Aveni used his perception of my religious persuasion to judge my scholarly work on Maya astronomy, calendars, and cosmology. I’m sorry to be so clear in the identification of this as bigotry, but that’s what it is. Gnosticism is a religion. It’s not my religion, but Aveni used his false construction that it is, as a means of negatively judging my character and my scholarly work to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy and mythological beliefs.

I can understand how you would like this to go away, but I assure you it will not. You must ask yourself if your circularly evasive and contradictory efforts to make this go away are congruent with the values and principles upon which academic publishing rests. Rather than publish these errors in some other way, as you suggest, I would certainly prefer that a written acknowledgement of this error, and all the other errors, be made. You should start over and enlist some unbiased advisers who aren’t on payroll or otherwise have self-interest at stake.

John Major Jenkins

Item 1c. Complaint with Aveni's errors sent to Pratt

Some Errors Needing Correction in Aveni's 2009 Book, 2012: The End of Time

John Major Jenkins. January 7, 2015

There are at least six factual errors in Aveni's 2009 book that are worth noting for correction. A concise list of the errors is given below, but please read the narrative for a fuller explication:

1. Incorrect assessment of Grofe's methodology of approach, with a resulting thumbs-down assessment of Grofe's findings. Page 105.
 2. Incorrect assessment of the direction of the rate of precessional change, with resulting incorrect assertion as to the inaccuracy of Grofe's findings. Page 96.
- Note: Grofe's work provides support for the precessional premise of my 2012 astronomy work. The two errors above had deleterious repercussions in that they were cited and adopted by at least four other scholars, in order to show that my work was not viable or had been "debunked."
3. Aveni's supporting citation to a section of my 1998 book that does not, in fact, provide support for his demeaning assertion about my attitude toward Maya scholars and their critiques. Pages 23-24.
 4. The use of religious bigotry as a critique: The false assertion that I belong to the religion called Gnosticism, packaged with his bigoted application of his belief, supposedly demonstrating that a Gnostic religious persuasion invalidates ones scholarly work. Pages 15-16, 18, 23, 158-159.
 5. Factually incorrect statement regarding the Izapa ballcourt's horizon alignment, 48° in error. Pages 54-55.
 6. Incorrect reporting of the McKenna brothers' book as a "booklet" published in "1971". Page 16.

Fuller Treatment

There are two errors regarding Aveni's assessment of Michael Grofe's work on Maya astronomy and the precession of the equinoxes, found on pages 105 and 96. The **first factual error** in my list (p. 105) involves Aveni's incorrect assumption (despite what Grofe actually stated about his methodology in his 2007 PhD dissertation, and elsewhere) that Grofe was looking for modern astronomical values in the ancient Maya inscriptions. This false assumption provoked Aveni to criticize values that didn't precisely agree with modern values. This critique missed the entire point of Grofe's approach, which was to identify the values used by the ancient Maya. (And those might, understandably, be slightly different than modern values).

Aveni's **second error** (p. 96) is that he assessed the changing rate of precession *backwards*, resulting in his

incorrect assertion that Grofe's calculations were inaccurate. These two items, together, were the bulwark of Aveni's critique of Grofe's work, which, accurately understood, provides great support for the core premise of my own work on the precessional alignment in era-2012. The errors enshrined in Aveni's book have had repercussions in being cited and adopted by other scholars. For example, Restall & Solari (2011) called Aveni's critique "brilliant" and concluded that my 2012 alignment work had been "debunked."

Other scholars who specifically cited Aveni in arguments that my work was not viable, include Whiteside & Hoopes (2014). I critiqued their 2012 essay in my own peer-review paper, published with some difficulty in an effort that extended, with various ancillary efforts, into October of 2014. I noticed a few of Aveni's errors upon my first reading of his book, in late October of 2009. Grofe noticed the errors and corrected Aveni in a private email, *which Aveni acknowledged*. In his IAU paper, Grofe wrote:

In his critique of my work, Aveni (2009: 105) clearly misunderstands that I am attempting to derive an indigenous Maya value for the sidereal year, which remains stable for thousands of years, rather than using any contemporary value for precession, which relies on the length of the tropical year and therefore does vary over time. Aveni's calculations of the change in the rate of precession are in error throughout, in that he miscalculates that the decreased rate of precession in the past leads to a shorter cycle of precession when it actually leads to a longer cycle (*ibid.*: 96). In addition, Aveni incorrectly interprets my results by claiming that the 218-day shift of the Copán tropical year occurs over the 30,000+ year interval between the Serpent Base and the Era Base, rather than over the correct 15,009 sidereal year interval from the introductory distance number in the preface (Grofe 2011:221 - IAU, Cambridge U Press).

Note that Grofe enumerates a total of *three* errors (the third being in the last sentence above). I emphasized the first two as they relate directly to the precession question, which impinged on the assessment of the viability of my work by other scholars.

The **third error** in my list involves Aveni's citation (pgs. 23-24) to a section of my 1998 book that *does not contain support for his assertions*; in fact, *it contradicts* his assertions. Aveni asserted a demeaning characterization of my attitude and reaction to scholars, which is not supported by the source he cites. Observe: On pages 23-24, Aveni stated that "Jenkins' ideas have not been well received among mainstream Maya scholars, who place little stock in subjective analogies and knowledge acquired through revelation" (implying, falsely, that this is my *modus operandi*). Aveni continues: "Meanwhile, freelancer Jenkins responds by disparaging the academic community of Mayanists who, he says, have shut him out and ignored him."¹⁸

As support for his statement, the superscripted end-note 18 refers to Appendix 5 in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (see the note on p. 168 of his book). If you would like to read my entire Appendix 5, I will send it. My quotes below make my point. Again, Aveni's assertion that I was "disparaging the academic community of Mayanists" and that I say I've been "shut out and ignored" is not supported. The

issue here is that, in that entire appendix, *there is no statement or even an insinuation by me that I am complaining about being "ignored" or "shut out."* My appendix responds in a clear and cordial manner to Linda Schele's critique of 2012 ideas, including a few that are central to my work. My response is titled "Response to Counterarguments".

To heighten the irony, if we actually read my Appendix 5, which Aveni cites as support for his misleading comments, we find me supportively citing Aveni himself in my penultimate concluding paragraph (bolding added for emphasis):

If we do not allow these ancient skywatchers to have been sophisticated enough to notice precession, we relegate the alignment of 2012 A.D. to the unexamined bin of "coincidence." To conclude that this is coincidence pushes our thoughts beyond credible bounds of reason. The alternative, as resistant as many will be, is that the creators of the Long Count calendar calculated the rate of precession over 2,000 years ago. **Few Maya scholars are as qualified to comment on this point as archaeoastronomer Anthony Aveni, who wrote, "Ancient astronomers easily could detect the long-term precessional motion . . . Through myth and legend the earliest skywatchers transmitted their consciousness of the passage of the vernal equinox along the zodiac from constellation to constellation" (1980:103).** In the interest of clarity, I will mention that it would be more accurate to say that the alignment occurs in *the era* of A.D. 2012; because precession is such a slow phenomenon, fifty years on either side of 2012 might be appropriate. Of course, this wider timespan strengthens the position of the coincidentalists.

In summary, it is true that December 21, 2012 does not represent "the end of the Maya calendar." Such generic phraseology rarely results in clarity. Though I continue to occasionally use "end-date" as a casual convention, the more accurate identification, one that is perfectly true, is "the end-date of the 13-baktun cycle of the Maya Long Count." Schele's argument that a 20-baktun cycle had precedence over the 13-baktun cycle is not well founded, confusing what one seventh-century Maya ruler said about the nature of the Long Count with what the original creators of it intended. A repeating 13-baktun cycle is implied wherever Creation monuments have been found—for example, at Coba and Quirigua. Rather than looking at Classic Period examples to define the nature of the Long Count, we need to look carefully at who created the Long Count system, and where and when it arose. This consideration sends us back to the little understood Middle Pre-Classic period of the Ixapan civilization (Jenkins 1998:361).

To give a sense for the tone of my comments, the very first paragraph of my appendix reads:

This appendix grew out of a need to respond to "Comments on the Creation Date," posted on the Mesoamerican Archaeology Homepage website by Linda Schele, April 1996. The so-called "end-date" of the thirteen-baktun cycle of the Maya Long Count in A.D. 2012 has been the subject of internet discussions, and in early 1996 Linda Schele responded to a question regarding the Long Count. She

addressed the importance the Maya applied to the date in A.D. 2012, and reiterated her viewpoint as found in *A Forest of Kings* (1990): "The Maya, however, did not conceive this to be the end of creation, as many have suggested" (82). This basically sums up her position on the meaning of the 13-baktun cycle end-date in 2012. The statement is essentially correct, because the Maya believed that time is cyclic, but continuing ambiguities demand that we clarify our terms and ask some more pointed questions regarding this date. I have always made an effort to refer to this date more specifically as "the end-date of the thirteen-baktun cycle of the Maya Long Count calendar," and I do not concur with the Neo-Atlantean pole-shift cataclysmologists on the idea that the world will literally end in 2012. With this distinction in mind, I admit that I still occasionally write, as a shorthand note, "end-date" or "end-date in 2012." This does not mean that I believe the Maya calendar or the world will end in A.D. 2012. However, as I will show, it is clear that the 2012 date was singularly important for the people who created the Long Count calendar (Jenkins 1998:357).

In reading these excerpts, does one get the same sense about my position regarding scholarly critics that Aveni painted, and cited to this appendix in my book? I really need to underscore this strongly: there is NOTHING in that cited source to support Aveni's misleading and disparaging characterization of me. AND, in fact, the appendix shows me engaging the critical counterarguments in a productive, informed, reasonable, and fact-based manner.

A **fourth error** involves a false assertion as to my religious persuasion. In addition, we find what can only be described as bigotry applied as a critique. The evidence for this occurs over several pages of a constructed narrative, with several specific identifying statements in various places throughout the book. Early in his book Aveni constructs a framework in which various authors are framed as belonging to a belief system, and an approach to 2012 and the Maya, that he characterizes as "Gnostic." On pages 15-16, Aveni cites a scholar of Gnosticism (R. Grant) for a definition of Gnosticism, and writes:

One scholar has characterized Gnosticism as a mixture of eastern religions couched in the language of Greek philosophy and originating in "an atmosphere of intense otherworldliness and imaginative myth making." **These words fit today's 2012 wisdom seekers like a glove.** [emphasis added]

That "today's 2012 wisdom seekers" include authors of 2012 books, such as myself, is suggested here *and then confirmed* in his following paragraphs in which he offers a definition of Gnosticism in a modern context followed by a sequential discussion of its purveyors. Speaking of the writings of the ridiculed "Y12ers":

Often laced with scientific language, this new brand of Gnosticism is built around the basic idea that all existences originate in a higher power that manifests itself by successive emotions that take the form of turning points, or turnovers, of eons.

(Successive emotions?) His immediate sequential treatment of 2012 writers then begins with the preamble “let us take a look at some of these professed, latter-day wisdom seekers”, showing how Aveni believes that the following authors belong to the category of “Gnostic” wisdom seekers. The litany includes, in sequence, Geoff Stray, Terence McKenna, myself (John Major Jenkins), Carl Calleman, Daniel Pinchbeck, Lawrence Joseph, and Whitley Streiber. He tacks on, for good measure, a few Maya “elders” and “seers”.

Aveni introduces my own work (p. 18) as a “prognosis” with “mystical overtones” for “timing the advent of earthly paradise.” This kind of misleading, semantically loaded, low-resolution assessment is on par with saying that Einstein believes if you run really fast you won’t age. Generally, his paraphrases and sketches of my work on page 23 are extremely misleading and flawed — even when he quotes me directly. How can this be? Three reasons, and these are general problems that are hard to fix with errata, but which occur throughout: **He quotes me out of context, imputes dubious intentions onto me which seem to exist only in his imagination, and he never cites my follow-up book to *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998), which clarified and updated some of my interpretations (*Galactic Alignment*, 2002).** In short, Aveni appears to be poorly informed about my work and findings, despite our email exchange of April 2008. Another possibility is that he is sufficiently informed but chooses to not summarize it accurately, instead crafting dismissals of it that rely heavily on jingoistic insinuations and *ad hominem* jabs. I really don’t know how these things passed peer-review.

According to Aveni, Gnosticism is a gateway that leads ineluctably to Blavatsky and using terms like “galactic.” On pages 157-158, Aveni cleverly merges Arguelles’s mystical use of the term “galactic” with my chapter title “The Forgotten Galactic Paradigm”, and asserts that this is a place where can be found “a quintessential 21st-century version of the star-fixed ages of humanity” and a “Blavatskian appeal.” (My disagreements with Blavatsky’s Theosophy are found in my 2002 book.) This is a clever guilt-by-association construct that other critics, like John Hoopes, like to employ. Regarding Arguelles, the huge gulf of difference between how he and I used the term “galactic” might have been noted by Aveni, but that would have mitigated his deceptively asserted “guilt-by-association” construct. His summary of what my chapter contains (quoted above) has an apparent cogency because Blavatsky, following Hindu notions, espoused a World Age doctrine, much like the Maya did. The Maya World Age doctrine has been noted by researchers like myself, Gordon Brotherston, Eva Hunt, Linda Schele, Zelia Nuttall, and others, who correctly identified the World Age doctrine within the Maya Creation Myth. Despite evidence in the Maya Creation Myth and calendar to the contrary, Aveni has been adamantly anti-World Age for decades, I suppose ever since his debates with Linda Schele. The insinuation that my interpretations derive from Blavatsky is a logical fallacy. Furthermore, and more importantly, *his idea that my chapter contains any kind of “appeal” is totally wrong — it’s a concise summary of the findings within the book.* The flaw here is identical to **error number 3** — the cited source does not contain support for what was asserted.

Continuing on page 158, he calls me “prophet Jenkins” (10th line from top) and suggests my words indicate that I am a promoter of “galactically derived higher wisdom” (his words). I have never prophesied or predicted anything specific about 2012, and only in a qualified sense have I suggested there is a “prophecy” for cycle endings in the Maya Creation Mythology. That is a reconstruction of an embedded Maya prophecy, of a type, that resides within the Maya Creation Myth — namely, simply that the vain and false ruler Seven Macaw was expected to appear at the end of the cycle. That’s not even really a prophecy. And it’s not me gazing into a crystal ball and predicting what’s going to happen in 2012, as his label is misleadingly intended to suggest to his readers.

His odd belief that I promote a “galactically derived higher wisdom” somehow follows from me musing that a spiritual awakening offers “conscious relationship with each other and a creative participation in the Earth process that gives birth to our higher selves.” Oddly, Aveni writes that there is “nothing new here”, and then he segues cleverly into a quote about alien civilizations and an “Encyclopedia Galactica” that can provide “improvements in our lives that we cannot predict.” The reader is teased to believe this is another quote from me, but then, surprise! No, Aveni writes, these are not the words of “a Gnostic New Age prophet” (158, 7th line from bottom). ***Here we find specific evidence that Aveni does, in fact, assert that I am a “Gnostic.”*** (The phrase “New Age Gnostics” is used frequently in the book, e.g., p 151.) As Aveni reveals, the quote is actually from SETI scientist Frank Drake, who was musing about his belief in our inevitable encounter with beings from other planets. Aveni then forces an analogy between 2012 and galactic aliens, and leaps from me to a “galactic club” quote from Jose Arguelles, thus bringing his deceptive guilt-by-association construct full circle.

Here, Aveni is crafting a link between my use of the word “galactic” (which refers in my work to an astronomy-based paradigm utilizing the Milky Way galaxy in my precessional alignment reconstruction) and the mystical mumbo-jumbo of Arguelles. But Aveni goes further and asks why people are fixated on that word, “galactic.” He asks an expert and finds that it involves a fear of “things that are psychologically incomprehensible and even threatening” and, perhaps, the hope for a “hidden meaning” (159). So, in less than two pages Aveni crafts a thread of insinuating false assertions that leads very far away from my intention in titling a chapter in my book “The Forgotten Galactic Paradigm.” (Sorry for the length; I’m laying out his narrative and his specific comments regarding the “Gnostic” charge).

The material I sketched above shows Aveni’s various references to me as a “Gnostic”, with false and forced arguments that associate me with dubious writers and concepts. His belief is that such a religious persuasion is highly suspect and conflicts with doing sound scholarship. First of all, I do not belong to the church of Gnosticism. I don’t know how else to say this; I am simply not a member of that church, in the same way that I am not Jewish, Muslim, or Hindu. Thus his **fourth**

factual error is his assertion that my religion is Gnosticism and I am a Gnostic. But what if I was? Since when does ones religious affiliation serve as a lynchpin for denouncing ones scholarly work? It is unclear how Aveni's bigotry has gone unnoticed and was given a pass. None of his reviewers have noted it; none of his fact-checkers or peer-reviewers caught it. Rather, it seems to have been allowed as a viable applied critique to myself and other 2012 writers. I don't think that bigotry is an acceptable method of academic critique. This should be considered another error worth addressing and, somehow, "correcting", but it is more egregious than a mere factual error — it is an ethical error and a violation of scholarly principles.

I have, in fact, written about gnosis, as one of many forms of knowledge within a hierarchy of ontological states — and one closely related to the type of knowledge glimpsed by shamans, including Maya king-shamans — but Aveni demonstrates that he doesn't care about *what I've actually written* and his understanding of it is completely lacking. His definition of Gnosticism and the beliefs he imputes to Gnostics don't correspond at all to my own ideas or my understanding of Gnosticism and gnosis. Chapters in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment* — a book he doesn't cite — explored this topic within the context of the Perennial Philosophy and non-duality in Oriental Metaphysics. He doesn't demonstrate that I am a Gnostic, he merely asserts it. And it is FALSE. His definitions of it are not congruent with my ideas and my work, but he asserts the label anyway. If I was Jewish, and he used my Judaic faith as a means of putting down my scholarship, I think we'd be having a very different kind of conversation here, one that has great potential for high profile media coverage. Even though his assertion that my religion is Gnosticism is wrong, his argument remains an applied bigotry that intolerantly disparages and discredits, using misinformation and false premises.

Error number five, the Izapa ballcourt alignment. On page 54 Aveni writes that I "refer to the solstice alignment of Group F ballcourt." Yes, I did, in my 1996 monograph called *Izapa Cosmos* and in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. Notice, however, in his loose lingo he doesn't specify which solstice. It is the December solstice sunrise. In actual fact, I was *the first person* to calculate and publish this December solstice sunrise alignment of the Izapan ballcourt — *four years before the Aveni & Hartung publication that Aveni actually cites*. Despite our email conversations and letters going back to 1996, Aveni neglects to correctly cite my prior discovery and publication of this alignment. I was unaware of Aveni's obscure 2000 publication until 2009, when he told me about it at the Tulane conference. On page 54 of his book he danced around acknowledging my independent discovery and first publication of it. But the real issue here is that Aveni reports the ballcourt alignment incorrectly! He writes: "Indeed, we found it to align approximately 1 degree off the December solstice sunset / June solstice sunrise direction" (54). No, it isn't to the "December solstice sunset / June solstice sunrise" (this would be a 66° azimuth), but to the December solstice sun**RISE** / June solstice sun**SET** direction (a 114° azimuth).

Disregarding the ambiguity of his "1 degree off" statement (my actual solstice observations at the site, adjusted for the

changing obliquity of the ecliptic and horizon features, reports less of an error), we nevertheless have a very unfortunate reporting error, amounting to a substantial **azimuth error of 48 degrees**. And although this is no doubt simply an unfortunate conceptual guffaw (much like his errors in assessing the Sidereal Year and the precession of the equinoxes in Grofe's work), there is no other explicit, correct, statement about it in Aveni's book. (There is a description of the chart on the next page that mentions a clustering in the 20° – 30° range off the cardinal directions which "matches winter solstice sunrise and June solstice sunset", but I'm afraid the reader is unlikely to get the connection, as it is stated separately and outside of the previous Izapa ballcourt discussion.) So, on a very important point that is the centerpiece of my reconstruction work on the astronomical concerns of the Izapans, we have factually wrong and contradictory information given to the reader.

Factual error number 6. He calls the McKenna brothers' *Invisible Landscape* book a "booklet" published in "1971" (p. 16). He must never have seen it, let alone read it. It's a standard-sized book, first edition hardback, published in 1975. This is just one of several typos (or sloppy research or bad fact-checking standards) I ran across, but I prefer to focus on the more serious errors as described above.

There is one final comment in Aveni's book that I'd like to highlight for its misleading quality. I guess this could be called **error number 7**. This error is on par with Aveni's mistakes regarding Grofe's work. In discussing how the Maya might have been tracking precession, he writes:

Or you could track "one day of precession" by noting the slow shifting of the stars in the zenith, or the shifting dates of solar relative to stellar zenith passages, as some investigators have suggested¹⁰ (104).

The end-note 10 refers to Appendix 3 and other pages in my 1998 book. The reference is to my identification of the sun and the Pleiades conjoining in the zenith as a central element in the New Fire Ceremony, which I discovered was also embedded into the architecture and orientation of the Pyramid of Kukulcan at Chichen Itza. This was unprecedented work, argued over several chapters in my book, though Aveni characterizes it as being "suggested" by "some investigators" (plural).

The problem here is how he dismisses it in the next sentence: "Once again, however, the problem is that stars shift at a variable rate" (104). This is true for stars that are not on or very close to the ecliptic. My model utilizes the sun (which is by definition on the ecliptic) and the Pleiades star cluster, which is very close to the ecliptic. Unlike stars far from the ecliptic, both of these shift at a constant rate with precession. The model involves the fact that the sun will be at the nadir when the Pleiades pass through the zenith *at midnight* (in November, which defines the New Fire Ceremony and the end of a 52-Haab Calendar Round). Consequently, I noted that this means the sun and the Pleiades will be in conjunction exactly six months later, in May. The timing of this conjunction shifts with precession and slowly approaches the date of the solar zenith-passage in late May. The specific date of the solar

zenith-passage is a function of latitude, but at Chichen Itza it targets a precessional alignment of “the sun and the Pleiades in the zenith” that is occurring in the 21st century AD — thus coordinating, via a totally different method of precessional calculation, with the Long Count’s era-2012 galactic alignment.

Thus, my work reconstructs how the Pyramid of Kukulcan, combined with the New Fire Ceremony, is a “precessional star clock set in stone” (Jenkins 1996, 1998). And the “Forgotten Galactic Paradigm” (which I also refer to as “the galactic cosmology”) involves the coordination of these two cosmologies at 9th-century Chichen Itza. This has nothing to do with Arguelles’s “galactic” ideas, as Aveni earlier portrayed. Aveni’s rationale for dismissing the relevance of this work is flawed because the solar and stellar features are not subject to the “variable rate” he states is “the problem” (that would only effect stars not on, or very close to, the ecliptic).

Michael Grofe (2011). “[Measuring Deep Time.](#)” Also on his [Academia.edu page.](#)

Book and articles that cited Aveni’s errors favorably as a premise for dismissing my work:

Restall & Solari (2011). *2012 and the End of the World.* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers). Restall is Professor of Colonial Latin American History, Anthropology and Women’s Studies at Penn State; Solari is Associate Professor of Art History and Anthropology at Penn State.

John Hoopes. 2011 (Review of Aveni’s book). *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXII. (UT Press). Anthropology professor at Kansas State University. Posted on Mark Van Stone’s website.

Item 1d. Second round of emails with Pratt (May 2015)

April 30, 2015

Dear Darrin Pratt,

It’s come to my attention that the University Press of Colorado is publishing, next month, a scholarly anthology titled *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*:

<http://upcolorado.com/university-press-of-colorado/item/2693-cosmology-calendars-and-horizon-based-astronomy-in-ancient-mesoamerica>

I have reason to be concerned about possible erroneous statements made in this book by Anthony Aveni, based on the experience I had with you in January-February (2015). As you will recall, I presented to you several factual errors in Aveni’s 2009 book, published with your press, that you and your advisers evaded acknowledging and refused to offer a correction of, as per your stated errata policy. These errors were enumerated clearly to you, and they reflected badly on my reputation and my work to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy.

Based upon this recent circumstance, I am concerned that you may overlook or condone and, ultimately, as before, protect false statements made by Aveni about my perceived religion and my work. I also suspect that the same poor vetting and fact checking might also apply to other authors in the anthology, such as John B. Carlson and Ed Krupp, both of whom have published or stated false things about my work. I would suspect that the protectionism you extended to Aveni would also be extended to these two other authors, should they decide to slip into their essays potentially slanderous and factually incorrect things about my work and my character.

For separate testimony and confirmation of the errors in Aveni’s book that I sent you in January, which you subsequently denied, I have collected assessments by reputable scholars and scientists who all confirm that the errors I sent you are indeed errors. This will be useful if an unresolved situation needs to be dealt with via a cease-and-desist order, until my current questions are resolved.

My purpose in contacting you is to request that a pre-publication copy or file of the forthcoming book (*Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*, edited by Dowd and Milbrath) be sent to me so that I can check it for your press’s continuing publication of false statements about me, my perceived religion, and my work on Maya cosmology that will, as before, misinform other scholars, distort the published record, and be potentially damaging to my reputation and career. I will not accept your verbal assurance that no such statements exist in the forthcoming book, due to your evasions and unreliable contradictory assertions during our previous communication. Please inform me how you would prefer to send me a pre-publication review copy (print or digital). Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

[Note: My concerns expressed in this email proved to be warranted, because of Krupp’s indirect indication of my work via his “End Times Follies” category of denigration, in his Preface to the anthology, and the simultaneous echoing of my pioneering ideas about 2012 in the chapters by John B. Carlson and Clemency Coggins.]

May 7

Dear John,

Anthony Aveni has actually submitted 1 or 2 corrections based on your previous correspondence that will be made to the ebook edition. The print book is essentially dead in the water and we have only a handful of copies in stock.

He did not make all of the corrections you felt were necessary, because he does not agree that they are, in fact, errors. Once again, this is the way that scholarship progresses. People have differences of opinion. Those errors he feels were justified errors will be corrected, those that were not will not. If you or the other colleagues you have that support your view of the evidence would like to publish your own interpretation, you are, of course, free to do so. When the corrected ebook is available, I’ll send you a copy for your review.

Regarding the new book, is there some reason that you cannot simply purchase a copy? It would seem to be up your research alley, whether or not you agree with all of the scholars involved.

Best, Darrin

May 7

Darrin,

That's interesting news. I suppose that's a step in the right direction. It does counter what you insisted upon in your previous emails — that you, your advisors, and Aveni could not (or would not) confirm that any of my enumerated errors were actually errors. I'm glad I could play a role as an unpaid fact-checker, and I'm sure my name will now be added to the Acknowledgments. I would like to know which errors he still considers not to be errors because, in fact, they are all errors; thank you for when you send me a copy.

The new volume looks intriguing but was a concern to me because, as I mentioned, Krupp and Carlson both have a history of stating and publishing factually incorrect and denigrating characterizations of me and my work (much like Aveni). And since you were unable to effectively vet Aveni's false statements, I have good reason to suspect that similar assertions by Krupp and Carlson (if they are made in the forthcoming book) would also go unchecked. I was asking for a pre-press copy so I could perform the effective fact-checking myself. I've had to do a lot of damage control on unethical and under-informed scholars, regarding their unprofessional and inaccurate shredding of my reputation and my work. So, my request was a kind of anticipatory damage control. It's probably not that likely that they've mentioned my work — maybe Krupp? — but knowing one way or the other would determine my course of action and possibly avoid further embarrassment for your press. But I take it you don't want to send me a review copy. You are right in that the material is up my alley, and I could also review it for the Institute of Maya Studies Explorer magazine or even Colorado Libraries Journal (I reviewed Mesoamerican titles for them in the 1990s, including ones by UC Press). In any case, I'll find out soon enough.

I was curious, just by the way, of the cover photo of the Milky Way. Very nice. Did one of the editors or contributors supply that? I'd be very interest to know where and when that was taken — is there any byline credit for it in the book? Sincerely,

John

May 7

Hi John,

We did a universal search of the Dowd and Milbrath volume and you are not mentioned in the text at all. So I think you have nothing to be concerned about there. But the book is already published, so too late for a prepress check. Should be a credit for the image on the cover, yes.

Attached is the revised copy of the 2012 book in PDF format.

Best, Darrin

May 7

Great, thank you. I'll check it out. Best wishes,
John

Also May 7

Dear Darrin,

I believe you may have sent me an old un-revised PDF of Aveni's book. I don't see any changes/edits. In the file I sent you on January 8, which you said was sent to Aveni, errors #3-6, and error #7 discussed on pages 6-7 of the file, have not been addressed or changed in the PDF you sent. Neither are Aveni's errors in assessing Grofe's work, which are errors 1-2 in my file, edited or addressed. If you feel I've missed something, please indicate. Otherwise, I don't think I was sent the revised PDF. Sincerely,

John

May 8

[From Darrin Pratt]

OK, I'll ask.

May 11

[From Darrin Pratt]

Please note from production:

The highlighted Aveni text is attached here. The only change made based on Aveni's review of Mr. Jenkins' commentary is in note #12 on p. 173; the remainder are corrections that Tony himself requested a few years back.

See attached. [The same file was resent, now with changes highlighted]

May 12

Darrin,

So, to be clear, this is a revision for the eBook only? And this revised version is now released & available in the market, as of this month? I imagine there may be a slight uptick in sales due to the many mentions of Aveni's 2009 book in the recently released *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy*, which is essentially an homage dedicated to Aveni's work.

FYI, the comment Aveni added on p. 173 is the long-needed response to Grofe's correction, which I understand Aveni was already planning to make. I had indeed reiterated that problem in my list of 7 errors, but it appears that none of the other errors I enumerated were addressed by Aveni, including the Izapa ballcourt error and the incorrect publication date for the McKennas' book — which are basic factual errors. Do you have an explanation for this oversight?

Are you, as Aveni's academic publisher, simply acquiescing to the demands or dictates of your author, rather than applying an objective peer-review assessment of their statements, as is your mandate as an academic publisher and member of the AAUP? Isn't the scholar/author suppose to be subject to the

peer-review process facilitated by the academic publisher, rather than the academic publisher being subject to (i.e., controlled by) the dictates of the author/scholar?

John Major Jenkins

May 13

Hi John,

I think I've already answered your questions a couple of times at this stage. I'm sorry you feel that there are errors that we will not correct, but we, as a point of fact, do not agree that they are errors. Again, if you feel the need to correct the scholarly record, then you should publish your own piece that rebuts these points.

Please forgive me if I do not continue to reply to further correspondence on this matter, but I feel that the communication is going in circles and I have a lot on my plate to deal with. I wish that I could provide you better resolution, but this is the best that I can do.

Best,
Darrin

Item 1e. Email queries sent to AAUP Committee for Member Standards and Policy

From my behak72 gmail account, sent to Kyla Madden and then Susan Patton:

May 8, 2015

2014-2015

Committee Roster

Kyla Madden, McGill-Queen's, Chair

Allyson Carter, Arizona

Gabriel Dotto, Michigan State

Garrett Kiely, Chicago

Leila Salisbury, Mississippi

Eric Schwartz, Columbia

Board Liaison

Garrett Kiely, Chicago

Central Office Liaison

Susan Patton

Kyla Madden

Admissions & Standards Committee

<http://www.aaupnet.org/about-aaup/committees-a-task-forces>

Dear Kyla Madden,

I hope you can answer or direct my query to the appropriate person. I am working on a report on academic publishing ethics and standards. I've looked through the AAUP and under the Member Admissions & Standards page (the committee you chair) it is stated that one of the tasks of your office is to:

"Investigate any complaints regarding the failure of a member to adhere to the relevant standards of membership, and make appropriate recommendations for further action to the Central Office and the Board." At:

<http://www.aaupnet.org/about-aaup/committees-a-task-forces/admissions-a-standards#sthash.TOBhjGTf.dpuf>

My question is: What are the relevant "standards of membership"? Could you direct me to a resource either internal or external to your organization which you use as a guideline for these standards? We generally understand what constitutes sound scholarship and responsible academic publishing (e.g., regarding fact-checking and errata policy). My study assesses and compares the specific standards statements the different organizations use. For example, if one of your member presses fails to abide by stated standards, an investigation would proceed under your office. But what are those stated standards? Thank you for your consideration of my request. Sincerely,

J.M. Jenkins

May 8, 2015

Dear Mr Behak, [note: I had signed my letter as "J Jenkins"; but this gmail address had a previously used pen-name embedded in it.]

Thank you for your note and interest in the work of the AAUP.

The AAUP's web site contains a [Membership Guidelines page](#), which include information on the several categories of membership in the Association, what is required for admittance to each, and what is needed to maintain membership. I hope this page will help to answer your questions surrounding the standards observed by the Association.

If you have any follow-up questions you are welcome to contact Susan Patton, Membership Manager at the AAUP.

Best wishes,
Kyla

May 20

Dear Susan Patton,

As my previous email to Kyla Madden indicates (May 8), I'm interested in academic standards and the process by which your Member Publishers are approved and maintained. In the Membership Guidelines, the qualification of a "Full" member is verified/approved through their parent organization's committee or board:

(b) A committee or board of the faculty of the parent institution or institutions shall be charged with certifying the scholarly quality of the publications that bear the institutional imprint.

From your vantage point (the AAUP), if an issue of violating academic standards arises, would the member's board/committee then be tasked with investigating? Or would your office directly assess the complaint? Thank you,

J. M. Jenkins [Note my identification of myself]
behak72@gmail.com

May 27. Resent the above email to Susan Patton

May 27

Dear Jon Behak, [Again, she has read the pen-name username rather than my signature; I clarified this persistent misreading in a subsequent email to Susan and Kyla]

Thank you for your inquiry. To clarify, an applicant press qualifications are evaluated by the AAUP's Admissions and Standards Committee, the Board of Directors, and the AAUP voting membership. A member press is not vetted by its editorial board.

To be eligible for full membership AAUP members should meet the following requirements,

- (a) Eligible presses must be an integral part of one or more such colleges and universities, and should be so recognized in the manual of organization, catalog, website, or other official publication of at least one such parent institution. The organization and functions of the university press must lie within the prescription of its parent institution or institutions.
- (b) A committee or board of the faculty of the parent institution or institutions shall be charged with certifying the scholarly quality of the publications that bear the institutional imprint.
- (c) Publication of ten or more scholarly titles in the twenty-four months preceding the date of application shall be required for admission to full membership. Scholarly books, journals, and digital projects that include original scholarly content will all be counted to satisfy this requirement. The word "scholarly" is used here in the sense of original research of a character usually associated with the scholarly interests of a university or college. (Textbooks, manuals of a synthetic character or intended for class use, and publications for which the press serves primarily as a printer and/or distributor for other departments or divisions of the university or college are not to be included in the aforementioned minimum scholarly publishing requirement.)
- (d) An acceptable scholarly publishing program shall have the benefit of the service of not fewer than three full-time equivalent employees, of whom one shall have the rank and functions of director. This official shall report, organizationally, to the President of the university or college, or to an officer at the vice-presidential or decanal level (i.e., an officer reporting either to the President or to the chief academic officer) having both academic and fiscal authority, or to the designated representative of a group of such institutions who shall have both kinds of authority.

Below is the process for cancellation in the event a press is charged with failing to meet membership criteria.

A university press, by its very nature, must be devoted to scholarly and educational ends; the failure of a press to pursue such ends as its fundamental business shall constitute grounds for canceling its membership in the Association. Any accusation of such a failure will be brought to the Committee on Admissions and Standards for a recommendation to the Board. Cancellation of membership shall be effected, on recommendation of the Board of Directors, by a two-thirds' majority vote of the members present and voting at the Annual Meeting or a Special Meeting, a quorum being present.

I hope this helps. If you have any further questions, please let me know. Best,

Susan

Susan Patton
Membership Manager AAUP
28 West 36th Street #602
New York NY 10018
[212.989.1010](tel:212.989.1010) x 25
spatton@aaupnet.org
AAUP 2015 • June 18-20 Denver
aaupnet.org @aaupresses

June 9

Hi Susan,

Thank you for your helpful response. I think my interest, if I may focus in on this a little, is in regards to what resource the AAUP would use to judge that a member publisher might not be applying scholarly values in its editorial, fact checking, and peer-review process. This concern of mine seems most closely related to Item "b" of your guidelines, involving "the scholarly quality of the publications that bear the institutional imprint." But no further details are offered.

Here's the issue I'm trying to clarify in my query to you and other academic institutions. If, in the event that a complaint is filed against one of your member publishers, in regards to their practice of "scholarly quality" and academic standards, do you employ a standard objective reference against which the issue will be judged? The 2/3rds majority vote you mentioned suggests a subjective judgment of your Board Members, but from what objective resource for academic standards is the judgment being determined? I think, for example, of the guidelines drawn by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE): <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines> (see also their linked "Code of Conduct for Academic Publishers").

We all assume that scholars and scientists all know what good academic practice is, but I'm trying to determine what objective reference guidelines are employed, by AAUP and other institutions. Or is the judgment of the AAUP Board of Directors accepted at face value, without an explanation or citations to rules offered, as some objective standard? These standard guidelines could be as simple as rules for citation practices, support for arguments, peer-review anonymity or qualifications, and the application of errata policies. Again, we all learn this early on in our educations, but what is the standard reference that is being used?

I greatly appreciate you indulging me in my questions. By the way, I note the AAUP meeting in Denver, June 18-20. I'm considering attending, to see what's going on. Do you recommend? I live in Colorado. Best wishes,

John

June 9

Thanks for your response. I hope you don't mind if I can't provide a full response for a week or so. My other responsibility is organizing our annual meeting, so I'm overwhelmed with lots of little details. It's a great meeting and you are welcome to register. We've got more details here: <http://www.aaupnet.org/events-a-conferences/annual-meeting/aaup-2015>.

Hope to see you next week!

Susan

June 12

Okay, I understand. Sorry for my long email. In a nutshell, I'm wondering if AAUP employs a standard objective academic guideline resource, such as the one provided by COPE (Committee on Publishing Ethics), when assessing a "lapsed standards" complaint against one your member publishers? Thank you. [from John]

Item 1f. Cover letter with Complaint files forwarded

(this email is also attached as a Word-doc)

Association of American University Presses (AAUP)

Admissions & Standards Committee

Kyla Madden, McGill-Queen's, Chair

kyla.madden@mcgill.ca

Susan Patton (spatton@aaupnet.org)

Allyson Carter, Arizona

Gabriel Dotto, Michigan State

Garrett Kiely, Chicago

Leila Salisbury, Mississippi

Eric Schwartz, Columbia

Subject line: Request for your review/assessment of an academic standards incident with the University Press of Colorado

Re:

Request for review of an incident with the University Press of Colorado, a violation of scholarly publishing standards and the terms of AAUP's admissions and continuing membership policies, as stated in the Membership Guidelines.

Dear Kyla Madden and Susan Patton, July 9, 2015

I communicated with you both last month regarding your academic standards policies. I appreciated your prompt

responses to my questions. (I previously emailed through my account behak72, with the username Jon Behak, but I signed my emails John Jenkins. I don't want this to cause confusion. I am author, teacher, and Maya scholar John Jenkins (John Major Jenkins) and will hereafter use my other gmail account, the2012story@gmail.com, to communicate with you.)

I hereby formally request that you review the publication quality and behavior of the University Press of Colorado, AAUP member publisher. The incident involves communications earlier this year with the UP of Colorado director, Darrin Pratt. It unfolded over a dozen or so emails, and he and his staff refused to acknowledge demonstrable factual errors in a book they published. The process I documented indicates their use of inept and anonymous fact-checkers, deference to the judgment of the author who perpetrated the errors in the first place, and their evasive request (after initially being proactive and cooperative) that I solve the problem myself in some other way, outside of their professional responsibility to directly acknowledge and correct errors in their own scholarly publications.

To be as clear as possible, and to help you understand this two-part incident, here is the sequence of events. The first attempt to seek a solution was in January-February 2015; a second communication occurred in May 2015:

January-February 2015

1. I contact Darrin Pratt and ask about their errata policy. Yes, of course, they do have one — an errata sheet in unsold book stock.
2. The errors are in a 2009 book that is now virtually out of print (Anthony Aveni's *2012: The End of Time*), so the standard errata-sheet policy would be ineffective. Pratt says, conciliatorily, that "I'm sure we can figure something out" (January 7th email).
3. I send the seven identified errors, easily stated in less than a page. Eight additional pages provide more details and corrective evidence, in a narrative form. I attach this file for your assessment, which was sent to Pratt on January 8, 2015; I also attach the entire email exchange between Pratt and myself, January-February 2015.
4. Almost six weeks elapse while Pratt's "trusted advisors" assess my alleged errors. Finally, I am informed that none of the purported errors can actually be confirmed as, in fact, being errors. They say that neither the book's author or their "trusted advisors" believe these are errors. I ask if their advisors are lawyers or knowledgeable fact-checkers. No response.
5. I am very surprised. Pratt is apologetic, as if he knows this is neither right or fair. A policy similar to "outsourcing" is asked of me, in which I am told I should take my grievance and publish it elsewhere. I take this as sloughing off, onto me, their professional obligation to correct errors committed by their author, which somehow made it through their peer-review academic publishing process.

(NOTE: one of my main issues, for you to consider, is whether or not the UP of Colorado is following an objective editorial process, or has more or less just published what Aveni handed them. As you can imagine, the latter scenario is open to abuse

by axe-grinding scholars with an agenda to mitigate selected people. In Aveni's case, I have on record a first-hand account that he told his colleagues (at SAA 2008) to not refer to me or my books by name. This may have been his sour-grapes reaction after favorable coverage of my work in the *New York Times*, July 1, 2007 Sunday Magazine. So, there is a background and context for this issue with the ethics and standards of the University Press of Colorado — are they merely the voice-box of this senior author's personal agenda, or do they uphold academic principles and scholarly standards that override his personal agenda?)

I noted in my attached "error file" that two of the errors (pertaining to the work of Michael Grofe) were already acknowledged by Aveni; I was told by Pratt that Aveni was already planning a correction of some kind. Four of the other errors, as I explained in my file, pertain to my own work on Maya astronomy and period-ending beliefs relating to the controversial "2012" topic. These errors include *a demeaning use of my perceived religious persuasion as a means of critiquing my scholarly work*. I identified this as religious bigotry. The other errors involve a deceptive citation practice employed by Aveni (citing to evidence for his claims, where this is none), and centrally important aspects of my work on Maya astronomy and archaeoastronomy. I explained to Pratt that Aveni's book has been, and continues to be, cited as an authoritative "debunking" of my work, and therefore continues to be damaging to the accurate depiction of my work (see, e.g., some examples cited in my file). This is why I've sought a correction, and I stated to Pratt that I'd accept a written acknowledgment of the errors, with which I could attempt to remedy the existing and ongoing proliferation of mistaken judgments of my work, which authoritatively cite Aveni, in the published record and in high-profile information outlets such as Wikipedia. My attempt at a mild form of solution — a simple written acknowledgment of the errors — was rejected in no uncertain terms. Despite the fact that Aveni's book is on the shelves at over 500 university, technical, and college libraries, and will thereby continue to misinform students and readers indefinitely, I was willing to accept a mere acknowledgement of the errors.

The unprofessional behavior of the UP of Colorado is unacceptable, and thus I request that your Admissions & Standards Committee address this question:

Do you believe that the UP of Colorado is, in this specific incident, upholding basic standards of fact-checking (in the initial assessment and editing of Aveni's manuscript), error acknowledgement (after publication), and transparent and honest correction?

If yes, I assume that you have independently assessed errors 3-7 in my attached file (we can ignore the Grofe errors) and are not simply relaying some assurance garnered from Darrin Pratt. Then please provide me with the name(s) of your reviewers and advisors who cannot determine that errors number 3-7 in my file are in fact errors. If any of these can be found to be, in fact, an error (such as the publication year of the McKennas' book), then explain to me why the need for any correction was

rejected by the UP of Colorado, and I was told, in effect, to get lost?

An addendum to this January-February sequence of events occurred in May, when Darrin Pratt informed me that a revised, "corrected" edition of the eBook format of Aveni's book was just released. But, upon examination, the only correction was in regard to Grofe's work, which Aveni was already planning on making. None of the other errors, which were of course already denied, were corrected. So, a perfect opportunity — one I hadn't even expected — to correct the record was passed by.

You explained to me in my earlier questions (from my gmail behak72), regarding member policies, that the scholarly qualification of each publisher cannot be determined by their in-house board members, and assessments of complaints take place solely in your office. I am not pushing for a 2/3rds vote to oust the UP of Colorado from membership in the AAUP. I am, rather, requesting an oversight review of this situation and some kind of corrective action to their unprofessional behavior. They've violated the primary mandates, stated in your Membership Guidelines (<http://www.aaupnet.org/aaup-members/becoming-a-member/guidelines-for-membership>), that AAUP member publishers must be concerned with *education* and following *scholarly standards*. The factual errors in Aveni's book do not educate, they misinform. The ugliest error is an ethical one of a bigoted, *ad hominem* narrative that denigrates a career author, teacher, and researcher. The *scholarly standards* in this book, and in the fact-checking of this book, are lacking. I have provided specific, tangible examples.

Here is the situation as I see it: The University Press of Colorado has produced *and then defended* a book that does not educate, but rather misinforms. A functioning and unbiased process by which misinformation (errors) should be corrected in a peer-reviewed academic publication was subverted, in favor of a senior contributing scholar (Aveni, who boasts in his book of having produced many previous projects with the University Press of Colorado). This is demonstrably shown, and easily shown, in the one test error that I included. It's a fairly trivial correction to Aveni describing a book, incorrectly, as a "booklet" published in 1971 (it was published as a full-scale hardback in 1975). Again, I included this on purpose, as a test. Any competent fact-checker employed by the UP of Colorado, or Pratt himself, could confirm this error online in less than two minutes. Anyone on the AAUP staff could Google the correct information. But this error, and all the others (apart from the two Grofe errors already noted) could not be confirmed as being, in fact, errors (please read Pratt's statements in the email exchange of February 2015). This strikes me as a gross failure of academic publishing and errata correction standards. I tried to resolve this with clear and honest communication, but that must work both ways, and Pratt has asserted the matter is resolved and he has nothing more to say. It isn't resolved, by any measure with which a functioning academic publishing & correction process should operate. So now I turn it over to you. **I assume you should be concerned that one of your member publishers is refusing to uphold the standards that your Member Guidelines require.**

In summary, the following issues have become apparent during this process, in which I asked the Director of the University Press of Colorado to assess seven factual errors that I had carefully selected in Anthony Aveni's 2009 book *2012: The End of Time*.

- Substandard peer-review and fact checking process.
- Apparent deference to the authority of book's author, rather than applying an unbiased and objective assessment of the errors.
- Refusal to even acknowledge basic, unambiguous, factual errors.
- Neglect in correcting the errors when the opportunity arose in later producing the revised eBook.

I'm willing to discuss this matter by phone, or to participate in a conference call, or answer any questions you have. I'm simply wanting a basic acknowledgement that the errors are errors. I carefully selected unambiguous ones amidst a morass of loaded lingo, snide insinuations and distorted paraphrases. I'm not asking you to address those; I'm asking you to address factual errors, each one of which is presented in clear language in the attached file (Errors-Avenis-Booka.pdf). After almost six weeks Pratt responded to it on February 18th with a 147-word dismissal. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Featured essays, interviews, peer-reviewed papers and chapters, at: *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com>). Bio: http://johnmajorjenkins.com/?page_id=16.

Attached files:

1. Errors-Avenis-Booka.pdf (sent to Pratt as Word-doc on January 8, 2015)
2. Gmail-DarrinPratt-Jan-Feb2015Policy-regarding-errata-AVENISBook.pdf (emails with Pratt between January 5, 2015 and February 25, 2015)

Item 1g. Ensuing emails and phone calls, through change of committee chair and members

There was no response after a week, so I queried to Kyla Madden and Susan Patton on July 16:

Dear Kyla Madden and Susan Patton, July 16, 2015

Can either of you confirm that my email sent on July 9 was received? It was in regard to my request:

Re:

Request for review of an incident with the University Press of Colorado, a violation of scholarly publishing standards and the terms of AAUP's admissions and continuing membership policies, as stated in the Membership Guidelines.

I understand that your office at AAUP is responsible for addressing / assessing the publishing standards of your member publishers. My email clearly explained the incident and provided two supporting documents attached as PDFs. Do I need to resend? Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins / the2012story@gmail.com

July 17

Dear John Major,

I'm sorry that I neglected to confirm receipt. Yes, we did get your message, and we are reviewing your complaint. Best,
Susan

July 17

Dear Susan,

Great, thank you. BTW, you can call me John. "Major" is my middle name that I use in my published work. Please feel free to forward my email request and attachments to the other members of your committee, who I listed at the top of my email. After you and any others have read my email, the error descriptions file, and my email exchange with Darrin Pratt, I'd like to then arrange a conference call with you and any others involved in assessing my request, or at least with one person representing all. I've learned that it will be important to establish that you understand what I am saying, and that my intentions are to help the academic publishing system function according to its respected mandate.

I really feel a phone conversation will be important, because I've experienced that all manner of mistaken readings — some willful and others accidental — can occur in emails. I'd like this to be a proactive and engaged process, with two-way communication happening. I understand this is unexpected and might not be something your committee must deal with often, but it is an aspect of what your committee is for. I am available most afternoons after 3 pm NYC time. Finally, can you give me any kind of estimate for when my email and the two files will be read? If there are any questions about the clarity or meaning of any of it, please feel free to ask me. Sincerely,

John

Five weeks pass without a response. I call Susan Patton's office and receive an out of office message; she will be unavailable until August 30. On August 25 I call Kyla Madden leave message, with my phone number and email address, asking for a quick update of the steps they've taken to address my complaint. No response. I call again on August 29, leave detailed message with my phone number and email address. No response. On September 8 I phone and leave messages for both Susan Patton and Kyla Madden. Susan's response:

September 8

Dear John,

I'm sorry I missed your call earlier. Just a quick update on the process. The chair of Admissions and Standards Committee is

currently reviewing your complaint with the University Press of Colorado. We should have her recommendation on any further action shortly.

Best,
Susan

Kyla's response:

September 8
Dear John Jenkins,
Thank you for your email and recent phone messages regarding your complaint about an AAUP member. My term as chair of the Admissions and Standards committee finished at the end of June, but I understand that this matter is under review with the new chair (Leila Salisbury) and that she hopes to have information for you soon.

Thank you very much for following up and for your patience in awaiting a response. Sincerely,

Kyla Madden

I decide to establish contact immediately with Leila Salisbury:

September 8
Dear Leila Salisbury,
After some persistent effort I was finally given an update from Kyla Madden, regarding the complaint I filed two months ago. She said she is no longer the chair of the AAUP Standards and Admissions committee, and that you have taken on this role. Rather than repeat all of the basic orienting information regarding the issue I have raised and requested that the AAUP assess (regarding the University Press of Colorado), I wanted to simply be in contact with you to confirm that you were forwarded the cover letter and the files that I sent to Kyla Madden and Susan Patton on July 9, 2015. Have you received these?

In addition, since two months have now elapsed I am now inquiring as to what steps have been taken to review the matter? And I also want to extend my open communication with you, in the desire for a proactive solution, and let you know that I am available by phone or email should any questions arise. Phone [970 686 5325](tel:9706865325); email: the2012story@gmail.com. So, in summary:

1. Have you received the files previously sent, including the cover letter?
2. What steps have been taken, now that two months have elapsed, to address my complaint?

Thank you. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

She responds, September 8:

Dear Professor Jenkins,

I did indeed receive copies of all the materials that Kyla and the AAUP central office had received (including your cover letter). I reviewed the situation and sent an assessment to AAUP's central office for final review at the very end of August. I expect you should be hearing from the central office shortly.

With many thanks, Leila

I respond to Kyla's email of September 8, on September 16:

Dear Kyla,
Thank you for letting me know. I was unaware that the baton had been passed to others. I was hoping for more of a dialogue than a decision handed down, case closed, but it's nice to know that something is moving forward.

In any case, I notice that you are a chief editor at a university press, and I'm sure you've had experience with wrongs, slippery, or objectionable statements made by your scholarly authors. Do you feel that bigotry is easy to spot, or are there gradations of insinuation? Here's my question: Given the objectionable nature of such a tactic of critique — especially leveled against a living author — wouldn't you, as an editor, flag for clarification even the slightest possibility that a bigoted critique of a living author's religious persuasion and scholarly work was being made?

I'm doing a survey of editors and directors at university presses, and already have gathered over a dozen responses to this question. I was hoping to include your own response in my metric. Thank you and best wishes,

John M Jenkins

Item 1h. Their Decision

On September 29, 2015 I received an email from an AAUP Program Assistant, Bailey Bretz, with the brief message:

Mr. Jenkins,
Please see the attached letter.
Best,
Bailey

The attached letter was a PDF with an official AAUP header and signature of Peter M. Berkery, Jr., Executive Director of the AAUP.

Dear Mr. Jenkins, 29 September, 2015
I am writing in response to your 9 July communication to Kyla Madden and Susan Patton requesting the Association of American University Presses to review an incident arising between yourself and the University Press of Colorado.

Upon referral to the Association's Admissions & Standards Committee, it has been concluded that the incident provides no basis upon which to take disciplinary action against the AAUP member press.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Cordially,

[signature here]
Peter M. Berkery, Jr.
Executive Director

cc: Leila Salisbury, Chair, AAUP Admissions & Standards Committee
Susan Patton, AAUP Member Services Manager

And so, after almost nine months of persistent effort it comes down to, once again (like Pratt’s response in February), a curt dismissal (even more curt than the previous one), effectively denying that there were errors in Aveni’s book, errors that continue to be cited as valid and factually accurate debunkings of my work and career. These factual errors are not to be acknowledged let alone corrected, according to stated and known academic publishing policies. The Ivory Tower has officially become a House of Cards, with one scholar (Anthony Aveni) and his academic publisher, as well as the agency that supervises and mandates that publisher, insisting that they have the right to ignore and violate scientific standards of fact checking and correction. How does science get broken? Scholars and their publishers break it.

I did follow up with an email to Leila Salisbury, as it was not clear from the “decision” whether or not her committee had indeed performed their assessment function. Did they determine that all of the errors were invalid? So I emailed her once, twice, three times to seek a clarification for this simple question. She evaded and directed me to speak with the Executive Director of the AAUP, Peter Berkery. On October 27 I called his office but got the voice message. So I emailed:

Dear Peter Berkery, 10-27-2015

I was directed to you by Leila Salisbury, chair of the Admissions & Standards Committee at AAUP, for an answer to a simple question that she was unable or unwilling to provide.

I filed a complaint with the AAUP back in July, regarding the refusal of the University Press of Colorado to acknowledge, let alone correct, a variety of errors in one of their books (2012: *The End of Time*, by Anthony Aveni, 2009). These errors had, and continue to have, deleterious repercussions in how my work has been viewed by other scholars in the field. In turning the matter over to your AAUP member Standards Committee, I was asking for an independent and objective assessment of the validity of the errors I had enumerated.

A "decision" was sent to me from your office on September 29, stating that “the incident provides no basis upon which to take disciplinary action against” the University Press of Colorado. I had explicitly stated in my cover letter to the committee that I wasn't interested in any kind of punitive action, such as a majority vote to oust the member press, but merely in knowing whether or not they could confirm, objectively and independently, that any of the errors I

pointed out were actually errors. Before I filed my complaint I had previously confirmed, in a communication with Susan Patton, that it was the function of the member standards committee to perform this assessment, outside of any influence from the member press under consideration, or their board members.

In stating that there was "no basis" for any action, your decision certainly gives the impression that the assessment was indeed performed and none of the errors could be verified as being errors. But I didn't want to presume, so I sought a simple clarification with Leila Salisbury, asking the simple two-part question:

Did the committee assess the various errors I articulated in my complaint, and did they find any of them to be valid?

It's basically a simple yes/no question. I'm not sure why the chair of the committee that supposedly read and analyzed the merit of my complaint could not answer this question, but instead directed me to speak with you. I would therefore like to make an appointment to speak with you by phone. I can be available at any time during your office hours; five to ten minutes will suffice. Please suggest a good time that I can call and reach you. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

October 28
Dear Mr. Jenkins,

Thank you for your email. I apologize for the confusion regarding the nature of your query to the association regarding the University Press of Colorado. It was never clear to anyone in the Central Office or the Admissions & Standards Committee that you were requesting the assessment you describe below. The association does not perform such assessments. Moreover, the deliberations of the AAUP Admissions & Standards Committee are confidential, and it would not be possible for me to disclose the nature of those deliberations to you. AAUP’s sole interest in question’s regarding a member’s conduct is whether it calls into question a press’ continued eligibility for AAUP membership – a matter exclusively internal to the association.

While I am happy to schedule a time for us to speak via phone, in fairness I must advise you that our conversation will be constrained by the restrictions I’ve just described.

Kind regards,

Peter Berkery
[1-212-989-1010, x29](tel:1-212-989-1010)
[1-917-288-5594](tel:1-917-288-5594) (mobile)

October 29
Dear Peter Berkery,
I was quite clear in why I was requesting that the AAUP Admissions & Standards Committee assess my complaint,

and in my emails of June I offered to further discuss and clarify any questions that the Committee might have.

I'm not sure if you are aware of the details of the complaint. One of your member publishers refused to acknowledge, let alone correct, factual errors in one of their publications — most of which have serious implications for the accurate reception of my work and background. It is a fundamental responsibility of legitimate academic publishers to recognize errors and offer corrections for the published record. Their refusal to do so would call into question their continued eligibility for AAUP membership. (Any “disciplinary action” to be taken is a separate question and not my concern; I was simply asking the AAUP Admissions & Standards Committee to perform one of its stated functions.)

The merit of my complaint is predicated upon the validity of the errors I indicated, and thus an assessment of those errors would of necessity need to take place. I had confirmed earlier with Susan Patton that the A&S Committee performs this assessment independently and objectively, and it's clear from the online mission statement that such oversight is one of the functions of that Committee. It is a check on the “standards” of admission and continued membership.

But you just informed me that the AAUP does not perform such assessments. You wrote: “The association does not perform such assessments.” This is a contradiction. Furthermore, if the merit or validity of my complaint was not actually assessed, how, then, can you determine there is “no basis” for any action, as your letter of September 29 informed me? Upon what was that decision based, if not upon an assessment of the merit of my complaint (the validity of the errors I pointed out)?

Based on what you've told me, the following are therefore correct statements:

Your decision that there was “no basis” for acting (letter of September 29) occurred without actually assessing the merit of my complaint (the validity of the errors).

It is possible for one of your member publishers to violate principles of academic publishing without any oversight, assessment, or action taken on the part of the AAUP. They can maintain their membership in the AAUP without a concern for violating the foundational principles of academic publishing, because the “standards” Committee does not actually perform assessments of their behavior when complaints arise.

Thank you for clarifying what the AAUP does and doesn't do. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

October 30

Dear Mr. Jenkins,

As much as I think it would be better all-around to let this matter lie, I feel obligated to correct an error of fact which has

informed your conclusions below (“the following are therefore correct statements”) ...

The AAUP does not perform the type of editorial assessment you requested of us for third parties. As our Admissions & Standards Committee (mis)understood your initial outreach to be a complaint against a member, the committee of course reviewed the facts you presented. However, as I explained, they did so in the context of determining whether or not they established grounds for disciplinary action against a member — their sole responsibility in assessing the facts you presented. Because member discipline is an exclusively internal matter, as I explained previously under no circumstances would that assessment be shared outside the organization. And, at the risk of being redundant, the context in which the committee assessed the facts is materially at variance from the context in which you requested an assessment (i.e., disciplinary action vs best practice). So, an assessment occurred, it just was not for the purpose you requested.

Needless to say, without elaboration the association therefore would reject your two “correct statements”, the latter viscerally.

I hope this clarifies our actions on this matter. I apologize if my prior response contributed to a misunderstanding of our position, which I now trust is fully resolved. I wish you well in your future endeavors.

Regards,

Peter Berkery

[1-212-989-1010](tel:1-212-989-1010), x29

[1-917-288-5594](tel:1-917-288-5594) (mobile)

Oct 30

Dear Mr Berkery,

So, I see now that the AAUP (standards committee) does indeed perform assessments of complaints, and did in fact assess the errors I presented. Thank you for the clarification.

Since it was found that there was "no basis" to establish "grounds" for any disciplinary action to be taken against the member press (the University Press of Colorado), it therefore follows that none of my alleged errors were confirmed as being errors. Correct? Otherwise, the alternative scenario is that no disciplinary action was taken despite one or more errors being verified. And if this is the case, then my second statement (in which member presses are free to violate academic publishing principles and behave unprofessionally without fear of discipline) would indeed be a correct statement. But since you viscerally reject the correctness of that statement, then I am left with the conclusion that NONE of my alleged errors were confirmed as, in fact, being errors. So, my revised statement of fact, based upon your clarification:

The AAUP Admission & Standards Committee did perform a review of my alleged errors, and found that none of them were valid.

Unless you inform me otherwise, I will understand that you agree with this statement, as it proceeds logically and directly from what you've communicated. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Oct 30

Mr. Jenkins: as I have explained twice now, the assessment of the Admissions & Standards Committee is completely confidential. While I cannot agree with your statement, I therefore cannot comment further.

By any reasonable reading of this exchange, it is clear that the AAUP cannot provide what you seek. I do not wish to engage further in a correspondence that assumes my silence confers assent, so I will end this matter here.

With kind regards,

Peter Berkery
[1-212-989-1010](tel:1-212-989-1010), x29
[1-917-288-5594](tel:1-917-288-5594) (mobile)

Oct 30

Dear Mr. Berkery,
I think the more accurate way of stating this is that “the AAUP **will not** provide what [I] seek.” But I have my answers now. What I’ve sought is the answers to a simple two-part question: did you assess the merit of the errors I identified and did you find that any of them are valid? You have now answered the first part, and thus logically follows two possible answers to the second part (“yes” or “no”). Unless you can offer some other semantic gymnastics to wiggle around the facts, either answer leaves the AAUP in a difficult position.

If “Yes”, then the correctness of my second statement in my previous email, despite your visceral disagreement with it, is indeed correct. If “No”, then you essentially disagree with what I recently learned from the author, Anthony Aveni. In an email communication with me of October 3, I asked him to tell me which of his statements about the Izapa ballcourt alignment was correct — the one in his 2000 publication (w/ Hartung), or the statement in his 2009 book. [see full exchange in Appendix below] As you’ll recall, I had noted that his 2009 statement was incorrect by 48 degrees. A simple matter of acknowledging and correcting — but one which has taken over nine months to address, with denials and evasions all along the way, up until the present moment where it remains, in your hands, uncorrected. Aveni and the University Press of Colorado denied it (in February), but now Aveni has let slip an acknowledgment that his 2009 statement, in his UP of Colorado book, was a mistake.

So, having informed you that the original author admits to an error, I hope you will take steps to speak with or discipline the University Press of Colorado for poor fact-checking and subsequent evasions and denial of a correctable error in one of their books. Otherwise, as a legitimizing agency the AAUP is functionally broken. It’s now proven that the UP of Colorado essentially violated scientific principles of reputable academic publishing (namely, fact-checking and honest error correction). The AAUP was subsequently complicit in not adequately assessing or requiring a correction of the situation. Thank you for wishing me well on my future endeavors, one of which you will be hearing about quite soon. Checkmate,

John Major Jenkins

Here is the exchange with Aveni that I mentioned in the email above to Peter Berkery:

Dear Tony, October 3, 2015
You report the azimuth alignment of the Group F ballcourt at Izapa in two different ways in two of your publications. In your 2000 publication with Hartung, you have it as roughly 114 degrees. In your 2009 book *2012: The End of Time*, your words identify a 66 degree azimuth. You state:

“Indeed, we found it to align approximately 1 degree off the December solstice sunset / June solstice sunrise direction” (Aveni 2009: 54).

An axis corresponding to "December solstice sunset / June solstice sunrise," as you state it, equals roughly a 66° azimuth at the latitude of Izapa. In recent correspondence with your publisher, I understand that you affirmed that this statement is not in error, and in fact it was not corrected in the subsequently released "corrected" edition of the eBook (May 2015). Am I to understand you have corrected your earlier work, and your position is now congruent with the latest statement, from 2009? And your calculation published in 2000 was in error? I'd appreciate some clarification of this murky issue. Thank you,

John Major Jenkins
Maya Cosmogenesis 2012 (1998)
Galactic Alignment (2002)
The 2012 Story (2009)
Director of *The Center for 2012 Studies*
(<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>)

Aveni replied later that day, without greeting or signature: “It is 114 degrees 29 minutes, originally reported in Aveni and Hartung 2000 "Water, Mountain, Sky" IN CHALCHIHUITL IN QUETZALLI ED. E. Quinones Keber, p. 60. Sometimes people murk mistakes.”

Here Aveni affirms his earlier position, which means that his later statement, in his 2009 book, is in error. This is as close as Aveni could come to acknowledging his mistake, which he refers to as a “mistake” in his email above. But throughout this

whole process, Aveni, his publisher, and the AAUP consistently refused to acknowledge this mistake, let alone implement a correction of it. I responded with a direct question for Aveni:

Tony, October 3, 2015
Okay, thank you. After communicating this mistake and several others to your academic publisher, Darrin Pratt at the University Press of Colorado, he replied to me on February 18:

"After discussing this with valued advisors, I do not believe that issuing an errata sheet for Anthony Aveni's *The End of Time* is warranted. What you describe in your Word document detailing the purported factual errors may or may not, in fact, be errors. **Certainly the author does not agree that he is in error on these points**, other than one point I believe he has already confirmed with and that he is in the process of correcting [the Grofe error]."

And, later, the error wasn't addressed or corrected in the revised eBook (which was released in May). Why did you deny this was an error at that earlier time, and neglect correcting it when the opportunity arose for the revised eBook?

John

And ... wait for it ... no response. And what if I was to present Aveni's confirmation that his 2009 statement was in error to the AAUP? (Well, that was the checkmate move; see exchange with Peter Berkery above).

2. David Morrison, NASA, and the NASA Communications Policy Office

- a. First Complaint Request sent, re Morrison's comments on the NASA website, sent to David Weaver, director of the NASA Communications Policy Office
- b. Ensuing emails and phone calls with the Office
- c. Second phase: email contact with Morrison, and I send him my Second Complaint Request, re his comments in his presentations
- d. Ensuing emails and phone calls to Morrison and the others, with no response
- e. Timetable of communications

Item 2a. First Complaint Request Sent, re Morrison's comments on the NASA website, sent to David Weaver, director of the NASA Communications Policy Office

Note: This formal letter is the "cover letter," pasted into the body of the email as well as attached as an MSWord document.

Subject line: NASA Communications Policy and request for error correction

NASA Office of Communications
Attn: Office of Communications Administrator David S. Weaver

http://www.nasa.gov/about/highlights/weaver_bio.html#.VNEdPtLF-uj
[202-358-1600 / david.s.weaver@nasa.gov](mailto:david.s.weaver@nasa.gov)
re: Communications Policy and error correction

Dear David S. Weaver, February 5, 2015

I'm seeking a correction to a violation of your stated policy regarding NASA communications with the public. It is in regard to at least two statements made by Dr. David Morrison, Senior Scientist at the NASA Ames Research Center in Moffett Field, California. (<http://sservi.nasa.gov/?profile=david-morrison>). The statements were made on his "Ask an Astrobiologist" educational public outreach Q&A web page, which is hosted on the NASA.gov website (see links below). Morrison concerned himself with making communications with the public and the media.

The official policy for NASA employee communications with the public and the media is stated at: http://www.nasa.gov/audience/formedia/features/communication_policy.html. I paste below the pertinent sections and have underlined the policy phrases that indicate how Dr Morrison and his statements come under the jurisdiction of this NASA Communications Policy, and should be corrected according to that policy.

Scope.

This directive sets forth policy governing the release of public information, which is defined as information in any form provided to news and information media, especially information that has the potential to generate significant media, or public interest or inquiry. Examples include, but are not limited to, press releases, media advisories, news features, and web postings. Not included under this definition are scientific and technical reports, web postings designed for technical or scientific interchange, and technical information presented at professional meetings or in professional journals.

Applicability.

(a) This policy applies to NASA Headquarters, NASA Centers, and Component Facilities.

Responsibilities.

- (1) Be honest and accurate in all communications.
- (2) Honor publication embargoes.
- (3) Respond promptly to media requests and respect media deadlines.
- (4) Act promptly to correct mistakes or erroneous information, either internally or externally.
- (5) Promote the free flow of scientific and technical information.
- (6) Protect non-public information.

Morrison's factually incorrect statements are not minor typos; they convey false and denigrating characterizations of a living person. In 2009 Morrison made two statements on his "Ask an Astrobiologist" web page, in response to public questions and

in regard to my work on ancient Maya astronomy and calendars, which I have published and presented since the early 1990s in both popular and academic venues. On February 17, 2009, Morrison wrote: “The claims about the Mayan calendar predicting catastrophe in 2012 began with John Major Jenkins (a self-styled “independent researcher”) in the early 1990s.” (<http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/>).

On March 9, 2009, Morrison wrote: “In the case of the 2012 hoax we have a confluence of pseudoscience websites that are trying to cash in on the growing fear of a cosmic disaster in 2012... The roots of the 2012 hoax lie in misinterpretations of the Sumer/Babylonian mythology by Zecharia Sitchin and of the Mayan calendar by John Major Jenkins.” (<http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/03/10/1365/>)

Both of these quotes firmly and authoritatively assert that my work is about “predicting catastrophe in 2012”, that such claims for the Maya calendar “began” with my work, and that I have tried to “cash in” on the growing public fear of “cosmic disaster in 2012.” These assertions are totally false and violate your stated public Communications Policy of honesty and accuracy.

The rest of my email will necessarily be concerned with providing you with some evidence as to the *actual* content and character of my work. You may notice, in this light, that Morrison himself did not provide any positive evidence for his contemptuous assertions, which itself is unprofessional and should be a red flag.

My research into ancient Maya calendars and cosmology has always been oriented to reconstructing what the ancient Maya believed. I am not now, and never was, in the business of peddling doomsday prophecies. After seven years of travels and studies at Maya sites, by the early 1990s I was studying the Maya traditions and evidence related to the 2012 period-ending date. I found that the Maya had a doctrine of period-ending renewal, and that there was no evidence for a belief in a 2012 catastrophe. My 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* was titled as such to emphasize *cosmogogenesis*, the Maya doctrine of *worldrenewal*, which is simply an expression of a demonstrable Mesoamerican belief about cyclic time and calendar period-endings. There are concluding chapters and dozens of quotes in that book demonstrating my non-doomsday perspectives and findings, such as:

“Both worldmaking and worldrenewal are rooted in the concept of cosmogenesis. Creation and recreation happen in endless cycles, an idea implicit in the Mesoamerican doctrine of World Ages. Thus, if cosmogenesis (the birth of the current World Age) occurred back in 3114 B.C., then A.D. 2012 represents a new cosmogenesis. In short, the Maya believed the world, the cosmos, will be reborn, or recreated, in A.D. 2012. This is why my book is called *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*” (Jenkins 1998:29-30).

“The Hero Twin story is one “myth” that encodes the astronomy of the Long Count end-date. Earlier, we saw how the New Fire ceremony was the “myth” that explained the Zenith Cosmology. There is another Mesoamerican tradition that encodes the alignment in 2012, one that involves heroic triumph and Mystery Play, as well as human sacrifice. Like the Hero Twin and New Fire myths, this esoteric tradition, with precessional knowledge at its center, was not a marginal aspect of Mesoamerican society. It had everything to do with the renewal of the sun, the rebirth of First Father, and the triumph of light over darkness. It is the Mesoamerican ballgame (Jenkins 1998:125).

In the relationship between the Milky Way and the Great Ballcourt just described, the dark-rift is the “central hole” of the Milky Way ballcourt; in other words, it is the cosmic goal-ring. Its cosmological meanings include a center and navel of the sky, a portal to other dimensions, and a place of rebirth. This is where the solar deity—the big game-ball—will be reborn at the end of the current era” (Jenkins 1998:133).

My book offered an evidence-based reconstruction of ancient Maya cosmology — and it doesn’t embrace 2012 as a catastrophe. In the Introduction, I critiqued an alarmist doomsday book on 2012 and I dealt with the distinction to be made between “end of the world” language and an “end of a World Age” doctrine evident in the Maya Creation Myth, the end of a *cycle* of time (namely, the 13-Baktun cycle in the Long Count calendar). The doctrine was tied to the Maya belief in performing ceremonial rites intended to help facilitate the *renewal* into a new cycle.

For two decades I have expressly emphasized in print, in my public and academic presentations, and in media interviews that *the Maya did not believe 2012 was about a cataclysmic doomsday*. For example, in a July 1, 2007 interview in the *New York Times*, I stated: “...it’s about transformation and renewal. It’s certainly nothing as simplistic as the end of the world.” Twelve years before Morrison began commenting on 2012 writers and theories, in my presentation in 1997 at the *Institute of Maya Studies*, associated with the Miami Museum of Science, I stated “I don’t believe it [2012] is about catastrophe” (Jenkins, 1997, “The Astronomy of Baktun 13,” *The Institute of Maya Studies*). On my website (which Morrison apparently knew about because his public presentations use a photo of me taken from my web page and he quotes my author bio) I have had posted since 2006 a document called “How Not to Make a 2012 Documentary” (<http://alignment2012.com/historychannel.html>). In it, I critiqued the false doomsday-2012 assertions in a History Channel documentary of 2006.

My subsequent books, including *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History*, Tarcher/Penguin, 2009) never adopted a doomsday perspective on 2012, but rather continued clarifying the ongoing reconstruction of ancient Maya beliefs and astronomy, with the express emphasis that they did not think of 2012 as a catastrophic doomsday. I even offered, in my presentations

going back to the late 1990s, suggestions as to why modern people and the media fall prey to such misinformation, and I did so years before Morrison and other scholars began commenting in similar ways about the exploitation of 2012.

I'm not sure how much more evidence you would need. This isn't even a debatable gray area in my work, and I am not sure how Morrison could have been so misinformed as to the nature of my work, which in any case is primarily rooted in archaeoastronomy. When the 2009 disaster movie about 2012 was announced and slated for release, I wrote and posted on my website the following message, right on the front page:

The 2012 Movie

Guess What? There is ZERO evidence that the ancient Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012. The Maya calendar does not END in 2012. DOOMSDAY-2012 is a fallacious construct, a projection of exploitative and underinformed writers and Western nihilistic fantasy. A huge publicity campaign has begun for Hollywood's 2012 catastrophe movie, to open November 13, 2009. Is this Hollywood appropriation of 2012 mere harmless entertainment? At the very least, this entertainment comes at a price, and that is: *the complete and utter misrepresentation of what 2012 meant to the creators of the 2012 calendar*. I write about this in my new book, *The 2012 Story*. My nine books on Maya cosmology and tradition going back to 1989 explore the facts, the evidence, and the reconstruction of a lost paradigm.

It is still there today: <http://Alignment2012.com>. In a full-page call-out box for *Lonely Planet, Belize Guide*, I wrote: "One wonders why there is so much misinformation about 2012 in the media and the marketplace. The answer involves a conflict of ideas about time. In the Maya worldview, time moves in cycles and the end of a cycle brings renewal. There are spiritual teachings in the Maya Creation Myth that describe the process. In the Western Judeo-Christian time concept, time is linear. Creation is followed by history and then an apocalyptic final end. Doomsday is not something inherent in the ancient Maya's understanding of 2012, it is something projected into it by our own culture's bias toward violence and a final destruction." (Piece titled "2012: How the Maya Saw It.")

Since 1995 I've also been posting online my research essays on reconstructing ancient Maya astronomy and calendars (e.g., see <http://alignment2012.com/fap10.html> from 1992), which demonstrate the scholastic nature of my work. See also my website: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>. One might accurately summarize and then debate my findings, and they are presented as evidence-based efforts to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy and cosmology. See, for example, my analysis of the 2012 inscription on Tortuguero Monument 6 at the Carlos Pellicer Museum in Villahermosa, Mexico, in 2010: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/T6Monument.pdf>; or my presentation on Tortuguero astronomy at the 75th meeting of the *Society for American Archaeology* in 2010: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/Astronomy-in-TRT-SAA.pdf>; or my chapter in the academic anthology introduced by Dr. Michael Coe: <http://www.alignment2012.com/Jenkins-in-Gelfer-anthology2.pdf>; or my essay in the German journal

Zeitschrift für Anomalistik: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>. I've been an invited teacher at various institutes and universities since 1997. My work has been recognized and cited by various scholars, such as astronomer Anthony Aveni, epigraphers Barbara MacLeod and Mark Van Stone, astronomer-epigrapher Dr. Michael Grofe, and Dr. Robert Sitler.

On another point of correction to Morrison's statement of February 17, 2009, the 2012-doomsday association actually "began" with a statement in the 1966 book *The Maya*, by Maya archaeologist Michael Coe, where he characterized it as the Maya "Armageddon."

The comments by Morrison are false, not to mention denigrating, and clearly fall under the "Responsibilities" items of honesty and accuracy (#1), and of promptly correcting errors (#4), in your Communications Policy, as outlined above.

I appreciate your time and attention to this matter. Please let me know that you have received and are processing my request.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The2012story@gmail.com

Item 2b. Ensuing emails and phone calls with the NASA Office

On February 16th I resent the above Letter of Complaint, with a new brief cover letter:

Dear David S. Weaver,

On February 5th I sent an email regarding NASA's communications policy. It had the subject line "NASA Communication Policy and request for error correction." Could you kindly let me know if you received it? Thank you,

John Major Jenkins

There was no response. On February 24 I called and was put through by the secretary to leave a message for Mr. Weaver. No response.

On March 10 I again called Mr. Weaver and left a message. Link here to mp3. He calls back a short time later. We briefly discuss the issue; he asks me to resend the original complaint file. So I immediately send the same Complaint file (above) with a new brief cover letter:

Dear Mr Weaver,

Thank you for taking my call today and addressing this issue. I am resending my email of February 5 as you requested. I went to some length to provide background and quotes from my work, but the two errors in David Morrison's statements about me and my work, as posted on the Nasa.gov website, will be clear within the first page. I suppose one solution would be to

simply delete the two passages where they occur on the NASA.gov website (see links and quotes below). However, since these errors were repeatedly asserted by Morrison in a number of professional presentations he made at scientific conferences, which are now posted as videos online, I would also appreciate it if David Morrison can acknowledge that these assertions he made about my work, and propagated for a number of years, are incorrect. Thank you,

John M Jenkins

March 10. Weaver responds later that afternoon, cc'-ing Dolores Beasley (Ames Research Center director, ostensibly Morrison's supervisor) and Bob Jacobs, his assistant in his office:

Mr. Jenkins,
Thanks for following up on this. Based on the issues you raise below, the following statements on the "Ask an Astrobiologist" website will be edited. The Feb. 17, 2009 post will now read: "The claims about the Mayan calendar predicting catastrophe in 2012 began with John Major Jenkins in the early 1990s." For the March 9, 2009 post, the phrase "The roots of the 2012 hoax lie in misinterpretations of the Sumer/Babylonian mythology by Zecharia Sitchin and of the Mayan calendar by John Major Jenkins" will be deleted.

Again, I appreciate your reaching out and raising your concerns.

David S. Weaver

Associate Administrator for Communications
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
202.358.1898
@davidweaver

On March 11, I respond and point out the error was not actually corrected:

Dear Mr Weaver,
Thank you for your attention to this matter. I appreciate that you will delete the erroneous statement of March 9 [2009]. You noted that Morrison's statement of Feb 17 [2009] was to be changed. However, the changed version is not substantially different from the original version. Please compare the two versions:

original statement: "The claims about the Mayan calendar predicting catastrophe in 2012 began with John Major Jenkins (a self-styled "independent researcher") in the early 1990s."

your suggested alteration: "The claims about the Mayan calendar predicting catastrophe in 2012 began with John Major Jenkins in the early 1990s."

As you can see, only the parenthetical part was removed, which in any case is merely a non-essential ancillary comment. But the entire construct is in error, on two fronts: claims about the

Maya calendar predicting catastrophe in 2012 did not begin with my work (it began with Michael Coe's book of 1966), and my work is not, and never was, about arguing that the Maya calendar predicted catastrophe in 2012 — which is not an interpretation that my research has found to be supportable and which I've therefore ever advocated.

I don't know how the statement might be edited in any meaningful way, unless "did not begin" replaces "began." Perhaps it is best to delete it, since the incorrect statement of March 9 is also being deleted. Please clarify how Morrison's incorrect statement of Feb. 17 is to be corrected. Thank you,

John M Jenkins

There was no response. Six days later, on March 17, I resend the above, with a new brief cover letter:

Dear Mr Weaver,
David Morrison's statement of February 17 has not been corrected:
[\(http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/\)](http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/).

As I pointed out in my email six days ago, although your "edit" removed the parenthetical aside within the false statement, the false statement about my work remains. Your employee Communications Policy, cited in my previous email, requires honest, accurate, and prompt correction of errors. I'd greatly appreciate this matter being resolved without further delay. It's now been almost six weeks since my first inquiry of February 5. Thank you,

John M. Jenkins

No response. On March 22, I resend the March 10 email again, with new emphatic subject line "Error on NASA Website is still UNCORRECTED" and a new brief cover letter (cc'd also to the others):

Dear Mr Weaver,
David Morrison's statement of February 17 HAS NOT BEEN corrected:
[\(http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/\)](http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/).

As I pointed out in my emails of FIVE days ago and ELEVEN days ago, although your "edit" removed the irrelevant parenthetical aside within the false statement, the FALSE STATEMENT ABOUT MY WORK REMAINS UNCORRECTED. I don't know how you determined that your suggested edit was a sufficient correction. It is not a correction, at all.

Why is it proving so difficult for you to abide by NASA's stated Communications Policy? I know you must be busy, as we all are, and I've been very patient. **Please acknowledge receipt of this email and implement the correction.** If you or

your advisers are having trouble understanding the unambiguous foundation of the needed correction, even after my explanations and evidence previously sent, I will be happy to arrange a phone call. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

No response. Between March 25 and April 13 I left several phone call messages for David Weaver, Dolores Beasley, and Bob Jacobs. No responses until Jacobs calls me back (on April 13). He asks me to resend the link to Morrison’s blog and my original Letter of Complaint. (I’ve recent this several times at this point, some five weeks after my initial contact).

So, on April 13 I resend the link and Complaint directly to Jacobs, with a new brief cover letter:

Dear Mr Jacobs,
I am reattaching, below, my original communication with David Weaver which details the nature of my work — providing proof for the falsity of David Morrison’s statements. As I mentioned on the phone, one of the statements was deleted, but the other one was not corrected. If one was acknowledged as being in error, it is not clear why the other one was not. The one that remains is here:

(<http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/ask-an-astrobiologist/answered/2009/02/18/1348/>).

(See the sentence about my work, John Major Jenkins, being about doomsday).

I appreciate you looking further into this matter and I look forward to the matter being resolved promptly, and you letting me know. Thank you,

John Major Jenkins
[970 xxx xxxx](tel:970xxx xxxx)

On April 13, Jacobs briefly acknowledges receipt. Eight days pass. On April 21 I ask for an update from Bob Jacobs:

Dear Mr Jacobs,
Have you received a response from Ames Research Center regarding your query of April 16? I appreciate you facilitating this.

If they have been supplied with the link and my corrective email (which David Weaver previously sent to Dolores Beasley on March 10) it should be a straightforward correction. Sincerely,

John M Jenkins

April 21. Bob Jacobs’ response:

I’ll double back with them when j [I] return from NYC.

Typed using one finger on a sheet of glass.

April 23. His follow-up response:

Hi John. I’ve been assured the segment is coming down. Apparently the editor for that page has been on spring break.

April 23. My response:

Dear Bob Jacobs,
Thank you, that is a relief and good news. I hope I can be notified, if possible, when it is done. Thank you for helping facilitate this correction. Best wishes,

John M Jenkins

Between April 24 and May 22, I frequently checked Morrison’s NASA webpage until I noticed that Morrison’s false blog entry was removed, without explanation or comment. The same day (May 22) I send an email to David Morrison (only):

Dear David Morrison, May 22, 2015

On February 5 I asked David Weaver, director of the NASA Communications Office, to apply the “Responsibilities” rule for NASA scientists to “act promptly to correct mistakes or erroneous information” (in the NASA Communications Policy) in order to correct two factually false statements you had made on your Ask and Astrobiologist web page (from February and March of 2009). These pertained to incorrect assertions about the nature of my Maya astronomy & calendar research. After much persistence, many phone calls and emails extending over three months, it appears that last week the deletion of the final offending page was made.

I’m fairly certain you were privy to my request. Did you also receive the MSWord doc I sent to Weaver on February 5, providing proof for the needed corrections? For whatever role you played in making the corrections, I want to thank you.

I wanted to be sure that you understood the factual basis of the corrections and get your assurance that you will not propagate similar errors in the future, regarding the nature of my efforts to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy and associated beliefs. I did not receive confirmation from Weaver or Jacobs that you had acknowledged the needed corrections, and I apologize for the extra precaution here, but I’ve had to endure persistent efforts by under-informed scholars and scientists to denigrate and mitigate my work (even while my core ideas about the Maya doctrine of world-renewal and precessional astronomy are now being echoed by Maya scholars themselves; see, e.g., chapters by Carlson, Dowd, and Coggins in *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*, 2015, University Press of Colorado).

So, I’d appreciate a quick response that you acknowledge the two corrections made to your Ask an Astrobiologist pages on the NASA.gov website. If you were not privy to previous

communications or the nature of the needed corrections I'll be happy to share more details. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

Eighteen days pass. June 9, Morrison finally responds, cc'd to the others (Jacobs, Weaver, and Beasley).

Item 2c. Second phase: email contact with Morrison, and I send him my Second Complaint Request, re his comments in his presentations

Mr. Jenkins: June 9, 2015

I am glad you approve of the NASA actions to remove offending sections from the Ask an Astrobiologist website. I suggested this action as the simplest way to resolve the issue. FYI, I am no longer associated with Ask an Astrobiologist.

David Morrison

June 9. I send my Second Complaint to Morrison, cc'ing the others. This was the initiation of Phase 2, in which the more egregious and unprofessional offenses of Morrison were put on the table:

David Morrison,
I'm glad you agree that the corrections were necessary, and thank you again for suggesting the solution that was implemented. The fact that my work was never about arguing that the Maya calendar 2012 date was about doomsday is readily apparent in all my books, articles, and presentations at both academic and popular venues.

I was, of course, surprised when I discovered that you were broadcasting this erroneous notion. The "Ask an Astrobiologist" occurrences are now resolved. However, now there is the matter of the same errors being disseminated in your presentations and panel discussions at many scientific conferences. Many of these are now posted on Youtube, on the official Youtube channels of the scientific establishments you spoke at. Your authority as a NASA scientist and spokesman was always emphasized. Therefore, the same Communications Policy that I cited, in my email to David Weaver of February 5, in my request that the policy be "promptly" applied to correct your statements on your NASA "Ask an Astrobiologist" pages **also applies to these instances**. I'll chose one of these instances for the purpose of illustration.

On your Wikipedia page (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Morrison_%28astrophysicist%29) your activities in addressing "the 2012 doomsday hoax" are mentioned. One of the links given is to a lecture you gave at the Silicon Valley Astronomy association: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zc3ESO7kkdI>

Within this talk we find you depicting, in one of your slides, a picture of me with my 2009 book titled *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin Books). These images were apparently taken from my website <http://Alignment2012.com>, and this same slide is used in many of your presentations which are now freely viewable to millions online. Please go and look at it, at the 15:42 mark in the link given above.

Please note your three captions to the slide:

1. "John Major Jenkins Mayan apocalypse"
2. "John Major Jenkins is an independent research who has devoted himself to reconstructing ancient Maya cosmology and philosophy"
3. "Mayans (with the help of friendly aliens) developed precision calendar that allowed them to predict the end of the world in 2012"

The first and third convey totally false notions, as we now agree and which my detailed explication sent to David Weaver on February 5 made clear. I am re-attaching this file, in case you need to review the facts. The other caption is merely a quote from my bio, which is a true statement. However, you found it necessary, in your discussion, to lampoon this quote by stating:

"He advertises himself as an *independent researcher*. Now, that's a cool name. That's what someone writes who doesn't have a degree [laughter from audience], who has never taught at a university, who has no funding, is probably unemployed [more laughter from the audience], but who is writing a website. You find lots of independent researchers on the internet, and he developed from his studies of the Maya the idea that the Maya calendar predicted doomsday in 2012." — David Morrison, begins at the 15:46 mark

David, as you now understand from the recently applied corrections, your assertion that I've worked to argue that the Maya predicted doomsday in 2012 is a totally false assertion (in fact, I've argued strongly against it for over two decades). And, frankly, your comments indulge in demeaning *ad hominem* jabs, guaranteed to evoke titters from your audience. This is an unprofessional mode of critique.

Please also see similar factually incorrect assertions and *ad hominem* smears in your presentation at the NASA Aims Research Center (at the 19:27 mark and the 43:30 mark: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TWbN7TBLfT0>).

These smears and errors remain posted for public consumption through your auspices as a respected scientific authority and NASA employee/representative. So, a very serious problem remains. I am being civil, cordial, and diplomatic in seeking a correction to this. My suggestion is two-fold, and this seems to me to be the minimal amount of effort that will be acceptable:

- 1) find and remove all of the false statements from the online videos of your presentation. I can help direct you to the ones I've located.

2) a brief statement written by you, stating that for many years you mistakenly broadcast several factually incorrect assertions about my work, including the ideas that my work was aided by “friendly aliens” and that my work argues that the Maya 2012 date was intended by the Maya to predict doomsday/apocalypse. (Please note here that I’m asking you for an official corrective statement regarding the *factual errors*, not necessarily the *ad hominem* smears. But an apology for those will be appreciated.)

If you have some other suggestion for resolving this, I’m open to discussion.

The irony of this situation would be less pronounced if my reconstruction work was not now, more than twenty years after my first publications on my 2012 work, being echoed by other Maya scholars (e.g., in the Carlson and Coggins chapters in the new anthology titled *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*, University Press of Colorado, 2015). I look forward to your considered response. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Item 2d. Ensuing emails and phone calls to Morrison and the others, with no response

No response from Morrison. Two weeks later, June 23, I resend my Complaint with a new brief cover letter, cc-ing everyone:

To David Morrison, Dolores Beasley, David Weaver, and Bob Jacobs,

I am re-sending my email of two weeks ago, regarding the unresolved situation of NASA scientist David Morrison’s factually incorrect statements about my work in his many presentations given at scientific venues, which are publicly available online. I’m glad that the two incorrect and denigrating statements that he made on the NASA website were corrected. I do hope that my concerns about these other items can be effectively addressed, and it won’t take, like last time, three months and dozens of emails and phone calls. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

July 28, 2015. No response from Morrison or any of the others after five weeks. I resend my Complain of June 9 with a new brief cover letter from a different email address, to Morrison and the others:

Dear David Morrison,

I am re-sending my email of June 9, which I also resent on June 23 (5 weeks ago). I am now sending it from a different email address, in the event that for some reason you are not receiving email from my previous email address (which you had previously responded to).

I’ll now add (July 28, 2015) that I have in hand written statements from two Maya scholars as well as from Bill Hudson, the director of the 2012Hoax website which you have favorably recommended in your comments about 2012. The two Maya scholars are Mark Van Stone and Dr. Ed Krupp. I’m sure you recognize the authority of these two, as you have shared 2012 panels and conferences with them. They all affirm in no uncertain terms that my work was not about arguing for doomsday in 2012, or that the Maya themselves believed so. You asserted in many of your presentations that I argued for doomsday in 2012, and these presentations remain posted online (example previously given, see below) as damaging misrepresentations of my work, my character, and my motivations. Your narrative insinuates that people like myself are responsible for at least one suicide and scaring little children.

As my email below details, it would be helpful for me to correct the record if you would acknowledge that you were in error, regarding your unambiguously wrong and denigrating assertions about my work.

This is my third attempt since June 9th to communicate my reasonable request for your correction, as is required of you as a NASA employee, in the NASA Communications Policy previously cited. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Communication of June 9, 2015, sent to all recipients, not yet responded to: [second Complaint was re-pasted here].

No response. August 11. I call Morrison’s office number, left brief cordial message requesting his response. No response.

September 13, 2015. Comments. It’s apparent that I would need to go to the “higher court” of NASA’s office of investigations to try to resolve this, as Morrison displays unprofessional resistance to acknowledging the errors he made. He is apparently too smart to fail, too high in an Ivory Tower of elitism to admit error, as all practicing scientists should be able to do. Deleting the two blog posts is not acknowledgment of the errors, it’s just making something go away. The same, and more egregious, errors in his presentations are the more serious offense, and they remain unaddressed, unacknowledged, and uncorrected to this day. Morrison, “Dr Doom,” is therefore demonstrably not a functioning and practicing scientist.

Item 2e. Timetable of communications:

1. February 5, 2015. Filed Complaint, emailed to NASA Office of Communications Director David S. Weaver. Fully supported with evidence and links.
2. February 16. After receiving no response, I resend the same file with brief cover letter.
3. February 24. No response. Called Weaver’s office, left message
4. March 10. No response. Called Weaver’s office, left another message

5. March 10, he calls back. I re-explain the situation. He asks me to resend my Complaint.
6. March 10. I resend my Complaint, originally sent Feb. 5, with brief cover letter.
7. March 10. Weaver responds later in the day with email, describing actions to be taken. He cc's Dolores Beasley, director of Ames Research Center where Morrison works, and Bob Jacobs, assistant director in Weaver's office.
8. March 11. I respond and point out that the actions are incomplete and don't actually address the problem, in one of Morrison's blog posts. I also cc the others.
9. March 17. No response. I resend my clarifying email of March 11, with new cover letter, to Weaver and the others.
10. No response. March 22. I send new cover with emphatic subject line "Error on NASA Website is still UNCORRECTED" to Weaver and the others.
11. March 25. No response, call to Weaver's office, left message with secretary.
12. March 26. No response, call to Weaver's office again, left message with secretary.
13. March 27. No response. Call to Dolores Beasley, left message.
14. March 30. No response. Called Beasley again, left message.
15. April 8. No response. Called Weaver's office, left message with secretary.
16. April 13. No response. Called Weaver's office; he is out of office. I asked to talk to his assistant Bob Jacobs, left message for him.
17. April 13. Jacobs calls back. I re-re-explain the situation. He asks me to resend the complaint and the link to Morrison's blog post.
18. April 13. I send direct link to Morrison still uncorrected blog post, and the original Complaint sent to Weaver on February 5.
19. April 13. Jacobs acknowledges receipt of the above.
- Items 20-23. April 21-23. Brief email exchanges with Bob Jacobs, assuring me the process is being addressed.
24. May 22. After repeated checking of the blog post over the previous 5 weeks, I notice that it has been deleted. Both the offending blog posts are now removed. There was no "acknowledgement" to the erroneous information. I was not informed by anyone involved as to this occurrence, and my request for error acknowledgment was ignored.
25. May 22. I email David Morrison, initiating contact. This will be the prelude to Phase 2 in which I will ask him to address the occurrence of his same errors in numerous presentations at scientific venues, many of which are freely available online (Youtube, etc). Emailed to Morrison only.
26. June 9. He briefly responds via email, also cc'ing Beasley, Weaver, and Jacobs.
27. June 9. I respond with my Phase 2 request that he address the other occurrences of errors online. I suggest an easy solution — his simple acknowledgment of the errors. This "second Complaint filing" contains links and quotes from his presentations.
28. June 23. No response. I resend my second complaint with new brief cover letter.
29. July 28. After five weeks and no response, I resend the second complaint file to Morrison and the others. I send it from

- a different email account in the event they were blocking my other email address.
30. August 11. I call Morrison's office number, leave message, cordially asking him to respond to my request (the recording of my call to him was botched in my laptop). No response.
- September 27. No response up to this date.
November 2015. No response.

3. Ed Krupp / Sky & Telescope / Beckman Center / Griffith Observatory

- a. Emails with Krupp, 2015
- b. Cover letter for package of writings sent by mail
- c. Corrections and questions sent, with invitation to respond
- d. Paragraph from Open Invitation Space on Website
- e. Confirmation email
- f. Final letter sent to Krupp during correspondence in the 1990s

Item 3a. Emails with Krupp, 2015

June 8, 2015:
Subject: Greetings from John Major Jenkins

Dear Ed Krupp,

As I recall, we last communicated in 1998 or 1999. I read with interest the recent anthology *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (eds Milbrath and Dowd). I was hoping you could clarify your comments in your preface. I note that you cited Aveni's 2009 book and mentioned the Xultun murals. Fascinating stuff! You also mentioned the 2012 "End Times Follies."

In your recent article of 2014, ("Archaeoastronomical Concepts in Popular Culture" in *Handbook of Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy*) you critiqued my work within the context of this "End Times Follies" (p. 278). In the more limited space of your recent preface you didn't mention me or my work, and I'm wondering if you still hold this association between my work and what you refer to as the End Times Follies. In addition, in another of your previous articles published in late 2012 (an updated version of your *Sky & Telescope* article, *iniQ Magazine*, Vol. 1 No. 5, December 2012, First Citizens Investment Services, titled "Time's Up: 2012 and the Maya Calendar End Times Follies") you depicted and critiqued my 1998 book, and also clearly portrayed me as a primary choreographer of the said Follies.

But just so I can be clear as to what your intended allusion in your recent preface was, I'd appreciate your quick response. Perhaps something in your thinking has changed. If space had allowed would my work also have been mentioned there, as being part of the End Times Follies?

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies
the2012story@gmail.com

June 9:
Subject: Cirque du Calendar [he kept changing the subject lines]

Dear John,
Thank you for your e-mail message dated 8 June 2015. Although I am not certain how to answer your question, I am charmed to hear from you. The focus of my homage to Tony Aveni in *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-based Astronomy* was, of course, Tony and not 2012. In any developed account of the 2012 carnival I would not fail to reference you, but that was not the subject of the piece.

There is ample documentation to associate your first book and related activities with all of what I actually called the "2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies." I don't think I portrayed you as a primary choreographer of the 21 December 2012 circus, but you and your book had a lot to do with the run-up to winter solstice, 2012. The shelf of 2012 books in the Griffith Observatory library and the file of 2012 articles document that. If I were to write another piece specifically on the 2012 theme, it would be folly to omit you.

I wrote "Griffith Observatory, Apocalypse Police" for the August, 2013, issue of the *Griffith Observer*, and the giveaway "Not the End of the World!" button we produced for 21 December 2012 is on the cover. You were not mentioned in that article because the article is about Griffith Observatory's response to predicted cataclysms, not the details of the "2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies."

If you would like a copy of that issue and one of the buttons, please let me know your mailing address. I'll send them right out to you.

Post-apocalyptically,

Ed

Dr. E.C. Krupp
Director, Griffith Observatory
2800 East Observatory Road
Los Angeles, California 90027
e-mail eckrupp@earthlink.net
phone (213) 473-0824
fax (213) 473-0816
WWW <http://www.GriffithObservatory.org>

June 9:
Dear Ed,
I think you did answer my question, in your second paragraph — that you firmly place me under the umbrella of your "2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies." I appreciate the clarification. However, something remains unclear. While the 2012 "End Times" phrase suggests that those under this umbrella are engaged in making doomsday predictions, in your penultimate paragraph you seem to make a distinction in *not* mentioning my work in an article you wrote in 2013 about "predicted cataclysms." But including me in the 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies seems to suggest this, given how you discuss this umbrella in previous articles. So, do you

hold the position that my work advocates that the Maya believed the world was going to end in 2012? Or no? That's the clarification I'm seeking. Thanks,

John

June 9:
Subject: Life After 2012

Dear John,
You did not say the Maya predicted apocalypse for 2012, and in fact, I said as much in the *Sky & Telescope* article and in its subsequent incarnations in *IQ Magazine* and in the November, 2012, *Griffith Observer*. I quoted you: "a tremendous transformation and opportunity for spiritual growth, a transition from one world to another."

The phrase is not "End Times" but "2012 Maya Calendar End Times." Eschatology, however, does not necessarily mean cataclysm.

Whether your work advocates that the Maya believed the world was going to end in 2012 or not isn't really relevant, however. An attentive reading of your books would confirm that you judged the Maya did have a prophetic intention linked with the completion of Bakt'un 13. You argued the Maya imagined a transformational change, not a physical destruction. Nonetheless, your embrace of winter solstice, 2012, provided a popular framework for all kinds of accompanying supposition, commentary, assertion, and preoccupation. The concepts you promoted became part of that thread along with other 2012 threads. The 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies was a cultural phenomenon in which we were all embedded.

Calendrically correlated,

Ed

June 9:
[To Ed]: Okay, interesting. In your first email you mentioned "The shelf of 2012 books in the Griffith Observatory library and the file of 2012 articles." Have you read my 2009 article that was published in the anthology by a New York City publisher, called "You're Still Being Lied To"? The article is called "Fear and Loathing in 2012-Land." I critiqued many voices and theories in the 2012 phenomenon. Is this Griffith Observatory library, and the articles files, open to the public? I'd be happy to mail you a few articles I wrote for inclusion. What do you say?

John

[P.S.] Also, do you have a copy of my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* on the Griffith Observatory library shelf? I can mail one of those too.

June 9:
Subject: Life After 2012
Dear John,

The Observatory library is for the use of Observatory staff. It is not open to the public. It has your books and at least one book in which you have an article. I also own personal copies of the same books. I shall be pleased to receive any publications you wish to forward. Please send them to me at the address below.

Collecting documents,

Ed

Dear John,
After sending my last message I encountered your other message. Yes, one of the books we have (and I have) is *The 2012 Story*.

Confirming astronomically,

Ed

June 10
Subject: A Center for 2012 Studies [this was my subject line change]

Dear Ed, June 10, 2015

I'm assembling a package of articles for mailing to you. I'm not so much interested in the 2013 article of predicted catastrophes that you mentioned, but I have been curious about your Time's Up program for Griffith Observatory, which debuted in May 2012. Do you have a written script for this that you could share? Or, at least, I'm curious if I was mentioned by name. I'd suspect that, more likely, at least my 2012 alignment work was mentioned, and I'm curious how it was characterized and discussed. I suspect that it would be similar to how you've depicted it elsewhere, conflating it with a smorgasbord of other ideas that I don't advocate (bowling pins, rogue planets, etc).

I'd like to return to your comments in your first and second emails. I'm glad you acknowledge that I *haven't* argued that the Maya predicted apocalypse in 2012. You quoted me writing about "a tremendous transformation and opportunity for spiritual growth, a transition from one world to another." The operative word here is "opportunity". My interpretation is that the Maya did not expect a sudden, predetermined "thing" or "prophecy" to "happen" on the period-ending date in 2012. The doctrine, or ideology, I identified and fine-tuned explicating, is that the Maya believed that, at period-endings like 2012, "deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal." And yes, it's a transformational process. For the ceremonialists engaging the deity sacrifice rituals, it can be experienced as a spiritual awakening or "spiritual growth".

There is a very important term missing in the quote from my work you provided. The accurate quote is: "*a time of tremendous transformation and opportunity for spiritual growth, a transition from one World Age to another*" (MC2012, 1998:XL1). (BTW, in 2011 Sven Gronemeyer characterized 2012 as an "era transition"; and Barb MacLeod described it as a "great return" of a cycle.) Notice that in my correct quote the transition is from one **World Age** to another.

I realized early on in my work that a distinction had to clearly be made in the terminology used to discuss 2012 — the difference between "end of the world" claims and reconstructing an "end of a World Age" doctrine in Maya thought. In fact, this distinction is clearly discussed in the pages prior to my quote given above.

However, my discussion from the Intro to my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* is precisely where you, in your Beckman Center presentation of November 2009 (which was done concurrently with the release of your *Sky & Telescope* article) have offered a misleading presentation about my work — one that definitely conveys the sense that I adopted and advocate an "end of the world" interpretation of 2012. Let's take a look. Here is a quote from your Beckman Center talk:

"In this book [*Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*] Jenkins, in restating an unfounded belief, asserts **'the Maya believed the world will end in 2012.'** You will find that passage in that book. The Maya *didn't* believe that." — Ed Krupp, "Time's Up," The Beckman Center, November 2009. Mark 49:40. It's important to hear the inflected emphasis and tone of voice in your actual delivery of this passage: MP3: <http://alignment2012.com/krupp1.mp3>

You basically took a partial-sentence truncated passage out of context and conveyed a false notion about my work. The word "end" in the bolded quote above *is in quotes in my book* (p. XXXIV), which of course didn't get conveyed in your voicing of the line. This is the visual clue to the reader that the "end" is a provisional or questionable attribute given by whoever believes it to be true, like air quotes implies. And the "whoever believes it" is clearly referential *to the two authors I was just previously discussing*, where I said there was uncertainty or "doubt" about their sunspot flare theory. But "one thing is for certain" (this was my very next sentence, note the counterpoint between "doubt" and "certain"; I'm still characterizing their dire theory here): "The Maya believe the world would end in 2012." This was my sardonic *paraphrase* of *their* belief. You should appreciate and not have a problem with this kind of theatrical mimicking of a dubious belief, because you've employed it yourself. For example, in your *Sky & Telescope* article you wrote:

"The ancient Maya of Mexico and Guatemala kept a calendar that is about to roll up the red carpet of time, swing the solar system into transcendental alignment with the heart of the Milky Way, and turn Earth into a bowling pin for a rogue planet heading down our alley for a strike." — Ed Krupp, "[The Great Doomsday Scare](#)," November 2009.

Aha! *You will find that passage in your article.* The very next sentence in my book, however, after your selective partial quote, should have given you pause: "But what does this mean?" I then go on to make the distinction between "end of the world" and "end of World Age," and identify my position (in reconstructing Maya beliefs) as belonging to the metaphorical application of the phrase (that it's an era birthing, ultimately about transformation and renewal). This is made clear throughout the five sentences that follow your extraction of part of a sentence, forcing it out context and misleading your

audiences into getting a totally pejorative and wrong take on my work. The full passage (beginning after my statement that “I concluded that some doubt hung over the sunspot hypothesis” [of Cotterel and Gilbert]) reveals *the exact opposite* of what you conveyed to your audience:

“One thing is for certain: The Maya believed the world will “end” in A.D. 2012. But what does this mean? The end-times doctrine can be interpreted in two ways: metaphorically and literally. **My metaphorical interpretation is that the Maya believed that around the year we call 2012, a large chapter in human history will be coming to an end.** All the values and assumptions of the previous World Age will expire, and a new phase of human growth will commence. Ultimately, **I believe the Maya understood this to be a natural process, in which new life follows a death.** [This is, essentially, an early languaging of my interpretation that, in Maya thought, sacrifice and renewal, death and life, go together and are both present at a 13-Baktun period-ending; the end of one World Age and the beginning of another]

As a litmus test for how listeners would likely receive your portrayal of my work, I sent the mp3 clip of your Beckman Center talk to some random acquaintances, and every single one got the impression you were arguing that my work advocated doomsday. If that wasn’t enough, you also stated in your talk that:

“Jenkins is probably more responsible than anybody for the current flurry and character of the interest in 2012 – although you gotta hand it to Arguelles for really lighting the fuse.”
Audio clip: (mp3 <http://alignment2012.com/krupp2.mp3>).

This clearly refers, in the context of the 2012 doomsday movie just coming out (when you were giving your talk) and your overall portrayal of the 2012 topic, to the ubiquitous doomsday-2012 meme. And “lighting the fuse” is evocative of triggering a bomb going off, causing great destruction. Yes, others have hijacked my ideas for their own dubious theories and doomsday devices, and I’ve tirelessly spoken out against these misinterpretations. The media and documentary production houses have violated contracts and micro-edited my interviews to suit their purposes and distort my work. You don’t adequately distinguish what my own stated intentions and findings have been from the unfortunate hijacking of my work by doomsday pimps and others. Like many critics of the “2012 phenomenon”, you never mention that I’ve been critiquing the Maya calendar / 2012 pop marketplace for longer and more tirelessly than most. The very phrase “the 2012 phenomenon” was being used by Geoff Stray and myself long before it was appropriated by academic 2012 critics. (See my review-essay in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, 2014: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>.)

You are basically blaming me (making me “responsible”, see quote above) for the 2012 doomsday mess — for what exploitative fools did with my work. This is why I believe you perceive me as a primary choreographer in your “2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies.” The problem with your interpretation is that you are employing undiscerning guilt-by-

association constructs. In other words, you don’t acknowledge how I’ve written extensively against the doomsday mess, as well as ridiculous ideas such as we find in Arguelles, Calleman, and others. I have even long disagreed with McKenna’s “sudden change” idea (see my discussion in *The 2012 Story*.)

In your narrative, my work is a smooth continuation of early and quite dubious ideas about 2012 proffered by others. And you don’t acknowledge a fundamental difference between my 2012 work (beginning in earnest circa 1993) and what came before. Which is that I took 2012 seriously as a legitimate topic of rational inquiry, regarding that the ancient Maya thought about it. Many scholars, including perhaps yourself, have been unwilling to entertain that rational investigators might be able to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about the 2012 period-ending date. I was doing this as an extended investigation at a time when almost all scholars and academic publishers treated 2012 with derision. And many still do, *despite the two 2012 inscriptions we now have at hand*. My approach was to examine the pre-Classic culture, and site, that informed scholars had already credited with formulating the Long Count calendar. My logical and reasonable approach to the topic thus followed, with striking and potentially revolutionary results (revolutionary in terms of how we understand the level of astronomical knowledge among the pre-Classic people of Mesoamerica, and the sophistication of their integrative religious ideologies).

Thus, much of my work springs from my interdisciplinary analysis of the Izapa civilization. My two-part interpretation is simply stated: **the creators of the Long Count intended the 2012 period-ending date to target a rare astronomical alignment within the cycle of the precession of the equinoxes, and saw this alignment as signaling (not definitively causing) the need for deity sacrifice in order to facilitate worldrenewal.** There it is in one sentence, less than 50 words. This is, in essence, what I reconstructed at Izapa and argued in the mid-1990s, while also drawing from other sites and evidence elsewhere. I’ve been happy to fine-tune this definition of my work over the years, but the ideas are there, in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. And sure, some of the languaging in that book is not as clearly expressed as I would now prefer, but that’s the nature of evolving writing skills and honing the clarity with which ideas are expressed, over time. And there is a lot of post-1998 writings and research, including my 2010 SAA presentation

(<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>), that critics have overlooked. For example, your later articles and presentations don’t cite my 2009 book, *The 2012 Story*, which came out the month before your *Sky & Telescope* article and provided exhaustive critiques and discussions of the 2012 milieu. That book sold widely and internationally and was translated into several languages, in paperback and hardback. I suspect that at least some critics ignore that book because I also took to task Maya scholars (someone had to do it) for their ridiculous and fallacious assertions about 2012 (notably, Aveni at Tulane).

Now, I’d like to point something out. I’m not trying to convince you of my findings. However, what is striking is that other Maya scholars have been recently echoing my own two-

part interpretation, which I originated some two decades ago. For example, in the same anthology that you wrote your preface for (*Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy*, 2015), John Carlson offers an interpretation for how the ancient Maya thought about 2012. He writes that it involves *deity sacrifice as a necessary prelude to world-renewal*. Clemency Coggins advocates for a pre-Classic precession awareness, and explicitly reiterates my model for how the cosmic center deity evolved as human groups migrated into the Tropics (*MC2012*, 1998, 31-40). She also echoes certain ideas I've reconstructed about Izapa, but she neglected to note the Izapa ballcourt's alignment to the December solstice sunrise. (In addition, elsewhere Michael Grofe is finding that the ancient Maya could accurately track the Sidereal Year and the Tropical Year — supporting evidence for my 2012 “galactic alignment” reconstruction. See his peer-reviewed essays posted on his Academia.edu page). So, as part of your Follies narrative you would likely have critiqued and dismissed my ideas in your Preface, if space had allowed (your citation to Aveni in any case serves this purpose), but meanwhile two other scholars *in the same anthology* echo key ideas in my two-part 2012 interpretation — in both the astronomical and ideological aspects. (Not to mention that curious book jacket image, which seems to depict a pre-dawn version of the sun's alignment with the nuclear bulge of the galaxy, a.k.a. the galactic alignment.)

So, how do you reconcile these facts:

- In the mid-1990s I emphasized that my work was about reconstructing what the ancient Maya believed about 2012. I found evidence and an astronomical key that was symbolized in Maya Creation Myth concepts and other evidence, and this was a departure from what came before in the work of others. (Arguelles's “galactic synchronization” is NOT at all the same as the precession-based galactic alignment. McKenna's definition of it was quite loose, and he didn't explicitly connect it to a Maya intention with 2012 in his 1975 book (he gave it a 200-year range)).
- A simple definition of what my findings are is available in my many articles, presentations, web pages, interviews and books, but has never been accurately portrayed by my critics, despite direct communications with them over twenty years. More usually, my work is conflated through guilt-by-association allusions with doomsday theories or other writers in the marketplace.
- My two-part interpretation (a precessional alignment of the solstice sun with the Milky Way/ecliptic Crossroads & southern terminus of the Dark Rift that signals the time for deity sacrifice in order to facilitate world-renewal) is now being echoed in the statements about 2012 published by Maya scholars (not as a coherent integration, but elements are found in Coggins, Carlson, Callaway, MacLeod, Grofe, Dowd, Barrientos, Gronemeyer, and others).

That third point is a far cry from where Maya Studies stood on 2012 when I first published my pioneering 2012 work in the mid-1990s. Acknowledgment or cognitive dissonance? Well, mitigating comments by critics continue to be published. Your

own allusions to the 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies indicts my work as dubiously part of the same marketplace mess that I've actually critiqued and exposed the fallacies of. And you do, in your preface, cite Aveni's 2009 book as support for your dismissive attitude. My critique of Aveni's book will open up another can of worms, perhaps best reserved for a separate discussion. Do you believe that Aveni's critiques of my ideas and position, in his 2009 book, are accurate and reliable? It seems you do.

I should close here, and this will have to serve as an overview. It's very difficult to offer a brief recapitulation of the issues I've seen with your critiques of my work. Some are just purely factual corrections (can send if you like) but many are conceptual, in terms of your forced narrative of where my efforts fit within the evolving 2012 discussion, my presumed “influences” and associations. There is increasing cognitive dissonance within Maya Studies as the ideas I've long articulated with good evidence and argument (but which are rarely accurately summarized or even acknowledged) are slowly being subsumed into the general consensus. This is, of course, the three stages by which breakthroughs in a field of study are integrated: 1) the originator of breakthrough work is ignored, 2) the ideas and the originator are vehemently attacked, and 3) the breakthrough ideas are accepted as if they were known all along. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
 The Center for 2012 Studies
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>
 [emailed to Krupp after initial cordial exchange, 6-10-2015]

June 10
 Subject: Centered in 2012
 Dear John,

Thank you for your message sent 10 June 2015.

I fear you the believe most of what I have written and said about the 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies was much more focused on you and leveraged by you than was the case.

You were not mentioned in any way in the *Time's Up* planetarium show. Your books were not referenced. The 2012 of the public imagination was the focus, and I've described that in detail. I think you have very little understanding of planetarium shows at Griffith Observatory. The show was really about the second law of thermodynamics, and the 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies were the hook by which we explored that subject.

Your exposition below has moved far beyond an exchange of correspondence, and I do not have the ability to explore all of the details that are understandably meaningful to you. There are ample forums for your analysis, and if you really want others to evaluate the validity and value of your books, the work is always there for independent review. My line about bowling pins and roque planets obviously applies to the much bigger 2012 realm and does not single you out. Of course, you are free to think and say what you like, but that doesn't mean I agree.

Best celestial wishes,
 Ed

Ed,
 Since "the 2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies were the hook" of your Time's Up planetarium show, and you said that it would be "folly" to not mention my work in a run-down on that topic, it was reasonable for me to ask the question, for clarity. And I wasn't believing anything in particular; that's why I asked. Thanks for the clarification.

I'm surprised you don't have any time for my direct questions about your various comments on my work, which I spent a great deal of time reading, viewing, assessing, and responding to. Other forums would not be an appropriate place for me to pursue this (I think that's called outsourcing), because it pertains to your own misleading presentation of my work to your audiences. And, again, as I mentioned, I am not here trying to convince you of my work. Rather, I'm pointing out to you that you took a truncated sentence from my book out of context in order to convey a demeaning and wrong portrayal of my work to your unsuspecting and trusting audiences. Specific details were provided to you. No comment? Since you otherwise confirmed that you don't think my work argues for doomsday, then why did you do that in your 2009 Beckman Center talk? (Also in your Pomona College talk, also online.)

As for the galactic alignment and the earth as a bowling pin destined for demolition, this too came across as way of lampooning a core idea in my work and, like your other comment, it was associated with doomsday. Sure, it can be fun to lampoon all the silliness in the marketplace. But your liberal use of loose lingo is like reporting what 3rd-Graders think about Einstein's Relativity Theory as a means of debunking it.

Well, I'm not going to repeat my points and questions that were clearly articulated in my previous email. Here we are, almost 17 years after I sent you my 1998 book for review. You haven't provided a critical review of my work, but a menu of your misunderstandings about it. I can only ask that you please try to be better informed about what I've actually written through the years. I have been easy to reach by email since our last communication in 1999. Try to understand the categorical distinction between my approach and the folly dancers you've associated me with. Try to accurately portray the effort I have made to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy, rather than lampooning me through guilt-by-association constructs. Such un-discerning debunkery is extremely unwarranted given that, as I pointed out, *my core ideas are now being echoed by various professional Maya scholars writing about 2012*. Perhaps some of the essays I am sending will be helpful, so that in future discussions and publications you can accurately portray my work before offering your comments on it.

Sincerely,
 John Major Jenkins

June 10:
 Subject: Centered in 2012
 Dear John,

Thank you for your message.

I understand your view of my comments and publications, but I don't agree.

Even if my workload prohibits detailed response to your previous message, I shall always be pleased to hear from you.

Taking a time out,

Ed

Item 3b. Cover letter for package of writings sent by mail

Dear Ed Krupp,

July 9, 2015

I am enclosing a booklet and a selection of articles and chapters. It strikes me that your comments and critiques about my work are not very well informed regarding what I've actually written through the years. Much hinges on your distorted, partial, out-of-context extraction from the Introduction to my 1998 book. You don't seem to have read or considered my lengthy letter to you of early 1999, after I sent you my book for review. That was the last I heard from you until I reached out last month (June 2015). You easily could have contacted me at any point during the interim period of 16 years, and I would have been happy to dispel your mistaken notions about my work and clarify any questions. Your updated *Sky & Telescope* article for the *IQ Magazine* (December 2012), would have benefited from a reading of my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, which you claim to have on hand. Likewise, the same issue applies to your *Handbook for Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy* article of 2014.

A few basic points about my work that my critics prefer to ignore: I investigated 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. My approach has always been *to try to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought of 2012*. I asked the right questions, regarding the origins of the Long Count (the "2012" calendar), and studied the most relevant time and place: Izapa and the Izapan (Isthmian) civilization. I investigated evidence for how the creators of the Long Count thought about 2012, during a time when all Maya scholars treated 2012 with contempt and derision or, at best, something to be examined only as a psycho-social phenomenon of the modern marketplace. In August of 2010, the first serious treatment of 2012 by so-called "real" scholars, as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought, was published (MacLeod and Gronemeyer, *Wayeb* no. 34). This occurred four months *after* my SAA presentation on the Tortuguero inscriptions.

Thereafter followed the Oxford IX conference in Peru, with the academic papers on 2012 being published by the IAU in July 2011. Then, the Gelfer anthology (in which I contributed a chapter). Then *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. 24 (August 2012). The papers in these journals which suggested, proposed, deduced, or reconstruction anything about what 2012 might have meant to the ancient Maya included the core ideas that I published in the mid-1990s: the precession-based galactic alignment (properly understood), and a doctrine of period-ending deity sacrifice & world-renewal. Please read the essays by Carlson, Grofe, MacLeod, and Callaway if you are doubtful. And now we have Carlson's 2015 essay and Coggins essay, in the anthology you wrote your preface for — both of which echo my long-ago articulated ideas. Comments? If you don't

understand that my work was centered on an interpretation of deity sacrifice & world-renewal which the ancient Maya saw timed by the galactic alignment, you should re-read *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, the core ideas of which are summarized in a concise section of my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*.

I enclose the following:

My booklet of late 2012, titled *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy*, based on my presentation at the New England Archaeological Research Association (NEARA).

“Approaching 2012: Modern Misconceptions versus Reconstructing Ancient Maya Perspectives” (2011, in the anthology edited by my Joseph Gelfer, preface by Michael Coe).

“The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)” in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (January 2014). This is my critique-review of an essay by John Hoopes & Kevin Whitesides (2012), in the same journal.

“12/21/2012: The Game Ball Goes Through the Goal Ring,” *Institute of Maya Studies Explorer*, Vol. 41, Issue 12. (answering questions)

“Fear and Lying in 2012-Land,” January 2009. Critique of the 2012 phenomenon, in the anthology *You Are Still Being Lied To*, ed. Russ Kick.

I also enclose a print-out of the email I sent you on June 10, which contained comments and questions regarding your portrayal of my work. That was four weeks ago, and you haven’t responded. I think a responsible scholar should respond to the person whose work he was maligned and inaccurately assessed. To this end, please see the Open Letter piece, also enclosed. This contains many of the points from my email to you of June. It also indicates factual errors in your various articles on 2012. There are many more, but I’ve selected a few.

I invite you to respond to this Open Letter which corrects and critiques your statements about my work. It will be posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>); and I will be happy to post your rebuttal when you provide it. My email: the2012story@gmail.com.

The skewed narrative and basic factual errors in your treatments obviously suggest that you aren’t that well versed in the ideas and publications of “the 2012 phenomenon,” which I’ve been critiquing since the late 1980s. Read, for example, my “Fear and Lying in 2012-Land” piece or the several in-depth chapters in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, which was published before your *Sky & Telescope* article. Early critiques (Arguelles, etc) are in my 1992/1994 book called *Tzolkin* (Borderland Sciences Research Foundation).

It’s funny, in 1996-1997 I was inquiring at academic publishers regarding publishing my magnum opus, *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. The conversation was over as soon as I mentioned 2012 — within 45 seconds of the phone call’s initiation. Why? Because, of course, 2012 was not a valid topic of rational inquiry. For scholars and for academic publishers, that’s been the case until a smattering of serious scholars took it up,

beginning in 2010. Which is just to say that my work was too far ahead of the curve to be of interest to academic publishers in 1996. I don’t think you’ve read the academic literature on Maya precession calculations, the 3-11 Pik formula, or Tortuguero Monument 6. If you had, you would see how my interpretations of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya started being echoed much later by scholars. But many of them have gotten the memo jammed down their throats, from Aveni or Stuart, that 2012 cannot be treated seriously! Don’t mention or cite JMJ (Carlson, Aveni); don’t explore the unique ways the Maya tracked precession; and any talk of world-renewal is New Age rubbish (Hoopes).

Finally, I did not print-out my *Society for American Archaeology* paper “The Astronomy of Tortuguero Monument 6.” In 2009, I was invited by Drs Robert Benfer and Larry Adkins to speak on the SAA panel “Archaeoastronomy in the Americas,” which happened April 15, 2010. My read paper was included in the 206-page debate about it, sponsored by Dr. Ed Barnhart and the board members at the *Maya Exploration Center*. This occurred in late 2010, with comments by Stan Guenter, Gerardo Aldana, Michael Grofe, Barbara MacLeod, Ed Barnhart, and others. The entire transcript, with my concluding comments, is posted at Barnhart’s MEC website (<http://www.mayaexploration.org>) — and it’s also at *The Center for 2012 Studies* website. Please read my SAA paper in that file. In the larger debate you can perceive the juvenile and irrational debate & critique / evade & repeat tactics of anti-2012 scholars like Guenter and Aldana. They project upon me something that I am not, which is akin to the worst kind of bigoted, mean-spirited, scape-goating. Really amazing to experience, and disappointing to see professional scholars behaving so badly.

I hope you will file my enclosed booklet and articles in your Griffith Observatory library, so you and your colleagues can be accurately informed about my work. The skewed, under-informed, juvenile, and unprofessional critiques of my work are documented for the record. I also hope that whatever future attempts you make to critique my work will be informed by these essays, and take into account the odd circumstance that the two core ideas about 2012 that I articulated in the 1990s were echoed years later by other Maya scholars — notably by John B. Carlson in the same anthology of 2015 (*Cosmology, and Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy...*) that you wrote a preface for. Yep, the ancient Maya believed that, at the period-ending of 2012, deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies

Item 3c. Corrections and questions sent, with invitation to respond

Questions for Dr. Edwin Krupp, Open Letter

John Major Jenkins, Director of [The Center for 2012 Studies](http://thecenterfor2012studies.com)

Dr Ed Krupp is the Director of Griffith Observatory in Los Angeles, for some 40 years. He has written popular trade books

as well as articles on Maya astronomy in *The Griffith Observer* newsletter, *Sky & Telescope* magazine, *Astronomy* magazine, and elsewhere. He is or has been on the editorial board of several journals including *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (ed. John B. Carlson).

In November 2009 Krupp gave a presentation at The Beckman Center in Irvine, California, as part of the Distinctive Voices series sponsored by grants from the Kellogg Fund, the Casey Fund, and the President's Circle Fund of the National Academy of Sciences. The Center website states it is "a program of the National Academy of Sciences Communication Initiative to increase science literacy." Krupp's talk is posted here: <http://media.voicesatbeckman.org/dv/110409/index.html>. (Also at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGJRGE52WU4>.) It was co-sponsored by the Orange County chapter of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), was titled "Time's Up", and was all about critiquing 2012 publications, which at that time necessarily did not include any writings by professional scholars (because none, except Robert Sitler and Anthony Aveni, had produced anything. Aveni's book probably appeared too late for Krupp's consideration, having been published a mere two weeks earlier. Sitler's 2006 essay on "The 2012 Phenomenon" was overlooked by Krupp).

Krupp dealt with books, ideas, and theories that have appeared in trade publications, Krupp himself being no stranger to the challenges of writing for trade publishers and a popular readership. His presentation at The Beckman Center was given apparently on November 4, precisely the day of the premiere, nearby in Hollywood, of Roland Emmerich's 2012 disaster movie. I had been tapped by Sony Pictures, a month earlier, to participate in their press conferences for the movie, offering my expertise in conversations with the media. I had told them that my work has argued and shown for almost two decades that the Maya did NOT believe 2012 would be a cataclysmic doomsday, and I seriously considered how effective I might be in conveying this truth. My liaison with Sony Pictures said my position didn't matter, and I decided it would be worth the effort. There was no payment, though travel and lodging was covered. My book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin, 2009) was also slated for release, and it would be good promotion (something all free-lance authors must pursue and, hey, how many independent Maya scholars get to promote their new book on the Hollywood Red Carpet?).

So, I was on the Red Carpet while Krupp was giving his talk nearby. Perhaps he knew this, which might explain some of his angry comments. I was able to facilitate a good interview on the Red Carpet, with the help of my brother, which we edited and posted on Youtube the next day: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IV-tOkWmFIY>. It emphasized my position that the Maya didn't think of 2012 as a doomsday. Contrasted with the apocalypse porn that surrounded me, it made for an honest yet satirical report.

Ed Krupp and I communicated by mail between 1996 and early 1999. I had sent him several essays on my new findings relating to Maya astronomy and the 2012 date in their calendar. I may have even sent him a copy of my monograph *Izapa Cosmos* (1996). In any case, we did have a few cordial exchanges, but after I sent him my published book in 1998,

followed by a letter in January 1999, there was no response from him. That was our last direct communication as of early 2015. Sixteen years. He doesn't appear to have written a review of my book for the Griffith Observer newsletter, which was offered as a possibility. But he was clearly busy crafting his narrative of 2012 books and authors, into which I would be fitted, and his viewpoint is expressed in his November 4th Beckman Center presentation and his *Sky & Telescope* article in the November 2009 issue.

Thereafter, he gave virtually the identical presentation at least two more times: Orange County Astronomers meeting (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xL5gyy5tuZA>, March 2011) and at his alma mater Pomona College (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XZvZR7OT9Rs>, 2011?) (That's all I'm aware of; there may be more.) As late as December 2012 he was still addressing the hyped and alarmist doomsday propaganda, when he spoke and participated in a panel with Andrew Fraknoi and David Morrison, at a conference on December 11 sponsored by the Seti Institute and his employer, The Griffith Observatory.

In my questions to Krupp I will focus on his Beckman Center presentation, which is posted as a video on The Beckman Center website for their Distinctive Voice series, as well as in at least two posts on Youtube. Before beginning I need to state unequivocally what my work on 2012 has been about, since the early 1990s. It can be done very simply: **The creators of the Long Count intended the 2012 period-ending date to target a rare astronomical alignment within the cycle of the precession of the equinoxes, and saw this alignment as signaling (not definitively causing) the need for deity sacrifice in order to facilitate worldrenewal.** A more detailed treatment is in Appendix 1.

The Beckman Center "["Time's Up" presentation](#)" of November 4, 2009. "["The Great Doomsday Scare" article for Sky & Telescope](#)" (November 2009 issue), posted on the NASA.gov website, *Sky & Telescope* website, and the Griffith Observatory website.

Questions Addressed to Dr. Krupp

(1) Do you believe that readers of my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* would conclude that I believed the Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012?

Here is a quote from your Beckman Center talk:

"In this book [*Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*] Jenkins, in restating an unfounded belief, asserts 'the Maya believed the world will end in 2012.' You will find that passage in that book. The Maya *didn't* believe that." — Ed Krupp, "Time's Up," The Beckman Center, November 2009. Mark 49:40. Audio links (windows media file or mp3): <http://alignment2012.com/krupp1.wma> (MP3: <http://alignment2012.com/krupp1.mp3>)

This basic statement was repeated, almost verbatim, in other presentations you gave until at least March of 2011. (2) Do you feel that your statement accurately conveys my belief and position on the Maya and 2012?

Here is a quote from your *Sky & Telescope* article:

“The ancient Maya of Mexico and Guatemala kept a calendar that is about to roll up the red carpet of time, swing the solar system into transcendental alignment with the heart of the Milky Way, and turn Earth into a bowling pin for a rogue planet heading down our alley for a strike.” — Ed Krupp, “[The Great Doomsday Scare](#),” November 2009.

This sentence appears in your article. (3) Why should I not embrace and broadcast to others that you stated this, with the emphasized insinuation that you believe it? It’s a sentence that appears in your book! Proof! Could it be that I might effect such a deception only by taking your quote out of context and failing to report the very next sentence in your article? Because this is exactly what you did in your truncated partial-sentence quote, extracted from my 1998 book. I was discussing the viewpoint of a 2012 doomsday book, and satirically paraphrased their “certain” position on it (much like you did in the sentence I quoted from your article). The word “end” is in quotes in my written sentence (which, of course, did not get conveyed in your voicing of the line). In my *very next sentence*, I state “But what does this mean?” I then make a clear distinction between dubious “end of the world” language and an “end of a World Age” renewal doctrine demonstrable within the Maya Creation Mythology. There are dozens of passages in my book that clearly express my non-doomsday position on 2012.

So, I’ll restate my earlier question in a different way: (4) Would a critic who cherry picks a truncated quote from my book, ignoring the context of the discussion, in order to convey to his audiences that I believed the Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012, perhaps harbor an unprofessional and/or malicious bias? The inflection of your spoken words is important and telling, which is why I’ve provide two audio clips of your voice.

The accusatory intent of your construct is clear, because a few seconds later you cast blame: “Jenkins is probably more responsible than anybody for the current flurry and character of the interest in 2012 – although you gotta hand it to Arguelles for really lighting the fuse.” This clearly refers, in the context of the 2012 doomsday movie just coming out and your overall take on the 2012 topic, to the ubiquitous doomsday-2012 meme. And “lighting the fuse” is a metaphor for triggering a bomb going off, causing great destruction. Audio clip: (windows media file <http://alignment2012.com/krupp2.wma>) / (mp3 <http://alignment2012.com/krupp2.mp3>).

Meanwhile, as I alluded to above, *on this same day as your presentation* I was being dogged on the Red Carpet by my Sony liaison while I tried to get recorded a statement as to the Maya *not believing the world will end in 2012*. My comments made to reporters theoretically went out to millions of people. By the way, I had refused to sign the Sony release contract, which had all manner of ridiculous protections and provisions for Sony, including the clause that I could never sue Sony or their parent company for anything, ever, for all time. As a result of my refusal to kowtow to corporate Hollywood, it was unclear whether my wife and I would have viable airplane tickets home the next morning.

Of the media interviews I did, *Time Magazine*¹ and “Teen Hollywood” accurately reported my non-doomsday position: <http://www.teenhollywood.com/2009/11/10/2012-should-you-be-scared>. In which I said about the movie: “It has a brief reference to the galactic alignment at the beginning, but there is a tendency by the media, and I’ve experienced this directly for many, many years, to use this kind of standard bumper sticker that the Mayans predicted the end of the world in 2012, and I just can’t reconcile that with what I know from my own research into the evidence.”²

(5) How many presentations do you recall you gave, in which you conveyed one or both of your statements about my work to your audiences? (I found three that are posted online). (6) Did anyone ever approach you with a correction? (7) Is there anything in our letter exchanges of 1996-1999 that gave you the impression about my work that you conveyed to your audiences? (I find nothing).

(8) Have you kept up with more recent studies and books on 2012, by myself and by other Maya scholars, including your friends and colleagues? And has your attitude changed toward the idea that we might be able to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012? (This was my *modus operandi* beginning in the early 1990s, which was not utilized in academic publications by professional scholars until the *Wayeb* no. 34 monograph by Barbara MacLeod & Sven Gronemeyer in August of 2010, released four months after my presentation on the 2012 text from Tortuguero Monument 6 at the 75th meeting of the *Society for American Archaeology*).

Finally, (9) can you acknowledge the following three factual errors? The second one, in particular, had repercussions in how you conceived and characterized my work as merely echoing the McKennas’ earlier work, and that my book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* merely “repackaged” already stated earlier ideas. These are very misleading statements, if one understands what the McKennas actually wrote in the first edition of their book (1975), and what the state of the 2012 discussion was when I began my effort, in the early 1990s, to reconstruct, with evidence, *what the ancient Maya believed about 2012*. In other words, despite a few partial or indirect clues, the effort was non-existent when I began. The following statements in your article are echoed in your presentations.

A Few Errors of Fact

1. On Frank Waters’ *Mexico Mystique* (1975) book. You write in your “Great Doomsday Scare” article:

Waters also miscalculated the date when the calendar would supposedly pull down the shades. “The end of the Great Cycle . . . will occur Dec. 24, 2011 A.D.”

No, Waters did not “miscalculate” this, he drew it from Maya scholar Michael Coe’s 1966 book (cited in Waters’ bibliography), and he is the one who miscalculated it (which has been well known for many years), and which Coe (2011) admits. This incorrect statement is repeated and currently maintained on the Griffith Observatory website: <http://www.griffithobservatory.org/events/2012.html>, where you (Krupp) provide an endorsement link to Morrison’s “Ask an Astrobiologist” page on the NASA.gov website.

2. You write: “Another book in 1975 also spotlighted the Maya calendric roundup. Dennis and Terence McKenna discussed it in *The Invisible Landscape: Mind, Hallucinogens, and the I Ching*. That book at least got the Baktun-13 end date right: Dec. 21, 2012.” In actual fact, the 1975 first edition did not explicitly mention *December 21* of 2012, and it did not at all, anywhere, mention the Maya or the Maya calendar. The posited mathematical Time Wave, based on the Chinese I Ching, was projected to end “a 4,300-year cycle ... around the year 2012” (174). The final phase of his Time Wave is elsewhere described as “the ingress of novelty into our own epoch, from 1945 to 2012” (184). That’s it. There are no Maya or Mesoamerican Studies sources listed in the bibliography, and the terms “Maya”, “the Maya calendar”, and “2012” do not appear in the Index. The McKennas had not yet, in fact, committed to the solstice date in 2012, and they were unaware of the coincidence of their I Ching-based theorizing with the 2012 date in the Maya calendar. This was introduced in a few sentences added to the 1993 second edition of their book, along with a new sky diagram (which you depict in your presentation). (The “1993” edition didn’t really hit the shelves until early 1994.)

3. My book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* was published in 1998, not 1995, although some of my earlier findings were published in my 1995 books *The Center of Mayan Time* and *Izapa Cosmos* (1996). I wonder if you even had it in hand when you wrote your critique. Your quotes pertain to my Introduction, which you may be aware has been freely posted on my website, in full, since 2002.

Ed, here’s another correction for you. In your article in *Handbook for Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy* (ed., Clive Ruggles, 2004), you wrote on page 278 that “E.C. Krupp wrote the first widely circulated, nationally distributed detailed commentary on dubious 2012 notions (Krupp 2009)...” Well, it’s fine to pat yourself on the back, but this is a totally false statement. As my article in *Zeitschrift fur Anomalistic* (2014) and my chapter in the Gelfer anthology (*2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, 2011, intro by Michael Coe) point out, I have been critiquing dubious 2012 notions, in addition to academic discussions and mentions of 2012, since the early 1990s. (My early book *Tzolkin*, 1992/1994, can be considered an early example, which was distributed domestically and internationally). Also, my book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin) came out the month before your article and it contains lengthy and detailed chapters that critique dubious 2012 notions and theories (e.g., Waters, Arguelles, Calleman, Joseph, McKenna, etc), and I didn’t commit the basic factual errors that you did in assessing these ideas, which I enumerate above). Another article of mine which critiqued the burgeoning 2012 mess in the marketplace (e.g., Lawrence Joseph’s book and others), and which saw mainstream national and international distribution, was *Fear and Lying in 2012-Land*, published in the anthology of social critique called *You Are Still Being Lied To* (editor Russ Kick, New York: The Disinformation Company). It was released in January 2009. In fact, it had been on the shelf of my local Barnes & Noble bookstore for many, many months when your *Sky & Telescope*

piece appeared in the magazine section. Those are just a few examples — not to mention my 2011 chapter in the Gelfer anthology which critiques you, Aveni, Lounsbury, along with other distortion-meisters in the popular marketplace (Xerox copy enclosed).

Immediately after the above quote from your 2014 chapter, you state that “At the same time Aveni published an entire trade book on the subject for the general reader” (p. 278). No, Aveni’s book was published by the University Press of Colorado — an AAUP approved peer-reviewed scholarly press. I emphasize this because Aveni’s was the only book by a professional Maya scholar on 2012 that was NOT published with a trade publisher, and it contains at least seven factual errors that misrepresent my work, Maya methods for tracking the precession of the equinoxes, and the Izapa ballcourt’s alignment. Feel free to address this problem with Aveni’s book, and why you and other Aveni champions have not applied critical thinking and fact checking to his comments, one of which is a use of religious bigotry in his allusions to my work. Ethics, anyone?

Appendix 1. My Work: A Concise Description

My “work” is the effort I’ve been engaged in since the 1980s to understand Maya cosmology, culture, and calendrics, and specifically my effort to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. My awareness of 2012 began at age 12 in 1976, as I recounted in my book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin, 2009). My writings on 2012 can be traced to comments in my 1989 book *Journey to the Mayan Underworld* and my 1992/94 book *Tzolkin*, but reached a breakthrough and the beginning of an intense period of focus in early 1994. My “2012 alignment reconstruction” (also sometimes referred to as the “2012 alignment theory” or “galactic alignment theory”) has been presented, defined, elaborated, defended, and tested in many books, personal exchanges, websites, interviews, workshops, classes, presentations, and articles beginning in 1994.

In a nutshell, in my study of the pre-Classic site of Izapa (the culture and site that many Maya scholars believe was involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar), my study of ballgame and Creation Myth symbolism, and king-making rites, I’ve argued that **the creators of the Long Count intended the 2012 period-ending date to target a rare astronomical alignment within the cycle of the precession of the equinoxes, and saw this alignment as signaling (not definitively causing) the need for deity sacrifice in order to facilitate worldrenewal.** There it is in one sentence, less than 50 words. So, my reconstruction work has two aspects: a precession-based *astronomy*, and an *ideology* (which I also sometimes refer to as a “spiritual teaching”). To reiterate: my work has never been about arguing for a world-ending doomsday, nor for an *automatic and predetermined* spiritual ascension, consciousness awakening, transformation, or “bliss out” slated to happen in 2012. My work argues and deduces from presented evidence and academic sources, and articulates what the pre-Classic creators of the Long Count (the “2012 calendar”) thought about 2012. More recently, I’ve been interested in tracing how those traditional, core ideas were maintained, adapted, or violated through the Classic Period

(200 AD to 900 AD). (See, e.g., my booklet *Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions*, 2011, and essays on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website.)

simultaneously echo and dismiss my work. **Addendum:** [here is my initial email query to Krupp](#) (June 2015).

Finally, how do you reconcile the fact that John B. Carlson's "deity sacrifice and world-renewal" interpretation of 2012, in the 2012 anthology you wrote the preface for (*Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy*), echoes my own long-held interpretation of 2012 with your characterization of my work as a dubious and dismissible component of your "2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies"? I sent article proposals to Carlson about my 2012 work between 1994 and 1999 and he, like you, received my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* for review in 1998.

Item 3e. Confirmation of receipt

Sincerely,

Dear John, July 28, 2015
Thank you for your e-mail message sent 27 July 2015. Your packet of materials did arrive safely, but I have had no chance to look at it. Ongoing programming and publication deadlines, three public lectures, and the unprecedented encounter with Pluto have commanded my attention and Griffith Observatory's resources.

John Major Jenkins
July 7, 2015 The2012story@gmail.com

I can't promise when I'll be able to read your material, only that I shall do so. My work on astronomy and culture is discretionary and peripheral to my primary responsibilities.

Best celestial wishes,

Ed

Notes:

1. Interview with Stephen Snyder, *Time Magazine*, November 19, 2009. <http://techland.time.com/2009/11/19/mayan-expert-2012-not-just-silly-but-offensive/>

4. John Hoopes, University of Texas Press, Wikipedia, Zeitschrift für Anomalistik

2. The previous media event and film showing I spoke to the media at, two weeks earlier in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, led to several good doomsday-fallacy exposé interviews on Channel 9 News in Denver. The 8-minute news segment they produced was broadcast the first week of November and was archived on the Channel 9 News website for several years. It included interview footage I did at the Channel 9 News studio, and was linked to a similar morning news interview I did with them in 2012. They adopted my long-argued position that the Maya didn't predict cataclysm at the end of the 13-Baktun period in 2012.

- 4a. How it Started: Hoopes's Refusal to Answer a Simple Question
- 4b. Hoopes Makes the Maya World Age Doctrine a New Age 2012 Mythology
- 4c. Calling out Hoopes, July 2011
- 4d. Hoopes Evades Discussion on Whitesides' FB Page
- 4e. I Response to Hoopes's Questions, March 2011
- 4f. Hoopes's Mayanism (from The 2012 Story)
- 4g. Mayanism Prison Hoopes (2014)
- 4h. 2011: Complaint filed with University of Texas Press, re AJ Vol. 22
- 4i. Ensuing emails with AJ editor John B. Carlson (Hoopes cc'd)
- 4j. My *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* review of the Whitesides-Hoopes article
- 4k. Ensuing email exchanges with Hoopes (and Whitesides elsewhere)
- 4l. My Response to their Response (August 2014)
- 4m. Annotated Summary with links to others items

Item 3d. Paragraph from Open Invitation Space on my website, *The Center for 2012 Studies*

Item 4a. How it Started: Hoopes's Refusal to Answer a Simple Question

July 23, 2015. Open Letter to Ed Krupp, following an email exchange (in June 2015) in which I summarized my response to his critiques of my work in his various presentations and articles between 2009 and 2014. After he declined to comment during our email exchange, I mailed him a package of essays (as agreed), my booklet titled *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy* (2012), and my Open Letter, inviting his response. Here is [my cover letter](#) mailed with the package, July 9, 2015. [Here is a PDF of the Open Letter](#), receipt confirmed at Griffith Observatory on July 13, 2015. Given his under-informed assertions, clever selective quoting of my words, and factual errors, his response will be of interest, which I offered to post here. One wonders if he will attempt to wiggle around acknowledging any of it, much like [Hoopes & Whitesides](#) did. I initiated contact with Krupp to clarify his comments in the Preface he wrote for *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (eds Milbrath & Dowd, 2015). This item is relevant because it reveals a cognitive dissonance in how scholars within Maya Studies

Observers are aware of a "feud" between myself and John Hoopes, but are probably not aware of how it began. For years, I was tolerant and accepting of Hoopes's disagreements and critiques of my work. But something happened in early 2008 that, at the time, I was unaware of. Hoopes and I had a debate about the World Age doctrine in Mesoamerican tradition (here: <http://alignment2012.com/Hoopes-JMJ-January2008.pdf>). He was clearly resistant to the evidence I was presenting to him. Simultaneous to our emails exchange (a one-week period in early January 2008), he began to craft his Mayanism construct on Wikipedia, which sought to frame 2012 and 2012 ideas as being a "mythology" invented by modern writers and the

marketplace, being largely influenced by astrology, Blavatsky's Theosophy, and any other handy pseudo-thingy. The timing of this is preserved in the Wikipedia back-pages for the Mayanism entry, which Geoff Stray brought to the surface in mid-2014: <http://update2012.com/Truth-Deniers-July2014.pdf>, pp 16-20.

In the comparison between his "sheep's clothing" niceness with me in our exchange on the Lawrence, KS newspaper comments section, and what he was doing simultaneously behind the scenes on Wikipedia, we have the essence of Hoopes's duplicity and dishonesty, his secretive strategies, and his pre-ordained agenda to craft mitigating narratives. Much of his behind-the-scenes chicanery has come to the surface only recently. A specific breakthrough in my awareness of Hoopes's truly unprofessional and dishonest nature came in mid-2011, when I discovered, in July, his false and unsupported comments about my background in the pages of Carlson's *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol, XXII (released around April of 2011). I was still willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, and sent him this polite inquiry:

-----Original Message-----

From: John Major Jenkins [mailto:kahib@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2011 10:05 AM
To: Hoopes, John W
Subject: quick questions

John [Hoopes],
I hope you're having a good summer. There is a PDF of your review of the Aveni & Van Stone books from *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, on Van Stone's website. Is this the exact same version that was actually published in the *Archaeo* journal? It's copyrighted to 2009 but included a reference to the (August) 2010 Wayeb 34 essay. So, when was it actually completed, and how is it copyrighted to 2009? Appreciate your clarifications,

John Major Jenkins
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

His response, as can clearly be seen, was snide and evasive and engaged a tactic of "turning the tables":

----Original Message-----

From: "Hoopes, John W"
Sent: Jul 20, 2011 3:12 PM
To: John Major Jenkins
Subject: RE: quick questions

Hi John [Jenkins],

It's nice hearing from you. It's been a busy summer and one that is going by all too quickly.

I'd like to answer you but I'm disinclined to do so until you're willing to help me.

I still need copies of *Journey to the Mayan Underworld* (Four Ahau Press, Boulder, CO: 1989), *Mirror in the Sky* (Four Ahau Press, 1991), and *Mayan Sacred Science* (Four Ahau Press,

Boulder, CO: 1994). They're cited in lots of different places but almost impossible to find.

One you tell me how I can obtain them (photocopies would be adequate), I'll be happy to help with other questions.

Saludos,
John [Hoopes]

I was quite surprised. This was the first time he used this odd request that I send him my previous writings, which became his reflexive *modus operandi*. I tried to accommodate:

From: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>
To: "Hoopes,John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
Subject: RE: quick questions
Date: Jul 20, 2011 5:04 PM

John [Hoopes],

You have *Mayan Sacred Science*; it is the same book as Jaloj Kexoj and Phi-64 (1994), which as you previously told me John Carlson sent you an illegal photocopy of.

Journey to the Mayan Underworld (1989) will be serialized in the 18 monthly issues of Baktun newsletter, which you are welcome to subscribe to like everyone else. I will send you the link when it is ready in the next few weeks, and give you a 50% discount.

Mirror in the Sky, as I've previously mentioned, was a limited edition release and is currently out of print. I can arrange to have a service provide a copy of this rare book for \$350.

Those are the answers to your questions. Now, if you'd be so kind to please respond to my simple questions. I'm giving you the benefit of the doubt regarding what are a few glaring errors and libelous statements, as to whether these were corrected in the published version. I can easily find the answer by looking at the journal in the local library.

John Major Jenkins

The request for my early books was an evasive ruse that Hoopes has used repeatedly; even when he already possessed things he was requesting! I was asking a simple question about the PDF version of his review that I had in hand, giving him the benefit of the doubt and wondering if it was representative of the published version. He wouldn't even respond to that simple first question! In any case, I was able to determine that the PDF I had was indeed the version as published. So I next asked:

Date: Jul 21, 2011 11:32 AM

John Hoopes,
Do you, at this time, represent as factually correct all your comments and citations in your Review-Essay of Aveni's 2009 book and Van Stone's 2010 book. which

appeared in the *Archaeoastronomy* journal (University of Texas Press)? And can you provide proof for your statements about me? I'm concerned with determining whether your statements are intentionally defamatory or are merely the result of poor research.

John Major Jenkins

He must have sent an email, as I allude to his comment (in my next email to him, below) that I was "offended".

To: "Hoopes,John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
Subject: Your baseless statements
Date: Jul 22, 2011 10:54 AM

John Hoopes,
My question to you involves a matter of whether you published supportable, fact based statements, not whether something is personally "offensive" to me. The published misrepresentation of the facts of a person's life, career, and work is called libel. Please send me the supportive documentation that led you to say that I once worked as a professional astrologer. Please also send the proof for your statement that my work was "influenced" by Dane Rudyar, and that his work provided "the intellectual underpinnings" for my "claims" about the galaxy.

I have no idea where you came up these fantasies, which are clearly intended to be damaging. I've never even tried to work as an astrologer. I've researched and studied astrology, and written critiques of the various assumptions associated with it, but that does not make me a professional astrologer. As for Rudyar, you asked me this question apparently way too late (this past March). Your slanderous presumption was already in press. Since I clarified for you the lack of influence by Rudyar and my lack of familiarity with his work, can you acknowledge and correct your error? Or, if you believe that I was lying to you, can you supply the proof for your statement? Thank you,

John Major Jenkins

No response, many days pass...

To: hoopes@ku.edu **Cc:** John@Hoopes.com
Subject: Please provide proof for your statements.
Date: Jul 27, 2011 10:37 PM

John Hoopes,
I've inquired several times now to clear up this matter. I'm asking a simple question: Can you provide proof for your published statement that I once worked as a professional astrologer?

John Major Jenkins

Resent the query:
John Hoopes,

August 2, 2011

Hello?

I just invited you, four times, to be accountable for the unwarranted, defamatory, and factually incorrect comments you made about me in your published review-essay. I gave you the benefit of the doubt and an opportunity to explain and clarify. Shall I characterize your behavior as 1) unconscionable, 2) reprehensible 3) an inability to think critically, or 4) ignorant? I'd like to know asap, for the piece I'm writing for a well-known popular magazine.

John Major Jenkins

And this is how the "feud" began: Ignorant hostile resistance of a "professional" scholar deeply immersed in hubris and elitist privilege. — John Major Jenkins, 9-11-2014.

Item 4b. Hoopes Makes the Maya World Age Doctrine a New Age 2012 Mythology

Exchange between John Hoopes and John Major Jenkins, January 9 to January 15, 2008, in the comments section of the Lawrence Kansas newspaper online, that ran a story on 2012 in late 2007.

The topic of debate is whether or not the World Age doctrine was known and used by the ancient Maya. Hoopes debates against, I present the evidence for it. It's curious that during these seven days Hoopes began building and redefining the Mayanism entry, as an "eclectic set of modern beliefs, etc". One of these eclectic beliefs that Hoopes frequently targets in his critique of Mayanism is the doctrine of World Ages. He came to assert that it arrived into the 2012 discussion via influences from Blavatsky and Theosophy, and was therefore a dubious modern construct inappropriately applied to the ancient Maya. This kind of loose association ruse was typical of Hoopes's approach, and we see here in our debate that, as his adamant position crumbled in the face of evidence and my arguments, he decided to launch a separate strategy of building a Wikipedia entry in which he could enshrine and circularly legitimize his baseless anti-World Age position. It was a way of attacking a premise of my work. I'm not sure if he had his own convictions against it, or if it became a favorite anti-JMJ talking point because he believed he had found a polemically useful way to put it down.

Exchanges:

Posted by [JM Jenkins](#) on January 9, 2008 at 12:43 a.m.

To John Hoopes, Part 1

But the Christian eschatology is so fundamentally different from Maya time conception, that although an opportunity was theoretically present, it does not seem to have occurred, otherwise the Popol Vuh would have a very different appearance. I'm afraid your critique does not lead to viable conclusions. In regards to Jimenez, what I said was that any introductions he made must have minor, otherwise we would see the blatant stamp of Christian dogma. But we don't; that was my point and thus my original comment is sustained.

I don't believe pursuing Jimenez's motivations are relevant to the topic at all, since the doctrine as it survives in the Popol Vuh bears all the signs of Maya cosmovision rather than Christian theology - it is one of cyclic time and World Ages. It may be interesting to pursue your line of thinking for its own sake, but it's a sidetrack and only serves to derail and diffuse the main line of the investigation. Unless you can discover that Jimenez was a secret hermetic eschatologist who harbored heretical cyclical beliefs about time rather than towing the linear / apocalyptic party line, it's a waste of time.

I'm aware of the various influences that came into highland Guatemala. Ruud van Akkeren did an insightful study of this in his book *The Place of the Lord's Daughter* - have you read it? However, many central elements of the Popol Vuh have an ancient lineage, since we find key episodes on the very early carved monuments of Izapa - how do we explain this? Some kind of continuity from what appears to be the origins of the Popol Vuh myth, circa 100 BC, to the recording of the Popol Vuh in the 1550s, is undeniable. Here we encounter pre-Conquest Maya documentation on the carved monuments, and thus we need to understand the iconographic precursors to hieroglyphic writing.

-continued-

Posted by [JMJenkins](#) on January 9, 2008 at 12:43 a.m.

To John Hoopes, Part 2

The epigraphers of Classic Period writing could learn much from the iconographers of Pre-Classic symbology. For example, several symbol forms at Izapa have evolved into conventionalized hieroglyphs. The upturned frog mouth of Stela 11 is an early form of the upturned frog mouth glyph that means "to be born" (Kelley, 1976). The caiman on Stela 25 is clearly an early form of the Starry Deer Crocodile of Classic Period iconography, as David Stuart stated in his 2005 book but that he, oddly, dodged in our private communique of last summer.

Your last paragraph is baffling. Do you disagree with the observation that, conceptually speaking, a 13-Baktun cycle in the Long Count is equivalent to a "World Age" in the Popol Vuh? I guess I'd have to direct you to the writings of Gordon Brotherston for edification on that point. I don't need to be led through some kind of thesis-advisor process - I've heard the stories of what that's like — something like a fraternity hazing I gather. Soon I'll be having to provide evidence and citations that the Maya could count, or that they really did look up at the stars! Why do you assume that the arbiter of truth can only come from "evidence" cited from Classic Period Maya texts? What constitutes evidence in your view?

It seems that the sources of allowable evidence have been so severely limited such that only the most conservative of interpretations can be maintained. This may be cautious scholarship, but I don't think it's good scholarship. I consider the carved monuments of Izapa to be "statements"; epigraphers do not because they don't see "writing" there.

My answer to your last question would be: all of the Creation dates that are written 13.0.0.0.0 provide evidence that a 13-Baktun period is - a) A World Age, b) ? c) ? d) ? Please provide alternative options for a, b, and c, as I can't think of any.

Secondly, there is a World Age doctrine in the Popol Vuh — we agree on that, right? There is a sequence of World Ages

described in the Popol Vuh. Was this idea introduced from Jimenez? Extremely unlikely. As extremely unlikely, as laughably unlikely, as space aliens landing to spawn the Maya. We are left with the unavoidable conclusion - unless you really really want to avoid it - that the World Age doctrine is an authentic ancient belief of the Maya. Again, I refer you to Brotherston for context. If this idea is a stumbling block for you, let's bring it to Aztlan.

John Major Jenkins

Posted by [tomking \(Tom King\)](#) on Jan. 9, 2008 at 2:06 p.m.
Do pertinent descriptions of World Age periods and the Maya Creation Myth exist only in the Popol Vuh and the Books of Chilam Balam? JMJ mentioned glyphs...

Posted by [JMJenkins](#) on Jan. 9, 2008 at 10:29 p.m.

Hi Tom,

Evidence for a World Age doctrine, and that World Ages last 13 Baktuns (5,125 years) is found in the glyphs in certain Creation texts - at Coba, Quirigua, Tortuguero, the Vase of the Seven Lords, and elsewhere. These are the texts dated 13.0.0.0.0.

JMJ

Posted by [Hoopes](#) on January 14, 2008 at 10:29 a.m.

Dear John MJ,

I'm sorry I put you on the defensive! That's never my intention, but I do understand where those sentiments might originate. The main point that I was trying to make is that, given the fact that the Popol Vuh and Books of Chilam Balam carry some elements of Christian eschatology, these cannot be considered (or referred to) as if they were "pristine" documents. I did not mean to imply that there were any introductions of Christian theology although I think it's important to acknowledge that these exist. You say that Christian theology is "fundamentally different", but that's really not so. Notions of cyclicality related to astronomical observations came into Christian thought through Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and other influences. Christian imagery is replete with references to the resurrected sun/son and many other astronomical/astrological allusions (a number of which remain as subject to varying interpretations as those in the Popol Vuh). These include the various astronomical events associated with the Christmas story, which were undoubtedly associated with cyclical events.

These are not easy to dismiss, especially if one of the motivations of Ximénez in transcribing the Popol Vuh was to either: 1) demonstrate the similarities of Christian and Maya traditions (i.e. the notion of a Great Flood punishing evil, the resurrection of self-sacrificed culture heroes who triumphed over death, etc.), 2) to demonstrate that Maya mythology was a form of blasphemy (i.e. an intentionally distorted version of the Christian myth, perhaps the result of demonic influence), or 3) some combination of these. I think it's naive to ignore the similarities and the ways in which the Popol Vuh may have been modified in post-Conquest, pre-transcription contexts. The Spanish were constantly seeking either affirmation or disproof of their success at communicating Christian doctrine,

which is indeed cyclical (the myth of the eternal return) and millennialist.

Please resist the impulse to feel defensive. I'm really trying to help. The reason I asked the question is because I think a systematic review of "all of the Creation dates that are written 13.0.0.0" and their contexts would strengthen your argument more than reference to the Popol Vuh, specifically because of what I've mentioned above.

Posted by [Hoopes](#) on January 14, 2008 at 2:40 p.m.

Well, it looks as if the 2012 mythos and related ideologies have found a prominent place in Guatemalan politics:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7081...>

"The 56-year-old Mr Colom has a background in the textile business and does not belong to any of the 23 Mayan ethnic groups who make up more than 40% of the population. But he has been ordained a Mayan priest, and drew much of his electoral support from the rural areas where poverty amongst indigenous groups is deep-rooted. Mr Colom, who will start his four-year term on 14 January, says he will regularly consult a group of spiritual leaders, known as the Mayan Elders National Council."

The council is headed by Don Alejandro Oxlaj, who is speaking at today's inauguration. Don Alejandro is a major figure in New Age "Mayanism" who has had the support of Carl Johan Calleman, one of the principal figures promoting 2012-related prophecies. Don Alejandro is known for making references to phenomena such as mediumistic contact with Pleiadeans (extraterrestrial entities from the Pleiades). He was prominently featured in a recent film titled "The Shift of the Ages": <http://www.shiftingages.com>

Don Alejandro is also a spiritual advisor to the alternative think tank Common Passion: <http://www.commonpassion.org>

It will be fascinating to see how Colom's presidency unfolds and whether New Age ideas will move closer to center stage as a syncretistic movement for peace and reconciliation.

Better this than what's already been in Guatemala's past.

—[John Hoopes]

Posted by [JM Jenkins](#) on January 15, 2008 at 8:14 p.m.

John H.,

I think what you are sensing is frustration rather than defensiveness. I am presenting rational, well argued information. And yet we are descending into an endless Socratic debate based upon nitpicking minutiae. The critique regarding distortions added to the Popol Vuh via Christian influence, at least to a degree that actually mitigates my thesis, remains an assertion on your part. I'm afraid the burden of proof rests with you on this one; my observation that Christian theology is linear whereas Maya time philosophy is cyclic is widely understood; it is frustrating and baffling that it is being utilized as the linchpin of your critique. Meanwhile, the main points of my argument are being ignored. Instead of engaging the main points of my thesis, irrelevant sidetracks are being widened as if what may be found there could make a lick of difference anyway. Perhaps you are doing this subconsciously in a reflexive advisory role, I don't know. Again, frustrating

and baffling - much like the enervating current exchange with Marcos V on Aztlan I am having. If you are as well versed as I am in the various traditions that are relevant to this discussion, I don't see the value in derailing the discussion down irrelevant sidetracks. Furthermore, when I do respond cogently to your objections, my responses are qualified and countered from a vantage point that has nothing to do with the intention of my statement. Thus, I feel the frustrating necessity of re-re-repeating previously emphasized points. You'll have to admit, this can make anyone frustrated if not crazy. If you're trying to make me dig for citations in this online venue, I don't think this is an appropriate place for that; I refer you to my publications.

What I was trying to present in my brief article (linked above) was a way to rationally frame our approach to 2012, utilizing the bare minimum of facts that we have at our disposal and that we can all agree on. (This is an overdue, and necessary, framing of the 2012 topic because scholars have failed to frame the 2012 topic at all, apart from saying "the world isn't going to end" or merely addressing the social feeding-frenzy phenomenon of 2012 rather than the thing-in-itself as a real artifact of the Maya calendar tradition.) The application of reason to those facts leads to the conclusion that the end date of the 13-baktun cycle (December 21, 2012) was very very very probably placed intentionally by a people of high mathematical and astronomical achievement. That conclusion follows from the mere facts of the end date, as sketched, and diversionary side issues do not mitigate that conclusion.

continued -

Posted by [JM Jenkins](#) on January 15, 2008 at 8:15 p.m.

-continued to John H.:

In addition, it is not necessary to collate and examine the list of monuments and ceramics that utilize the date 13.0.0.0. The very simple fact that this date (which we can read as "the end of a 13 baktun cycle") is found in contexts involving Creation narratives indicates, all by itself, that a 13-Baktun cycle was conceived as a great cycle, what we can term a World Age cycle. I'm not sure of you object to this terminology, or if you object to identifying these dates as an indication of a belief in a 13-Baktun period/cycle/Age. If you reject making a conceptual connection between this 13-Baktun period and the Mesoamerican concept of Ages, then you need to read Brotherston for starters. I can't shake the feeling that you're just being difficult on this point, trying to save face perhaps, for once we understanding that relationship between the Long Count calendar and the World Age doctrine in the Creation mythology, then the connection to the World Age in the Popol Vuh is obvious. The only thing preventing this conclusion is your assertion that the World Age doctrine in the Popol Vuh is not a native belief but was introduced by Christian influence. So, please, find me one scholar who argues that the World Ages documented in the Popol Vuh are introductions from Christian influence. If not, then we are left with the extremely likely conclusion that the 13-Baktun period recorded on Maya creation narratives is identical to the World Ages spoken of in the Maya Creation Myth.

John Major Jenkins

Item 4c. Calling out Hoopes, July 2011

On Sep 1, 2011, at 11:17 PM, "John Major Jenkins" kahib@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

I agree with {John B.] Carlson that the dearth of currently known info on the 2012 date does not mean that 2012 wasn't important to the ancient Maya. I suspect that an examination of any 4 Ajaw 3 K'ank'in dates in the record might be revealing. In addition to the late-Classic data that Carlson alluded to, I'll also mention that pre-Classic information from Izapa, though not involving hieroglyphic texts, is relevant, precisely because a growing number of scholars agree that Izapa was involved in the formulation of the Long Count. Here we have my already completed studies which should be of interest, because my Izapa-based proposals regarding what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 are being echoed in the recent Cambridge papers.

To be specific, we have Grofe (solar-Crossroads alignment astronomy), Callaway (Era Base Creation myth parallels to 2012), Carlson (Bolon Yokte related deity roles, sacrifice and worldrenewal) and MacLeod (TRT Mon 6, period-ending ceremony and a "great return").

So, to summarize, we have a ceremonial ideology of period-ending deity sacrifice or ceremony, in order to facilitate worldrenewal in 2012. And we have, associated with this ideology, the idea of the rare precession-based alignment of the solstice sun with the Milky Way-ecliptic Crossroads. Astronomy and ceremony go together here, which is not at all surprising because we find this kind of parallelism in many Maya inscriptions. This is what we can summarize as being the current scholarly interpretations from those scholars who have looked proactively at the evidence for what the ancient Maya thought about 2012.

To state the obvious, these recently published ideas from scholars echo what I've been reconstructing and publishing about 2012, based on my archaeoastronomical and iconographic research at Izapa and on the ballgame and the Creation Myth, since 1994. Which is basically this: a period-ending sacrifice and renewal involving a deity, a cyclic replication of 3114 BC, coordinated with the precession-based alignment of the sun with the Milky Way-ecliptic Crossroads on 13.0.0.0.0 in 2012. It seems probable that a Long Count / Creation Myth paradigm was established in the pre-Classic which was expressed at Izapa, whose central tenets (ideological and astronomical) were preserved into the Classic Period to be reflected in Tortuguero Monument 6.

John Major Jenkins

-----Original Message-----

From: "Hoopes, John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
Sent: Sep 2, 2011 1:51 AM
To: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>
Cc: John B Carlson <taloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod <bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion <ncampion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway <ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone <mvanstone@swccd.edu>

Subject: Re: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?

The absence of Long Count dates in the many Preclassic monuments at Izapa seems to me a significant impediment to interpreting Izapa as a site that played any meaningful role in the origin of the Long Count.

John [Hoopes]

Sent from my iPod

From: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>

To: "Hoopes, John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>

Cc: John B Carlson <taloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod <bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion <n.campion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway <ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone <mvanstone@swccd.edu>

Subject: Re: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?

Date: Sep 2, 2011 10:31 AM

Note: none of our posts will be posted to the Aztlán list, as per the policy, so this is proceeding offlist.

John Hoopes,

I already responded to the lack of LC dates at Izapa many times, years ago, and in my recent book *The 2012 Story* (2009:63-64, and chapter 4). The relevant point of entry into a conversation about this is: Why do Coe, Rice, Guernsey, Norman, and Malmstrom, and me (who happen to be the investigators who actually studied Izapa) believe that Izapa was very probably the locus of the Long Count's origins? The situation is more complex than you might prefer it to be.

Having addressed that diversion, I'd like to bring the focus back to what I actually said in my email below. You may question my strategy of trying to understand the Long Count's 2012 period-ending date by studying the site and culture that many scholars believe was involved in the Long Count's formulation, but what are your thoughts on the fact that my astronomical and ideological proposals about how the ancient Maya thought about 2012 (which you can find expressed in my book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, 1998) are being reiterated or echoed by scholars in the recent Cambridge IAU 278 publication? I honor the different routes and investigative acumen that has led them to their respective positions, but how do we address the fact that I found those same ideas too, in my study of Izapa?

John Major Jenkins

The Center for 2012 Studies

<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

>From: "Hoopes, John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>

>Sent: Sep 2, 2011 11:24 AM

>To: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>

>Cc: John B Carlson <taloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod

<bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion
<n.campion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway
<ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone
<mvanstone@swccd.edu>
Subject: Re: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?

I've also been informed that my reply to this thread won't be posted to AZTLAN. The policy is to permit notifications regarding publications, talks, videos, etc. but the restriction on 2012-related discussions remains in place.

"Why do Coe, Rice, Guernsey, Norman, and Malmstrom, and me (who happen to be the investigators who actually studied Izapa) believe that Izapa was very probably the locus of the Long Count's origins?"

I think one would have to ask each of them: 1) whether it's so, and 2) if it's so, why? What individual investigators believe--and why--may prove to be quite varied. The "devil," of course, is in the details. I doubt very much that they're all on the same page but I'm willing to be proven wrong.

John [Hoopes]

Sent from my iPod

From: [John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>](mailto:John.Major.Jenkins@ix.netcom.com)
To: "Hoopes,John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
Cc: John B Carlson <tlaloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod <bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion <n.campion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway <ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone <mvanstone@swccd.edu>
Subject: Re: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?
Date: Sep 2, 2011 11:58 AM

John Hoopes,

But the general fact remains: Izapa is on the map for LC origins, according to the scholars who have studied it.

Now, again, if we can have closure with your diversion, which I responded to, can you please address what I actually put on the table in my email? I notice that it's been stripped out of the email sequence below, so I'll restate it again:

"What are your thoughts on the fact that my astronomical and ideological proposals about how the ancient Maya thought about 2012, which you can find expressed in my book *Maya Cosmogony 2012* (1998), are being reiterated or echoed by scholars in the recent Cambridge IAU 278 publication? I honor the different routes and investigative acumen that has led them to their respective positions, but how do we address the fact that I found those same ideas too, in my study of Izapa?"

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

From: "Hoopes, John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
>Sent: Sep 2, 2011 1:05 PM
>To: John Major Jenkins <kahib@ix.netcom.com>
>Cc: John B Carlson <tlaloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod <bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion <n.campion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway <ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone <mvanstone@swccd.edu>
Subject: RE: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?

Dear John [Jenkins],

My thoughts, for what it's worth, are that your astronomical and ideological proposals about how the ancient Maya thought about 2012 are NOT being reiterated or echoed by any of the scholars in the recent Cambridge IAU 287 publication.

How do we address the fact that you found those same ideas too? I think it's clear from your publications that you were reading the work of earlier authors. The most parsimonious explanation is that you found them in the literature.

John [Hoopes]

To: "Hoopes,John W" <hoopes@ku.edu>
Cc: John B Carlson <tlaloc@umd.edu>, Jorge Pérez de Lara Elías <jorgepl@estudioelias.com>, Barb MacLeod <bmacleod@austin.rr.com>, Campion <n.campion@tsd.ac.uk>, Callaway <ccallaway@students.latrobe.edu.au>, Van Stone <mvanstone@swccd.edu>
Subject: RE: [Aztlán] 2012: End of the world?
Date: Sep 2, 2011 2:32 PM

John Hoopes,

It's quite clear you haven't read the IAU papers under consideration, or you are simply selectively not seeing the actual words that were being used in those papers. The ideas that arose among the papers by Carlson, MacLeod, and Callaway, involve (ideologically) "transformation", a "return", "renewal", "creation myth" repetitions, cyclic ties between 3114 and 2012, and so on. Where an astronomical component is identified, in Grofe's paper, we have a reference to the same alignment scenario that is the centerpiece of my work. I suppose you will never be able to acknowledge this, because you can't practice unbiased scholarship if I am in any way involved. This is amply proven by your unsupportable and libelous statements about me that you have already published in the recent *Archaeoastronomy* journal. Your behavior is shameless and unprofessional.

As for your odd assessment that I drew my interpretations of Izapa cosmology, regarding how the future period ending in 2012 was thought about, from previous literature — that's quite impossible my friend. Show me the citations. I've honestly shared with you the sequence of my unfolding work, leading me to an unprecedented reconstruction, but you chose to ignore that and instead propagated false defamatory statements that

you have refused to explain or defend. If you think you can, please do so now. You know what I'm talking about.

Please read the section on Izapa in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. As any good scholar will do, I cite and build upon previous work, but my conclusions about how 2012 was conceived by the originators of the Long Count paradigm, which I believe was conceived at Izapa, were an interdisciplinary synthesis of my new findings on the archaeoastronomy at the site. No one had ever approached Izapa in this way with calendrical origins in mind, interpreting the archaeoastronomy, Creation Myth imagery, and iconographic ideology. 2012 was never previously elucidated in this way in the literature, and yet my interpretations were quite understandable and consistent with Maya astronomy and cosmology, if all the pieces of evidence were put together. It's just that no one had done it before.

We could debate the various points of my reconstruction. However, that isn't the point here. My simple point was that 1) debunker scholars, like you, believe that my ideas about 2012 are nonsense; 2) those same ideas have just appeared in the first scholarly collection of articles on 2012. I'd submit that there is a large gulf of cognitive dissonance happening here, driven by an irrational and politicized environment that is maintained by a few undiscerning "critics" who aren't actually practicing scholarship, but something else entirely.

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

Item 4d. Hoopes Evades Discussion on Whitesides' "2012 Discussion Group" FB Page

John Hoopes, July 11, 2014

I know you are aware of the critiques and questions about your Mayanism concept, and other items from your writings on the 2012 phenomenon and critiques of my work, over at the 2012 Research Discussion Group on Facebook. But you've made a point to remind the group that you can't see my posts (because you blocked me). However, you should be able to read Geoff Stray's posts; he brought up valid comments about your Mayanism construct and we've had questions about your use of the 2012 phenomenon phrase that beg your clarification.

I'm wondering, did you also block Stray, such that you can't see his comments? Why would you not want to discuss your work and respond to informed critics? It's clear by this point that you are evading our desire to discuss your work, ask questions, and seek clarifications. Why are you not willing to engage in a process of discussion and critique with two people who have been studying and writing about 2012 for much longer than you? If you unblock me, you should be able to see my comments and questions. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

John Hoopes, July 11, 2014

As a follow-up to my previous email, I'd like to point out that I've been inviting discussion of my 2012 work and research on the FB group, but you blocked me. I've had to correct and clarify several false premises and notions about my "influences" and ideas. Do you not have a response to my corrections and clarifications? Since the early 1990s I've invited debate and discussions with scholars on my work; this is merely the latest in my two decades of efforts to discuss and debate my work. But you are unwilling.

And yet, in your ZfurAnom article with Whitesides you assert that I practice a "hermeneutic" in which I see myself as immune from the need to undergo scholarly scrutiny and debate about my work. Do you find it ironic that, in fact, I've actively sought this for two decades? And that it is actually you who is evading dialogue and debate about YOUR 2012 work?

In a related matter, I wonder if you actually responded to any of my seven points of correction and critique regarding your article with Whitesides? Or, in your response, did you merely evade addressing the corrections? For example, did you address or at least acknowledge your error about who was first using the "2012 phenomenon" phrase?

Furthermore, this recent FB experience proves (once again) that I'm willing to discuss and debate my work, and I've gone to great lengths to help you be accurately informed about it. What is not acceptable is critics, like you, who construct false frameworks into which my work is force-fitted instead of accurately summarizing my work before critiquing it. You are employing a strategy of baseless mitigation, not an open, informed, and respectful inquiry.

As one example among dozens, you assert that my 1998 book was published under "the editorship" of Barbara Hand Clow. You are utterly clueless as to the actual events, but your choice of words clearly shows your desire to denigrate my book through crafting an insinuation of acquiescing to Clow's "editing". Nothing is further from the truth — but that's diagnostic of your assessments of my work. You are consistently very very VERY far from the truth. If you are willing to be accurately informed and have a discussion, you should unblock me. If not, stay in hiding and continue violating the basic principles of good scholarship, not to mention human decency.

John Major Jenkins

John H. July 12, 2014

I understand that you've posted cryptic cartoons and false assertions on the FB group (which I can't see, because you blocked me). My response to you is below.

Listen, I don't really want to keep hammering these points. Why can't you just be honest? Do you want to go down in history as a dishonest scholar who betrayed science and couldn't correct his demonstrable errors? I'm asking, to begin with, that you write a correction to your false constructs in your *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. XXII review-essay piece. This includes the false construct that I once worked as an astrologer

and therefore my work is pseudoscience, and that I got (plagiarized) my galactic ideas from Dane Rudhyar. Were you aware of the impact of your words when you wrote them? Why didn't Carlson flag these comments as unsupported, ad hominem, and unprofessional? Your comments are very serious allegations and assertions, asserted as facts, which at bottom are denigrating and damaging to my reputation and career. And they are completely false. I've asked you for your evidence; after three years you've failed to provide any. Therefore, you should retract these false comments. If you need to cry uncle, say something. If you're unable to be a man, to be a real scholar and do the right thing, just tell me and I'll move on to other things as I don't want to keep hitting your brick walls and dealing with your juvenile evasions.

FB post to Whitesides 2012 Discussion Group, July 12:

I understand that John Hoopes is posting cryptic cartoons and making comments which, of course, I cannot see (because he blocked me). As a reminder, I never blocked him and I'm actually inviting dialogue. In fact, since mid-2011 I've invited dialogue and have asked pointed questions of him, regarding his misleading and often false characterizations of my work. He just wrote, in response to a suggestion that he might be able to have a civil discussion with me: "One would think, right? However, that has not happened in this case, despite years of earnest effort on my part." This comment has to be a joke, because Hoopes has avoided dialogue and discussion with me since mid-2011, when he published baseless, unsupported, and false things about me and my background in the *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. XXIV and I requested that he provide evidence for his denigrating assertions.

More recently, when I inquired about his comments in the essay he co-wrote with Whitesides for *Zeit. fur Anom.*, he simply replied with repeated requests that I send him all of my writings going back to the 1980s, so he can 'fully assess my work' — and ignored my good-faith effort to explain each title and send him links when possible. This has become his repeated mantra, an evasive trope — requesting I send him all of my multi-genre output over a 25-year writing career, including poetry, travelogue, personal memoir, fiction, etc, much of which is unrelated to 2012.

If Hoopes has made an earnest effort to dialogue, as he claims, then why did he block me and why does he avoid having an adult and honest discussion? Probably because he knows that he's been crafting false narratives about me and my work and has no recourse but to hide behind the badge of 'bona fides' and collusion with his colleagues. We had cordial relations up to early 2011, and he asked me several times to share with him my arguments, influences, relations with other authors, and the development of my work. This I did, honestly and clearly (I have nothing to hide). However, he NEVER has used anything I shared with him to accurately convey my work; instead, he's lifted bits and pieces out of it to invent false and misleading narratives about my background. So, he's a wolf in sheep's clothing, and one can only hope that all the distortions and misleadingly false characterizations he's heaped upon me will get sorted out by honest and discerning readers and future historians.

These recent events are further testimony to the failure of certain scholars to accurately assess 2012 ideas and authors, revealing instead a consistent strategy of mitigation that employs sub-standard scholarship, false assertions, invented narratives, and loaded innuendos. Retractions, errata, and corrigenda are necessary in virtually everything Hoopes has produced on 2012. In a world of honest scholarship, these things would be easily arranged through his editors and publishers, but, sadly, dishonesty, evasion, and subterfuge has been rampant in the treatment of my 2012 work. My efforts to discuss the factual errors propagated by Hoopes and other debunkers has met with brick walls combined with additional attacks launched at me from other directions. That's not science, that's turf protection. <http://www.retractionwatch.com>

4e. I Respond to Hoopes's Questions, March 2011

Here is my response to Hoopes's questions about my work with his faux-sincere desire to accurately represent my work in his upcoming presentation in Austin. This must have been the 2010 conference, which my friend Georgeann attended. She said Hoopes portrayed modern 2012 New Agers as heir to occult and theosophical influence, much like the Nazis. According to Georgeann, Hoopes's coverage of my work was "snide." This juts underscores Hoopes as the unreliable wolf-in-sheep's clothing. The fact is that none of his subsequent descriptions of me and my work ever drew from any of my comments below. He was just fishing for compromising bits he could twist and distort.

Hi John [Hoopes],

Thank you for spending the time to summarize my work. All of the points can be elaborated and contextualized, and special circumstances could be brought up for consideration. However, in the interest of simplicity, I'll keep comments brief, below. You seem to focus on the philosophical side of my reconstruction work, understandable given your interests in documenting the ideological "phenomenon" of 2012. This area will ultimately be subject to debate and disagreement.

In terms of the other part of my reconstruction work, you could mention the astronomy of the 13 dates on TRT Monument 6, as documented last year in my SAA presentation and as debated and documented on the MEC-Facebook discussion (online at the Maya Exploration Center). In brief, a reasonable proposal regarding why Bahlam Ajaw utilized the 2012 date is because of the astronomical parallel to his birthday. This presupposes an awareness of the sun's alignment with the Crossroads in 2012, which consequently provides rather large support for my "2012 alignment" reconstruction, as documented in MC2012 (1998). It should also be mentioned that the prejudiced comments of Guenter and Aldana failed to mitigate the arguments presented in my paper; in fact, the contributions of MacLeod and especially Grofe were helpful in clarifying the evidence and logical traction that underlies my work.

- Q: That 13.0.0.0.0 4 Ajaw 3 K'ank'in was NOT interpreted by the ancient Maya as an end-of-the-world event in a physical sense?

A: Yes. In the highest spiritual teaching that can be identified in, for example, the Maya Creation Mythology (the Popol Vuh), 2012, like all cycle endings, were treated as liminal zones in which transformation & renewal is the preferred outcome, which must be facilitated by sacrifices. The literalized cartoon version of this spiritual teaching, which is also possible to find in some Maya representations, is graphic destruction. These are visions of period endings from the vantage point of the limited ego, the fiction of a stable ego identity, which perceives change and transformation as annihilation. From the vantage point of the midwives of rebirth and renewal (the Hero Twins, for example, who are charged with defeating the "Lords of Darkness" and the egoism of Seven Macaw) period endings are not literal destructions of anything real, they are openings to renewal IF the sacrifice of ego illusions can be accomplished.

- (Q: Following Malmstrom) that the Long Count was invented at Izapa in the first centuries BCE (do you have a specific date?)

A: I actually took my clue from Michael Coe, who said in one of his books something like "The priority of Izapa in the development of the Long Count is quite clear cut." But yes, Malmstrom's view of this is congruent with my own. However, unlike Malmstrom I don't think the Long Count was the invention of one "New World Hipparchus." Because of the prior evidence of precessional adjustment back to La Venta, I imagine that centuries of astronomers were involved. Furthermore, as I've reconstructed it, it's possible, or even probable, that the expectation of a future alignment of the solstice sun and the Milky Way developed before the precise calculations were established that resulted in the Long Count system. Thus, the archaeoastronomical statements at Izapa could have been established before the Long Count was inaugurated. Conservatively, I envision these things happening in the early to mid 1st century BC. Possibly earlier, 3rd or 2nd centuries BC.

- (Q: Following Edmonson & Bricker) that the Long Count was calculated so as to complete a Grand Cycle on the winter solstice on 13.0.0.0.0 4 Ajaw 3 K'ank'in.

A: Edmonson's solstice observation in his 1988 book was important confirmation of my suspicions regarding the solstice placement of 13.0.0.0.0 according to the 584283 correlation. However, the question remained why 2012 should be the year, the culmination of cycle of 13 baktuns. My investigations led me to Izapa and to precessional considerations, which neither Edmonson nor Bricker mentioned.

- Q: That in an original Izapan Long Count, the day was 13.0.0.0.0 1 Ajaw 1 K'ank'in; the original Izapan calendar was altered in the Classic period, probably at Tikal.

A: Correction – it would be 4 Ajaw 1 K'ank'in. First off, this reconstruction is not a critical point that makes or breaks my thesis. I applied Edmonson's methodology of reconstructing possible transformations of the calendar system. The Tikal system is not attested as existing during the era of the Long Count's first appearance in the archaeological record, therefore we can't assume that the original haab position should be 8 Cumku and the original 2012 haab position should be 3 Kankin. No one had ever considered this circumstance and suggested reconstructed CR positions that would correspond to the temporally appropriate pre-Tikal system. Assuming that the Long Count and the Calendar Round systems were coordinated at the origin of the LC, one expects some kind of calendrical congruence between the two systems. Such a backward reconstruction of congruence from the Classic Period Tikal system is possible, but not at the 3114 nexus — it is only possible at the 2012 nexus. This is because no easy shift from 8 Cumku to anything indicative of a base-system is possible; but it is possible with an easy (albeit theoretical) 3 Kankin shift. A relatively simple transform from the Tikal results in an earlier system, hypothetically in existence at Izapa, in which 13.0.0.0.0 in 2012 falls on 4 Ajaw 1 K'ank'in. With the haab set to 1, and the possible linguistic implication of Kan-Kin meaning "Kan-cross-sun," we find a curious connection to the alignment image. However, we can't be sure that Kankin would have been linguistically understood by the Izapans in this way, as that month name comes from post-Classic Yucatec.

- Q: That the Maya were not only aware of Precession, but could calculate it with precision in the Preclassic period.

A: This would be the unavoidable conclusion. To what degree of accuracy they were capable is not precisely known. The evidence in the Classic Period, from Grofe's work, is that they used sidereal positions of the sun and compared them at long intervals. This is exactly the kind of astronomical method that could have been used in the pre-Classic to project an accurate future sidereal position of the sun. The cross of the Milky Way and ecliptic would have been the compelling target point in this reconstruction. The astronomical sophistication required to project a future solstice date, which itself is strongly suggested by the solstice placement of the 13.0.0.0.0 date in 2012 (which means they had an accurate knowledge of the tropical year of 365.2422 days) is almost on par with accurately understanding the sidereal year and precession. In fact, it was the key that allowed Hipparchus to calculate precession using positional star data that was only 140 years old. Thus, the suggestion of this level of astronomical sophistication in the pre-Classic is not out of the question, especially considering astronomical adjustment for precession evident at La Venta and Tak'alik Ab'aj.

- Q: That there were Five World Ages, each 13 baktuns long; the upcoming 13.0.0.0.0 date marks the end of a full Precession cycle of 26,000 tuns.

A: This is a reasonable deduction. I believe that the Mesoamerica time-space doctrine is templated upon the quincunx symbol, which has four corner points and a central, fifth, point. Thus, 5 Ages and 5 spatial directions. Conflicting information, for example in some readings of the Popol Vuh Ages, gives 4, but I believe this indicates a forgetting of the original doctrine — i.e., informants who have lost the center, so to speak. My own interpretation that the era-2012 alignment would logically signal the end of a precessional cycles follows from the winter solstice being the end-beginning anchor point or “root” of the year, and Galactic Center Crossroads (of Milky Way and ecliptic) being a spatial center or root. It’s not certain if the ancient Maya saw it this way, and it’s not a critical point for my theory — i.e., the ancient Maya did not need to have a cyclic concept of precessional motion for them to have projected to the future alignment of solstice and Crossroads in era-2012. However, given the circularity of the sky, it seems reasonable to suspect that they would have known that one period of 13-baktuns covers 1/5th of the circular sky. Thus, 5 of these great periods, or Ages, would complete the circle. MacLeod summarizes her similar views on this in her 3-11 Pik paper.

- Q: The conjunction of the Sun with the Dark Rift at the Galactic Center on 13.0.0.0.0 4 Ajaw 3 K’ank’in and its correspondence with a winter solstice is an event that happens within a narrow “Era 2012” window from 1998 – 2013 that occurs only once every 26,000 years.
A: Correction: The “alignment window” I propose runs from 1980 to 2016. It is a purely astronomical calculation, based in astronomy, in order to avoid the confusion that the “alignment” happens precisely on and only on one day, December 21, 2012 (an absurd notion because precession is so slow). My 36-year “window” was derived from Meeus’s supposedly precise calculation of the solstice **point’s** alignment with the **galactic equator** (in 1998), combined with the approx. 36 years it takes the ½-degree-wide body of the sun to precess through the galactic equator—thus 1980 to 2016. This is not to suggest that empirical effects are thus suppose to happen within this range; it is merely a reasonable way to think about, and discuss, a minimal zone for the alignment. The Galactic Center is the larger field in which the more precise Crossroads is located. The southern terminus of the dark rift and the Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic are located within the large visually perceivable field of this “nuclear bulge” (a term used by astronomers) of the Galactic Center. The dark rift and the Crossroads are demonstrable concepts in Maya cosmology and Creation Mythology, which connote concepts of “center” and the birth-death nexus (portal of the underworld). This is the simple evidence I presented years ago, which Malmstrom ignored in his under-informed attack, that indicates that the Maya thought of the Galactic Center region as a “cosmic center” and a birthplace — concepts true to what the GC is.

- Q: The symbolism of this conjunction—as conceived by the ancient Maya—is that of a union of the First Father (the Sun) with the Great Mother (the Milky Way) as part of the rebirth (?) of Creation

A: Yes. The archetype of “First Father” is a primordial core image which I believe manifests in a variety of contexts and deity names, including One Hunahpu (at Izapa), GI (at Palenque), and the Maize Deity. The astronomical reference is to the December solstice sun (at Izapa) or sometimes the emphasis is on the sidereal position of the Crossroads (symbolically the “cosmic center” throne of “First Father”). And yes, the Crossroads/throne theme and the dark rift lend themselves to a concept of rebirth and renewal that can operate on different levels, from the rebirth of a man as king to worldrenewal at a large period ending (such as in 2012 AD).

- Q: The symbolism of this conjunction was recorded on monuments at Izapa, where (following Barba de Pina Chan 1988?) these were used to teach shaman-priests.

A: I believe I encountered Barba de Pina Chan’s work at some point. If I recall correctly, her observation was that that Popol Vuh episodes were portrayed on the Izapan stela, but she didn’t have an interest in astronomy. I do believe that Izapa served some function as a ceremonial initiation center. My first clue for Popol Vuh imagery on the Izapan monuments came from BYU’s Izapa study by Lowe, et al, and V. Garth Norman’s work.

- Q: Maya shamans had insight into the cosmos as the result of metaphysical vision quests undertaken with the assistance of hallucinogenic substances.

A: Yes, the evidence at Izapa is Stela 6 and mushroom stones found throughout the region, some of which can be seen at the Tapachula museum. As I discussed in chapters in MC2012, following Reichel-Dolmatoff, Peter Furst, Borhegyi, and other scholars, psychoactive substances used by Native American shamans frequently resulted in complex geometrical cosmic models as well as — almost always — a non-dual insight regarding the interpenetration of the different levels of the cosmos, including human subjective experience (the inner dream world) and the external world (the earth environment and astronomy). Such a perspective can be recognized as an advanced metaphysical insight, a hallmark of Oriental metaphysics and Eastern Religions which in many ways is antithetical to assumptions of Western science and religions.

- Q: Detailed, ancient knowledge of the cosmos reveals that ancient Maya spirituality is a manifestation of a “Primordial Tradition” of perennial philosophy shared by other esoteric wisdom traditions in India, Egypt, the British Isles, and elsewhere.

A: Yes, but it’s not in the details of cosmological modeling, it’s more in the “holistic” integrative vision of the cosmos, what scholars dryly acknowledge as “reciprocity.” The main link-point I see between Maya spirituality and the perennial philosophy is the doctrine of

self-naughting, as I discussed in *Galactic Alignment* and *Pyramid of Fire*. This is, basically, the high ideal of self-sacrifice — the sacrifice-transformation-renewal principle as applied to the human life-cycle and to time cycles, thus period endings in the calendar system.

- Q: The core of Maya spirituality is based on perennial philosophy's teachings about cyclical events accompanied by sacrifice, transformation, and renewal.
A: Yes, thank you. This is still a value performed by Maya ceremonialists today, and is observed in Classic Maya rituals. Sacrifices must be performed at period endings, to facilitate renewal. This principle can be applied, by analogy, to the 2012 period ending.
- Q: The date of December 21, 2012 represents a long-anticipated opportunity for spiritual transformation if the proper sacrifice—extinguishment of the ego—is performed.
A: Yes, that is my reading of the archetypal message in the Maya Creation Myth (the Popol Vuh). It is also apparent in the Creation Myth symbolism of the Izapa monuments, thus pre-Christian influence.
- Q: Maya mythology, including the Popol Vuh, communicates the teachings of perennial philosophy; this is also a significant part of the content of Maya art
A: In some cases, but Maya art is a widespread and diverse phenomenon.
- Q: Maya cosmology and spirituality are intimately connected and reflect knowledge of an ancient Primordial Tradition that is the foundation of all major religions
A: Yes, and this Primordial Tradition or Perennial Philosophy is not to be confused with cheap New Age products in the marketplace.
- Q: If we can understand what the Maya and other keepers of the wisdom of perennial philosophy were trying to teach, the world will be a better place; December 21, 2012 is an ideal time to start a new cycle of Precession with a fresh perspective.
A: Well, that's up to the individual to decide if they feel so inclined. If one needs to have a position on the future, regardless of 2012, engaging the perennial methods for opening to higher wisdom can be recommended. This is a complex topic; since so many people are projecting hopes and fears onto 2012, it cannot be ignored. It boils down to basic advice, applicable to any crisis or challenging situation. Most people on the planet, outside the highest elite of first-world countries, are in crisis.
Note: My beliefs and position on the Perennial Philosophy is nothing I wish to shirk or downplay. However, I've learned that critics often like to belabor the interpretive, terminological, and philosophical debates that can arise. The reconstruction of the astronomical intention in the 2012 date is what Maya scholars should be more interest in, and new evidence from Tortuguero could be discussed. I realize this may not be your area.

Thank you again for the invitation to respond and clarify.
Best wishes,

John [Major Jenkins]

I know there is a LOT more, but I want to be able to summarize your main points in just a couple of Powerpoint slides.

Thanks,
[John Hoopes]

Item 4f. Hoopes's Mayanism, excerpts from *The 2012 Story* 2009

Here are three excerpts from my 2009 book; some of my comments were cited on the Talk page for Hoopes's Mayanism entry. The implications go beyond the mere use of terms, and involve the ongoing activities of the modern Maya to restore sovereignty; thus my lengthy treatment of the ideas of Victor Montejo (including a traditional text he transcribed which he believes may refer to the 13 Baktun period-ending in 2012). Beyond the provided quotes (buy a copy: http://johnmajorjenkins.com/?page_id=36), I also explore the ideas of Robert Sitler and Garrett Cook, showing that my own work is in agreement with their perspectives on several key points that have been criticized in my work. Notwithstanding my cordial treatment of Hoopes and his Mayanism, my section title is an allusion to the inquisitorial "hammer of witches" text from the Middle Ages:

The Hammer of Mayanism (Note: End Note reference are indicated but not supplied in these excerpts)

Yale graduate Dr. John Hoopes has been active on popular e-list discussion boards, such as the Tribe 2012 Yahoo group, which he now moderates. I've had many engaging debates and exchanges with Dr. Hoopes over the years, and he has had an active interest in all aspects of the 2012 phenomenon for some time. In fact, he has a particular interest in the popular manifestations of the 2012 meme, and was initially supportive of Daniel Pinchbeck's book *2012: The Return of Quetzalcoatl* as it was about to be released in 2006 (providing prerelease announcements on 2012.Tribe.net). By that time he had already developed a friendship with Pinchbeck, a burgeoning pop icon, and had hung out with him at the Burning Man Festival. After Pinchbeck's book came out, Hoopes wrote that it was "disappointing that Pinchbeck, who claims substantial research and journalistic skills, did so little homework on Maya scholarship. His extensive bibliography cites only three references by academicians on the ancient Maya."²² The book was apparently not quite what he thought it was going to be. His conversations with Pinchbeck must have led him to expect more interviews with scholars and less hype. As it turned out, the book revolved largely around Pinchbeck's own psychological adventures and quandaries, the dénouement featuring his Technicolor encounter with the Plumed Serpent, Quetzalcoatl, during an ayahuasca vision.

Dr. Hoopes professes an interest in my research, and indeed has engaged me in discussions on many occasions. No amount of reasoned argument and presentation of evidence seems to sway him from his views. For example, he sides with Justeson on fudging the solstice placement to make it seem not at all that unlikely to be a coincidence. Encouraging me to publish something in a reputable academic journal, Dr. Hoopes believes I can make my case more plausible to scholars. This may be true, but my experiences with academic journals have revealed entrenched resistance, not to mention issues with the perceived implications of my work. The deck is stacked against progress offered by outsiders. The excoriating treatment of Whorf by Thompson is ample testimony to this tendency in Maya studies. Nevertheless, I'll probably stick my head in this guillotine, if only to document, once again, how facts are treated if the implications are unwelcome.

Currently working on his own book on the sociological phenomenon of 2012, Hoopes has contributed to creating and defining an entry on Wikipedia called "Mayanism," which he used to label 2012-related books and ideas that fall under a carefully elaborated New Age profile: *Mayanism is a term coined to cover a non-codified eclectic collection of New Age beliefs, influenced in part by Pre-Columbian Maya mythology and some folk beliefs of the modern Maya peoples. Adherents of this belief system are not to be confused with Mayanists, scholars who research the historical Maya civilization.*²³

I am listed as one of the authors published by publishing houses who promote this Mayanism, and my work is discreetly and more or less accurately handled. His sociological approach provides a valid new framework for approaching the 2012 phenomenon, and the concise summaries of the various topics described in the Wikipedia entry are handled admirably, although I disagreed with the appropriation of the term "Mayanism" from its original context.

I called into question his selection of the term "Mayanism" for his purpose, which takes on a pejorative flavoring.²⁴ Several years ago I was beginning to use the term in my own writings, following the lead of Victor Montejo, a Jacaltek Maya scholar who survived the death squads in Guatemala in the 1980s, eventually moving to the United States to receive an MA from the State University of New York and an anthropology PhD from the University of Connecticut. He now teaches in California. He had used the term for a pan-Maya identity that shared certain characteristics, universal traits and beliefs and practices that would thus define Mayanism. This proactive use of the term was consistent with the positive use of similar terms, such as "Hinduism," "Buddhism," and "Sufism."

Hoopes had appropriated a term already in use, defined by an ethnic Maya scholar, and inverted it to mean something essentially negative, to corral the host of imaginative New Age doomsday theorists and those who recognize many forms of knowledge, including both that acquired by scientists through discursive analysis and that acquired intuitively as direct gnosis. A definition of gnosis from the vantage point of perennial wisdom teachers such as Suhrawardi, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, or Frithjof Schuon should probably be added to the Wikipedia entry, for as it stands it casts doubt on the merit of knowledge gained through shamanic or visionary means. This is a situation full of irony, since the ancient Maya kings themselves employed visionary shamanism to gain

knowledge (gnosis) that conferred upon them the right to rule. Scholars themselves, however, rarely language these facts about Maya philosophy so bluntly, instead preferring to cloak the truth in abstractions. I registered my complaint on Aztlan and to Dr. Hoopes privately.²⁵ If Wikipedia is the arbiter of reality in any sense, then Hoopes has been successful at co-opting and inverting the term "Mayanism." The endeavor is laudable, but the choice of terminology is misleading and unfortunate.

Hoopes spends a great deal of time moderating many different discussions on the 2012 Tribe website. His interest in 2012 lies not with the possibility of reconstructing authentic beliefs connected with it in the Maya tradition—I doubt he believes there is anything to be found there—but rather he wants to track the 2012 meme as it is interpreted through the filter of pop culture. Thus his interest in "Mayanism" and how such a thing, as he defines it, manifests in my work, Argüelles's books, Calleman's ideas, and particularly in the recent book by Daniel Pinchbeck. (Jenkins 2009: 221-226).

And later in the book:

Mayanism and the Baktunian Movement

In Chapter 6 I discuss the appearance of the term "Mayanism" in a new Wikipedia entry, where it is used as a blanket term to refer to the New Age appropriation of 2012 and Maya concepts. I pointed out that using it in this way conflicted with the proactive use of similar terms, such as "Hinduism" and "Buddhism," and distorted Victor Montejo's original use of the term. In 2001, no less reputable a source than *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures* listed an entry called "Pan-Mayanism," consisting of a cultural entry by anthropologist Kay Warren and a political entry by Victor Montejo.

Neither entry gives the slightest indication that Mayanism, or Pan-Mayanism, has anything to do with the New Age appropriation of Maya traditions. Montejo observes that a new identity for the Maya is forming as the twenty-first century begins, one that involves "reorganizing themselves and making alliances among distinct Mayan organizations in order to reach a consensus on how to negotiate with the government of Guatemala on behalf of their communities."²⁶ Acknowledging common goals, beliefs, and identity is at the root of this development.

Kay Warren, in her cultural section of the Pan-Mayanism entry, notes that "indigenous activists have confronted powerful stereotypes" and in response "Mayan-identified activists have created hundreds of organizations and institutions in the 1980s—including research institutes, publishers, training centers, libraries, and training groups—to identify the vitality of indigenous language and culture."²⁷ Out of this process a Pan-Mayan identity is emerging, one that is predicated on shared beliefs, customs, and values among many different Maya groups speaking different languages. A truly universal level of Maya tradition has been found in this process. This Mayanism highlights the common values and goals of diverse Maya communities, based on the core elements they all have in common.

Some of these shared qualities and values are elaborated in Montejo's article "The Road to Heaven: Jakaltek Maya Beliefs, Religion, and the Ecology." While his Oxford entry on Pan-Mayanism focuses on political struggles, this article is much like a companion piece that explores folklore and religious beliefs. He states that the theories advanced to explain the "primitive religions" of indigenous people are unsatisfactory. Early anthropologists were likely to explain Maya traditions as a product of magical thinking and superstitions, a laughable belief in ghosts and protective prayers motivated by a fear of the unknown. This is the typical view of scientism toward indigenous practices, and Montejo rightly observes that "Western scholars have tried to explain indigenous religiosity from a Eurocentric point of view."⁸ He identifies the reference point of *nature* as a common thread of indigenous Maya beliefs, one that might be considered the hinge point of Mayanism. Cycles in nature, patterns in the sky and in agricultural rhythms, life cycles of animals and plants and human beings, were all joined under the unifying umbrella of nature, Mother Earth and Father Sky, or as the Quiché Maya say, "all the sky-earth."⁹

"Earth and Heaven," Montejo writes, are "the generators of life and happiness."¹⁰ This viewpoint provides a reference point for a pan-Maya identity and a satisfactory framework for a correct understanding of the term "Mayanism," stated in the work of a Maya intellectual and professor of anthropology who provides "an indigenous perspective," arguing that a "concern for the natural world, and the mutual respect this relationship implies, is constantly reinforced by traditional Mayan ways of knowing and teaching." Importantly, he formulates his thoughts on this pan-Maya basis of Maya spirituality in terms of what we could call a realized Perennial Philosophy: "For indigenous people, the environment and the supernatural realm are interconnected. This holistic perspective of human collective destiny with other living creatures on earth has a religious expression among indigenous people."¹¹

I interpret this as coming from the perspective, or value position, in which ego is already placed in right relationship with the unitary consciousness; Seven Macaw has successfully been transformed into One Hunahpu. The fourth point in Huxley's elucidation of the Perennial Philosophy, in which the purpose of human life is to live in the awareness of eternity, has been achieved. Paradoxically, this can occur only when the full life-and-death whole is embraced, something indigenous cultures are much more adept at than Western Eurocentric cultures, which deny death and thereby drive their citizens less elegantly toward it.

Victor Montejo's book *Maya Intellectual Renaissance* is an important resource for understanding the political, mythological, and social implications of a burgeoning Maya revival. He specifically suggests that the 2012 cycle ending is a critical component of this process. Framing the entire discussion within the emergence of a new Maya leadership taking the world stage (e.g., Rigoberta Menchú), Montejo explains "the present revitalization of the Maya culture in terms of its place in history, as occurring in the 'prophetic' cycle of time, the oxlanh b'aktun."¹² The word "oxlanh" means 13, and "b'aktun," or "b'en," refers to the Baktun period of the Long Count. Montejo points out that the phrase "Oxlanh B'en" was

found in a Jakaltek Maya folktale he documented and translated, called "El Q'anil: Man of Lightning":

. . . *But in Oxlanh B'en, when the war breaks out
We ourselves will come back as we are now
And nobody else will act in our place
Then, we will finish off the enemy.*¹³

The context of the phrase makes sense, and Montejo believes it is a late reference to the 13-Baktun cycle ending. This is pretty interesting, but as for the literal meaning of the story, we should always take this kind of information with a grain of salt, not placing undue emphasis on it as a literal, inviolable prophetic utterance. Information like this gets filtered through a dozen storytellers over many centuries, and each adds and subtracts his own energy and thoughts. The idea of the final line, that "we will finish off the enemy," takes on political urgency or threat to enemies of the Maya. Its metaphorical meaning seems to derive, however, from the scenario in *The Popol Vuh* when the Hero Twins defeat "their enemies," the Dark Lords of Xibalba, at the end of the story, thus ushering in the new cycle and the rebirth of their father.

Historically, the Maya have often reasserted their self-determination at cycle endings in the calendar. The Caste War in the Yucatán, for example, was driven by a prophetic voice coming from the "Talking Cross" at Chan Santa Cruz toward the culmination of a Calendar Round. Today, as the end of the 13-Baktun cycle approaches, Montejo suggests that the Maya renaissance is a part of a millenarian phenomenon he calls the "b'aktunian movement."¹⁴

This movement, which grows with the emergence of Pan-Mayanism, will inform and define the true Maya identity. I see this as a *true* identity as opposed to *new*, because the process seems to be more about a revival, an awakening, than the creation of something new. New elements, however, will unavoidably come into play as the Maya integrate themselves, as they always have, with new environmental and political realities, so a bit of both perspectives must be acknowledged. The *true identity* can be understood as existing at the essential core, while changing patterns of outer identities morph along the surface.

Change at the husk (the surface) and the seed (or core) is the essence of a beautiful paradigm of time that the Tzutujil Maya call *jaloj kexoj*. Spirit (*k'ex*, essence) and matter (*jal*, form) unfold in tandem. The priority of the seed-identity is necessary in the same way that spirit has priority in informing the ever-changing patterns of material forms. The Tzutujil Maya doctrine of *jaloj kexoj* goes hand in hand with another conception called "Flowering Mountain Earth"¹⁵ in which reality grows, like a flowering mountain, outward from the spiritual essence as it becomes all the many things of manifest existence.

Mayanism is concerned with the collectively shared seed-identity, and the Baktunian Movement is concerned with reestablishing and maintaining correct orientation between ego and Self, between matter and spirit, between indigenous and colonial mind-sets, to empower Maya leaders. This formula is similar to the mandate obeyed by ancient Maya kings—establishing within themselves an integrated shamanic conduit

between sky and earth, between this world and the other world, and through that role they were empowered as political chiefs.

Montejo writes that “Prophetic expressions of the indigenous peoples insist on the protagonist role that new generations must play at the close of this Oxlanh B’aktun (thirteen B’aktun) and the beginning of the new Maya millennium. The ancestors have always said that ‘one day our children will speak to the world.’”¹⁶ And, again, the role of 2012 in Montejo’s conception is clear:

*This millennial or b’aktunian movement responds to the close of a great prophetic cycle . . . the great prophetic cycle of 400 years in the Maya calendar. For the Maya, this is not the close of the second millennium or 2000 years after Christ, but rather the close of the fifth millennium according to the ancient Maya calendar initiated in the mythical year that corresponds to 3114 B.C. [correction of typo in original] . . . The b’aktun includes the global concept of time and the regeneration of life with new ideas and actions. In other words, the theoretical b’aktunian approach leads us to understand the effect of human ideas and actions on all that exists on the earth and their effectson the environment and cosmos.*¹⁷

Montejo’s observation not only helps us understand the concept of Mayanism (in which the spiritual values taught in *The Popol Vuh* are realized), but also helps us understand the indigenous attitude toward nature, one that is sustainable and diametrically opposed to the dominator style of colonial Western civilization. The Maya Renaissance can and should have a wider sphere of impact, one that speaks to the global crisis created by unsustainable, nature-destroying practices that need to be transformed at their roots in the collective consciousness.

—end excerpt (Jenkins 2009: 361-366)

And in my Glossary of Terms (Appendix 1) of *The 2012 Story* I restored the originally intended academic meaning of Mayanism:

Mayanism. The essential core ideas or teachings of Maya religion and philosophy. A counter-definition of Mayanism has developed on Wikipedia that uses the term to identify popular and New Age appropriations and misconceptions of Maya ideas. This is a problematic use of the term, because it contradicts the consistently proactive meanings ascribed to analogous terms, such as “Hinduism” or “Buddhism.” (Jenkins 2009: 419).

Item 4g. Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes

Written & Compiled May 21, 2014

My title was intended to be an attention grabber, because this topic requires some attention. “Mayanism” continues to receive concurrence and support from scholars (Johan Normak’s presentation in London, in April 2014, demonstrates this.) The term was adopted and developed beginning around 2008 by an anthropologist who teaches at Kansas University named John

Hoopes, who is also known for his various articles that attempt to define and debunk what he calls “2012 mythology.” His use of the term “mythology” in various contexts indicates that he doesn’t ascribe to the definition of the term that mythologists themselves use; instead, for Hoopes, he uses the common uneducated colloquial meaning of the term, as in a *lie*, a *fabrication*, or a *fiction*.

The distortion of terms like mythology among academic critics is to be expected within the context of a guerrilla skepticism that attacks and distorts ideologies and beliefs, be they religious or philosophical or intellectually based, that acknowledge spiritual or symbol meanings outside of the box of scientific materialism and atheism. Such guerrilla skeptics, or “unhealthy skeptics,” are active in online venues like Wikipedia, where they can freely craft and develop their frameworks. These frameworks are not oriented toward scholarly fairness and open-minded investigation, but rather serve as pejorative containers for unwanted authors and ideas, thus essentially serving like a concentration camp. Not surprisingly, John Hoopes is active in various entries on Wikipedia, including the Mayanism entry, where in the “Talk” page one can observe his efforts to do what is necessary in order to better legitimize his pet project. On the Aztlán e-list moderated by his friends/colleagues he is on record applauding the merits of Wikipedia. My own posts to Aztlán in early 2012, responding to Hoopes with links to the many complaints and studies that called into question the alleged fairness of Wikipedia, were censored by the site’s moderators.

The criticisms against Mayanism are many, as can be seen in the Talk section of the Mayanism Wikipedia entry. In my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin), I provided a detailed analysis and discussion of Hoopes’s flawed Mayanism construct, and I cited the earlier work of anthropologists Kay Warren and Victor Montejo in order to restore its originally employed meaning (see Appendix 1 for excerpts from my book).

In a forthcoming article I noted that Hoopes uses his term Mayanism interchangeably with the phrase “the 2012 phenomenon.” I also noted that Hoopes incorrectly credits Robert Sitler with coining of the phrase “the 2012 phenomenon,” and overlooks or ignores the prior use of the term by Geoff Stray, documented in 2002 and 2005. Stray and myself were both using the term well before Sitler’s 2006 use; Sitler possibly adopted the term from conversations and email exchanges he had with me in mid-2004, when he was writing his article. The circular implications of the true facts of this matter are curious to contemplate: Hoopes’s Mayanism imitates “the 2012 phenomenon”, which is a concept coined and used by the very same authors who are sentenced to the concentration camp of Hoopes’s Mayanism.

Hoopes’s categories are one dimensional and limited. The use of “the 2012 phenomenon” by Stray and myself (and even Sitler) suggests a larger and less pejorative application of the phrase that includes academic writings on 2012 and what the modern Maya think about 2012. In my introduction to Stray’s 2005 book (which Hoopes falsely conflates with “doomsday” books while ignoring Stray’s use of the “2012 phenomenon” phrase), I proposed the term “2012ology” and identified Stray as a 2012ologist. I used the term in later published writings including my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*. My phrase was used

in Restall & Solari's 2012 book (which also cited and critiqued my work and Stray's work), without due credit given, and reviewers of their book assumed it was their own term. It's curious that reviewers who cited Restall & Solari's use of "2012ology," believing they had coined it, basically had an approving attitude toward the term, but scholars citing my use of it (such as Sacha Defesche) insinuated judgment of it.

Scholars appropriate the prior work and ideas of independent thinkers who do their work outside the hallowed halls of academia, and they credit each other with ideas articulated and pioneered by non-scholars. The manner by which they do this is essentially elitist and intellectually dishonest. And the process often involves appropriating and distorting the meaning of a term that was previously coined and used in a more neutral non-contemptuous way. In the case of Mayanism, we see the "-ism" suffix used in many other like-in-kind terms (like Hinduism or Marxism or Judaism) where it is a proactive designator intended to encompass the essential elements of the religion or school or movement being discussed. Mayanism would thus represent the shared characteristics or essential beliefs of the Maya across various tribes or language groups (even through time). This is how Mayanism is used in the Pan-Mayanism discussions of anthropologists Kay Warren and Victor Montejo beginning with publications in the 1990s. Their "Pan-Mayanism" requires a root "Mayanism" of congruent meaning.

Hoopes's Mayanism, in comparison, posits a category in which he places criticized authors, publishers, and theories about the Maya and, particularly, about the 2012 topic. Curiously, Hoopes doesn't include any of the writings of himself or his degree-holding colleagues in the Mayanism category, even though the vast majority of academic writings on 2012 are reactionary to the doomsday, New Age, and millenarian writings on the subject, and therefore should be seen as being totally *dependent on* Mayanism. Without "Mayanism" most the academic writings on 2012 would not exist. This underscores the fact that most professional scholars, who are immune from inclusion in Hoopes's pejorative Mayanism concentration camp, are not concerned with attempting to reconstruct what the ancient Maya believed about 2012. One would think this would be the primary concern of academics treating 2012, but it is not. Most scholars, usually coming from the disciplines of archaeology, astronomy, or epigraphy, jumped disciplines and appointed themselves as sociologists and culture critics. Their critiques of the marketplace were always superficial and misleading, much less in-depth and informed than the critiques offered by myself and Geoff Stray. Again, a circular conundrum arises from the scholars' false categories: the indicted chief architects and occupants of Mayanism are actually the ones who have been providing the most in-depth critique of Mayanism for the longest time. (My 1992 book *Tzolkin* could be considered the earliest book that contained critiques of ideas and authors later identified with "Mayanism", and Geoff Stray's website is a compendium of thorough critiques since 2000.)

Frequently, scholarly critique of 2012 authors, presented in university conference settings, was reduced to juvenile lampooning which guaranteed titters of laughter among the elitist milieu of colleagues. Hoopes's low-level discernment likewise does not distinguish the efforts of researchers like

myself who offer well-documented reconstructions of ancient Maya cosmology from under-informed model-making and doomsday rhetoric in the marketplace. Instead, Hoopes favors superficial guilt-by-association constructs. For example, Hoopes seems to believe that authors published by the same publisher who published one Mayanism book must all be members of Mayanism. He also believes that anyone who perceives the World Age doctrine in Maya thought must have gotten the idea from Theosophy. I'd think such odd and self-serving constructs would be transparently unacceptable to any thinking person, but instead Hoopes's works are cited and recommended by his colleagues, who likewise wish to damage, mitigate, or exclude the contributions of outsiders.

In one instance, Hoopes's editor at a peer-reviewed journal published by the University of Texas Press, John B Carlson, even green-lighted and then, later, defended Hoopes's false statements about me and my background, in which he dismissed my work as pseudoscience (because the galactic alignment is, in Hoopes's mind, "astrology") and asserted that I lifted my galactic ideas from an astrologer named Dane Rudyar. These are totally false and *unsupported* assertions. Hoopes's false assertions, tantamount to an accusation of plagiarism, were unchallenged during the peer-review process, and were manifestly approved, supported, and then defended by the journal editor, John B. Carlson (see Appendix 2 below).

In regards to my own interpretation of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya (worldrenewal facilitated by deity sacrifice), we find that some scholars came to echo this very same interpretation. Notably, John B. Carlson himself, who was instrumental in allowing the publication of Hoopes's false, unsupported, and defamatory accusations about my background and my work. Carlson claimed this very same interpretation (my interpretation of 2012)¹ in his article that was published in the *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. XXIV (August 2012), of which he is the Editor in Chief. No real opportunity for peer-review process there, during which it might be suggested that the prior findings of other researchers that are congruent with your own findings be cited.

Readers, peers or not, can interpret for themselves what this combination of circumstances means, especially in light of the fact that I contacted and then sent John Carlson some of my early writing on my 2012 reconstruction *in 1994 and 1995* (see Appendix 2 for my early letters to Carlson with a discussion of his treatment of my work and his support of Hoopes's unprofessional and unethical chicanery).

The selective, limited, and biased framework of Hoopes is also revealed in his assessment of which books on 2012 he considers to be valid. Hoopes acknowledges basically four books by his colleagues as being legitimate treatments of 2012 — the ones by Aveni (2009), Van Stone (2010), Stuart (2011), and Restall & Solari (2011). All of these books were reactionary in nature, contain critical factual errors, and were oriented to critiquing other theories and books, offering very little in terms of what the ancient Maya may have thought about 2012. In the rare asides when they do, the conclusion is either that the Maya thought nothing about 2012 (certainly not

¹ Also in his May of 2010 talk and his 2011 IAU paper. My claim here is not hyperbole. See an essay I wrote in June of 2010 that spells it out: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/2012center-note10.pdf>.

doomsday) or that it was just a mathematical and calendric marker. This reveals that, for Hoopes, legitimate books about 2012 are ones that critique the “2012 mythology” which, for Hoopes, is largely an invention of modern writers and the popular marketplace derived from Theosophy.²

Hoopes is a hold-out of an expired approach to 2012 that was maintained in the 1990s, when scholars believed there was no evidence for 2012 being a concept to the ancient Maya. Scholars believed that 2012 simply was not a valid artifact of the ancient Maya, that the 2012 cycle ending falling on a solstice was just a coincidence, and there were no inscriptions about it. This changed when the Tortuguero “2012” inscription became widely known in 2006, and again with the La Corona 2012 inscription in early 2012. I had been arguing, based on my work on the ballgame-Creation Myth at Izapa, that 2012 was a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought; for years that position was rejected by scholars like Hoopes. The Tortuguero inscription definitively proved them wrong, but instead of accepting this new evidence they baffled it with irrational assertions that “it doesn’t tell us much” (Stuart), that it was “a bit boring” (Houston), that it doesn’t indicate any kind of “future prophecy” (Stuart), or that a few glyphs were too eroded to be conclusive (Hoopes, Aveni, with many other parroting). Or, most tellingly, that it didn’t say anything about doomsday (Van Stone) and thus the 2012 topic was debunked. The assumption here, common among many scholars when you peel back the layers of unexamined belief, is that for them 2012 is *synonymous with doomsday*.

So, Hoopes’s irrational commitment to 2012 having no meaning to the ancient Maya could be preserved, and his efforts to define and debunk his perceived “2012 mythology” or “Mayanism” were geared to keeping the lid on the barrel. This is not the practice of any kind of worthwhile rational scholarship; or we might say that *it’s the scholarship of mitigation in service to isolating and neutralizing unwanted ideas and authors* — even if those ideas are congruent with Maya thought. *Especially if those ideas are distasteful to Hoopes’s own beliefs*. For example, the doctrine of period-ending world-renewal in Maya thought has a similarity to the “New Age” idea of spiritual rebirth in the Age of Aquarius. Worldcentering and worldrenewal — I cited Maya scholar David Carrasco’s work on this and discussed these valid Mesoamerican Creation Myth concepts in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogony 2012* as a supporting premise of my work. But Hoopes cannot allow the Maya to have formulated this doctrine

² A reviewer of an anthology that both Hoopes and I contributed to (see Gelfer 2011) contrasted Hoopes’s obsession with debunking the “myth” of 2012 with my evidence for why 2012 is a true artifact of ancient Maya thought. Storm wrote: “Jenkins achieves the most important objective of any researcher by informing us without bias or prejudice, which is far from the aims of those who wish “to carve out a market share of the burgeoning 2012 cottage industry” (p. 165). Most importantly, Jenkins debunks the idea that the 2012 end-date is only a New Age myth. He proposes, by considerable weight of good science, a (to use his words) “rare astronomical alignment that occurs within the cycle of the precession of the equinoxes, which culminates on December solstices in the years around 2012” (p. 169). These culminations involve our Milky Way galaxy. In short, December 21, 2012, is no myth, Maya or otherwise” (Storm 2012). The quotes are to my “Approaching 2012” chapter (Jenkins 2011).

of worldrenewal, within their own belief system, because it resembles a primary feature of his Mayanism.

What logically follows is disturbing but is apparently what Hoopes’s Mayanism is built for: the entire Maya civilization must be relegated to Hoopes’s ideological prison, along with the modern researchers who rediscovered and articulated certain core beliefs of ancient Maya civilization. That belief is simply that deity sacrifice is necessary for worldrenewal in 2012 (Jenkins 1998).

Item 4h. 2011: Complaint filed with University of Texas Press, re *AJ* Vol. 22

I called Sue Hausmann on September 8, 2011 and informed her of my concern. I asked if she could facilitate a response from John Hoopes. She asked me to send her an email detailing the passages in Hoopes’s article, and stating the issue. I did so, with Item 1 below. She apparently responded by sending my email only to Carlson, not Hoopes. Carlson’s first response came four days later (see exchanges in **Item 4d**).

1:
Dear Sue Hausmann,

Thank you for your attention to this issue. The PDF of John Hoopes' review in Vol XXII of *Archaeoastronomy* was freely posted on Mark Van Stone's website, and that is where I accessed it. The statements in question are found in the right column of page 143:

"The "2012 Phenomenon" makes much more sense in the context of astrology than astronomy, as becomes clear from the influence of astrologer Dane Rudyard on New Age prophet and 2012 guru Jose Arguelles and on John Major Jenkins (who once worked as a professional astrologer) ..."

(further down the column):

"His [Rudyard's] book *The Planetaryization of Consciousness* (1970) helped inspire the first Whole Earth Festival while *The Sun is Also a Star* (1975) provided the intellectual underpinnings for claims by Arguelles (for whom Rudyard was a personal mentor) and Jenkins about ancient Maya concerns with the movements of the Sun relative to the Milky Way galaxy. ... astrology is a pseudoscientific "fringe" discipline."

I am not a professional astrologer, never have been and never tried to work as one. An early book of mine (1992) criticized pop / causal astrology. Hoopes's intent to defame is evident in the (false) identification of me as a professional astrologer, in the misleading association of my astronomical reconstruction work with an astrological context, and with the assertion that astrology is pseudoscience. I informed Hoopes by email quite some time ago that I was only vaguely familiar with the name Rudyard. Having subsequently looked into Rudyard's writings, I find that they have nothing to do with my reconstruction of precessional astronomy in ancient Mesoamerica, nor the arguments and evidence I've brought to bear on my thesis —

accept for the shared use of the term "galactic." Since I know my work to be, and present it as being, unprecedented, and I don't credit Rudyar with it, Hoopes's statement is tantamount to an accusation of plagiarism. These are very serious lapses in scholarly professionalism, accountability, and ethics. It's unfortunate that such comments were not flagged for checking, and that they've already appeared in print. They are totally false, designed for defamation. Even the trade publishers I've worked will flag questionable comments for checking, as a standard procedure. I've tried to seek a response from Hoopes, or an explanation, but he has refused to respond.

My suggested solution:

1. Facilitating a response from Hoopes
2. A printed correction in a future edition

A possible future problem must also be addressed. As I mentioned on the phone, my additional concern is that Hoopes's under-informed and incorrect statements will appear in Hoopes's forthcoming essay in the next *Archaeoastronomy journal*, which features papers on 2012 by MacLeod, Grofe, Callaway, Carlson, and other presenters from the 2011 Oxford IX Archaeoastronomy conference in Peru. Since there is such a highly politicized climate around the 2012 topic, and much misinformation about my work and ideas, I would prefer that I would be allowed to vet for accuracy anything that was written about me and my work in the pages of *Archaeoastronomy journal*. Thank you for your time. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins
kahib@ix.netcom.com

Item 4i. Ensuing emails with *AJ* editor John B. Carlson (Hoopes cc'd)

I:
----Original Message-----
From: John B Carlson
Sent: Sep 13, 2011 11:01 PM
To: John Major Jenkins
Cc: Sue Hausmann
Subject: Regarding John Hoopes's statements in Archaeoastronomy: 8 Sept. 2011 e-mail from John Major Jenkins

14 Sept. 2011
Mr. John Major Jenkins

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

On 8 September, Sue Hausmann, the Journals Manager for the University of Texas Press, sent me an e-mail indicating that you had telephoned her regarding a complaint about one of our book reviewers for *Archaeoastronomy: The Journal of Astronomy in Culture*, Professor John Hoopes of the University of Kansas, Lawrence. She asked you to send her an e-mail regarding the details of your complaint, which you did, and she then forwarded your e-mail on to me and asked that I follow up in my capacity as Editor-in Chief of *Archaeoastronomy*.

As I read your e-mail of 8 September to Ms. Hausmann, you are accusing Professor Hoopes of "intent to defame" in regard to specific language that he used in mentioning your name in a review of two books by other authors that appeared in *Archaeoastronomy* vol. XXII on pages 139 – 145. As Ms. Hausmann and I read your e-mail, you seem to be accusing Hoopes of "intent to defame" for what you say is a false identification of you as a "professional astrologer" and with the statement that "astrology is a pseudoscience."

You write: "I am not a professional astrologer, never have been and never tried to work as one. An early book of mine (1992) criticized pop / causal astrology. Hoopes's intent to defame is evident in the (false) identification of me as a professional astrologer". As part of your case against Professor Hoopes, you mention "an early book of mine (1992)" but do not cite it. It will be necessary to know what publication this is and what it says in order for me to evaluate your complaint.

Thank you in advance for providing this information.

Sincerely,

John B. Carlson, Ph.D.
Editor-in Chief
Archaeoastronomy: The Journal of Astronomy in Culture
cc: Sue Hausmann, Journals Manager, University of Texas Press

I was traveling between September 12-17, from Seattle to Portland to a beach house in Oregon without (thankfully) internet. I thereafter traveled to my brother's house in Washington state and responded on the 18th.

2:
On Sep 18, 2011, at 12:28 AM, John Major Jenkins wrote:

Dear John Carlson and Sue Hausmann,

To clarify, I am simply requesting that John Hoopes supply proof for his statements, published in *Archaeoastronomy journal*, Vol. XXII. I was hoping that Sue Hausmann could facilitate a response from him, since he refused to respond to my several email requests last month. In this regard, his statements are explicitly asserted but no citations or proof were provided for them. That is what I am requesting be provided. The inability of Dr. Hoopes to provide such evidence for his statements will determine whether or not my "accusations" are warranted. Please re-read the details of my email below, lest I be forced to repeat myself.

Your desire to assess a previous 1992 publication of mine is irrelevant to this request. This inquiry should rather be directed to Dr. Hoopes, who bears the onus of providing proof, citations, or some kind of evidence for his statements. I am offering the benefit of the doubt, and would appreciate a straight forward response. Whatever role the editors of the journal played in allowing his unsupported statements to make it through to publication, without proper flagging and professional fact-checking, is a different matter.

Sue, your attention to resolving this matter will be greatly appreciated. For your convenience my earlier email is copied below (see item 1 above). Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
Cc to Sue Hausmann

3:

19 Sept. 2011

Mr. John Major Jenkins

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

I did not require this clarification; your previous letter was clear on this matter. I understood that you are accusing one of our book reviewers, Prof. John Hoopes, of "intent to defame" you with a statement that you had worked as a "professional astrologer." In your first (8 September) letter of complaint to Sue Hausmann, Journals Manager of the University of Texas Press, you specifically mention one of your own published books from 1992 in support of your assertion that you are not and have not been a professional astrologer. As you said in that e-mail, "An early book of mine (1992) criticized pop / causal astrology." It is extremely unusual for an author to refuse to supply the complete citation of one of his own published books, specifically a work that he is using in a formal complaint that he was misrepresented and, furthermore, has been defamed. It is incomprehensible that you should follow up with *your* statement, in your 18 September e-mail to me and Sue Hausmann to which I am replying, that "Your desire to assess a previous 1992 publication of mine is irrelevant to this request."

I replied to you on 14 September, as Editor-in-Chief of *Archaeoastronomy*, regarding your complaint, which is included again here in my reply. I will repeat what I said then: "It will be necessary to know what publication this is and what it says in order for me to evaluate your complaint."

If you are unwilling or unable to cite your own work that you contend is directly relevant to the appropriateness of your complaint, this concludes the matter as far as I am concerned. I have reviewed what is available to me, and see nothing in what Professor Hoopes wrote in his review that is factually incorrect. I suggest that you take this up with him if you continue to have any further concerns.

Sincerely,
John B. Carlson, Ph.D.
Editor-in Chief
Archaeoastronomy: The Journal of Astronomy in Culture
PS: At her request, I am not including Sue Hausmann, Journals Manager, University of Texas Press, in this reply.

4:

Sept. 19, 2011

Dear John Carlson,

You wrote that you "see nothing in what Professor Hoopes wrote in his review that is factually incorrect." How do you know what he wrote is not "factually incorrect" if he did not supply the citation for what he stated as fact? How are readers going to know, or verify for themselves, if he did not supply a source for what he said, which amounts to defamation in the

context of his overall treatment? Let's review:

Step 1: My request asks John Hoopes to supply the citation(s) to the sources that support what he asserted as fact. These were defamatory statements that you, as editor-in-chief of UT's *Archaeoastronomy* journal, should have flagged for fact-checking. Your failure, as editor, to do so is a fact of the matter.

Despite your bewilderment at my refusal to cater to your irrelevant evasions, Step 1 is what is required before any other matters need be pursued. I have indeed been trying to take this up with Dr Hoopes, as you suggested, but he has refused to respond to my queries. This is why I was asking the journals manager, Sue Hausmann, to help in facilitating a response and resolution to the situation.

My question to you is: as editor-in-chief, do you not have a policy for flagging and fact-checking unsupported statements, especially if those statements amount to defamation of a living author in the context of the associations asserted in the construct of the piece? I feel this is a very serious breach of professional ethics. As a matter of decency, I will reiterate my concern for what Hoopes may be writing in his contribution to the forthcoming issue of *Archaeoastronomy*, which contains expanded essays by the contributors to the recent Cambridge IAU 278 journal. In the interest of clarity, and accurate fact-based presentation, I have offered to review and fact check his article. I had assumed this would be a welcome invitation in order to preserve the reputation of your journal. Thus, the matter is not ended here, as you would wish, but will continue if Hoopes's unprofessional and sub-standard scholarship — his tactic of baseless character assassination and defamation — continues to be sanctioned and/or overlooked by you, John Carlson, the editor-in-chief of *Archaeoastronomy* journal.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

P.S. I am including Sue Hausmann in this email because I did not receive any notice from her that she was no longer willing to help facilitate a resolution to this matter.

5:

Sent September 20:

Dear John Carlson,

I feel it is necessary to put a fine point on my inquiry. I am not making "a case" to you. I am not inviting you to receive a defense of my work, or assess evidence from me regarding my work or anything that I have written or believe. The issue is with your author, John Hoopes, asserting as fact things about me which are not supported with evidence or citations in his *Archaeoastronomy* Vol XXII review/article. This fourth email reiterates that I am inviting a clear response to a simple question: can Hoopes supply the evidence or citations for the statements he made? (For the record, my effort here follows several emails to Hoopes several weeks ago which went unanswered after his initial acknowledgement of receipt.) Can you facilitate a response from John Hoopes regarding this issue? If so, please relay his response to me. If not, please explain why. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Apparently, Sue Hausmann may have forwarded my query to you, but not to Hoopes, because that is the appropriate chain of responsibility and accountability given your editor-in-chief status.

Update. 12-19-2011. No response after this for several months. I then called Sue Hausmann; she was evasive and said she'd look into getting a response. Several days later someone else in her office — not a lawyer — emailed me and said that my lawyer should send an official request. Carlson turned the tables and made an irrelevant book source a pretext for ending his responsibility.

Item 4j. My *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* review of the Whitesides-Hoopes article

The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon): A Critique of the Whitesides & Hoopes Essay

**John Major Jenkins, Director of
The Center for 2012 Studies**

In their article in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (2012), Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes state that Robert Sitler was “the first to use and define the term ‘2012 phenomenon’” (Whitesides and Hoopes, 2012:50). They cite Dr. Sitler’s 2006 *Nova Religio* essay as the source. But Sitler himself, in his essay, mentions Geoff Stray’s book *Beyond 2012*, published in 2005 and which Sitler states “promises to be the most comprehensive book on the 2012 subject to date” (Sitler, 2006:29). In that book of 2005, Stray uses the term “the 2012 phenomenon” more than once,³ first in a note to his Introduction, where he states:

“www.diagnosis2012.co.uk – also known as 2012: Dire Gnosis, where *Dire* means serious or urgent, as well as dreadful, and thus sums up the ambiguous nature of the 2012 phenomenon” (Stray, 2005:288)

Stray’s book was written largely in 2003, with the first manuscript completed by March 2004 at the latest (when he sent it to me). Sitler may have been aware of Stray’s prior use of the phrase, and he did not claim to have coined it. Whitesides & Hoopes, however, have assumed and asserted this and for the record it needs to be corrected. Stray’s book is also acknowledged and cited in the Whitesides & Hoopes

³ For example, Stray, 2005:239, 288. The original version of my Foreword, completed by March 18, 2004, used the phrase “the 2012 phenomenon.” The excised section was originally placed before the second-to-last paragraph, and is here in full: www.Alignment2012.com/the2012phenomenonMarch2004.html. I was unconcerned with cutting it, as I preferred to use the term “2012ology” and called Stray “the first 2012ologist.” See www.Alignment2012.com/2012ology.html for more. In the first paragraph of the published version I state “the plethora of writings on it [2012] is a phenomenon in itself” (in Stray, 2005:9).

article, but in a misleading construct in which it is paired with Lawrence Joseph’s *Apocalypse 2012* (a doomsday book) as books “characterized by a preoccupation with physical disasters” (51). This is an incorrect characterization of Stray’s book; it is concerned with assessing the full spectrum of 2012-related ideas (as its sub-title suggests). Although Stray’s 2005 book was known to the authors, his prior use of the “2012 phenomenon” phrase in that book was overlooked and “the first to use” the term was incorrectly credited to Robert Sitler.

The fact is that the 2012 phenomenon phrase was being used by Geoff Stray and myself for at least three years prior to 2005. For example, Stray used the phrase in news items of August 2002 and September, 2003.⁴ My own uses of the explicit phrase are found in various emails, such as one to Stray on January 15, 2004 and one that I posted online in April 2004.⁵ To the best of my knowledge Geoff Stray coined the phrase, and was evidently using it four years prior to 2006.

In addition, although Whitesides & Hoopes also claim that Robert Sitler *defined* the term in his 2006 essay, *there is no definition of it in that source*. Sitler was using it as if it was already a known phrase, a known concept. Which it was. A sense for Sitler’s perspective on what the 2012 phenomenon is can nevertheless be gathered from his treatment throughout his essay, and it emphasizes the views of modern Maya leaders. In the Abstract of the Whitesides & Hoopes article, they define the 2012 phenomenon as “a polythetic set of romantic beliefs that derive from eclectic assertions about the ancient Maya woven into a diffuse mythology with specific relevance to contemporary issues” (50). This definition is more narrow than the framework embraced by Sitler, Stray, and myself, as it omits inclusion of recent academic writings of scholars on the topic as well as modern Maya perspectives on the matter.

Their definition sounds very similar to Hoopes’s description of “Mayanism” in the Wikipedia entry that he has developed since 2008, which he elaborated in a 2011 article called “Mayanism Comes of (New) Age” (Hoopes, 2011). In that article, similar descriptions shift between being called Mayanism and the 2012 phenomenon. Supporting this conceptual conflation of terms, I note that Whitesides & Hoopes use the term Mayanism interchangeably with the 2012 phenomenon (Whitesides and Hoopes, 2012:53). This is done without explanation or a distinction offered. The problems with Hoopes’s Mayanism construct are several, on grounds of semantics and prior usage of the term, which were brought up as challenges on the Wiki Talk page for the entry.⁶

⁴ See Item 72 at www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/new3.htm#judge; also at www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz13.htm. The news item of September, 2003 is at www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz25.htm. Stray’s website developed from his booklet of 1999.

⁵ See www.Alignment2012.com/zap-jenkins-dialogue.html. On October 26, 2001, I sent an email to Geoff Stray and proposed we collaborate on a book that would be “an effort to explore and understand the phenomenon of 2012 as an eschatological vortex, and the ideas being projected on to it.”

⁶ One challenge is that it appropriated a term already in use by other scholars (anthropologists Kay Warren and Victor Montejo) and *inverted its meaning*. Within an earlier “Pan-Mayanism” concept elaborated by scholars in the 1990s it was essentially a proactive term uniting diverse Maya groups under similar beliefs and goals, not unlike similar proactive terms like Hinduism or Judaism. Hoopes’s

In their Abstract we also read that “This paper includes the fullest historical account so far of the emergence of the 2012 phenomenon” (50). Four pages later we read that “The history of the 2012 phenomenon has been detailed in two recent articles (Hoopes 2011a, 2011b). For this reason, only a brief summary is given” (54). This is a contradiction, and should be flagged for clarification.⁷ One of the sources cited in the quote (2011a) is that same essay by Hoopes (titled “Mayanism Comes of (New) Age”) which, as the title suggests, is a historiography *not* of the 2012 phenomenon, but of Hoopes’s challenged “Mayanism” project on Wikipedia. Here, a history of the problematic category of “Mayanism” is apparently intended to stand in by proxy for a history of the 2012 phenomenon.

Whitesides and Hoopes critique Dr. Wouter Hanegraaff for “neglecting to acknowledge” earlier mentions of 2012 ideas, and they point out that he “overlooks significant antecedents” in the work of earlier writers (68). This is a valid criticism, which can be applied to the supposedly “fullest historical account” of Whitesides and Hoopes. For example, none of my earlier critiques and comments, in many books, articles and online venues including e-list groups that Hoopes belonged to (Aztlán), were cited or acknowledged.⁸ In my 1992 book on the Maya calendar I discussed and critiqued various calendar correlations (including the Waters/Coe error); I thoroughly critiqued the errors in Argüelles’ Dreamspell system, clarified the origins of the Harmonic Convergence in Tony Shearer’s work, mentioned the 20th-Baktun ending at Palenque, discussed astronomical tracking of seasonal quarters in the Long Count leading to the solstice 2012 period-ending, and criticized the burgeoning New Age spiritual marketplace.⁹ My 1992 book could justifiably be identified as providing a very early, if not the first, critique of many items, ideas, authors, and issues later identified with “the 2012 phenomenon.”

Another oversight is the claim of there being “only four” books on 2012 by “academic scholars” (53). They neglect to mention PhD-holding Robert Sitler’s 2010 book called *The Living Maya: Ancient Wisdom in the Era of 2012*, which updated some of his earlier views.

inversion makes it a negative label for criticized theories, people, publishers (see also Jenkins, 2009:224-225, 228, 361-364). In Warren (1998), **Pan**-Mayanism is predicated on the existence of a Mayanism of congruent meaning.

⁷ The “history of” the 2012 phenomenon is semantically inclusive of its “emergence”; at the very least some clarification of the Abstract’s ambitious self-description is necessary.

⁸ Jenkins (2009; 2011), www.Update2012.com, and www.Alignment2012.com/Chapter3.html.

⁹ *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies* (1992/1994). The book was published by Four Ahau Press in 1992 and reprinted in 1994. Hoopes cited my book in an earlier paper he wrote (Hoopes, 2011) and I had mentioned it to him several times in emails before 2011. See also my detailed history of the galactic alignment idea in Appendix 1 of Jenkins (1998).

Response to the Critique of My Work

My work is not treated in the Whitesides & Hoopes article until the final section, titled “Conclusion.”¹⁰ Only my 1998 book is cited as support for several dense sentences of assertions. They state that I “promoted” the “ideas” of McKenna and Argüelles (69). No specific page numbers in my book are offered, and this assertion is demonstrably false. As mentioned, I was the first to publish a detailed critique of Argüelles’s systemic errors in 1992. I continued the effort through the 1990s, in 2002, and in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (which Hoopes told me in 2009 that he had read), where I also stated my disagreements with McKenna’s core notion about 2012 (that a sudden, radical change is to be expected).¹¹

After my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* was released, which McKenna wrote the Introduction for, we both noticed that a superficial reviewer conflated our respective ideas and framed me, incorrectly, as merely echoing McKenna’s work. Even though we both wrote about 2012, our approaches and conclusions were very different. We both wrote letters to the editor of the magazine in which the review appeared to clarify the originality of my findings.¹² My work was never concerned with promoting the ideas of McKenna and Argüelles, but rather with documenting and presenting my study of Izapa and my reconstruction of the cosmological preoccupations of the culture that scholars had credited with being involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar.¹³ Their critique, here, is a misleading guilt-by-association construct.

Whitesides and Hoopes next state that:

[...] a hermeneutic technique of “unburdening” oneself of the need to be an expert by adopting an idiosyncratic analytical technique supposedly immune to literary scholarship is one also employed by John Major Jenkins

¹⁰ Sitler described my work as “a central influence on the 2012 phenomenon” (Sitler, 2006:29), so it is odd that Whitesides & Hoopes began what should be a discerning and detailed treatment in the Conclusion to their article, where they treated it superficially.

¹¹ See, e.g., www.Alignment2012.com/following.html, Jenkins (2009:90-95) for the McKenna critique and Jenkins (2009:104-109) for the Argüelles critique.

¹² The review appeared in *Magical Blend* magazine in the Fall of 1998. Our letters-to-the-editor were published later in truncated form; they are in full here: www.Alignment2012.com/lettoed.htm. McKenna had *already made the distinction* in his Introduction to my book, saying it was “a revolutionary work of discovery and synthesis” and his “path of discovery was different” than mine (Jenkins, 1998:XXV).

¹³ I identified a pre-Classic period-ending doctrine of “transformation and renewal,” which has a superficial resonance with the ideas of McKenna and Argüelles, as well as the general “New Age” milieu. (It is *superficial* because among the various writers there are many differences in the details of how the renewal concept is used and implemented; those ideas do not “belong” to McKenna or Argüelles.) My usage was not derived from McKenna, Argüelles, Blavatsky, or the New Age movement, as some critics assert (e.g., Whitesides & Hoopes, 2011; Hoopes, 2011:54). It arose from my investigation of the evidence at the site of Izapa. That the ancient Izapans and Maya (and other cultures) had a World Age doctrine in which worldrenewal occurs at specific intervals should not be obviated by the fact that such ideas are superficially echoed in the modern New Age marketplace. Critics need to apply discernment to recognize the distinction.

(1998) in claiming that iconography on Maya monuments (especially at the site of Izapa) can only be analyzed “archetypally” based on the insights of an assumed “perennial wisdom tradition.” (69)

Each of these assertions is contradicted by my published words and efforts, as I show below. The one and only cited source that allegedly supports these assertions is my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. Nowhere in that book is there a reference to, or discussion of, a “perennial wisdom tradition” or an interpretive analysis of the Izapan monuments that proceeds “archetypally.”¹⁴ They further state that I utilized an “assumption of a pure truth (or insight into the nature of reality) attained prior to cultural dilution, corruption, and textual exegesis.” (69) This seems to be a grossly distorted reading of my view that it is best to study the origin place and time of the Long Count (the pre-Classic “Izapan civilization”) because it would provide the clearest window into the undiluted original cosmology before historical degenerations inevitably occurred.¹⁵ Their distorted reading of what is a rather commonplace observation about how the passage of time changes the original beliefs of a religious movement or cultural paradigm gives a pejorative slant on my actual approach — which was to study the evidence at the probable origin site of the calendar that gives us the 2012 period-ending date.¹⁶

None of these assertions by Whitesides and Hoopes are supported by anything that can be found in the cited book source, and I suggest this is a serious breach of academic standards. What they asserted can be obviated with my actual statements taken from that same book. In sharing my actual words below I am not trying to present an argument for my 2012 alignment reconstruction; rather, it is necessary to illustrate that the source cited by Whitesides and Hoopes, allegedly containing support for their contentions, actually provides a completely different picture of my approach and methods, and my consequent evidence-based deductions and interpretations.¹⁷

Although other academic studies also help to clarify the meaning of Izapan symbols and their relationships to other [Mesoamerican] art traditions, those studies were limited to looking at the symbolic or iconographic content of Izapa’s monuments. My approach to understanding

¹⁴ Also see my chapter-by-chapter summary of *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* for a complete lack of evidence for the contentions of Whitesides and Hoopes: www.Alignment2012.com/mc2012summary.html.

¹⁵ I have repeated this rationale many times in my presentations and publications (Jenkins, 2009:151). Michael Coe uses the phrase “Izapan civilization” (Coe 1966).

¹⁶ I found this in Michael Coe’s statement: “The priority of Izapa in the very important adoption of the Long Count calendar is quite clear cut” (1988:86). Later scholars concurred (e.g. Rice, 2007).

¹⁷ Relevant quotes and references to the archaeological and astronomical bases of my interpretations are ubiquitous throughout my book, and it’s striking that Whitesides and Hoopes selectively ignore them. Five chapters in the Izapa section (Jenkins, 1998:219-298) focus on topography, archaeology, calendars, site history, and especially astronomical orientation. My analysis of the birth of the Hero Twins (1998:155-166) is based in astronomy, following the work of Tedlock (1985).

Izapa’s monumental message begins with examining the local topography and astronomy as a basis for iconographic interpretation. Most of the iconographic studies completely ignore the orientations of the monuments within each plaza, their directional relevance to horizon astronomy, and their spatial relationships (Jenkins, 1998:223).

The quote above demonstrates that my analysis and iconographic interpretations (of the Hero Twin episodes carved on the monuments) are based on evidence within and around Izapa with a focus on local topography and astronomy. And:

We must understand that disparate ancient cultures who derived their worldviews from observing the natural world, a natural world that includes the sky, might have formulated very similar ideas. As archaeoastronomer Anthony Aveni said, “In ancient societies the sky and its contents lay at the very foundation of human cognition,” meaning that the shared backdrop of the night sky provides celestial dramas that were mythologized by diverse people in similar ways (Jenkins, 1998:162).¹⁸

This quote shows that my approach is congruent with comments by archaeoastronomer Anthony Aveni. Many additional comments in the section of my book called “Izapa Cosmos” likewise illustrate that my approach is based primarily on astronomy.

Most importantly, I discuss a methodology of environmental determinants presented by Billie Jean Isbell (1982), leading to my focus on the topography surrounding Izapa, the archaeoastronomical orientation of Izapa’s monument groups, and the astronomical movements above Izapa and along its horizons.¹⁹ My interpretations of the Hero Twin episodes portrayed on Izapa’s monuments were drawn from readings of the creation mythology already proposed by scholars,²⁰ and my identifications of astronomical components of the myth and its characters *as expressed specifically at Izapa* were deduced from archaeoastronomical alignments of monuments and the known symbolism of the ballgame’s role within the Hero Twin myth. There was no requirement of, or use of, an “archetypal” or “pure truth” reading, or an assumed “perennial wisdom tradition.”²¹

¹⁸ The Aveni quote is from Aveni (1984:255).

¹⁹ The full excerpt from Jenkins (1998:383-384) is here: www.Alignment2012.com/mc-dialectic.html.

²⁰ Dennis Tedlock (1985), Barba de Piña Chan (1988), Schele et. al (1993).

²¹ In later publications I recognized how the Hero Twins represent the archetype of the Trickster and Seven Macaw the archetype of the Tyrant, or vain egoism. I recognized that a doctrine of “solar deity sacrifice and rebirth” (evident in the Izapa ballcourt) is also found at the root of many world religions (the paradoxical “dying and resurrecting god”) and I elucidated this through the non-dual concepts supplied by writers on the Perennial Philosophy such as Joseph Campbell, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, and Ananda Coomaraswamy. However, none of this was in place in my 1998 book, and it is a fallacy to suggest that my reconstruction at Izapa is rooted in this later framework, is an imagined “pure truth”, or has no basis in the evidence at the site. The flawed description of my work by Whitesides

The assertion that I desire to unburden myself from a need to “be an expert” and that I wish to be immune from literary critique and scholarship is contradicted by over twenty years of actively inviting discussion and debate with scholars about my reconstruction work. I feel no need to unburden myself from the need to be an expert because *I am an expert* on Izapan archaeoastronomy, iconography, and cosmology, as demonstrated in my many publications, presentations, and findings at the site.²² I was the first to deduce and publish the fact that the Izapa ballcourt is aligned to the December solstice sunrise azimuth, and can claim several other unprecedented observations about the site which primarily involve archaeoastronomy.²³

I have had numerous discussions and debates with scholars, including John Hoopes, who I invited to participate in the debate about my work sponsored by Dr Edwin Barnhart and the scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*.²⁴ He declined, and avoided a discussion about it when I sent him the 206-page transcript of the debate afterward.²⁵ Years earlier, after a lengthy discussion with Hoopes in late 2007 I responded to his suggestion that I write a concise summary of my work. The draft was titled “A Rational Approach to 2012” and was sent to him, which he read in early 2008.²⁶

My effort to engage in dialogues with scholars is also illustrated by my invitation to scholars to receive my 1998 book, offering to send them copies for review and discussion. In 1999 I engaged in debates on my work and had discussions with scholars on the Aztlan e-list, which at that time was moderated by John Hoopes.²⁷ From 1994 to 2000 I had exchanges with Susan Milbrath, Dennis Tedlock, Gordon Brotherston, Linda Schele, Barbara MacLeod, Ed Krupp, Anthony Aveni, Timothy Laughton, David Kelley, and other scholars and astronomers, sharing my articles, responding to critiques and discussing Maya astronomy, mythology,

and Hoopes, asserted but not demonstrated, suggests they may have adopted a superficial understanding of a later elaboration in my writings and then mistakenly applied it retroactively (in a “cart-before-the-horse” operation) to my original pioneering analysis of the interdisciplinary evidence at Izapa.

²² Including presentations at Naropa University (in 1999), the *Society for American Archaeology* (2010), *The Institute of Maya Studies* (in 1997 and 2011), the Universidad Valle del Grijalva (2007) and the *First Izapa Round Table Conference* (where Garth Norman and Mark Van Stone also spoke).

²³ See Jenkins (1996) and www.Alignment2012.com/summary-of-my-work-on-Izapa.pdf. Aveni & Hartung (2000) later published a confirmation of my earlier ballcourt-solstice discovery (Jenkins, 1996; 1998). See also www.Alignment2012.com/izapa-solstice-2006.html.

²⁴ *The Maya Exploration Center*, at www.mayaexploration.org.

²⁵ The *MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion* of December 2010, moderated by Dr Edwin Barnhart, posted at www.mayaexploration.org and www.thecenterfor2012studies.com.

²⁶ At: www.Alignment2012.com/rationalapproachto2012.html. The first part was published in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter as a response to a critique by Dr Susan Milbrath (see Jenkins, 2008). The “lengthy discussion with Hoopes” alluded to was in the comments section of a Lawrence, Kansas newspaper, and is reproduced here: www.Alignment2012.com/Hoopes-Jenkins-Lawrence.html.

²⁷ The Aztlan archives for mid-1999 have disappeared, but my exchanges and debates with scholars at that time are preserved here: www.Alignment2012.com/chapter3.html.

archaeology, ethnography, iconography, and Izapa. These and dozens of other examples, continuing to today, demonstrate that I have in fact actively sought discussion and debate and have responded to my critics.²⁸ This is not the behavior of someone who seeks to be “immune” from “literary scholarship,” discussion, or critique, as Hoopes and Whitesides asserted in their article. To be clear, the *appearance* of support for their contentions is suggested by the citation to my 1998 book, but is not confirmed when that source is actually consulted. In fact, a logical method of interdisciplinary analysis of the evidence at the relevant archaeological site (Izapa) is demonstrated by my statements in that same book.

Conclusion

The brevity required in this review doesn’t allow a full treatment of many other aspects of their paper. Apart from specific factual corrections and my noting of various oversights, a general critique is that their definition of the 2012 phenomenon is narrow and barely acknowledges any scholarly efforts to reconstruct authentic Maya beliefs about 2012. They may respond to this by saying that they are not concerned with that approach and that it’s not part of the 2012 phenomenon as they define it. But if that is so then a conundrum appears, because *that is my stated and demonstrated primary concern since the early 1990s* (Jenkins, 1992; 1998; 2009) — yet they seek to critique it. In doing so, they do not accurately portray my interpretive methodology nor do they cite or address any of the evidence I’ve brought to bear on my interpretations and reconstruction work (since that is not their concern); instead, they engage in vague citation practices, insinuations of unscientific methods, guilt-by-association constructs, and assertions that are not verifiable and are not supported by the source they cite.

A more complete narrative of the 2012 phenomenon that includes scholarly reconstructions of what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, that includes ancient and modern Maya notions of reciprocity and cyclic renewal associated with calendrical period endings, and that gives a critical eye to academic perspectives on the topic, has actually been underway for longer than Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes have acknowledged, since well before either of them had published on the topic. This earlier pioneering work occurred in conversations and publications among researchers who have been discussing and critiquing the 2012 phenomenon (or, at least, what came to later be designated “the 2012 phenomenon” by those same researchers) since the 1990s.

References

Aveni, A. (1984). *The View From the Tropics*. In Krupp, E. C. (Ed.), *Archaeoastronomy and the Roots of Science*. AAAS Selected Symposium 71, 253-288. Boulder, CO: Westview.

²⁸ See www.Update2012.com/Jenkins-Guenter-Normak-Archaeological-Haaccetities.html, www.Alignment2012.com/milbrath9.html, www.Alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html, and other exchanges and reviews at www.Update2012.com.

- Aveni, A. & Hartung, H. (2000). Water, Mountain, Sky: The Evolution of Site Orientation in Southern Mesoamerica. In Quiñones Keber, E. (Ed.), *Precious Greenstone, Precious Quetzal Feather*. Lancaster, CA: Labyrinthos.
- Aztlan. Listserve of the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies, Inc. www.famsi.org/listinfo.html.
- Barba de Piña Chan, B. (1988). *Buscando raices de mitos y leyendas Mayas*. Campeche, Mexico: Ediciones de la Universidad Autonoma del Sudeste.
- Coe, M. (1966). *The Maya*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Coe, M. (1988). *Mexico*. (3rd edition, revised and enlarged). London: Thames & Hudson.
- Hoopes, J. (2011). Mayanism Comes of (New) Age. In Gelfer, J. (Ed.), *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (S. 38-59). London & Sheffield: Equinox.
- Isbell, B.J. (1982). Culture Confronts Nature in the Dialectical World of the Tropics. In Aveni, A. & Urton, G. *Ethnoastronomy and Archaeoastronomy in the American Tropics* (Vol. 385, 353-364). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.
- Jenkins, J.M. (1992). *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies*. Boulder, CO: Four Aha Press. Republished 1994, Garberville, CA: Borderland Sciences Research Foundation.
- Jenkins, J.M. (1996). *Izapa Cosmos*. Louisville, CO: Four Aha Press.
- Jenkins, J.M. (1998). *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012: The True Meaning of the Maya Calendar End-Date*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Company.
- Jenkins, J.M. (2008). December 21, 2012: Some Rational Deductions. In Reed, Jim (Ed.), *Institute of Maya Studies Newsletter*. Miami, FL: www.instituteofmayastudies.org.
- Jenkins, J.M. (2009). *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies, and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History*. New York: Tarcher / Penguin Books.
- Jenkins, J.M. (2011). Approaching 2012: Modern Misconceptions vs. Reconstructing Ancient Maya Perspectives. In Gelfer, J. (Ed.), *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (S. 163-181). London & Sheffield: Equinox.
- Rice, P. (2007). *Maya Calendar Origins*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Sitler, R. (2006). *The 2012 Phenomenon: New Age Appropriation of an Ancient Maya Calendar*. Nova
- Religio: The Journal of Alternative and Emergent Religions*, 9, (3), 24-38.
- Sitler, R. (2010). *The Living Maya: Ancient Wisdom in the Era of 2012*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Stray, G. (2005). *Beyond 2012: Catastrophe or Ecstasy - A Complete Guide to End-Of-Time Predictions*. East Sussex, UK: Vital Signs Publishing.
- Schele, L., Freidel, D., & Parker, J. (1993). *Maya Cosmos: Three Thousand Years on the Shaman's Path*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Tedlock, D. (1985). *The Popol Vuh: The Definitive Edition of the Mayan Book of the Dawn of Life and the Glories of Gods and Kings*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Warren, K. (1998). *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics*. Princeton University Press.
- Whitesides, K. & Hoopes, J. (2012). Seventies Dreams and 21st-Century Realities: The Emergence of 2012 Mythology. In Hövelmann, G. H. (Ed.), *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*. 12 (50-74).



About the author:

John Major Jenkins is an independent researcher and an expert on the Maya calendar and Maya astronomy. He has defined and debated key issues relating to the 2012 phenomenon for over twenty years and has taught at both popular and academic venues around the world, including the *Institute of Maya Studies* and the *Society for American Archaeology*. His books include *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998), *The 2012 Story* (2009), and *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy* (2012). He is the Director of *The Center for 2012 Studies*.

<http://www.JohnMajorJenkins.com>

Continued Discussion on *Seventies Dreams and 21st-Century Realities*

by Kevin A. Whitesides and John W. Hoopes

In: *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* 12 (2012), 50-74

<http://www.anomalistik.de/zeitschrift/ueber-zfa/bestellformular.html>

Item 4k. Ensuing email exchanges with Hoopes (and Whitesides)

This episode, which unfolded between December 19, 2013 and January 11, 2014, is so protracted that it is best to provide a link to the entire exchange:

<http://www.update2012.com/Scholarly-Dreams-and-Factual-Realities.pdf>. In brief, we see how Hoopes repeatedly ignored my explanations and links, simply repeating his request to receive all of my multi-genre writings. This was his irrational and malicious attempt to derail the publication of my critique, and create a false circumstance in which he could claim that I

was refusing to send him my writings — which in fact he and Whitesides did in their response to my critique. Hoopes’s desperation, to the point of absurdity, is evident in his emails to me of early January, where he badgers me with several different emails containing different angles of approach — including, for example, a forwarded email from the librarian at his university in Kansas, who could not find ISBN numbers for several of my self-published books on the 1980s (some of my early books of poetry and experiment quasi-fiction, themselves totally irrelevant to Hoopes’s responding to my critique, were self-published in limited editions and sold through my mail-order catalogue).

The long file linked above documents a desperate debunker whose malicious behavior was about to be exposed on his own terms, in a peer-review journal. This came to pass, but Hoopes and Whitesides wiggled around acknowledging even one of the factual corrections I pointed out, including the unambiguous fact that Sitler did not “first use” or “define” the phrase “the 2012 phenomenon.” The Wikipedia entry for that phrase, largely crafted by Hoopes, still reflects the falsehood, intended to write myself and Geoff Stray out of the narrative. (Actually, we are included in the narrative, but in pejorative, false, and denigrating ways — that’s how character assassins like Hoopes operate.)

Item 41. My Response to their Response (August 2014)

Deceptive Scholars Refuse to Correct Factual Errors
in Their Peer-Reviewed Study

John Major Jenkins. August 3, 2014

What happens when scholars don’t deal accurately and honestly with the material that they are studying? What happens, apparently, is business as usual. Exposing this behavior in scholars means there is an underlying agenda or bias, a fundamentalist conviction that they must maintain at all costs, even if it is not congruent with the facts. This is not good science, and it calls into question all of their work, their past work *and* future work. It becomes quite plausible that they pursued and acquired their degrees, their *bona fides*, as a strategy for a larger ideological agenda. Or, perhaps, they became corrupted and unethical at some point along the way, tempted by a role they might play in vanquishing their perceived ideological opponents or those who they are threatened by because they operate outside their academic guild. Here are some final observations on the failure of scientists to practice science, based on my own peer-reviewed critique of two scholars, and their invited response.

My review-essay called “The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)” was recently published in the German peer-review journal *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (14), January 2014, pp 53-62. It was a review of the article by Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes called “Seventies Dreams and 21st Century Realities”, published in the same journal in mid-2012,

which is available online on Academia.edu.¹ There are several additional essays I wrote that can serve as ancillary support for my corrections and critiques:

1. “Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities”
2. “Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes”
3. “Truth Deniers: How Scholars Exploit the Internet and Avoid Dialogue”²

The first item consists of the lengthy email exchanges between Hoopes, Whitesides, and myself, with some comments by the editor of the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, between mid-December 2013 and late January 2014. It occurred after Hoopes and Whitesides were sent my peer-review approved piece (around December 18) by the journal’s editors with an invitation to respond. This email communication, generally not required or advised in this critique-and-response process, was instigated by Hoopes’s incessant requests that I send him by entire body of multi-genre works going back to the 1980s, as some kind of prerequisite for him making an informed response to my critique.

This was a ruse intended to muddy the waters, a bid by Hoopes to upset the editors so they might cancel the entire plan. And it almost worked. The compilation I’ve entitled “Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities” documents the bad behavior and resistance of two scholars to be corrected on simple points of factual error, and the absurd lengths to which they would go in order to maintain their flawed ideas and writings. Hoopes even sent me a last minute email, on the day of the deadline for their response, which I respond to in Appendix 1 below.

The second item, “Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes”, is a piece I wrote in May 2014 that clearly states the many problems with Hoopes’s “Mayanism” construct, and shares the detective work that revealed his collaborative collusions with his friend and *Archaeoastronomy Journal* editor, John B. Carlson. It appears quite clear that the several articles Hoopes published in Carlson’s “peer-review” journal, which all contain errors as well as unsupported defamatory assertions about a living author (myself), were approved not through a standard un-biased peer-review process, but through a “wink-and-a-handshake” strategy. The underlying reason for this appears to be the likelihood that Carlson himself wished me to be mitigated, quite possibility because he has known, for years, that my interpretation of what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 (world-renewal that must be facilitated by deity sacrifice) anticipated his own interpretations, which he began to publish in his own journals in 2011. My early communications with Carlson, going back to 1994, are supplied.

Item number three, “Truth Deniers: How Scholars Exploit the Internet and Avoid Dialogue”, is a compilation of the exchanges that took place on Whitesides’ Facebook group, “The 2012 Research Discussion Group”, in July of 2014. I was

¹ Link is here: https://www.academia.edu/2174066/Seventies_Dreams_and_21st_Century_Realities_The_Emergence_of_2012_Mythology.

² All three essays are online at <http://Update2012.com>.

trying to open a dialogue with Hoopes, Whitesides, and Bill Hudson, and also wanted to share my ongoing 2012 research and ask some questions. In particular, I was seeking clarification on the difference between “Mayanism” and “the 2012 Phenomenon.” However, Hoopes had blocked me, followed by Hudson blocking me. So it became difficult to have a clear discussion with them. Then, after Geoff Stray provided some detective work on Wikipedia that revealed Hoopes’s aggressive construction of the Mayanism entry beginning in early 2008, which I built upon by sharing my email exchange with Hoopes in early 2008 to show that Hoopes was being deceptive, Whitesides deleted me from the group. And, in addition, they all ignored my separate emails and Instant Message attempts to communicate, which were professional and cordial. If one reads the exchanges one should note my cordial stance of inviting dialogue, compared to the hostility and *ad hominem* flippancy of others who were aghast at the questions and facts that were being presented.

There are many support files documenting exchanges, excerpts from my books, or previous articles that are freely available online and are cited in the footnotes of my essay. They are compiled here:

www.Alignment2012.com/the2012phenomenonMarch2004.html
www.Alignment2012.com/2012ology.html
www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/new3.htm#judge
www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz13.htm
www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz25.htm
www.Alignment2012.com/zap-jenkins-dialogue.html
www.Update2012.com
www.Alignment2012.com/Chapter3.html
www.Alignment2012.com/following.html
www.Alignment2012.com/lettoed.htm
www.Alignment2012.com/mc2012summary.html
www.Alignment2012.com/mc-dialectic.html
www.Alignment2012.com/summary-of-my-work-on-Izapa.pdf
www.Alignment2012.com/izapa-solstice-2006.html
www.mayaexploration.org (linking to:
http://mayaexploration.org/pdf/MEC_Facebook_Discussion_2010_Jenkins.pdf)
www.thecenterfor2012studies.com
www.Alignment2012.com/rationalapproachto2012.html
www.Alignment2012.com/Hoopes-Jenkins-Lawrence.html
www.Alignment2012.com/chapter3.html
www.Update2012.com/Jenkins-Guenter-Normak-Archaeological-Haeccities.html
www.Alignment2012.com/milbrath9.html
www.Alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html

There are more than 400 pages of material here, which thoroughly validate my interpretations and critique. Any thinking and unbiased reader who becomes familiar with my work, through these freely available sources or my books, cannot possibly agree with the skewed and denigrating assessments offered by Whitesides and Hoopes. But the task at hand is to offer, here, a summary and response to the critique-and-response now published in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*,

copies of which can be purchased by contacting the editors of that journal: www.anomalistik.de.

My Rebuttal to the Response of Whitesides and Hoopes

Despite my unambiguous corrections of several factual errors, they’ve managed to subvert honest scholarly process and wiggle their way around the corrections, invoking the sorcery of semantics and assertions that — not unlike many unsupported assertions in their original essay — are simply not true. Throughout their entire essay they avoid acknowledging even one of the corrections. It illustrates an unwillingness and a failure to correct themselves when demonstrably in error. This is not the behavior of honest scholars.

As the first example, we can look at my first point of correction, in which I provided the proof for Geoff Stray’s earlier use of the “2012 phenomenon” phrase. The published *uses* by Stray were unambiguously *prior* to Sitler’s 2006 essay. Recall that the authors credited Sitler with the *first use* of the phrase, as well as with defining the phrase. I also pointed out that there was no definition of the phrase in Sitler’s essay. This could have been a simple matter of acknowledging a correction but, instead, Whitesides & Hoopes responded: “We were referring to its use *and* definition.” No, they were referring to its *first* use. In my review I quoted their words, that Robert Sitler was “the first to use.” They refuse to acknowledge the factual correction on this simple point by saying that Defesche (2007) was “the second” to use it, thus maintaining their demonstrably false position that Sitler was “the first.”

Furthermore, they conclude that they “were following and extending this specific scholarly use, not its casual mention” (63). We are apparently suppose to believe that Stray’s earlier use (at least four times since 2002 and prior to 2006) was merely a “casual mention” of the phrase and does not constitute a “use of” the term. This fallacious and deceptive way of dismissing a simple factual correction is emblematic of their other responses, and is why I have titled my rebuttal “Deceptive Scholars Refuse to Correct Factual Errors in Their Peer-Reviewed Study.”

They also claim that Sitler did define the phrase, and we are suppose to believe that this constitutes a definition: “There is intense and growing speculation concerning the significance of this date among many New Age aficionados and others interested in Mayan culture” (Sitler, 2006: 24). That’s a definition? If Sitler’s sub-title (“The New Age Appropriation of an Ancient Maya Calendar”) is meant to be taken as a definition of the phrase, as they suggest, then we are left with a contradiction in which Sitler himself calls me a “central influence on the 2012 phenomenon” (Sitler 2006:29), yet my work is seen by Sitler to be the most well-researched work on the topic, is recognized as being concerned with reconstructing ancient Maya beliefs and *not concerned* with “appropriating” the Long Count calendar, but with articulating the ancient Maya beliefs associated with it. Thus, Whitesides & Hoopes have misconstrued Sitler’s perception of a distinction to be made in the nature of my work, compared to those in the marketplace who have appropriated the Long Count/2012 calendar and have invented various models, doomsday devices, and so on.

In several other examples, Whitesides & Hoopes distort (or ignore) the actual context and *words used* in my corrections *and in their own essay*. Their responses are therefore not to my critiques, but to an imagined distortion or incomplete truncation of my critiques. For example, in their original essay they wrote that I “promoted” the “ideas” of McKenna and Arguelles. I showed proof that I actually critiqued and disagreed with the core 2012 ideas of both McKenna and Arguelles, that I was not *promoting* their ideas, that McKenna himself had made a distinction between our approaches and conclusions, and that my critiques of Arguelles’ ideas go back to my 1992 book *Tzolkin*. They responded by addressing NOT their assertion that I “promoted” the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles, but that I merely had an “association” with them and their ideas. See how that works? Obviously, there’s a huge difference between actively promoting the ideas of others and simply having some kind of association with those people and their ideas. You could say we were all writers, or males, or had once stood in the same room. That is the kind of chicanery that Hoopes has frequently employed, and it is deceptively employed many times in their responses to my critique of their paper.

But they go further in laboriously scanning through my writings for a discursive example of me agreeing with McKenna’s comment that “resonant relationships” between the microcosm and the macrocosm is a good and useful framework. And elsewhere (in a letter to the editor of the Dreamspell “Time Bandits” newsletter in the early 1990s) I offer to help the Dreamspell group understand the authentic Maya calendar and where errors in the Dreamspell system were committed. Instead of seeing this as my effort to educate and clarify a murky appropriation and distortion of the Maya calendar, Whitesides & Hoopes craft a denigrating and false assertion that I was collaborating with them to build the Dreamspell empire. I frequently identify my role, all through the 1990s and beyond, as being in service to “clarity and discernment.”

So, instead of recognizing the role I played in correcting the Dreamspellers and defending the authentic Maya calendar from their “appropriation”, Whitesides & Hoopes turn the tables and make me an accomplice and consultant in their agenda — even though I was the first to expose the errors of Dreamspell, received many nasty letters as a consequence, worked hard through the 1990s to point the disillusioned Dreamspell fallout to ethnographic sources for authentic Maya calendar information, confronted and questioned Arguelles in person in 1999 (Jenkins 2009: 109), and continued my efforts all the way through to my 2009 book with Tarcher/Penguin, despite the adversity involved.

The two examples above were cited by Whitesides & Hoopes as evidence that I was “associated” with and agreed with the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles. This is yet another example of their deceptive approach, their insistence in maintaining a denigrating and false picture of my contributions, and their resistance to being corrected.³

The deceptive tactics of Whitesides & Hoopes are also clearly in evidence when they write: “Jenkins also claims that

in *Tzolkin* he ‘discussed and critiqued various calendar correlations (including the Waters/Coe error).’ However, *Tzolkin* makes no mention of Coe” (65). It was not necessary for me to discuss or mention Coe in my 1992 book in order to later identify the end-date correlation of December 24, 2011 (that Waters got from Coe) as the “Waters/Coe error”. If I had only identified it as the “Waters error” that would be inaccurate because it derived from Coe’s miscalculation. The point was that I had addressed the fallacy of this correlation in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, which is one point of several that indicates I was contributing critical analyses to items that would much later come under the “2012 phenomenon” umbrella. Obviously, Whitesides & Hoopes are trying hard here to use deceptive tactics in order to disallow my early contributions and analysis of 2012-related matters. This kind of deceit is, again, emblematic of virtually every evasive defense they offered in their response.

Whitesides himself no doubt composed (p. 65) the response to the evidence I provided that obviates the charge that I employ a “hermeneutic” of “being immune” to scholarly discourse and process, etc. The alleged evidence for this denigrating charge is cited to, and supposedly is to be found in, my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. In the initial email correspondence with the authors, in July of 2013, Whitesides acknowledged that he composed this part of the paper and that the citation must be wrong. But then he begged off and was elusive for many months, finally in November refusing to respond to my emails in which I asked for clarification. The curious issue here is that Whitesides, in his official published response, *did not admit to the citation error that he had previously acknowledged*, and instead defended and re-asserted a twisted version of the same charge. He actually *did not* respond to the quotes I provided and the facts of my twenty years of efforts to communicate and debate with scholars about my work — facts which totally mitigate his assertions. Instead, the authors assert that I’ve “repeatedly” refused to send them my various multi-genre publications going back to the 1980s. This is a lie. In fact, I immediately responded to this request, on December 23, 2013, and for the following two weeks repeatedly reiterated my response, offering links, excerpts, jpgs of images from and explanations of my rare out-of-print books, and ordering information. I wrote over 15,000 words in this effort. Hoopes was mainly behind these extremely odd requests, which simply ignored that I had already responded and provided as much information as possible. Many of the sources he was requesting were poetry, experimental narrative, travelogue, and biographical. He was clearly setting up an impossible and irrelevant task so that he could later claim I was uncooperative (which itself is untrue). This is exactly what he did, effectively demonstrating, for people who can read, the sad state of his ethics.

Another tactic employed by the authors was to sift through my book, looking for singular out-of-context occurrences of the words “archetype” and “perennial,” each of which occurs in my 1998 book in one place, in separate chapters. Their charge that I employed a “perennial wisdom tradition” and a methodology of interpretation of the Izapan monuments that proceeds “archetypally” is suppose to be vindicated by these two occurrences of these two words, in completely different chapters outside of my analysis of Izapa. The word “perennial,”

³ See Appendix 2 for another example involving the Hunab Ku symbol.

for example, was used in a common way meaning “always ongoing” and “archetype” was employed to identify the symbolic motif of “Jonah and the Whale,” in my retelling of a Maya folktale. That has nothing to do with my method of analyzing Izapan monuments and cosmovision, which, as I demonstrated clearly with quotations drawn from my 1998 book, is rooted in archaeoastronomy, topography, and astronomy.

They similarly grasp at straws in asserting that I employed a “pure truth” reading of the Izapa monuments that doesn’t require analytic assessment or evidentiary support and argument, and their alleged proof of this is the occurrence of the word “True” in the subtitle of my book, which was selected by my publisher: “The True Meaning of the Mayan Calendar End Date in 2012”. Obviously, we have more evasive semantic sleight-of-hand happening here; “true meaning” in the sub-title refers to my findings in *studying the origin of the tradition*, the meaning being “true” because it is the meaning ascribed to 2012 by the creators of the 2012 calendar. And I believe my interpretations to be true and accurate ones regarding what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, based on all the research, evidence, and arguments laid out in my book. It can also be noted that my original and preferred sub-title was “Precession Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica.” We might similarly employ the Whitesides & Hoopes tactic in chastising the dire and dramatic titles of Restall & Solari (*2012 and the End of the World*) or Aveni (*The End of Time*). Their contempt and hostility is revealed in their decision to selectively target and misrepresent my sub-title in this way.

This lame bid to defend their baseless accusation also ignores a very clear point that I made in my review, which I suppose I must repeat here:

They further state that I utilized an “assumption of a pure truth (or insight into the nature of reality) attained prior to cultural dilution, corruption, and textual exegesis.” (69) This seems to be a grossly distorted reading of my view that it is best to study the origin, place and time of the Long Count (the pre-Classic “Izapan civilization”) because it would provide the clearest window into the undiluted original cosmology before historical degenerations inevitably occurred.[14] Their distorted reading of what is a rather commonplace observation about how the passage of time changes the original beliefs of a religious movement or cultural paradigm gives a pejorative slant on my actual approach – which was to study the evidence at the probable origin site of the calendar that gives us the 2012 period-ending date.[15] (Jenkins 2014:57)

I suspect that Whitesides employed his ridiculous and fallacious accusations about my methods and interpretations in his dissertation on 2012, apparently awarded to him in 2012 by the University of Edinburgh. Consequently, the validity of his PhD would come into question if he officially admitted asserting false and denigrating things about a living author, *using for support a citation to a source that does not provide evidence for what he asserted*. And yet, he already *unofficially* admitted this during our email exchange in July 2013 (see Item 1 above, “Scholarly Dreams...”).

Whitesides & Hoopes also tried to explain away my noting of their oversight of including Sitler’s 2010 book called *The Living Maya: Ancient Wisdom in the Era of 2012* in their list of official, *bona fide* books on 2012. They explained that: “This was not an oversight. We consider that work to be in a different category and therefore did not treat it – as we did not treat many other popular trade books – as being equivalent to those by noted epigraphers, archaeoastronomers, ethnohistorians, and art historians.” Significantly, they neglect to point out that Van Stone’s book (2010) was a messily revised Power Point presentation and was self-published (and poorly edited, with many errors),⁴ the Restall/Solari book (2011) and the Stuart book (2011)⁵ were trade publications (which, elsewhere, in discussing my research being published with trade publishers, Whitesides & Hoopes claim are not valid academic contributions because they haven’t gone through peer-review), and Aveni’s 2009 book (which is the only one published under a peer-review process with a university press) contains critical errors⁶ and opinionated anecdotal assertions that *Whitesides himself took to task in his review of it on Amazon!*

In addition, in his book Sitler reported an important discovery made by Geoff Stray: that Maude Makemson, in her 1951 book *Jaguar Priest*, noted a possible 13-Baktun reference in the Books of Chilam Balam.⁷ The exchange between Stray and Sitler occurred in early April of 2006, and led directly to Tortuguero Monument 6 coming to widespread attention with Stuart’s early translation (following Sitler’s query to him)⁸ on April 6, 2006. In his book, Sitler also updated his views about my work, following open-minded conversations with me regarding the evidence that supports it, writing of the Maya’s knowledge of the astronomical aspect of my work that “...such a supposition seems quite plausible, I would even say likely” (Sitler 2010:21).

I submit that Hoopes and Whitesides decided to dismiss the relevance of Sitler’s 2010 book precisely because it lends support to my work. If they allowed it, they would appear to contradict themselves in stating, as they did, that my work “has been repeatedly rejected by academic specialists in the very areas in which he claims expertise (cf. Aveni, 2009; Malmström, 2003).” Furthermore, that statement should be qualified and adjusted to “under-informed and biased scholars

⁴ http://www.update2012.com/Review_Mark_Van_Stone-book.html

⁵ <http://update2012.com/review-stuartsbook.html>

⁶ <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoAvenisarticle.html>

⁷ Very important document revealing Stray’s role in the impending introduction of Tortuguero Monument 6 into the 2012 discussion: <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/sit.htm>.

⁸ Sitler also asked me if I knew of pre-Columbian references. On March 17, 2006 I replied via email that I thought Schele referred to one (<http://update2012.com/3-17-06.html>), and I thought it might be from Coba. I couldn’t locate it, but I was probably vaguely recalling her note in *Forest of Kings* (1990) that briefly mentioned the 2012 date on Tortuguero Monument 6. It was a failure on my part as, somehow, with my focus on Izapa, I didn’t consider how important such a date might end up being. In my “Mayan 2012 Statements” essay, dated March 18, 2006 (<http://www.alignment2012.com/mayan2012statements.html>), I wrote “...of all the Long Count dates preserved in the archaeological record, why are there only one or two that could be construed as referring directly to the 2012 end date?”

have repeatedly rejected Jenkins' work on demonstrably flawed grounds." Hoopes and Whitesides failed to perceive the flaws in those critiques by Aveni (2009) and Malmstrom (2003). I've respond to both of them, and both of them have utterly failed to adjust their assessments to the facts and corrections. Aveni, for example, asserted that I use Izapa Stela 25 as a "star map" for the galactic alignment. This is totally false. He also incorrectly assessed Michael Grofe's work on precession which lends support to my reconstruction work, and Aveni got the precessional motion backwards. Grofe has corrected Aveni on this,⁹ and Aveni privately (but not publicly) acknowledged the correction. Aveni also vaguely and inaccurately summarized my pioneering work on the Izapa ballcourt alignment (Aveni 2009: 54), and even stated the alignment direction of the ballcourt totally incorrectly (by some 48°), surely causing confusion in the reader's mind about the veracity of my ideas.¹⁰

As for Malmstrom, his 2003 critique was totally directed to my brief, 900-word "open letter to astronomers," first presented to the Aztlan e-list in 1999, then in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter in 2002. In it, I presented two simple facts from Maya star lore (the Dark Rift and the Milky Way/ecliptic Crossroads) that showed the Maya thought of the visually perceivable nuclear bulge of the Galactic Center to be a "center" and "source" (or birthplace). In Malmstrom's much cited essay (in which he incorrectly states the 2012 date in his title), he did not even address these two simple points in my essay. I repeat: *he did not even address these two simple points in my essay*. I repeat, again: ***he did not even address these two simple points in my essay***. I engaged an email discussion with Malmstrom in 2006, but he stopped responding after I cordially presented him with facts and corrections.¹¹ This is virtually how it always happens with under-informed and under-handed critics who initially see me as an easily flayable straw man of their imaginations, a target for their sadistic or bullying tendencies. When I respond with intelligent discussion, facts, citation, evidence, invitations-to-dialogue, and corrections, they hang up the phone without acknowledging they were mistaken. The same thing has happened with David Freidel¹² and Aveni¹³ (and many, many other scholars).

Whitesides & Hoopes next write that "Jenkins notes that only his 1998 book is cited as support for several assertions. This is correct. Academic citations are expected to be sufficient, not comprehensive" (64). When I noted that they cited *only* my 1998 book, I was noting that the proof for their assertions must therefore be found in that book; they provided no other citations to sources where evidence for their assertions might be found. However, there is no proof in that book for the assertions they made and cited to that book. I underscored this clearly in my review, stating: "To be clear, the appearance of support for their contentions is suggested by the citation to my

1998 book, but is not confirmed when that source is actually consulted" (60). My intention in using the word "only" was crystal clear, in a sentence that is apparently the sentence they were paraphrasing: "The one and only cited source that allegedly supports these assertions is my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998)" (57). They have cleverly misconstrued the obvious point that I was making, the point being that my 1998 book is certainly *not* a "sufficient" source to support their claims; in fact, that book is a *good source for statements that contradict the accusations they made*, which I cited and quoted in my response. They have evaded responding to the evidence I provided and by which a functioning peer-review process would require that an *errata* be made. They inappropriately and deceptively used a reference to my 1998 book as a source that supposedly provides supportive evidence for the (unsupported and demonstrably false) statements that they made, when in fact it does not.

There is the matter of the authors (probably Hoopes) claiming that they did indeed cite and discuss the work of professional scholars, in their critique of the 2012 phenomenon. They cite my own reference, in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, to Hoopes noting that Michael Coe conveyed a doomsday notion about the cycle-ending date (mistakenly given as December 24, 2011) as long ago as his 1966 book *The Maya*. And Hoopes exclaims that this is supposed to be a contradiction. Well, what I actually stated was that their treatments "omit inclusion of recent academic writings of scholars" (54, emphasis added). Much progress has happened recently, and much of that goes toward supporting my reconstruction work. For example, Grofe's work on the evidence that the Maya could accurately calculate the Sidereal Year and the precession of the equinoxes.

Furthermore, their definition of the 2012 phenomenon (which I quoted on page 54) clearly precludes scholarly writings. Elsewhere I've stated that Hoopes "largely" omits including scholars in his "Mayanism" box, which is true. In my 2009 book I charitably noted Hoopes's observation about Coe's "Armageddon" reading, even though I'd noted the same thing years earlier, because it was a point he was particularly happy to emphasize. I've also been generous in reporting, with credit, Hoopes's discovery of a possible use of 2012, in the mid-1960s, by novelist William Burroughs. Giving credit where credit is due, even to someone you often disagree with, is a fairness principle I embrace. In comparison, Hoopes demonstrably lies¹⁴ and goes out of his way to discredit me and never report the original contributions I've made (such as the Izapa ballcourt alignment, for one example among many). A specific example of one of my contributions to Hoopes's own research, which he absconded with and never credited me for, is discussed in Appendix 2.

I could continue with a point-by-point rebuttal, to each and every comment they made, but obviously this would be futile in terms of an honest due process according to the principles of good scholarship. It takes honesty and discernment for this to

⁹ Link is here:

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

¹⁰ <http://update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>

¹¹ <http://alignment2012.com/Malmstromexchangeon2012.html>

¹² <http://www.update2012.com/May2009.html> and

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

¹³ <http://update2012.com/Responseto-Aveni-on-my-TRT-essay.pdf>

¹⁴ A lie and libel are demonstrated when a critic knows the truth but nevertheless makes defamatory assertions. Email exchanges with Hoopes often reveal his acknowledgment of certain facts about my work that I've presented to him, but then later, in official peer-review contexts, he will assert the opposite to affect a denigration of me.

happen, and Whitesides and Hoopes have demonstrated that they aren't interested in being scholars, but in being something more like inquisitors, gatekeepers, or turf protectors willing to dishonor their profession and employ deceptive tactics in order to distort and mitigate my pioneering role in the unfolding 2012 discussion (or the "2012 phenomenon" if you prefer, used in its originally intended sense).

But I can offer two points of discussion that should be taken to heart by anyone who is following this demolition of science by alleged scholars, and who still cares about the injustice done to this 2012 topic.

1. The narrative they have tried to construct is a false and forced framework that does not accurately reflect the sequence of discovery and my own intentions and role in the process. They paint a picture in which my advent into the 2012 discussion, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, was merely a smooth continuation of earlier ideas and efforts from the 1970s. Although in any burgeoning field of study there are likely to be associations and contacts among the few who are drawn to a new topic (certainly true of one so compelling as "2012"), a sharp distinction must be recognized in my contribution, which should be thought of as a fundamental shift, a breakthrough. My work legitimized 2012 as a rational topic of extended inquiry by showing how the astronomy associated with 2012 involved known Maya concepts. I therefore lifted 2012 out of a generalized popular milieu of speculation. If we take a snapshot of the state of the topic in 1992-93, we find the two primary 2012 figures at the time were McKenna and Arguelles, whose ideas were based in I Ching mathematics and the idiosyncratic Dreamspell mysticism. There were also the Western astrological ideas of Ray Mardyks, who likewise was not concerned with reconstructing ancient Maya paradigms and beliefs.¹⁵ My work was singularly unique in this way, and proceeded with the eminently reasonable approach of studying the pre-Classic site of Izapa — the culture which relevant scholars believed was involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar that gives us the 2012 date. Critics like Whitesides & Hoopes might disagree with my findings, but they've never exhibited an ability in debating my arguments and the evidence that underlies them, or in even accurately summarizing what my work is about. Nor have they ever accurately presented this distinctive quality of my work and how it introduced the concept that "there is evidence that the Maya did think something about 2012" into an academic discourse that rejected that notion for years and years (until 2010).¹⁶ Instead, Whitesides & Hoopes employ a standard

¹⁵ Mardyks stated that he "did first make up the fantasy that the 'ancient Maya', whomever the fuck that might be, believed in a future galactic alignment." See <http://www.update2012.com/Hoopes-Mardyks-Collaboration.pdf>. This document also proves that Hoopes was deriving his deceptive ideas about the galactic alignment being "astrology" directly from Mardyks. In addition to the dubiousness of his claim, Mardyks tied the galactic alignment not to 2012 but to 1999 and barely mentioned the Maya, in a construct that adapted the Harmonic Convergence in a numerological model that drew largely from Western astrology and constellations. See, e.g., <http://www.update2012.com/HC-1987.pdf>.

¹⁶ Gronemeyer & MacLeod's Wayeb no. 34 paper on Tortuguero Monument 6 — the first "peer-reviewed" and "official" academic

tactic of sifting through my writings looking for marginal comments or speculations about larger provisional implications which they falsely represent as being my core convictions. That, too, is the dishonest tactic of polemical sophistry which seeks to denigrate rather than identify and understand the central intention and meaning of an investigator's work. It's dishonest, deceptive, and mean-spirited — and does not at all dignify the scientific and scholarly professions. Hoopes is particularly crafty at finding and using one-word occurrences (such as "Blavatsky") and blowing them up into an insinuation of secret influence.

2. There is an insurmountable problem for the "Mayanism" framework that Hoopes has worked at developing since early 2008.¹⁷ Several of the key identifiers of Mayanism are presented as being idiosyncratic modern inventions of the marketplace and a New Age 2012 mythology. One of these is the concept of the impending advent of a New Era or New Age. The conceptual contradiction here, which seems lost on Hoopes, is that the ancient Maya had a World Age doctrine in which world-renewal happens at distinct intervals timed by the Long Count calendar. The year 2012, the end of the 13-Baktun cycle in the Long Count, is a New Era. And now, beginning around 2010, many scholars are agreeing with this notion. But Hoopes clings to his false Mayanism construct, which he crafted as a way of mitigating and containerizing unwanted ideas and independent writers, and a lynch-pin of his ideological prison, guaranteed to imprison anyone who espoused the notion, is his belief that 2012 representing the dawn of a New Era is merely a New Age idea. It might be lamentable how this idea was expressed in many New Age books and so on, but my work was oriented to reconstructing Maya ideas and the core idea I found was that 2012 was thought of as a time of worldrenewal that must be facilitated by deity sacrifice. Hoopes will smear out the accurate phrasing here into a generalized and silly parody, in order to affect an association with the contestable pseudo-science of irrational New Age spiritualism. In so doing, he distorts and denigrates the research and evidence that led me to my interpretations that emphasize how such renewal concepts are found in ancient Maya thought and do not derive from some invented Blavatskian influence or 1970s "dreams", courtesy of the misleading narratives of Whitesides and Hoopes. Discerning critics need to recognize the accurate sequence of events in a historical context; unlike those two critics I was there during the process and was aware of what was going on, of who said what and when. Despite many exchanges with both Hoopes and Whitesides, they've never accurately conveyed anything I've shared with them about my influences, ideas, history, motivations, and discoveries. Scholars like Hoopes should use their intelligence to identify and differentiate these distinctions rather than wasting time in guild protection and crafting denigrating narratives through the sorcery of semantic tricks.

publication that unambiguously acknowledged that the ancient Maya thought *something* would happen 2012. They identified themselves as "Independent Scholars."

¹⁷ Proven by looking at the major additions made to the Mayanism topic on Wikipedia, by Hoopes in January of 2008.

Appendix 1: My Response to Hoopes's Last Email, of January 31, 2014

In the lengthy exchange with Hoopes and Whitesides (see "Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities", linked in the previous Item), while they were trying to subvert the critique-and-response process approved by the editors of *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, Hoopes's desperate grasping at straws continued to the very last day of the deadline for their response. I composed the following response to him the next day, when I received it, but decided not to send it because the deadline had passed and he was just re-re-repeating his requests, to which I'd already responded. He was clearly trying to craft a complaint that I was refusing to send him the materials he requested, and sure enough, we find this complaint in their rebuttal to my critique. It's a totally fallacious and dishonest complaint, as can be seen from the 15,000 words of responses and explanation and excerpts and jpps I sent to them in December and January (see, again, the "Scholarly Dreams" compilation). In any case, I include my final response to Hoopes below because it encapsulates and concludes quite nicely this episode, a sad episode which documents and reveals the pathetic attempts of scholars to abuse their academic credentials in order to denigrate and distort my work and, generally, to maintain a view that 2012 is a joke and an invented "mythology" — thus muddying the process of scholarly reconstruction and discovery, regarding what the ancient Maya actually did think about 2012.

John Hoopes,
You've sent me a last-minute email (sent January 31) requesting a PDF file of my 2008 IMS essay "Some Rational Deductions." In your email, which I just received today (February 1), you wrote:

Dear John [Jenkins],
Kevin and I are working on our response and we realized that, among the items that you have cited in your comments that we do not have, there is also this one:

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

Do you have a PDF version that you could provide us via email?

Thanks,
John Hoopes

The deadline for your response was yesterday so you've created a circumstance in which you can claim that I didn't respond to your requests on time. Very clever. However, you already have this piece. In Note 24 of my critique of your 2012 *ZfA* essay with Kevin Whitesides, I provided two online links. One is to the piece I wrote in late 2007, at your suggestion. It is part of this file that I adapted (and added my response to Milbrath) and sent to IMS for publication, which happened in early 2008. Consequently, you were informed of the

information directly, in early 2008. The other link in my Note 24 is the exchange we had in the Lawrence, Kansas newspaper's "online comment section," also late 2007/early 2008. In this exchange you acknowledged receiving my "Rational Approach" piece, writing "I think this is one of the clearest pieces you've written," and then commenting on some of its contents.

So, my point is threefold: 1) I have been concerned with engaging in dialogues with scholars about my work (this mitigates a charge made by you and Whitesides in your piece), and have gone to great lengths to respond to their (in this case, *your*) requests for clear summaries of my work. 2) You, in particular, have been informed with a clear statement of the evidentiary basis of my arguments and interpretations. You may not agree with them, but a scholarly critique would accurately summarize what my work is actually about. 3) Contrary to your assertions in your rebuttal to my review, I did respond to your insistence that I submit a concise essay on my work, and I then got an expanded version of it, custom tailored to Milbrath's critiques, published in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter (early 2008). Furthermore, you may recall that I asked you to put in a word for me with Dr. Joseph Gelfer, which helped him to accept my submission for his anthology called *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011). The breakthrough, however, really came when, out of the blue, Dr. Robert Benfer and Dr Larry Adkins invited me to present my research at the *Society for American Archaeology*. This led to the open and public peer-review of my work through the auspices of the scholars at the Maya Exploration Center — a rigorous process extending over almost four weeks that resulted in a 206-page transcribed document of the debates and exchanges, with me fielding, defending, supporting, and debating my work.¹⁸ I submit that this was orders of magnitude more rigorous than anything you had to go through in any of your peer-review papers on 2012, most of which seem to have been approved via a wink-and-hand-shake with your editor/friend John B. Carlson. The essay resulting from the four-week-long peer-review process I triumphed through was a 7500-word essay that, having been through the mill already, was expected to be readily approved for Benfer's archaeoastronomy anthology.

And here is a striking thing about your so-called critiques of my work over the years. You have never accurately summarized or represented my work in your various articles and essays. I used the early 2008 example of a direct conversation and communication with you, because the material is preserved and has been posted online for other readers to see for themselves. I also have an exchange we had in, I believe 2011 — just before your Austin conference talk. You had contacted me, saying you wanted to be accurately informed to represent my work. You sent me a dozen or so questions; I responded clearly and concisely. Several weeks later, in your Austin presentation, you insinuated that modern "New Age" writers on 2012 were inspired by Theosophy and occult symbols, just as Hitler was. You had not, in fact, used anything I had sent you. This is the repeated pattern, and you are doing it again here.

¹⁸ Online for free at www.mayaexploration.org and <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

I can point to your grossly inaccurate and totally false statements about me and my work in virtually everything on 2012 you have written, and underscore that what I have offered you, and you have requested, has never been accurately presented by you. This became clear to me in your April of 2011 *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXII “review” of Aveni and Van Stone, in your Gelfer piece¹⁹ (*Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* 2011), in your *Fortean Times* article, in your *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXIV (2012) essay, and in this *ZfA* piece with Whitesides.

You approach with a statement of concern for being accurately informed. But you don’t utilize anything that I’ve directly communicated. And you never accurately draw from what I’ve actually stated in my books. (An example of this would be your idiotic parody of my Dark Rift work in your *Fortean Times* article, ignoring the evidence and citations I offered in my 1998 book for the Dark Rift being thought of as a birth place.) Like a bad scholar, you don’t use any direct quotes from my work.²⁰ You are a wolf in sheep’s clothing. And your intent is now clear after many years of giving you the benefit of the doubt and believing that you would be an honest scholar, and you were interested in playing by the academic rules. But you are not. You are a dishonest pseudo-scholar; you abuse the privilege conferred by your degree, you manipulate the peer-review publication system, and craft false and misleading narratives about my work. I have clearly shown this in my critique of your *ZfA* piece.

I suspect that your response is going to continue with your ongoing evasion of the facts and your continuing effort to misrepresent my work.²¹ You are crafting a false narrative. But more to the point, you are clearly now exposed as a biased, unethical, and dishonest writer. The most egregious example is your totally unsupported assertions in your *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (Vol. XXII) piece, which I tried to rectify by communicating with you, with the journal editor, and with the journal’s university publisher back in 2011. The actual exchanges are revealing. The protectionism afforded to you by your editor and your publisher worked for you that time, which underscores the corruption and failure of academia in doing what it is actually supposed to do: accurately and fairly presenting and assessing facts, and correcting statements when proven wrong.

I succeeded in getting an official response to your ongoing unethical brand of “scholarship” in my critique-review of the piece you wrote with Whitesides. I’ve corrected a half-dozen or so factual errors. Let’s see if you can be a scholar and respond to those corrections, or if you are going to craft some other distractive and irrelevant indictment of me personally. I suspect the latter, because that has been your pattern. My conclusion that you are a confused and arrogant person, and a

¹⁹ <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>.

²⁰ His response (with Whitesides) to my review is the first time, but the quotes are selectively drawn out of context to insinuate denigrating things that are not congruent with my central concerns and interpretations. For example, my poetic speculations about the visions of Maya shamans is not, obviously, where the arguments and evidence for my reconstruction work is going to be found.

²¹ This is precisely what occurred, as I suspected.

deeply biased and sub-standard scholar/teacher, is reinforced by the comments of your students on RateMyProfessor.com.

What I wrote in my critique-review:

I have had numerous discussions and debates with scholars, including John Hoopes, who I invited to participate in the debate about my work sponsored by Dr Edwin Barnhart and the scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*.²² He declined, and avoided a discussion about it when I sent him the 206-page transcript of the debate afterward.²³ Years earlier, after a lengthy discussion with Hoopes in late 2007 I responded to his suggestion that I write a concise summary of my work. The draft was titled “A Rational Approach to 2012” and was sent to him, which he read in early 2008.²⁴

23. The *MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion* of December 2010, moderated by Dr Edwin Barnhart, posted at www.mayaexploration.org and www.thecenterfor2012studies.com.

24. At: www.Alignment2012.com/rationalapproachto2012.html. The first part was published in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter as a response to a critique by Dr Susan Milbrath (see Jenkins, 2008). The “lengthy discussion with Hoopes” alluded to was in the comments section of a Lawrence, Kansas newspaper, and is reproduced here: www.Alignment2012.com/Hoopes-Jenkins-Lawrence.html.
— end excerpt

So, as with my lengthy responses to your previous requests, on December 23 and in early January, I can reflect back to you here the exact same response: *You are trying to construct a narrative that you are not informed enough to make a considered response to my critique, but in actual fact I have already provided, in my critique, everything you need.* Your request evades the actual point I was making, which can be confirmed by reading the two online links I provided in Note 24. Your critiques proceed based upon ignoring the relevant material and the supportive evidence I have repeatedly provided. As a scholar, you basically practice ignore-ance (ignoring what I’ve actually written) and exploit the ignorance of your readers (who are not informed about my work and are relying on you to accurately represent it in your critique). But because you are a dishonest and unethical writer concerned primarily with crafting false and damaging narratives, you don’t do that. This is demonstrable now many times over in your various articles. I’d like to engage with an honest and informed critique of my work, but you are demonstrably not able or willing to do that. My critique published in *ZfA* shows this, and calls into question all of your statements about my work, which display a consistent strategy of mitigation you have been employing.

Please cease and desist from spreading and publishing demonstrably false and denigrating assertions about me and my work. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com> / <http://update2012.com> / <http://alignment2012.com> / <http://JohnMajorJenkins.com>

Appendix 2: The Hunab Ku symbol

In their response the authors note that, in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, I mistakenly stated the Hunab Ku symbol was found in the *Codex Nuttall*. It's actually in the *Codex Magliabecchiano*. Hoopes was involved in the actual turn of events that led to this correction.²² He emailed me with a question about the pre-Conquest use of this symbol, and said he couldn't find it in the *Codex Nuttall*. His angle was a bit of a "gotcha" challenge, for many believed that Arguelles himself had designed the symbol. I looked into my notes and found I had indeed mistakenly mixed up my sources, and reported it in my book incorrectly. I gladly acknowledged the correction — something that Hoopes can never bring himself to do. In addition, since he was interested in the history of this symbol, I offered to Hoopes the item of trivia that the symbol was used on the book cover and frontispiece design of a novel by Mariah Ellis Ryan called *House of the Dawn*, published long ago, in 1914. This certainly proved that it was not a design created by Arguelles. Hoopes later mentioned this use by Ryan, without credit given to me in contributing it to his research. He misrepresented this episode in his response in order to craft a demeaning picture of me, which pretty much underscores the unreliable, mean-spirited, unprofessional and deceptive nature of Hoopes's critiques.

A related issue with the Hunab Ku symbol is my interpretation that, like the Chinese yin-yang symbol, it represents the concept of "polarity reversal". An interpretive framework I articulated in my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* involved Jung's concept of enantiadromia (the historical process by which things evolve into their opposite), and I offered that the Hunab Ku and yin-yang symbols nicely represented this concept. (That there was an authentic Hunab Ku deity in Yucatan is now accepted by scholars.) In Hoopes's critique he spins my interpretations into being somehow derived from and promoting of Arguelles' ideas, who also used the "Hunab Ku" symbol, as it came to be called. This once again illustrates Hoopes's unwillingness, or inability, to discern the actual content and context of my writings, and instead craft irrational guilt-by-association accusations that actually have no merit.

Item 4m. Annotated list with links of other items

I've already supplied a huge amount of exchanges and evidence that exposes John Hoopes as a pseudo-scholar and an academic tool. See also the extensive section on John Hoopes at <http://Update2012.com>

5. John B. Carlson, Robbins Museum, *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, University of Texas Press, University of Colorado Press

- a. Article proposals & queries to Carlson and *AJ*, 1994-1997
- b. Emails with Carlson, re his Robbins Museum talk in 2010, and related emails
- c. Transcribed Excerpts from Carlson's 2010 Talk
- d. Cordial Email with info links and query, sent to Carlson in 2012
- e. Email sent to Carlson in June 2015, re Milbrath and his UP of Colorado article

Item 5a. Article proposals & queries to Carlson and *AJ*, 1994-1995

Early Letters to John B. Carlson and *Archaeoastronomy Journal*

There was no response to my three inquiries, which were sent through snail mail (in 1994-95 email was virtually non-existent and was not really the way to do business of this nature). The emails are unedited; my Boulder address is no longer valid:

Inquiry number 1 (Nov 22, 1994), general proposal:

The Journal of the For Center Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box "X"
College Park, MD
20741-3022

Nov. 22nd 1994

To the Editors,

I have been working on a paper which tries to answer the question of *why* did Mesoamerican astronomers implement the Long Count over 2200 years ago? My hypothesis hinges on the astronomical nature of the end date in 2012 A.D., and the likelihood that the Long Count's formulation and placement was the result of a forward calculation to this date. The enclosed essay should make clear the outlines of my hypothesis; however, this was an early version of my argument and I have since expanded my approach. Before I begin preparing a manuscript in detail, I need to know if you feel this would be something the *Archaeoastronomy Journal* would like to publish. If so, I can promptly respond with an outline of my criteria, methods and supporting arguments. I anticipate the final essay will be quite different from the version enclosed. I feel that the discovery presented is essentially correct, and a straightforward presentation is required. The implications of precessional knowledge among ancient Mesoamerican skywatchers will be addressed, and a survey of prior literature on this rather unpopular idea will be provided. Also enclosed is recent correspondence to Robert Hall.* I was encouraged to contact you and continue research on this topic after I read his article and book review in the recent *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (Vol. XI 1989-1993). Thank you for your time and consideration,

John Major Jenkins

*See "Other Files" section appendix for the Robert Hall letter.

²² Stray summarizes the episode:
<http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/new10.htm#hunab>.

Inquiry number 2 (March 19, 1995), addressed directly to John B. Carlson:

The Journal of the Center for Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box "X"
College Park, March 19th, 1995
20741-3022

Dear Mr. Carlson,

I'd like to share with you my work on the Mayan end-date, the question of precessional knowledge among the ancient Mesoamericans and the monuments of Izapa. The two enclosed booklets are a step towards understanding the implications of a simple astronomical fact: the winter solstice sun conjuncts the *xibalba be* on 13.0.0.0. Below is the letter I sent last November. I didn't get a reply, but that's okay - I understand the busy nature of publishing. I was encouraged by the editorial you wrote a while back on the potential contribution of "amateur archaeoastronomers". Basically, I just want to keep you posted on my developing study of this interesting facet of Mesoamerican cosmology.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Follow up inquiry number 3 (May 12, 1995), two months later:

May 12th, 1995

Dear Editors at *Archaeoastronomy Journal*,

Last November I sent a query letter to *Archaeoastronomy* regarding an article proposal. However, I didn't get a response. Neither did I get a response from *Arch.* contributor Robert J. Hall, whose work slightly overlapped my own. However, I can understand the busy nature of teaching and publishing etc, notwithstanding enclosed SASE's. At the end of March I submitted my monograph (in two booklets: "The Center of Mayan Time"). I directed it to John B. Carlson simply because, by virtue of his own work, I thought it might be of interest. Now I'd like to submit my essay for publication. I really think this idea should be opened up for dialogue, and the premise of my theory is actually very simple and straightforward: On the end date of the Mayan Long Count 13-Baktun cycle (December 21st, 2012 A.D. via the 584283 GMT correlation), the winter solstice sun occupies the "dark rift" in the Milky Way, known to the ancient Maya as the *xibalba be*. This is a function of the precession of the equinoxes and, if we go back to the dawn of the Long Count in southern Mesoamerica some 2000 years ago, the slowly converging process could have easily been observed. To be blunt, I claim intellectual property rights of recognition for this discovery. Obviously there are many additional questions that arise, and my article addresses some of these; however, it is primarily designed to introduce this concept for discussion. In addition, these ideas are a direct logical extension of Linda Schele's much-discussed theory of Maya Creation. She looked at the crossing point of Milky Way and ecliptic in Gemini, while my scenario looks at the other

crossing point - the one in Sagittarius. The enclosed article should clarify the details. Well, I would certainly appreciate some kind of feedback on this concept. First and foremost, I would like to hear from the editors of *Archaeoastronomy* whether they feel the basic premise has some merit. Problems with style, diagrams - even sloppy documentation - can be ameliorated. I would really like to have some kind of feedback on the likelihood of the basic premise of my article: Did the ancient Mesoamerican skywatchers calibrate precession over 2000 years ago, and identify a mythologically compelling future alignment - the end of the 13-baktun cycle? I've put this idea in the hands of those qualified to determine its merits, sending letters and queries far and wide, and continue to patiently wait for some, any, response. My argument is supported by a 110-page monograph, fully documented, exploring various implications of my thesis; (these were previously sent to John B. Carlson via the *Archaeoastronomy* address in March). Hope to hear soon...

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

I received no response to these three inquiries. In the mailings I sent:

- The "How and Why of 2012" article of 1994
- My two-booklet offering called *The Center for Mayan Time* (1995)
- A third article, which was "Maya Creation: The Stellar Frame and World Ages" (written in early 1995) that morphed into a chapter in *MC2012*

Two years later, in 1997, I sent out invitations to various scholars, including Carlson, offering to send a free pre-press copy of my forthcoming book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. Several scholars responded, but not Carlson. It was a form letter, with SASE, that I tried to make convenient for scholars to say something about. According to one file, I sent the inquiry to: David Kelley, John Carlson, Anthony Aveni, Vincent Malmstrom, Linda Schele, Gordon Brotherston, Munro Edmonson, Barbara and Dennis Tedlock, Justin Kerr, Victoria Bricker, Owen Gingerich, J. McKim Malville, Susan Milbrath, The Center for Maya Research in Washington DC (this was Lloyd Anderson's operation), and Ed Krupp. These are all dated July 7. There might have been a second batch of invitations I sent out to others a short time later. Here's the John B. Carlson letter:

The Journal of the Center for Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box X. College Park, MD 20741-3022

Dear Mr. Carlson,

July 7th, 1997

My name is John Major Jenkins. We briefly talked on the phone a few weeks ago.¹ I have been researching the

¹ I don't recall this phone conversation. It must have been inconsequential and probably involved my continued inquiry about writing an article, which must have resulted in an expression of no interest.

astronomy of the 13-baktun cycle end-date in AD 2012. I've found that the 2012 alignment of the solstice sun with the center of the Milky Way / ecliptic Crossroads (an effect of the precession of the equinoxes) provides a key to understanding Mayan cosmology. I have just completed a large study of this question, exhaustively documenting with academic sources everything I argue for, and would now like to offer my research for critical evaluation. I've chosen you and almost a dozen other Mayanists to receive this invitation to review my book, which I will send to you if you are interested. Because of the expense involved, I must request that you promise to comment on my work, in short or at length, before the end of the summer. Having labored on this question independently for almost ten years, assembling the evidence, I am confident that I am on the right track. Now, with the publication of my book, which I would like to send you an advance copy of, set for next spring, I am very interested in getting feedback from other researchers who are interested in understanding the Maya worldview. Together, we can explore the implications of the fact of the 2012 alignment and how the early skywatchers of Mesoamerica figured this all out over 2000 years ago. I will be presenting my research at the Institute of Maya Studies in Miami, Florida, in August. I feel we are approaching a major breakthrough in how we understand the scope of ancient Maya cosmology. Please read the enclosed synopsis² and respond with the enclosed SASE. Thank you for your time and careful consideration of my invitation.

Sincerely,
John Major Jenkins

I supplied an SASE for their reply and a detachable check-box form with the following two options: 1) I would like to review and comment on your book. Please send it to the following address: _____; 2) I have read your enclosed synopsis. However, I am not interested in commenting on your findings, because: _____.

I believe David Kelley was the only one to send a letter; a few others responded with the last box checked. Again, my earnestness is a bit heartbreaking to revisit, given how things have unfolded with many of these scholars ignoring my invitation to dialogue but seeing fit, later, to harshly and inaccurately critique my work (e.g., Krupp, Malmstrom and Aveni). My efforts to communication and dialogue with scholars started early and has continued without letting up for decades. It's incredible that Hoopes & Whitesides would write, in an article of 2012, that I was committed to a hermeneutic of avoiding academic scrutiny and process. Obviously this is either written by utterly clueless and biased people, or was intentionally stated in yet another unethical attempt to denigrate. I've always sought communication and open dialogue on my work; I've invited and have persistently tried to facilitate it. I even invite critics to respond to this document with their feedback and comments.

² This one-page synopsis was enclosed with each invitation and provide a concise summary of my work. A jpg of the exact piece with a discussion is here: <http://Alignment2012.com/synop1997.html>. This synopsis provided to Maya scholars, in mid-1997, an accurate framing of my approach to the 2012 question.

In April of 1998 I reached out, again, to scholars and made phone calls to the Tedlocks, William Sullivan, and Carlson. My call to Carlson was arranged because I had some questions for him, regarding the source for J. Eric S. Thompson's "Maya astronomy is too important to be left to the astronomers" quote. With this, I reached him and eventually asked if he would like a copy of my book (to be released the following month) for his review and comments. He declined, saying he didn't want to be influenced by other researchers on the subject of 2012.

In 1999, or early 2000, I sent another proposal to *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, after I noticed they had linked up with the University of Texas Press as their official publisher. Having earlier established a connection with Carlson, I figured I'd at least get some kind of response. This one was a proposal specifically about the archaeoastronomy at Izapa, and my unprecedented findings including the Group F ballcourt's alignment to the December solstice sunrise. No response.

Item 5b. Emails with Carlson, re his Robbins Museum talk in 2010, and related emails

The circumstances require a brief narrative. Carlson's talk at the Robbins Museum, hosted by the Massachusetts Archaeological Society (M.A.S.) was announced on the Aztlan e-list. The title was "Lord of the Maya Creations on his Jaguar Throne: The Eternal Return of Elder Brother God L – Senior Cosmogonic God and First Shaman – to Preside over the 21 December 2012 Transformation." In the 484-word Abstract, we learn that "Long Count cycles of 13 Baktuns" will be explored, and God L is a primary player. However, Bolon Yokte from Tortuguero Monument 6 (the "2012" inscription) is not mentioned, and is largely not relevant to Carlson's presentation. Rather, God L is relevant because that deity is associated with the 3114 BC Era "transition", and Carlson believes the deities connected to that date should show up again in 2012. It's a reasonable assumption, one that I offered in my book sent to Carlson in 1995. (I suggested that Creation Day occurs in both 3114 BC and 2012 AD, that they are conceptually similar in the minds of the ancient Maya.)

Other concepts in Carlson's title and Abstract echo my own ideas about 2012. His talk occurred on May 15 and that evening I was sent a link to an mp3 audio file by Greg, one of the attendees. He wrote:

Hi John, May 15, 2010 (evening after Carlson's talk)
I attended Dr. Carlson's lecture earlier today. Although his credentials and work are impressive to say the least, the presentation was not nearly so. Rather than speak primarily about 2012 and Mayan cosmology, he spent the majority of the time talking about "god L," ancient jars, and tobacco use. Needless to say he was completely dismissive of any and all non-academic researchers on the subject of Mayan cosmology and 2012, yourself included. The section of the audio you'll be most interested in is at about the one hour and fifteen minute mark in the recording. Apologies for the raw audio quality, but it was the best I could manage. Please let me know your impressions after you have a chance to listen.

I'd appreciate it. Thanks!

I listened to it with interest and was quite surprised at Carlson's comments about my work. He alluded to it as being "bogus" and "nonsense" without once stating what it was about or critically assessing it in any way. He stated that he'd read my books, specifically my 1998 *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* book, but that's not likely given his misrepresentation of my knowledge base, asserting that I didn't know certain things about Maya astronomy which are, in fact, discussed in that book. I decided to ask for my friend Geoff Stray's opinion and sent him the link to the file, which was uploaded onto the server of the guy who had recorded it.

Meanwhile, unbeknownst to me an acquaintance of mine, Tom Valovic, had also attended Carlson's talk. He emailed me the next day:

Hi John –

May 16

Yes, frankly I found the entire talk to be disingenuous at some level. I am stopping short of saying deliberately misleading as generally speaking I don't align all that much with conspiracy theorist camps. But in another setting his whole talk could easily be construed as a kind of disinformation. It just bothered me on so many levels though. He didn't talk about the Mayan worldview. He's an astronomer by training and he didn't talk about Mayan astronomy except to say they were clueless about black holes. He hardly spoke a word about their theories of time and the notion of cyclical history. At one point Carlson couldn't resist a few cheap laughs by showing slides about Mayan, uh, enemas. And he tarred and feathered new agers as a bunch of loonies who were going to show up on 12.21.12 for some big hippy party. The list goes on.

It just had the feel of a kind of hatchet job against so called new age interpretations of the Mayan material. Not that I think they are all valid either. But in my view the differences of opinion up to a point contribute to the richness of the mystery, facets of a jewel. ... That said, he wasn't talking to a large number of students at one of the Boston universities or some other major group. My sense was it was intended mainly for the somewhat cozy ingroup at the very modest Robbins Museum and they generated wider interest than they thought they would. This was a bit surprising (and positive) given that this was such an outlying region of MA. In terms of god L, if there was real significance here it was hard to glean and I've done a fair amount of reading on Mayan culture. For someone expecting to get some sense about the Mayans and 2012, the only thing in my opinion that they would come away with was that the 2012 meme was overblown and bogus.

All my best,
Tom

I responded:

Tom, May 17

Yeah, I like the part where he summarizes the year-drift formula info and then, as an aside, says, "Jenkins and Pinchbeck and Arguelles — those guys don't know anything

about this stuff." If you go to the INDEX of my 1992 book *Tzolkin*, as well as the index for *MC2012* (1998), you find an entry for "year drift formula" and the pages on which I define and discuss this topic. 1992, which may very well be the first published spot that mentioned it after Edmonson's 1988 discussion of it. Carlson is pretty typical of all the other academic egomaniacs who can't, or are unwilling to, apply rational assessment to what I've ACTUALLY written and said. I'm glad you pushed him to say whether or not he'd read my book *MC2012* — he quickly said yes when you pressed him. Given his lack of understanding of its content, given the above *faux pas*, I'd venture to say he's a liar. Also, I talked to Carlson on the phone in 1998 when my book came out and offered to send him a free copy of my book. He declined, saying he was working on 2012 himself and didn't want to be "influenced" by other people's ideas. Huh? I think this is a scenario that Galileo had a lesson in:

<http://alignment2012.com/demondevice.html>>

Hilarious!
John

During the ensuing debacle about the recording Tom told me he had arrived early, during the set-up, sat and chatted with others, and never saw or heard any proscriptions against recording.

Meanwhile, Geoff Stray posted his review of Carlson's lecture, using Carlson's author photo taken from the promo webpage for the talk. After I sent my first email to Carlson (see below, May 20), in which I noted Geoff's review, the use of this picture became a ridiculously emphasized accusation of copyright infringement, wielded by Carlson and his friends at the Robbins Museum, who Carlson insisted that Geoff and I must resolve the matter with. Carlson was thereafter silent and refused to respond to numerous cordial inquiries. Well, Geoff's website is not my website, but it seemed such a hilarious evasive ploy that Geoff and I Googled around for other pictures of "John B Carlson" and found a whole assortment of other people with that name. Geoff replaced the original photo with a dozen others: <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/Carlson.html>. Stray's review is preserved on that page and stands as fair and accurate:

I have heard a recording of the Carlson lecture (see below [the link provided is to the Robbins Museum event announcement, not the mp3 file]). Sadly, apart from his recognition that the Maya saw the end of the 13th Baktun as a significant era-end point, or Creation Day, Carlson turns out to be parroting the party line after all. He answered a query as to whether he had read any of John Major Jenkins's books and said he had read them, but then a few minutes later, stated that Jenkins and other non-academically sanctioned authors were not aware of the 1507 tropical years = 1508 haabs formula because they "hadn't done their homework". However, if he had actually read *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, then he'd have known that it was covered (see p. 46 and in more detail on p.360) - it is known as the "year-drift formula". It is also defined in the glossary of *The Mayan and Other Ancient Calendars*. Secondly, he shows that he has not read nor understood Jenkins's work, since he says the Maya could not have predicted Galactic Alignment since he does not believe the Maya could have known we live in a galaxy since they had only naked-eye astronomy. If he had actually read JMJ's

work, he would know that this is not significant because the Maya recorded it in their mythology, ball-court and ball-game design, etc. as Xibalba Be, the road to the underworld—they never described it as a modern astronomer would - it is absurd to imply they would have - and only those who have second-hand garbled versions or misunderstood summaries of MJJ's work would say this...and in fact, the archaeoastronomer Aveni has also revealed the same biased stance on this.

— (Geoff Stray May 2010).

I responded to Stray quickly:

Geoff,

Thank you for posting a review so quickly. Yes, I agree with everything you said. Pathetic and disappointing; I really sort of had him placed on a higher level as a scholar who wouldn't indulge in the same inane and inaccurate rhetoric as Tony "the bruiser" Aveni. Meanwhile, some new info is emerging on the Tortuguero text. I found it useful to identify when the CR begins in the 7th century, following the Tikal system. And the 9.10.13.0.0 date on Mon 1, with its 1 Ahau 3 Kankan CR position, is proving to be a haab pivot linking the 2012 date AND Bahlam's birthday, which must happen within a few days of 3 Kankin in the haab. (Sven mentioned the 2012 connection, but not Bahlam's birthday) Linking Bahlam's birthday with 2012 by way of a calendrical commensuration provides a rhetorical precedent for likewise seeing an **astronomical** parallel between the same two dates — that of the symbolically similar "sun-in-dark rift" image in 612 AD and 2012 AD. Bahlam had a providential, inborn, connection to 2012.

John [Jenkins]

My first email to Carlson which triggered his unprofessional reaction, effectively hiding away from the truth of his own statements, is below. After receiving the mp3 I chewed on things for a few days, collected my thoughts, re-listened to his talk a second time, and sent the email to Carlson:

May 20, 2010

Dear John Carlson,

It's been many years since we spoke. With great interest, I looked forward to hearing your report on your God L research, and had a friend record [meaning 'a friend recorded and then sent to me'] your presentation in Middleboro on May 15th. I shared the link with my friend Geoff Stray and he quickly posted what I perceive to be a fair and accurate summary: <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/Carlson.html>.

I want to correct several factually incorrect statements you made, in the hopes that you won't continue spreading misinformation about my work and my knowledge-base of Maya astronomy and calendrics. First, somewhere around the 75-minute mark you defined the tropical year value and the year-drift formula, then added an aside, "...by the way, John Major Jenkins, Pinchbeck, and Arguelles — these guys don't know anything about this stuff." In point of actual fact, both my 1992 book *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies* and my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* discuss these topics. You can look up "year drift formula" in the index to either of these books and find the page references.

You replied to an audience member's question that you had indeed read my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. I think not.

Apart from this specific example of you reporting factually incorrect information, I noted several generally cheap shots that are basically meaningless as a rational critique, and only serve a defamatory purpose. I've tried to engage my critics among the "professional Mayanists" on the actual points of arguments and evidence that I've brought to bear on my work, with consistently disappointing results (see <http://Update2012.com> for the biased assumptions exhibited by Aveni, Freidel, Krupp, Stuart, Malmstrom, and others -- all easily exposed). Example after example reveals that you and other critics, exuding an authoritative and informed veneer, are actually extremely underinformed and misinformed about what I'm actually arguing for.

I wish you were willing to think critically about the work your colleagues produce — for example, you lauded Van Stone's recent book but failed to report the several factually incorrect assumptions he harbors. He, like Marc Zender, don't seem to understand the sequence by which Thompson's support for the 285 by 1930 was superceded by his revised 283 by 1950, and then the original 285 was resurrected with flawed arguments by Lounsbury in the 1980s. Van Stone and Zender incorrectly state that Thompson came up with the 283 first and it was later revised to the 285. One consequence of their *faux pas* is the handy rhetorical purpose it can serve, to cast aspersions on the solstice occurrence of the 13-baktun period ending according to the 283 (which is insinuated to be the "old" one, the one that was "corrected"). See how that works? I know that you know the flawed arguments behind Lounsbury's 285, so you might want to help Mark understand the truth; he certainly didn't receive it from me when I clearly and explicitly informed him about the facts of the correlation in our email exchange of early 2008.

You might want to avail yourself of the detailed chronicle of the Long Count's reconstruction, the correlation, the so-called "2012 movement", academic intolerance, and other items I laid out in my recent book *The 2012 Story*. I'd offer to send you a copy but perhaps, as with my offer to send you a copy of *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* twelve years ago, you're doing your own research on 2012 and you don't want to be "influenced by other people's ideas." Well, maybe if you plan on talking about other people's work, you should try to be informed about it. That would be fair.

So, let's have a conversation. My hope is to communicate clearly to you what I've found in 20+ years of investigating Maya astronomy, iconography, archaeoastronomy at Izapa, and 2012-related topics. I find it amusing that all these late-comers in academia are popping up now and can't stand that I've already blazed the trail. For example, one thing I find interesting is that your write-up on how to think of 2012 and God L (as a "First Shaman" figure involved in transformation and worldrenewal) echoes exactly what I've been saying for many years about how the Maya thought of 2012, based on my work at Izapa. It seems likely that the same deity-complex and period-ending ideology that I've identified at Izapa, in the context of the Creation Myth imagery preserved at that pre-Classic site, was preserved into the late-Classic, albeit with some details altered.

I've also been working on the astronomy in the 13 dates on Tortuguero Monument 6, and presented my paper to SAA last month. You'd find this interesting, if you were open to it, as it integrates well with Michael Grofe's insightful work and Sven Gronemeyer's recent observations (in his forthcoming Wayeb Note 34). The 2012 date on Monument 6 is connected in a variety of ways to other dates in the inscriptions and events in Bahlam Ajaw's life. That's where the breakthroughs are happening — and they are affirming both the ideological and astronomical reconstructions I put on the table years ago.

Especially in consideration of your factually incorrect statement regarding my awareness of the year-drift information, and your agreement or disagreement with my correction of it, I'd appreciate a response. And if you'd like a copy of the audio recording of your talk, I will arrange to send you a copy. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Several weeks passed with no comment. I was busy preparing for a historic event at Izapa, in which I was collaborating with the non-profit *Maya Conservancy* to bring a committee of traditional Maya ceremonials (Don Rigoberto Itzep Canchavac, from Momostenango, and his associates) to Izapa, to ritually re-open the site. We were faced with pulling off a miracle as such rituals in Mexico were forbidden at the archaeological sites. Permissions were being sought and alternative strategies were being discussed. Then, Geoff sent me the following on June 7:

Hi John, 6-7-2010
I imagine you have also just received the email from the Archaeological society. [I hadn't, because they got my email address wrong.] Since they say the photo is copyrighted, I have replaced it with another image of Carlson. I don't see how they can demand that I remove the review. They didn't ask your permission to comment on your work, anyway...the "violation" is something that should not have been guaranteed to include the audience, without strip searches, unless the audience all signed an agreement. If it's now a crime to comment on a recording, then I am shocked. What do you think, John?
All the best
Geoff

Geoff forwarded to me their email (below), addressed to both of us. Note that it must have been responding to my email to Carlson of May 20, but completely ignored the unprofessional and false statement Carlson had made, which was the point of my email. This was the evasive *modus operandi* Carlson would employ thereafter without fail, that of ignoring and turning the table back on me, requiring something from me rather than addressing the issue. He must have shared this evasive tactic with John Hoopes, because later Hoopes started using it too.

Dear Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Stray, June 2010
This year, Dr. John B. Carlson of the University of Maryland, College Park, and the Center for Archaeoastronomy was invited by the Massachusetts

Archaeological Society to give our annual Maurice Robbins Memorial Lecture on May 15th at the Middleboro Public Library. Part of our formal agreement with Dr. Carlson was that his lecture was not to be recorded in any form.

His presentation was intended only for those who were there and paid for their attendance for the event. It has come to our attention, based on an e-mail sent by John Major Jenkins to Dr. Carlson on May 20th, that not only was Dr. Carlson's lecture taped surreptitiously, without his permission or ours by a self-identified friend of Jenkins, but that it was further copied and distributed to others. [False: it had been posted to a server online by the person who recorded it, and was downloaded from there separately by myself and Stray.] Furthermore, according to your e-mail to Dr. Carlson, you (JMJ) passed a link to this recording on to your friend, Geoff Stray in England, who "quickly posted" a brief critique of the Robbins presentation on his web site, diagnosis2012, in England. As we view this url, <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/Carlson.html>, it also reproduces a photograph of Dr. Carlson without permission, an image for which there is a copyright held by Daniel Lorraine, Treasurer of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society. Permission was given to the several local newspapers to provide an announcement for the Robbins Lecture, but copyright is held by Mr. Lorraine and permission was neither asked for nor granted to Mr. Stray or anyone else to reproduce it in any medium.

We request that this critique and photograph be removed immediately from all web sites and that further copies of Dr. Carlson's lecture not be further circulated without his permission. Please send a copy of the recording of the lecture to us as well as to Dr. Carlson, as a courtesy, and ask him if you might have his permission to retain the unauthorized recording. Making this recording without asking permission of the MAS and Dr. Carlson was, at the very least, an ethical violation of our agreement which is usually honored. This violation was further compounded by distributing it to others. The Robbins Lecture was an illustrated extemporaneous presentation intended for those who were in attendance, and can only be appreciated with all of the visual materials that accompanied the lecture.

We trust that you understand and will respect our position in this matter and respect our concern for our rights and those of Dr. Carlson. We trust that you will comply with our requests and will pass our letter on to the un-identified "friend of JMJ" who made the pirated recording in the first place. We would also appreciate a formal apology.

Sincerely,
Frederica Dimmick, President
Daniel Lorraine, Treasurer
Massachusetts Archaeological Society
cc: John B. Carlson, Director
Center for Archaeoastronomy

Our response, written with Geoff:

Hello [M.A.S.], June 2010

The photo that I (Geoff Stray) used was copied from the promotional flyer for Carlson's event that was posted on the MAS website.

<http://www.massarchaeology.org/Other/Robbins%20Lecture%20Poster%20Carlson%20May%2015%202010.pdf>

There was no copyright restriction stated on the document, and under the security tab in the "document properties" it states that "printing," "content copying," and "page extraction" is allowed. We interpreted the legality of using the photo on another website (not for reselling or for financial advantage but for informational purposes only) based upon these security statements in the document created by MAS, and the lack of copyright statement on the document or under the photo.

However, out of courtesy we will replace the photo with another one of John Carlson.

My personal response to them, immediately thereafter:

Dear M.A.S.,

June 2010

From my vantage point [JMJ writing here], I accessed a copy of a recording that was sent to me. There was no statement of copyright on it. I listened to it and determined that it contained offensive, factually inaccurate, and defamatory comments about me and my work. As someone who has respected and appreciated Carlson's pioneering work on Venus-Tlaloc warfare, I was shocked and disheartened. I informed my colleague Geoff Stray about the piece and requested a second opinion. He did what he did with it in terms of posting a review of it, which is the mission of his website "Diagnosis 2012" — to review and assess 2012-related manifestations in academia and the marketplace. He's done that with about 1,000 other things and, as far as I know, he has never received admonishments regarding his use of images or quotes for his review purposes. That is a standard caveat of fair use. But I'll leave that part up to him, as it doesn't directly involve me.

So, I have done nothing illegal or ethically questionable. And now I intend to quote (within fair use strictures) from Carlson's words, and to defend my work and correct the factual errors Carlson made in representing my work. MAS can either be a party to supporting the unethical and defamatory behavior of one of its guests or step aside and allow truth to get a hearing.

In defense of the person who made the recording: You state that your "formal agreement with Dr. Carlson was that his lecture was not to be recorded in any form." Can you please provide a signed copy of this formal agreement with the "no recording" clause? The person who recorded the talk tells me he arrived as Carlson began and he did not receive or hear any statement that prohibited him from recording the talk. It is not being sold for fiscal gain, and I have only accessed it for review and self-defense purposes. This person was unknown to me earlier but I consider him a friend now precisely because he helped me be informed about Carlson's disingenuous conduct, and he recognized the injustice committed.

However, I personally did not record or post or send this recording to anyone. I was happy to hear the recording of it myself, which was within my rights after it became apparent that it could be the subject of a possibly legally actionable investigation of defamation on the part of John B Carlson. In other words, factually inaccurate statements had been made by him about my work, and he had disseminated defamatory statements about me to the other people in attendance at the event. This could have been prevented by his own application of ethical restraint, as well as by being informed about my work before presuming to spread his own misunderstanding of it to others. In order to correct this ethical and intellectual oversight, I request that all people who attended his talk be contacted and that they be informed that:

1. Contrary to a statement made by Carlson at the MAS talk in Middleboro on May 15, John Major Jenkins has in fact defined and discussed the tropical year duration and the year-drift formula in his various books going back to 1992.
2. Carlson's statements about 2012 being about "transformation" and "worldrenewal" and that the Maya conceived 2012 as a "like-in-kind" event to the 3114 BC Creation date reiterates key ideas that Jenkins himself has emphasized in his reconstruction work of Maya cosmology going back to the early 1990s and that he has defended repeatedly for many years on Aztlan and other academic email lists to which Carlson belongs.
3. In 1998 Jenkins offered to send Carlson a copy of his book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, but was refused.
4. Although Carlson stated in his talk he had read *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, he overlooked the presence of "year drift" in the Index and therefore his further statement that Jenkins "doesn't know anything" (about the year drift formula) was misleading and factually incorrect.

Given the high standard of scientific conduct and ethical accountability upheld by MAS, I would expect that the injustice done to me would be recognized and I would have the support of MAS in rectifying the situation. Since I suspect it will be impractical to actually contact all of the people who attended, one solution to rectify the injustice that MAS was party to, would be for you to post the above clarifications and corrections on the MAS website. Let me know when it goes up so I can return MAS to good standing in my heart and mind. In addition, a formal written apology from Carlson will be requested in a separate email to him in regard to his factually incorrect statements and his general defamatory insinuations made in regard to my work and the limits of my knowledge of Maya cosmology, including his unconscionable and unprofessional oversight in mentioning the previous work published by me which anticipated, by many years, critical parts of his interpretation of 2012. This could have been presented as a congruence of separate work done by different researchers, thus mutually supportive, but for some reason an omission was deemed preferable.

For your own benefit, I suggest that MAS try to vet the intentions of their speakers, even apparently reputable ones, and also work harder to enforce your “no recording” policy if that is indeed your policy. For example, you might want to post it in the event announcement, in hand-outs given to attendees, or on a wall near the speaker. In my recent email to Carlson, I offered to arrange to have a copy of the recording of his talk sent to him. I haven’t heard back from him on that email, and wonder if I ever will, but I deduce he read it because he apparently sent it to you, which has thus resulted in your email to Geoff and me (by the way, you had my email address wrong, but we figured it out).

I’m disappointed that my email to him has been filed away without being responded to. It would be civil if John could just be straightforward and respond to my attempt to communicate with him rather than go indirectly through MAS and thereby evade responding to my queries. Of course, my offer to have a copy sent to him is extended also to MAS, and I will send one to him when he himself asks me for one, as I cannot accept MAS as having the legal right to represent his wishes unless you can show evidence that you have power of attorney.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Note: The file was burned onto a CD disk and sent; they claim they never received it, thus inviting me into a neverending merry-go-round. Clearly, this was a form of entrapment, as they could now claim that I wasn’t cooperating with their demands. Again, this is the classic Carlson table-turning move — and totally, ethically dishonest.

Curiously, anticipating Carlson’s entry into the 2012 discussion (because I saw his Robbins Museum talk advertised on the Aztlan email list), I had early on reached out to him by trying to open up a real conversation about Maya astronomy and 2012. Note that the following was sent to him on May 6th, eleven days prior to his talk when he made his denigrating and false statements about my work. He didn’t respond to it, but it shows me sharing my work and inviting dialogue. His subsequent comments showed his true colors, in not behaving like a responsible scholar who values facts and evidence.

Dear John [Carlson], May 6, 2010

Was wondering if you had any thoughts on the astronomy in the dates of Tortuguero Monument 6? It's particularly striking that Bahlam Ajaw was born in late 612 at a time when the sun was aligned with the nuclear bulge of the galactic center, at the southern terminus of the dark rift. This sidereal position of the sun, which in 612 AD was some 20 days before the solstice, is the position of the sun, on the solstice, on the 13-baktun period ending in 2012. It's probably a situation that was held to be meaningful by Bahlam or his rhetoricians, who also cited the sweat bath rite of December 6, 510 AD as an important founding event. This is another date on Tortuguero Monument 6 that shares, with Bahlam's birthday and the 2012 date, the image of sun on the

Milky Way at the dark rift. Oh, there's another one too, December 5, 647.

Oh yeah, there's also the May 30, 644 date occurred three days after a lunar eclipse positioned at the dark rift within the nuclear bulge. Michael Grofe provided many of these identifications and deciphered the text associated with the latter lunar eclipse as reading "it [the eclipse] happened in the celestial caiman." Yes, the lunar eclipse did indeed occur in the nuclear bulge of the celestial caiman. That indicates that the Maya at Tortuguero, who carved the 2012 monument, were tracking astronomical events occurring on at least some of the 13 dates recorded on Monument 6. That Bahlam's birthday and the 2012 date were placed in the left and right flanges of the T-shaped monument suggests a structural parallelism connecting him with the 2012 date. A compelling reason for this would be the like-in-kind astronomical position of the sun on those two dates. But of course that would require that my "2012 alignment theory" — i.e., that the ancient Maya were aware that the sun would be aligned with the nuclear bulge and the dark rift on December 21, 2012 — actually has merit.

These late-breaking ideas emerged between Michael and I after the Tulane conference in February 2009, and were published in chapter 7 of my book *The 2012 Story*. There are some Venus evening star patterns emerging too in the larger corpus of inscriptions from Tortuguero that you might be interested in. My discovery that another date on TRT Mon 6, July 23, 667, was a date when Jupiter was positioned at the dark rift, and is exactly 600 x 819 days away from December 21, 2012, indicates that the 819-day cycle was used on this monument at Tortuguero, ca. 669 AD — AND that the 2012 date is linked in a variety of previously unexpected ways to different dates in the text. Six of the 13 dates on TRT Mon 6 involve nuclear bulge / dark rift alignments. Exciting times. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Later, during the unfolding debacle and not wanting to assume he was in the loop (since the charade involved him passing off communications to the Robbins Museum people), I sent Carlson an update on what I’d explained to the Robbins Museum directors:

Dear John B. Carlson, 6-9-2010

I sent a private email to Frederica and Daniel at M.A.S detailing my response to their email to me. The reason I sent it privately to them is because it was signed by them, did not include your signature, and therefore I did not consider it to be an email from you to me, to which I should respond to you.

In good faith, however, I will apprise you of the basic clarifications that I offered them. Then, although my email to you of May 20 was set aside [for] the moment, I trust you will take to heart my response below and proceed with responding to that earlier email I sent to you. So:

I accessed a copy of a recording that was sent to me. There was no statement of prohibition or copyright on it. I listened

to it and determined that it contained factually inaccurate and defamatory comments about me and my work. I informed my colleague Geoff Stray about the piece and requested a second opinion. He did what he did with it in terms of posting a brief review of it online, which I did not specifically request but which nevertheless is the mission of his website "Diagnosis 2012" — to review and assess 2012-related manifestations in academia and the marketplace. Geoff is a person operating independently from me and I'll leave it to him to respond regarding his use of the photograph of you, as **that perceived violation doesn't involve me.**

The person who recorded the talk tells me he never received, saw, or heard a notice, in any form, that prohibited him from recording the talk. This person was unknown to me earlier but I consider him a friend now precisely because he helped me be informed about the injustice committed. But it must be emphasized that **any grievance for recording it and sharing it must be taken up with him.**

I personally did not record or post or send this recording to anyone. I was happy to hear the recording of it myself, because it became apparent that factually incorrect statements had been made by you about my work, and I would now have the opportunity to address my grievance to the one responsible, unlike so many other times when my work has been plagiarized, misrepresented, and distorted.

As you can see, I am therefore not responsible for any of the so-called "violations" that were addressed to me in the letter from M.A.S. So, now please respond to my email of May 20. Thank you,

John Major Jenkins

That was as clear as a bell. But Carlson refused to admit to his flippant statements and degrading errors. Further communications involved the Robbins Museum people claiming they'd not received the disk with the mp3 on it. I perceived this was a clever set-up-to-fail, and realized I was dealing with immature and unprofessional people, and I shouldn't play into it by sending another disk, and another, and another. My own honesty and generosity had backfired, in the hands of an unethical and cowardly "scholar."

Item 5c. Transcribed Excerpts from Carlson's 2010 Talk

Mp3 on thumb drive, Old laptop F:/From-documents. Five mp3 clips made, as indicated.

John Carlson's Robbins Museum presentation, May 15, 2010.

Preamble. My critics generally do four things when they assess my work: 1) they don't summarize what it is; 2) they don't directly quote or cite my actual words; 3) without informed discernment they associate me with pop writers whose work I've critiqued and whose work is qualitatively different from my own work, not even being concerned with my own central question: what did the ancient Maya think about 2012? And 4) they lie about having read my work, as evidenced in what they actually assert they know about it. Carlson does all four of these things, perfectly. And so, unlike his unwillingness to

perform an accurate scholarly critique of my work, following the scientific principles of how critiques are performed, I'm going to do him the service of accurately quoting his own words and, beyond that, provide audio clips of him speaking those words, lest my detractors distrust my efforts.

Carlson values first-order explicit evidence and should not have a problem with his actual statements in a public lecture being known more widely. The only reason he might is because of the misleading, false, and baseless nature of his comments. In the interest of scientific scrutiny and assessment, he should have no problem with his words being precisely cited for review purposes. This is a much more responsible and defensible way of critiquing someone's work, than the baseless cloak-and-dagger assertions committed by himself and his friend John Hoopes.

I should emphasize that my efforts are concerned with facts, evidence, clarity, truth and accuracy in assessing my work and in exposing Carlson's factually incorrect statements, as well as his baseless and demeaning attitude. This is underscored by the fact that my own articulation of the "sacrifice & worldrenewal in 2012" idea anticipated his own in the published record, by many years, and should have been known to him if he'd actually read my 1998 book and was aware of my work "from the beginning," as he claims. The irony is that I have held and still hold many of the same perspectives on research into Maya cosmology and employ the same methods (such as an interdisciplinary approach and looking at primary sources) that he does. Without discernment he slops me into the same category with Calleman, Pinchbeck, and Arguelles, and shows an utter lack of knowledge regarding what I've actually written in my books, despite his claim that he's read them.

I'll paraphrase some sections from his talk and provide exact transcriptions of others.

He states that the last time he publicly talked about this topic [2012] was April 5, 1993. The Katun ending/beginning. It's not at all clear what he covered in that talk. The connection with 2012 would be obvious, with any talk about Katuns and Baktuns and period endings in the calendar. In comparison, my 1992 book *Tzolkin* contained an essay on the April 5, 1993 Katun ending, and pointed out the strange circumstance that it corresponded with a Venus morningstar rising. Friends in Hawaii even climbed a mountain on that day to observe it.

At the 4:30 mark. Carlson talks about the astrophysical Black Hole concept, his early work as a radio astronomer, the Galactic Center, and mentions the 2012 winter solstice.

4:15 mark: "We live about 30,000 light years out from the center of it [the galactic center]..."

"I had a failed Dissertation project, to start with, looking for evidence of a massive black hole in the center of our galaxy. I'm just going to mention that because that's one of the things in the popular culture about this December 21st 2012 event — that the sun will actually be very close to the galactic center — it will be crossing the galactic plane, close to the galactic center — by the way, on the winter solstice. And some people are making a big deal of this in the popular literature. As an astronomer, I think, myself, that this is total coincidence, and

that the Maya could not have known this. And they certainly did not know that we lived in a galaxy or would not have known where the center is because you cannot see it, even with the biggest telescope in the world.” [recorded clip, 1:05 minutes]

6:14

“That’s what the galactic center looks like — we now know that there’s something between a 3- and 4-million solar mass black hole in the core of our galaxy. I want to assure you that the ancient Maya would be absolutely clueless [of this], although you will read that they knew about this in some of the current literature that you can buy at your bookstore.” 6:36

Indicating a slide: “That’s me in 1973. I looked like a hippie, but in fact I wasn’t one.”

Carlson emphasizes that he goes to the source material, and his work is interdisciplinary. This seems presented as a comparison to the New Agers who proclaim things from their drug induced revelations, of which I am supposedly one, although I’ve emphasized in my work on Izapa (especially my 1998 book, which Carlson claims to have read) that Izapa, with its archaeoastronomical orientations, ballcourt & ballgame, and Creation Myth monuments, is the core source material for understanding what the creators of the LC thought about 2012, and that my work is “an interdisciplinary synthesis.”

19:04. “A lot of New Agers plan to go there [Chichen Itza] in 2012.” The reason why is the shadow-serpent, which Carlson notes is a real phenomenon (he wrote about it in 1999 and it is “one of his projects” of interest).

Venus was the key that took him into these studies. God L is sacrificing God K — Venus-over-shell symbol (glyph), the Star Wars events in the inscriptions. Battles and sacrifices timed by the Venus almanac. This is “The astrology of ritual warfare and sacrifice.”

He started his investigations with an astronomical question — who is God L? God L was a patron of merchants. Panel at Palenque Temple of the Cross — God L is on the panel, smoking a cigar.

32:40. “Do we have any idea of what the Maya thought about the 3114 BC date?” Yes. Vase of the Seven Gods. “I am in the school that I expect him to be back. That he [God L] and his crew will be back in 2012 to do it again ... To gather the gods of creation and come back.”

34:45. “God L is among the gods gathered, as the chief god, to restart the world in 3114 BC, and I expect him to be back [in 2012].” Also states: “The night sky and the underworld are essentially the same thing.”

The Great Flood that destroyed the Maya world — Dresden Codex page. Carlson doesn’t buy this end of world flood idea — it’s God L and his companion Goddess O. (I discussed Goddess O in my 1998 book).

He got interested in this as “a personal metaphor.” What does he mean by this? He seems to distinguish a personal fascination with Maya shamanism, astrology, and ritual from his scholarly work. Well, that’s fine. That’s exactly my own distinction between my personal life and my scholarly efforts to reconstruct ancient Maya cosmology. So we have the double standard wielded by Carlson, compounded by his own hang-ups regarding his complete lack of experience with the shamanic realms of consciousness that he simultaneously doubts and craves to understand more deeply and personally.

37:03. He asserts, again, that he gave a lecture at the commencement of the final Katun, the 4 Ahau Katun, on April 5, 1993, at the Smithsonian Auditorium. A date he intentionally selected. “I’m not a mystic, this is just a personal metaphor.” Personal. The “personal metaphor” he refers to more than once seems to involve personal renewal. Did he note the Venus rising on that date? I don’t know, he doesn’t say. That was an occurrence I discovered in my own research in 1991. I wrote about that in 1991-1992, in my book *Tzolkin*. One wonders if Carlson favorably presented this connection in his 1993 talk, for it would cause a conflict with his stated belief that the galactic alignment was coincidence, and long-range Venus calculations back to 3114 BC would have been impossible for the ancient pre-Classic people who formulated the Long Count (see his quote below).

Kislak collection of Maya bottles, 37:45. They’re called pilgrim flasks and various other things. Maya God L is a Venus god, associated with jaguars, birds, merchants, etc. The tobacco god is God L — he is stored in the gourd. “God L is the personification of the *may* that is in these vessels.” [bottles]. The glyph for *ch’ul* — his [God L’s] name is “Holy Tobacco” or “Divine Tobacco.” His wife is the young moon goddess. God L was a powerful tobacco shaman figure.

At the 60-minute mark, Carlson speeds up his presentation. Now: The Vase of the Seven Gods.

JC: “Here’s the rollout of the Vase of the Seven Gods. It shows the gods gathered in the underworlds, in the darkness. It’s like the night before the new world, gathered here on 4 Ahaw 8 Kumku. This is the main text telling us who is going to be there and what they’re going to do.” ... “This glyph says cacao — it’s a drinking vessel.” 1:15

Carlson on Michael Coe’s “Armageddon” comment relating to 2012 (from Coe’s 1966 book). “People knew about it [Coe’s comment] in Maya studies but not in the popular culture.” 1:02:25. Apparently Coe’s words are depicted in a slide: “The world was created to be annihilated on December 21, 2012.” He was at Coe’s house in January 2010 — Coe still believes in this interpretation, and there are reasons why he does.

There are two vessels of interest now. The one on the right is the Vase of the Eleven Gods. Lou Ramire owns the vase, he is one of the top 25 bad guys. He invented bundling mortgages. It shows the same scene as the Vase of the Seven Gods, both from near Naranjo.

1:05:50. Carlson finally mentions Tortuguero Monument 6, which is “on the cover of my friend Mark Van Stone’s book.” The 2012 date is mentioned at the end of the Tortuguero text. It is the “only known example of the date that’s coming up.” He does not mention Grofe’s 2009 work (Wayeb no. 30; http://www.wayeb.org/notes/wayeb_notes0030.pdf) connecting Bolon Yokte on TRT Mon 6 with God L. In his later article of 2011, Carlson disagrees with Grofe’s interpretation.

1:07:12. Continues discussing the two Vases depicting the 3114 BC era base mythology, related to Native American imagery. Medicine bundles, war bundles. (He seems to be using an old school slide projector). Spots on anklets and wristlets. “The gods are performing sacrifices to restart the world.” Here we see Carlson’s understanding of the sacrifice and world-renewal doctrine that is essential to my interpretation of 2012.

“God L as Venus warrior sacrificer, as god of tobacco — the tobacco smoke generates the clouds and mists that bring fertility and rain and they had the practices that they would shed blood from sacrificial victims, put it on ritual paper, burn the paper, make smoke and make offerings.”

He now seems to be wrapping it up. “There’s much, much more. For me this has been a strange trip. There is the god of sacrifice and warfare. And God L is the tobacco god.”

1:09:56. Slide of the Aztec sunstone. “Here I simply want to say that the New Age is taking this over and that they are mixing [it up with] the Aztec calendar stone. If you wanted an hour or two lecture on what that means — I could do it cold, with no notes, I could tell you it’s a different story. It’s the story of the Five Suns. But the people are indiscriminately mixing it with Maya things.”

Next slide: “These are the New Agers at the edge of the cenote at Chichen Itza ... it’s going to be the place to be. Why? Because in the books of Chilam Balam of Chumayel, when Katun 4 Ahau was installed, he’s the lord of the Katun and he will be installed on December 21, 2012. The god will take [his throne?], will be seated, at Chichen Itza.”

Next slide, showing crowds at the Chichen Itza shadow serpent event: “Here [in this slide] people are going there to see the descent of Kukulcan, which happens on the equinox.”

1:11:45. Carlson introduces Jean-Jacques Rivard, and the “hierophany at Chichen Itza.” Rivard is apparently present for Carlson’s talk, though he has momentarily stepped out of the room. (Rivard broke the story on the shadow-serpent in his 1971 paper, which I read and cited in my 1998 book: <http://alignment2012.com/bibbb.htm>.)

1:13:00. “People will be going to Chichen Itza for 2012 because *there actually is* a Maya prophecy, that says the lord of the Katun will be seated here, and there is a prophecy that the Feathered Serpent will return.” Here we see Carlson’s belief in a Maya prophecy for 2012, but Campion doesn’t include Carlson in his MPM (Maya Prophecy Movement) category.

End of talk (1:13:12), Q & A follows. Announcement: Come back (across the street) to the museum for the wine and cheese. General hubbub of audience. Carlson adds: 1:13:45: “The serpent of light and shadow is one of my projects. I’m here today because of Jean Jacques Rivard.”

Q & A Section, beginning with audience member Tom Valovic

Question from Tom Valovic, author of *Digital Mythologies: The Hidden Complexities of the Internet* (1999). 1:15:20.

Begin clip recording here. “Thank you for that overview, and I really appreciate getting that perspective. I’m the co-founder of the non-profit organization called *The Emergence Project*. We sponsored Boston’s first conference on 2012 in June of 2009. John Major Jenkins was a speaker — I see you’re smiling at the mention of John Major Jenkins. I wanted to bring up a few points, because I wanted the folks here to know. There are significantly different interpretations from what you’re talking about, and I think they are scholarly and well done interpretations from people like John Major Jenkins... uh [with some hesitation], Carl Calleman...”

Carlson: “Okay, well, could someone bring up the lights?”

Tom: “There are prophecies in many other traditions ... so if we look at Daoist, Islamic, Buddhist traditions ***you see them pointing to this 2012 date. So, point number one is that you can’t just slice and dice only the Maya, you have to look at a large picture, and...”

JC: “Are you making a statement or do you have a question?”

Tom: “I do have a question ... okay ... you seem to be dismissing all of the other books out there.”

JC: (speaking over Tom): “I have, I have done great...”
Tom speaking through the interruption with effort: “Have you read any of John Major Jenkins’s books, he has about four of them out there. And have you read any of the words of Maya elders?” (He mentions Carlos Barrios for a “Mayan perspective on prophecy”.)

JC: Okay [smugly]. Do you want an honest unvarnished answer?”

Some audience members yell “Yes.”

JC: 1:17:43. “This is not scholarship. I think that John Major Jenkins, Daniel Pinchbeck, Carl Calleman, Hunbatz Men, I have read a good [amount], you can’t read it all — Jose Arguelles, I remember the Harmonic Convergence [in 1987]...”

Tom, emphatically: “Have you read John’s books?”

JC: “Yes, and, uh, do you want the opinion?”

Tom: “Okay.”

JC: 1.18.14. “It’s bogus and bad scholarship. Now, he’s been good at an amateur reading of the literature, I’m not saying he’s wrong about his nuts and bolts of Maya calendrics, but, uh, as far as I’m concerned it’s nonsense.”***

Tom: “And would you dismiss the Maya elders as well?”

Carlson: “Okay,” (somewhat perturbed) “I’ll tell ya what...”
End recorded clip 3:26 minutes — sub-clip between triple asterisks is 1:56.

Carlson goes on to note that the LC fell into disuse and is not followed, and it had to be reconstructed by modern scholarship, so many of the modern spokesman for the Maya aren’t well informed about the ancient traditions. But the 260-day calendar survives. He sat for a personal divination with a Quiché Maya daykeeper in Momostenango — if you really want to know what was going on in these cultures before an influx of New Age influence. He says: “I look at the evidence and I look at the data ... how about Faith?” He counterposes faith and reason.

Note: Carlson’s narrative about the loss of the LC, necessitating a reconstruction of the LC, and the fact of the surviving 260-day Tzolkin count is exactly the same perspective I’ve presented and emphasized for two decades! And it’s all recounted in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, as well as in other articles online. Carlson claims to have read my books, calls them bogus and nonsense, and then proceeds to repeat the viewpoints and understandings I’ve persistently emphasized in my work since the beginning.

Tom: “A mystical viewpoint is a necessary component to this...”

1.23.10. JC continues. “Okay, good, yes...” He then discusses the Native American church having sacraments and a use of “drugs” — ethnography of it, etc.

After discussing hallucinogens and shamanism, John B. Carlson then rambles with a series of non-sequiturs that function as a critique merely by loose associations: ***“So there is another way to revelation and I know that a lot of people involved in 2012 — I’ll mention Daniel Pinchbeck; I’ll mention John Major Jenkins — that various ayahuasca, okay, mescaline, psilocybin, all these things, I mean, go back — was a 60s person, I was at Woodstock — just so you know this is gratuitous — I am a non-drug user. I’ve taken a puff on a cigarette — I did inhale because everybody else around me was [laughter] but I have studied this so when I mention Daniel Pinchbeck or John Major Jenkins — and I have known about him from the beginning, when he first started this so I very much know what he is doing. (silence in audience) [1.24.02]. I consider it to be bogus.”**[recorded clip between double asterisks]

Pregnant silence.

Here we have evidence in Carlson’s own words that he was receiving and reading and aware of my work via the article

proposals I sent to him, as editor of *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, in 1994 and 1995, from the “beginning” of my work on 2012. Another piece of evidence in this regard is the fact that Carlson Xeroxed my materials that I sent him in 1995, and sent them to his friend John Hoopes.

Carlson continues rambling. “But if you “believe” — and I don’t like use that word, I don’t like the word “believe” — I like to be convinced of things, I’m basically pretty much a scientist, and if you think, and you can, [You can have experiences] by fasting, by drumming, by praying, and with these powerful intoxicants. If you want to do this you can have these altered states of consciousness.... I’m very interested in that as an anthropologist, but it’s not good scholarship.”

Tom tries to respond but Carlson says “I should take another question.”

Answering this other question on Maya Venus astronomy and 3114 BC, he ponders: “What level of astronomy did they have in their heyday? I do not think that they had the ability [to calculate Venus positions in 3114 BC], that they had the ability to project back to 3114 BC. Not anywhere near in the league to be able to do that.”

1.27.14.

But then he remembers something of possible relevance: “There’s something called the tropical year. Which is our year of the seasons, so if I said from the vernal equinox back around to the vernal equinox again, uh, right now – it changes slightly but right now it’s just about 365.2422 days. It’s just about 365 and a quarter. There is some evidence — it’s not overwhelming — that, uh, see if you can follow this — fifteen-hundred-and-seven tropical years of 584 — no, 365.2422 — days just about exactly equals fifteen-hundred-and-eight 365-day years. I know I said that right. There is some evidence that the Maya had an accurate length for the true tropical year of the seasons — not proven but there’s an argument that goes back to about 1930. And by the way, John Major Jenkins and these folks, they don’t know any of this; do you see what I’m saying? They don’t have any of this scholarship — they haven’t done their homework. So, I’m just, that’s just a...” [bar of hash? some derogatory remark muddled by laughter; chuckles and laughter in the audience]. [Recorded clip: 1:19 minutes]

Q: Where will you be on 12-21-2012?

He plans to be at Chichen Itza on Dec 21, 2012, “to watch the circus and to be with my friend Jean Jacques [Rivard].”

Rivard, in the audience: “Very unlikely” (“awww” laments the audience)... Rivard asks: “Are you making an analogy between the strewing of tobacco on the road and the strewing of the stars on the Milky Way?”

JC: “No, I haven’t.” And he elaborates a bit on the Milky Way.

JC: In conclusion Carlson promotes Van Stone’s book: “If anybody is really interested in a book that gives you the details, read Mark Van Stone’s book [on 2012, recently published].” Van Stone’s book was self-published in 2010, worked up from

a Power Point presentation he gave in 2008 and endorsed by FAMSI and Aztlan e-list.

End at 1.33.35 sign off, out of time — they’re going across the street for the reception.

Links to five clip excerpts:

Clip one: “I think this is total coincidence.” 1:05 minutes.
<http://Update2012.com/JC2010clip1.mp3>

Clip two, longer clip: “I see you’re smiling at the mention of John Major Jenkins.” 3:26 minutes.
<http://Update2012.com/JC2010clip2.mp3>

Clip three. *Sub-clip of the above clip:* “Have you read John’s books?” 1:56 minutes.
<http://Update2012.com/JC2010clip3.mp3>

Clip four. “I have known about him from the beginning, when he first started this.” 58 seconds.
<http://Update2012.com/JC2010clip4.mp3>

Clip five. “John Major Jenkins and these folks, they don’t know any of this.” 1.19 minutes.
<http://Update2012.com/JC2010clip5.mp3>

Item 5d. Cordial email with info links and query, sent to Carlson in 2012

Best to view here: <http://www.alignment2012.com/email-to-Carlson-June14-2012.pdf>. This email was sent to Carlson in response to an advertisement for his forthcoming talk, which would address the galactic alignment and 2012 — explicitly my unprecedented theory but of course not mentioned as such. I had always found it strange that Carlson refrained from commenting on this in his articles of 2011 and 2012, since he is an astronomer who edits the *Archeoastronomy Journal*. He had also been editing and publishing Michael Grofe’s two landmark essays on Maya sidereal and tropical year calculations which completely boosted my 2012 astronomy work, but he failed to understand how that breakthrough work was so important.

There was a clue to Carlson’s thinking on the 2012 astronomy in his Robbins Museum talk (May 2010), showing that without much thought or discernment he had adopted the typical dismissals and misunderstanding about my galactic alignment reconstruction — superficially focusing on the Galactic Center criterion. His upcoming talk framed the 2012 astronomy in predictably absurd terms, asking whether or not the Maya “intentionally created this coincidence” (that “the sun will pass through the plane of the Milky Way near the galactic center” [in 2012]). It’s not clear how coincidences can be “intentionally created,” but such confused malapropisms are diagnostic of how scholars misleadingly framed and commented on my work, despite accurate definitions and elaborations in my books.

Item 5e. Email sent to Carlson in June 2015, re Milbrath and his UP of Colorado article

Sent to Milbrath and cc’d to John B Carlson June 4, 2015, since Milbrath threatened that she was going to send my comments to Carlson:

Dear Susan, [cc’d to John B. Carlson]

You have fully misunderstood my statements and have jumped to a wrong conclusion, one that reflects badly on me. Please try to hear what I am actually saying. I believe I am writing clearly and concisely.

While it is *possible* that John B Carlson "stole" (or plagiarized) my ideas, I was willing to offer the benefit of the doubt and entertain the possibility that he had independently worked out the same "deity sacrifice and world-renewal" interpretation of the 2012 period-ending, based on Classic Period evidence (whereas I was drawing from pre-Classic evidence at Izapa). In this case — in which, mind you, I am offering the benefit of the doubt to NOT claim he stole my ideas — he would only have then "intentionally neglected to cite or mention my earlier interpretations which anticipated his own." (I stated this confidently because I know he was aware of my ideas, so he must have *intentionally* avoided mentioning them.) That's NOT the same as an accusation of plagiarism. An accusation of plagiarism is what John Hoopes did, and which John Carlson green-lighted and then defended, when Hoopes claimed I got my galactic ideas from Dane Rudhyar (in *Archeoastronomy Journal* Vol. 22). That situation is still unresolved in the published record.

In all honestly, what I've hoped for is a collaborative effort to work out how the period-ending idea-complex I identified at Izapa survived through the centuries and re-emerged in the ideas Carlson identified. They both result in an interpretation of the 2012 period-ending as involving deity sacrifice and world-renewal. You treat me like some horrible monster when I'm trying to contextualize the evolving discussion by including my work (which, however, has been consistently distorted or ignored until some colleague articulates the same ideas). Apparently, the fact that I got there first, during a decade (the 90s) in which almost all scholars and academic publishers treated 2012 with derision, is completely unbearable to the status quo — thus the incredibly irrational and unethical attempts at mitigation that I've experienced. It's looking more and more like this is going to be a permanent blight in the history of Maya Studies.

I'm sorry this is a touchy matter, but I ask that you carefully read what I actually stated and not project some nefarious motivations onto me. So, in addition, in regards to you, Anne, and the University Press of Colorado being "fair and reasonable" — **that was not an observation or accusation applied to your past behavior** (which I'd allow could simply have been an oversight), but a query regarding whether or not, *now that you know the situation of my having precedence on certain ideas in the published record*, you might be fair and reasonable in future treatments of ideas that you now know that I pioneered articulating and arguing for. Consequently, a future behavior, of "fair and reasonable"

editors, authors, and publishers, would be to take steps to correct the problem, or *at least acknowledge that an oversight has occurred*. That's not a lot to ask, especially after almost two decades of persistent efforts in communicating my findings clearly and inviting discussion.

As for John Carlson, he isn't very communicative, probably out of embarrassment for his role in some unprofessional shenanigans involving his journal. I ask for facts and evidence for false assertions published in his journal, he refuses. Nevertheless, I have sent him cordial emails inviting discussion, and asking for his ideas about, for example, the 2012 alignment astronomy. He must be way up there in an Ivory Tower, too high to respond to mere mortals. Well, it is curious that he never even responded to my several essay proposals in the mid-to-late 1990s. But I did speak with him in 1998 and I do know he received them. Since you've copied him on your email, I'll open this up to him, and reiterate to him that I am, and always have been, open about discussing his work, my work, Maya astronomy, Izapan archaeoastronomy, and 2012. What I've seen and experienced is, instead, an unwillingness to communicate and honestly address the bad scholarship he has let slip into his journal.

As for Krupp, my letter to him of January 1999, in which I responded to his critiques and I explained the evidence and reasoning underlying my interpretations, *was never responded to*. So, my last letter to him had the cordial tone of an Edwardian gentleman. Why do you assume that I would have triggered a bad response in him, from some bad behavior on my part? **The reality is exactly the opposite**. He just popped up in 2009 with bizarre constructs in his *Sky & Telescope* article that my work was behind the 2012 mania (= doomsday), I merely repackaged old ideas, I was some kind of galactic Arguelles devotee, etc. His critiques are baseless and misleading, and he just kept reiterating these weirdly denigrating readings of my work through many years of presentations and articles. I did get a chance to register my response to his contemptuous accusations and assumptions, in my chapter in Gelfer's anthology (*Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, 2011), but he doesn't seem to read the literature which he presumes to lampoon and debunk. He is basically an under-informed and presumptuous knee-jerk critic.

As for Aveni, he denies errors that are clearly errors and runs away when presented with facts that counter his apparent desire to put down my ideas, and me personally, with his factually flawed critiques. (Recall that I sent you five factual errors from Aveni's book, which you didn't comment on. You see, when scholars and their academic publishers don't acknowledge and correct errors, then science is broken.)

Finally, yes, as you mentioned I did state that "the fact remains that your anthology simultaneously denigrates the 2012 "End Times Follies", for which (according to Krupp) I am supposedly the main choreographer, while my core ideas about 2012 and Izapa cosmology are being echoed in two other articles in the anthology (Carlson and Coggins)." **And I asked how you reconcile these two contradictory situations**. I believe that's a reasonable question, and a fair topic of discussion. Can't we have a calm and carefully

considered discussion about that? I am totally calm and intellectually curious about your thoughts. Do you not accept the veracity of the two aspects of the statement? Why would you not want to discuss shortcomings or flaws in the anthology you edited which, as I stated earlier, is overall a great contribution.

So, I'll end by offering to have a phone conversation, or email exchange, with John Carlson (I've cc'd him on this email) so we can work out whatever bad feeling or misunderstanding still exists. Let me know, John. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Carlson did not respond, but the same day I noticed analytics activity on my Academia.edu page, where many of my essays are posted. There were page views of my "Mayanism" critique of Hoopes, which contains my early article pitches (of 1994 and 1995) to Carlson, at *the same time from two separate locations*: College Park, MD (Carlson) and Lawrence, Kansas (John Hoopes). I suspect Hoopes told Carlson that it contained my early letters to him, and Carlson was checking it out. Feeling sardonic, I sent an email to them both (and this includes a copy of my recent letter to Sue Hausman, Journals Manager at the University of Texas Press, see below):

JH and JC: [John Hoopes and John Carlson] June 8, 2015
Well, I see you two love birds are collaborating on some JMJ research. I'm glad you are reading my fact-based critiques of sub-standard scholarship in Maya Studies. I am aware that you've been looking at several of my essays on Academia.edu. Sometimes they don't load properly, so you should know that they can also be found on my own websites, as PDF files:

The Center for 2012 Studies
(<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>)
and Update 2012 at <http://www.Update2012.com>)

I've got the analytics on your visits, so if you have any feedback or comments I'm happy to discuss with you. I'm sure you will both agree that science has to be willing to correct its errors and acknowledge the previous work of others especially when, as in JC's case, his ideas about 2012 reflect my own (i.e. deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal). I'm quite pleased that you've finally come around to finding the same ideas I determined about 2012 long ago, though we have found it through different research avenues.

In addition, I'd like to share my recent letter to Sue Hausman (pasted below), journals editor at the University of Texas Press, explaining why I had to, in good conscience, decline her invitation for me to purchase Vol. 25 of *Archaeoastronomy Journal*. As you'll see, it has to do with the unprofessional response by journal editor John Carlson in green-lighting and then defending Hoopes's false and unsupported assertions about my background and ideas, in Volume 22. A real travesty in the annals of Maya Studies.

Well, irregardless of my own feedback it seems they had already decided that *Archaeo Journ* was not meeting their publication standards, though I do hope you can do some

soul searching and rise to the challenge of producing a good, reliable, and reputable academic publication. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Attached to email to Carlson & Hoopes:
Dear Sue Hausman,

May 10, 2015

I must decline your offer to buy the new edition of *Archaeoastronomy Journal*. The primary reason is that, back in 2011, when I raised a concern over a scholar (John Hoopes) who published factually false and denigrating things about my work in the Vol. 22 issue of *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, you failed to note the evasive behavior of editor John Carlson, who refused to require that Hoopes be forthcoming with evidence for his unsupported (and false) assertions. Do you recall how scientific and scholarly writing is suppose to function? It's a fundamental tenet of academic writing that scholars provide evidence for assertions that are stated as fact. So, I asked you to facilitate a response. That didn't happen after repeated requests, and so by default we are left with the conclusion, which is indeed the correct conclusion, that Hoopes has no evidence for his denigrating assertions about my background and my interpretations of Maya astronomy. The University of Texas Press evaded applying any errata policy, indicating a functionally broken academic publishing system.

In addition, my concern with Hoopes continuing to propagate false assertions and misleading characterizations of me and my work, in the Vol 24 issue of *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (see bolded section in my first email to you, below) was indeed, as events unfolded, warranted. Vol. 24 was published in August of 2012, some eleven months after my initial contact with you, in which I expressed my concern. The volume contained, as I had anticipated, a chapter by Hoopes. In it, he continued his misleading and denigrating narrative about my work. (For example, Hoopes cites a 1994 book of mine (citing my 1989 book), which was not about 2012 but which discussed a wide array of ideas about Maya culture and cosmology — and of necessity I drew from many of the “fringe” books where those ideas are found. Hoopes took the statement out of context.) **[In fact, Hoopes was citing a passage in that book in which I recalled my 1989 book, which was a travelogue that mused over a wide variety of ideas and topics about the Maya – as a critique this was certainly a stretch, even for an unethical straw-gasping debunker like Hoopes, but one which was duly green-lighted by Carlson]*** You may recall (see copy of my email to you below) that I had offered to vet his forthcoming essay for errors to avoid further embarrassment for Carlson and abuse of the publishing auspices of the University of Texas, but my offer was ignored. It is precisely this kind of unethical chicanery that I wanted to help the University of Texas Press avoid being published under their auspices.

Consequently, I cannot in good conscience support such a substandard publication, managed under substandard editorship which doesn't flag dubious assertions of its authors, doesn't require that they provide proof for their contentious assertions, and refuses to correct errors or even

investigate whether or not its authors have evidence for their statements which denigrate a living author. Perhaps your team should take a few classes and renew your commitment to university-level standards of academic publishing ethics and management. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

*This bracketed and bolded aside was in the letter

The final paragraph of my letter to Carlson and Hoopes refers to the fact that the University of Texas Press would no longer be publishing Carlson's *Archaeoastronomy Journal*. The reason why was offered by a person working in the UT Press Journals office:

John- January 6, 2015

UT Press decided not to publish the journal anymore because of frequent production delays. We had been taking orders for Vol. 25 for years, but the editors of the journal failed to provide us with content to publish. We agreed to publish this last issue, but we can't take the chance of extensive delays on further issues.

I'm not sure if they've found a new publisher, you might try contacting the Center for Archaeoastronomy to find out.
— end of email

Professional scholarly behavior has certainly not exactly been Carlson's forte. Rather sad, but not surprising if just desserts is appropriate for scholars whose Ivory Tower turns into a collapsing House of Cards. Say no more.

6. Susan Milbrath, University of Colorado Press, Clemency Coggins, John B Carlson, Anthony Aveni, Ed Krupp

- a. Exchange with Milbrath in IMS newsletter, 2007-2008
- b. Email exchange with Coggins
- c. Cover letter with review of the anthology, sent to editors Milbrath and Dowd
- d. Ensuing emails with Milbrath
- e. Report sent to University of Colorado Press director Darrin Pratt

Item 6a. Exchange with Milbrath in the IMS newsletter / magazine, 2007-2008

In the November 2007 Issue of the *Institute of Maya Studies Explorer* magazine (Vol. 36, Issue 11), editor Jim Reed wrote a piece called “Understanding 2012” which quoted my words, posted several months earlier, responding to a question posed on the Aztlan e-list:

In a post to Aztlan Listserv [4- 2007], a member asks:

In the preceding story [a *USAToday* piece on 2012], note the phrase "On the winter solstice in 2012, the sun will be aligned with the center of the Milky Way for the first time in about 26,000 years." Anyone want to speculated about what this means? I thought that we were always aligned with the center of the Milky Way (as a matter of fact aren't all the

stars aligned with the center, since that is the nature of "center").

John Major Jenkins responds:

Allow me to address your question about the solstice sun aligning with the center of our Milky Way galaxy. The alignment referred to in the *USAToday* article refers to an alignment that is caused by the precession of the equinoxes. Precession causes the sun's positions on the equinoxes to shift backward along the ecliptic, moving through the various ecliptic constellations (signs of the zodiac) over many thousands of years. This effect is due to the slow wobble of the earth on its axis. The phenomenon causes the equinox positions - and the solstice positions as well - to periodically come into alignment with the galactic equator - that is, with the bright band of the Milky Way galaxy. It is an astronomical FACT that the position of the December solstice sun will be aligning with the galactic equator in the years around 2012.

Specifically, following calculations by astronomer Jean Meeus (*Mathematical Astronomy Morsels*, 1997:216), and considering that the sun itself is one-half of a degree wide, we can speak of an alignment "zone", 1980 - 2016 AD. If you would like to read more and see a good illustration of this factual empirical phenomenon, please see my webpage: "What is the Galactic Alignment" (<http://www.alignment2012.com/whatisGA.htm>).

Secondarily, the alignment of the December solstice sun with the Milky Way's equator happens to occur in that part of the Milky Way that houses the "nuclear bulge" of our galaxy's center. Our Milky Way is saucer shaped, and to naked-eye sky-watchers the Milky Way appears wider between Sagittarius and Scorpio. That "nuclear bulge" is, visually, where the galactic center is located. It is where the December solstice sun is aligning. Thus follows the factually true statement about the sun, on the solstice, aligning with the center of our Milky Way galaxy. It is more precise, however, to speak of the alignment in terms of the galactic equator, as that affords a precise mid-line of the band of the Milky Way with which the solstice-galaxy alignment can be measured - as Jean Meeus did. Thus, the alignment "zone": 1980 - 2016 AD.

My work, since the early 1990s, and published in several books still in print, has marshaled evidence to show that this alignment scenario is the reason why the ancient Maya fixed the end of their 13-baktun cycle to December 21, 2012. For more information, you can peruse my website (<http://alignment2012.com>), or you can access the Aztlán archives from May-June of 1999, or the compilation of those Aztlán exchanges in a chapter that was excised from my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*: <http://www.alignment2012.com/whatisGA.htm>, or you can simply read my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, available for free through your institution's Interlibrary Loan service.

This is astronomy, not astrology, not the end of the world. It is a reconstruction of the astronomical knowledge of the early Maya people who devised the Long Count calendar. Susan Milbrath is quoted in the article as stating that it would have been "impossible" for the Maya to have been aware of the precession of the equinoxes. The problem here is that

many scholars don't even know what precession is. And, in addition, an awareness of precession is strongly suggested in the work of Gordon Brotherston, Marion Popenoe Hatch, Eva Hunt, and others. "Impossible" is an unnecessarily strong word in this case, as it closes the mind to the possibilities that can be, and have been, explored, elucidated, and documented in my work.

In fairness it should be pointed out that the USA Today piece did not mention my work, *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998), which is the source for L. Joseph's and D. Pinchbeck's messy but apparently popular books.

Editor's note: If you would like to read more and see a good illustration of this factual empirical phenomenon, please see Jenkins' webpage: <http://Alignment2012.com/whatisGA.htm>. Or for more information, you can access the Aztlán Listserv from May-June of 1999, or the compilation of those Aztlán exchanges in a chapter that was excised from his 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*, located at the same web address as mentioned above. Or you can simply read his book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, available for free through your institutions Interlibrary Loan service.

My comment on Susan Milbrath's statements in the *USA Today* interview prompted her to write a letter of correction which was published in the December 2007 Issue of the *IMS Explorer*. She appears to have read the link offered above, or glanced at it, since in her response she refers to my "alignment zone" interpretation (but calls it "26 years" rather than the correct 36 years). It's hard to understand how Milbrath could even formulate her critique based upon what I actually argue and present in this cited piece. Milbrath's response (in the December 2007 Issue of *IMS Explorer*):

"Just How Precise is Maya Astronomy?"

by Susan Milbrath
Curator of Latin American Art and Archaeology Florida
Museum of Natural History

In Vol. 36, No. 11 of the *IMS newsletter*, John Major Jenkins misrepresents my quote in J. Jeffrey MacDonald's article in USA Today. He says "Susan Milbrath is quoted in the article as stating that would have been 'impossible' for the Maya to have aware of the precession of the equinox." In the 2007 *USA Today* article I say that "astronomers generally agree that it would be impossible for the Maya themselves to have known that [the sun will be aligned with the galactic equator on Dec. 21, 2012.]"

My quote addresses specifically the issue of precision in Maya predictions. As Jenkins knows very well, in *Star Gods of the Maya* (1999:249, 257, 259), I discuss Maya records of long cycles of time that might have been useful in calculating precession of the equinox. The Dresden Codex and certain Classic monuments record pictuns (8,000 x 360 days) and there are also records of much longer cycles of time. In the book, I even refer to a record to a long cycle of 30,000 years involving the Pleiades that may have been an effort to calculate precession of the equinox.

The issue here is that Jenkins implies that the Maya were able to calculate the precession cycle with exact precision. Nowhere do we see a Maya record that accurately records the cycle of precession of the equinox known to us today. This cycle was not known in the West as such until the Renaissance (see James Evans *History and Practice of Ancient Astronomy* 1998). It does seem likely that the Maya recognized that star rise azimuths and heliacal rise/set dates changed through time, but they left no precise records of calculations involving such observations.

Jenkins implies an astonishing level astronomical precision by saying that the Maya were able to predict the exact location of the sun in the background of stars on December 21, 2012. The Maya visualized the Milky Way in quite a different way than we do, seeing it as a road, a river, or a serpent. Without NASA photos they could not have known the true shape of the Milky Way, and it would have been impossible for them to determine the location of the galactic equator. Jenkins tells us that the window for the sun crossing the galactic equator is a scant 26 years, citing Jean Meeus's *Mathematical Astronomy Morsels* (1997:216). This page illustrates only two tables showing the inclination in orbit for two of Jupiter's satellites between 1875 and 2175.

Setting aside the inaccurate page citation, we must ask how the Maya calculated the position of the sun relative to the galactic equator? We can use computer programs and NASA photos to illustrate this effect. Just what mechanism does Jenkins think the Maya used and how did they record this knowledge? Furthermore, tying the 2012 galactic event to the end of the baktun cycle implies that the Maya had precisely calculated precession of the equinox by around AD 300, more than 1000 years before this was achieved in western science. We do know that the Maya purposely set the calendric odometer to "roll over" at end of the baktun cycle on the winter solstice in 2012. This date was predetermined when the first Long Count inscriptions were recorded in the third century AD in the Maya lowlands (even earlier in the areas of Veracruz and Chiapas).

The end of the baktun on the winter solstice is not a coincidence, and this mathematical feat is certainly a sign of a sophisticated link between Maya astronomy and mathematics. The Maya must have set the baktun "end" at the same time they back-calculated a starting point for the baktun around 3000 BC. We can admire the Maya for their highly developed astronomy and mathematics, but we should not attribute to them impossible feats and thereby diminish their true accomplishments.

[Note: The editor added one small image of the sun at the Crossroads/Dark Rift (the 2012 alignment), with no caption.]

My response to Milbrath was then published in the February 2008 issue of the *IMS Explorer* (IMS Vol. 37, Issue 2). Section headings were added by the *IMS* magazine editor, Jim Reed.

December 21, 2012: Some Rational Deductions

Editor's note. In November 2007 the IMS published an article about the 2012 phenomena in which John Major

Jenkins commented on statements made by Maya scholar Susan Milbrath in a 2012 article previously published in USA Today. Susan responded to John's comments in an article we published in our December 2007 issue. Now, read on as John continues the discourse.

I appreciate Susan Milbrath's thoughts on Maya astronomy, and hope our exchange will inform and inspire the investigations of others. The citation I provided off the top of my head for Jean Meeus's calculation of the solstice alignment with the galactic equator was indeed incorrect. It's not on page 216 of *Mathematical Astronomy Morsels* (1997) as stated, but pages 301-2 of that book.

Milbrath clarifies her intent in the quotation that I had misread from the somewhat unclear phrasing of the USA Today journalist. Instead of stating that it would have been impossible for the ancient Maya to know about precession, she means it would have been impossible for them to have been aware of the galactic alignment of era-2012 with the level of accuracy she believes I require. Here, however, she mistakenly imputes that I require a level of precision that I do not. The confusion seems to arise from my use of precise astronomical terminology to define what the galactic alignment is. I define the galactic alignment as *the alignment of the December solstice sun with the galactic equator.*

An Alignment Zone?

Based on Meeus's precise calculation for the galactic alignment occurring in 1998, and the fact that the sun is roughly **one-half** of a degree wide, I pointed out that it is reasonable to think of this alignment as a "zone" stretching from 1980 to 2016 (36 years equals **one-half** of a degree of precessional motion). I then observe the fact that the 13-Baktun cycle ending date falls within this range. In the early 1990s, I took this more generalized situation of "being in the zone" not as a definitive proof of my alignment thesis, but as an indicator of *possible* intent on the part of the Long Count's creators, and a suggestion that it might be worthwhile to rationally investigate the topic further.

An Anthony Aveni Challenge

I think that my use of a scientifically accurate definition of the galactic alignment has been conflated with what ancient Maya naked eye star gazers would have been, and could have been, looking at. To use the term "galactic equator" in a scientifically precise definition of the galactic alignment does not mean that the ancient Maya star gazers utilized the exact same scientific concept that modern astronomers do. It does not logically follow. Thus, Anthony Aveni's challenge (In the [New York times article](#) of July 1, 2007) to demonstrate a Maya awareness of the galactic equator simply misses the point. I neither assume this nor state this in my investigation of ancient Maya astronomy.

What is significant, however, is that certain astronomical features that are compelling *to the naked eye* are involved in the galactic alignment (the Milky Way, the dark rift in the Milky Way, the cross formed by the Milky Way and the ecliptic, and the sun) and are very important players in the

Maya Creation Myth. It should also be emphasized, as I've frequently stated in my published work since the mid-1990s, that the Milky Way itself, and more narrowly the dark rift in the Milky Way, would have served the ancient naked-eye astronomers as the target for the galactic alignment rather than the abstract dotted line known to astronomers as the galactic equator.

A Conceptual Awareness

Another assumption that frequently occurs should be clarified. Instead of honing in on the ancient Maya's observational and calculational methodology and assuming a high level of precision, my approach to demonstrating 2012 as being intentionally placed proceeds along different lines. (I'm sure that progressive scholars will one day identify precessional interval mechanisms in the dated hieroglyphic corpus, as well as models of how precessional ideology relates to kingship and other much-discussed features of Maya culture, but I have approached the problem in a different way).

My methodology endeavors to show a meaningful presence, within core Maya institutions, of the astronomical features involved in the galactic alignment. This coordination involves several disciplines—it is an interdisciplinary synthesis—the integrative continuity and complexity of which mitigates the possibility that my observations are all just wishful thinking.

So, it is a false assumption that calculational methodology must be provided in order to prove intention. My methodology documents the secondary effects that are predicated upon and require an ancient awareness of the galactic alignment. The deduction is similar to deducing that Paleolithic humans knew how to have sex, because the secondary effect of that knowledge—progeny—is observable. We don't have any direct evidence for their knowledge or their "methodology" but the secondary evidence that they knew how to do it is undeniable.

Similarly, the astronomy of the galactic alignment is embedded within the Maya Creation Myth, on the monuments of Izapa, and in other Maya traditions such as the ballgame. A conceptual awareness of the alignment is clear in the iconography and the symbolic representations of astronomy within Maya mythology. This brief response to Milbrath is not the place to go further into the details of my reconstruction; the point is that my investigative methodology does not hinge upon the high level of precision that some criticize as being "impossible."

In my books I've even stated that 100 years within range of the precise galactic alignment calculated by Jean Meeus would still be compelling enough to justify further investigation.

It Isn't a Coincidence

I've addressed and clarified these issues on the Aztlan listserv, the University of Texas Mesoamerican e-list page and elsewhere, including a brief piece I wrote during recent exchanges with professor John Hoopes (see link below). This online article revisits the suggestion that it is unlikely for the

solstice placement of the end date to have been a coincidence, an idea supported by Milbrath in her rebuttal. Munro Edmonson pointed this out in his 1988 book *The Book of the Year*. I have explored and restated the implications of this idea and the interested reader can assess a rational analysis of the situation here:

<http://Alignment2012.com/rationalapproachto2012.html>.

—end

That was the last I heard from Milbrath until our communication in 2015, regarding the anthology she edited with Anne Dowd for the University Press of Colorado (see Items below).

Item 6b. Email exchange with Dr Clemency Coggins

Dear Clemency Coggins,

May 22, 2015

I recently read with great interest your chapter "The North Celestial Pole in Ancient Mesoamerica" and was fascinated to find you drawing interpretations similar to ones I offered in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. You may recall that we communicated briefly in 1996 (maybe other times, too?). It is certainly a long overdue confirmation that my interpretation of the geographical migration of the polar region as a cosmic center deity, from the far north into Mesoamerica, is not as wild as critics have characterized it as being, and will in fact be readily apparent to any scholar who takes the time to study pre-Classic tropical astronomy, sites, mythology, and the topography around Izapa.

I was hoping to discuss with you other elements of Izapa cosmology and pre-Classic precessional knowledge, that I believe are congruent extensions of the ideas you offered in your article. In particular, they involve a more complete reconstruction of ancient cosmology and astronomy at Izapa, by incorporating the iconographic and archaeoastronomical evidence from Groups A, B, and, importantly, the Group F ballcourt.

I have not seen incorporated into any discussions of Izapa cosmology (including Guernsey) the fact of the ballcourt's alignment to the December solstice sunrise horizon (Jenkins 1996, 1998). In 2009 I became aware of Aveni & Hartung's confirming publication of the ballcourt alignment, in their essay published in 2000. (I wonder why Aveni didn't tell me about it earlier, despite our communications in 1996-1998 and 2007-2008?) In any case, my independent discovery, calculation, and first publication of it was in my 1996 monograph *Izapa Cosmos*, then in *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998). Oddly, in Aveni's 2009 book (*2012: The End of Time*) he reports the Izapa ballcourt alignment **48 degrees** in error.

In my 1998 book I cited eight essays by you (see bibliography here: <http://alignment2012.com/bibbb.htm>), essays that I found very insightful.

Another important piece of the Izapa puzzle, which is critical for understanding my work and that I haven't seen broached elsewhere, is the fact that the Big Dipper rose over Tacana volcano at sundown on December solstices during Izapa's heyday (Jenkins 1998: Diagram 138, p. 255). This fact would

have been apparent if, in your Figure 5.16 (p. 128), you had portrayed Tacana volcano in your horizon astronomy map. I published this and many other things in my 1998 book, which contains five chapters devoted to analyzing Izapa's calendrics, archaeoastronomy, topography, regional ideas, archaeology, and iconography. I've been to the site over a dozen times since 1990.

Would you like to discuss things further? Best wishes, and thank you for your work,

John Major Jenkins

Coggins responded: May 22, 2015
I am very sorry John if you feel I have stolen some of your ideas. I do not think so. However our correspondence was long ago and I suspect I agreed with many things you said. Unfortunately I have never seen your book *Izapa Cosmos*, although I did see *Maya Cosmogonensis* around 2000 and apologize for not going back to it.

All the initial work for this paper was done long ago for an SAA panel in San Diego. Any up-dating I did involved the most recent published work I could find.

I have never thought much about the north group because I wanted to keep my points as simple as possible. I imagine those monuments do have astronomical significance. I was lucky to get that single Izapa sky figure into the article. They kept cutting down. Had I an artist, or talent, it would have been good to include Tacana.

In any case my interest is, primarily, the evolution and development of Maya iconography and symbolism across the millennia. There is more at Izapa than I had room for certainly. Perhaps I will get to it - and be sure to credit you.

Clemency

Clemency Coggins Professor Emerita
Departments of Archaeology and of the History of Art and Architecture
Boston University. Research Associate Peabody Museum, Harvard University

My responses to Coggins:

May 22, 2015

Hi — oh, I wasn't assuming that at all. I was rather delighted that your research had brought you into similar interpretations, based on your reasoned assessment of the evidence. I've tried to share the work with other researchers, often with inconclusive results. There's a perception that Group F may be a much later occupation, but this comes largely from Garth Norman's somewhat forced model. It's true that there was Classic and post-Classic activity in the ballcourt group, but the closest C-14 dates in the attached Mound 125a are pre-Classic.

For some reason Izapa is often overlooked or incompletely interpreted. I'm not sure why; perhaps a perception that it's BYU's baby. I'm grateful you have studied and written about it. The Izapa ballcourt alignment is quite frequently mis-portrayed in the literature, due to the unclear maps in the BYU studies. The monuments arranged around and in the ballcourt are congruent with the solar rebirth symbolism of the ballgame, and I briefly summarized this work in my 2010 SAA presentation paper, which otherwise was about Tortuguero

Monument 6. That paper was posted on Barnhart's *Maya Exploration Center*, and on my website:

<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/Astronomy-in-TRT-SAA.pdf>

The paper was put through the ringer in a public debate that Barnhart sponsored (<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>) and developed into a 9000-word essay to be published with an archaeoastronomy anthology edited by Benfer & Adkins. But it remains unpublished, though an abridged and rewritten version was published in the *Clavis Arts Journal* in 2014 (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Clavis3-description.pdf>).

Also, important work by Michael Grofe is being done on Maya awareness of the precession of the equinoxes. I hope we can stay in contact about developing discoveries. Best wishes,

John

No response, but trying to be proactive and informative:

Dear Clemency,

May 29, 2015

I'm providing here a concise summary of my work at Izapa: <http://alignment2012.com/summary-of-my-work-on-Izapa.pdf>.

My work at Izapa and related sites relates to my effort to reconstruct what the early calendar makers thought about 2012, because the Long Count is recognized by many scholar as being formulated within the Izapan/Soconusco region during the pre-Classic, with Izapa as a likely ceremonial and astronomical locus.

My interpretive approach is an interdisciplinary analysis of evidence within and around the site of Izapa. I specifically discuss, as a basis for my approach, Billie Jean Isbell's "environmental determinants" (1982). While studying and unpacking the often difficult BYU volumes on Izapa and visiting the site in person, I understood that the Izapans were interested in the "cosmic center" concept and had identified three different centers. This is my "Three Cosmic Center" hypothesis — which I believe is an indispensable key to understanding the site.

The iconography and archaeoastronomical alignments within the Group F ballcourt, which to this day remain largely ignored in scholarly discussions, is very important. Much of this was presented in my 1996 monograph and my 1998 book, with a chapter about Izapa in my 2002 book (*Galactic Alignment*) and a summary of the work in my 2009 book (*The 2012 Story*). The Izapa ballcourt material was also mentioned, with a diagram, in my 2010 SAA presentation. A large problem is the lack of clarity, in the literature, in stating the ballcourt's alignments to the December solstice sunrise azimuth. Even Aveni, who measured it with Hartung, states it incorrectly in his 2009 book.

In my Summary, linked above, I conclude with an interpretation of what the Izapans thought about the future cycle ending in 2012:

"My interpretation has been and remains twofold: (1) an ideology of deity sacrifice, transformation, and worldrenewal

in the Creation Myth context of Era transitions (World Ages), coordinated with (2) a precession-based astronomical alignment calculated by the ancient Izapans (or "early Maya") to be occurring in 2012. This is an integration of ideology and astronomy."

You can note that the first part of my interpretation ("world-renewal requires deity sacrifice"), which was in place by the mid-1990s, is echoed in John B Carlson's statements about 2012 in his chapter in *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*. Also in his previous essays in his *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (2012) and the IAU anthology (2011). I submitted article proposals on my 2012 work to him, for his journal, in 1994, 1995, and 1999. He never once responded, even with a "no thanks." I offered to send him, for reviewing, my 1998 book, but he refused. But I learned that he had read it by 2010. In fact, he asked at least one of his contributors to his *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. 24 (the 2012 issue), to not mention or cite my name or work. Hmmm.

As for the astronomical part of my 2012 interpretation, it's an alignment within the precession of the equinoxes. I appreciate that you see the same evidence for a pre-Classical awareness of precession that I've cited and discussed (Hatch, etc), and your additional insights lock that in even more clearly. And now that we have Michael Grofe's findings on the sidereal year, at Tortuguero and Palenque and elsewhere, the accurate calculation by the ancient Maya of a future sidereal position of the sun at a significant Creation Myth location (the Crossroads / Dark Rift) doesn't seem so far fetched.

Of course, the real problem has been that my many academic critics have never accurately summarized what my work is about, nor do they discuss the evidence and arguments I've brought to bear on my interpretations. Instead, they lampoon and use *ad hominem* lingo and assert falsehoods about my background and ideas. Stan Guenter, David Stuart, Ed Krupp, Anthony Aveni ... the list is very long. A clear case for this is in the essay published by Hoopes and Whitesides, which was the runner-up for the prize-winning essay in 2012 (in *Zeitschrift fur Anomalistik*).

I was able to publish my critique of at least five unambiguous errors: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf> Their response was to wiggle around acknowledging every single one of them, a real travesty. So, that's apparently how it works when an outsider offers breakthrough work. Now, twenty years later, we're seeing those ideas seep into the general discourse, even while the mitigation machine continues. For example, when Krupp, in his preface to *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy* sneers at the 2012 "End Times Follies", we can look back on his presentations and articles and find that he indicts me as the main choreographer of these Follies, a main cause of the 2012 doomsday mess.

And then Krupp immediately cites Aveni's 2009 book — the only book on 2012 published by a scholar with a university press. In his book, apart from at least 7 factual errors, Aveni constructs an argument that I (and others) are "Gnostics" who engage in "New Age Gnosticism". He then conflates me with Blavatsky and Theosophy via a guilt-by-association construct. Since when is the perception of one's religious affiliation

grounds for critiquing someone's scholarly work? None of his reviewers or colleagues seem to have been willing to point out that this is essentially religious bigotry. The reason why is that Aveni performed a function of mitigation, and meanwhile Carlson states the same interpretation of what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 that I presented in my 1998 book, a book that is never accurately characterized and is always denigrated.

It's been a quite disappointing experience, these past 25 years. I've been cordial and invitational with scholars, at least up to the point where they got really nasty and I had to put my foot down (see, e.g., <http://www.Update2012.com>). I suspect that there will be more developments and findings that will be supportive of my work in the coming years (as if Tortuguero Monument 6 wasn't enough), and the truth will eventually come out. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

No follow-up responses from Coggins were received. So, once again, there was no chance for dialogue with a scholar who was belatedly beginning to follow the same track of evidence and deductions that I pioneered many years ago.

Item 6c. Cover letter with review of the anthology, to editors Milbrath and Dowd

Cover letter, Subject: Partial Review of *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy*.

Dear Susan Milbrath and Anne Dowd,

June 3, 2015

I am enclosing an adapted and personalized version of my forthcoming review-essay of *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*. Overall, it is a welcome contribution to the field, and congratulations! But there are a few problems. I've learned over the years to not expect too much in the way of dialogue with scholars and critics, even if they have directly and publicly commented misleadingly on my work. However, I really hope you will seriously consider my concerns articulated in my enclosed essay.

It should be of interest and a concern to you because, in essence, you should come away with the awareness that "oh my, in the anthology of articles that we supervised and edited, two of the contributors have echoed, and presented as their own proposals, ideas that were actually argued, articulated, and published long ago by another researcher." This circumstance is compounded by the fact that I had communicated with and sent my work to both of the relevant contributors (Carlson and Coggins) in the 1990s. I will offer that, in a recent cordial communicate with Coggins about her article, she acknowledged that she apparently overlooked how some of her ideas reiterated my own, and offered to acknowledge my work in a future publication. Carlson's relation to my work is a more difficult matter, which my essay explains.

There are also difficult implications, that you should be made aware of, with the denigrating comment by Krupp, regarding the 2012 "End Times Follies," as well as the frequent and

favorable citations to Aveni's 2009 book *2012: The End of Time*.

I offer an informed and concerned critique of your book — the enclosed customized excerpt contains only a partial review that focuses on selected aspects of it. I hope that one or both of you will offer a considered response. I can boil this down to shorter treatments for publishing in various places, and I'd like to be able to report that the editors have offered a considered response. Generally, I'm happy that these ideas are getting out there; we just need to get the proper credit and sequence of discovery correct, which I'm sure you will agree is important for the published record. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

[P.S.] For your convenience I paste below my entire letter/review. I also attach it as an MSWord document.

Dear Susan Milbrath and Anne Dowd, June 3, 2015

I read with great interest the recent anthology you both co-edited together, *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (University Press of Colorado). I'm writing a review-essay and wanted to share some observations directly with you. My treatment must be a review-*essay* because there are related matters and back stories that the contributors and the various ideas within the anthology require a deeper explication of.

First, congratulations! It's a great collection of essays. Given that the essays were based on the SAA meeting of April 2012, I suppose it's not surprising that the 2012 period-ending was mentioned in many of the essays, and was even the subject of an interpretation offered by Carlson as well as a denigration offered by Krupp. My comments will focus on these occurrences and related research — in the essays by Krupp, Carlson, Milbrath, Dowd, Aveni and related archaeoastronomy in Coggins.

A little back story. I presented at the 2010 SAA meeting, invited by Robert Benfer and Larry Adkins for their Archaeoastronomy panel. My subject was the astronomy of the 13 dates in the Tortuguero monument 6 "2012" inscription, with a focus on the astronomical parallel between Lord Jaguar's birthday (Date 1 in the text) and the 2012 period ending (Date 13 in the text). My point here is that there were breakthroughs afoot that supported my earlier work to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, but it was suppressed. (See appendix 1 for the rest of this preamble).

My interpretation, evident in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* and many subsequent books, essays, and presentation, is this: **The creators of the Long Count calendar intended the 2012 period-ending date to target a rare alignment within the precession of the equinoxes, that of the December solstice sun aligning with the Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic at the southern terminus of the Dark Rift in the Milky Way. This astronomy was associated with a World Age doctrine and the ballgame/Hero Twin mythology at Izapa, in which deity sacrifice was necessary in order to facilitate world-renewal.** My work is based

largely on the archaeoastronomy, topography, and iconography of Izapa, following a methodology of "environmental determinants" articulated by Isbell (1982).

My interpretation that 2012 was thought of, by the Long Count's creators, as involving *deity sacrifice and world-renewal* is echoed in Carlson's essay in your anthology. Although his work is based in Classic Period evidence, and mine in the pre-Classic evidence at Izapa, it's not much of a stretch to understand that the idea-complex formulated at Izapa morphed into a similar doctrine held in the Classic Period. Carlson, however, did not cite or mention my earlier work which anticipated his own interpretations of 2012. I had sent him my essay proposals, for his *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, in 1994, 1995, and 1999. In my submitted queries I sent various articles I had written as well as my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. I had a brief phone conversation with him in 1998, but he declined to review my book. By 2010 he stated in a presentation he gave [at the Robbins Museum] that he had read my book, and that my knowledge of Mesoamerican astronomy was lacking — that I didn't know about, for example, the Year-Drift Formula. This was either pure ignorance or a calculated smear, since the Year Drift is discussed in my 1998 as well as my earlier book of 1992. It is even listed in the Indexes of both books.

In 2011 Carlson green-lighted the publication, in volume 22 of his journal, a review-essay by John Hoopes that further maligned my reputation and ideas, by asserting an accusation that I worked as an astrologer (thus, was a pseudoscience guy) and had plagiarized my 2012 astronomy ideas from astrologer Dane Rudhyar. Both were totally false assertions (Rudhyar never discussed the galactic alignment), and were not supported by Hoopes with any evidence or citations. In these assertions I am accused of plagiarism and astrological pseudoscience, yet no evidence was cited for these slanderous statements, and editor Carlson did not flag these unsupported assertions. I questioned Hoopes cordially; he ignored me, then blocked my emails. I thus asked the University of Texas Press, which published Carlson's journal, to facilitate my request for evidence for the malicious assertions. They sent my request to Carlson and he simply asserted there was nothing wrong (nothing wrong with his author making slanderous assertions without providing any evidence). Meanwhile, shortly thereafter, during the preparation of Volume 24 of his journal (which was the "2012" edition containing contributions by Grofe, MacLeod, Callaway, Hoopes, Van Stone, Sitler, Whitesides, and himself) he asked at least one of his contributors *to refrain from mentioning me or citing my work*. In this volume we find Carlson's interpretation of 2012, much like in your anthology, that 2012 was to be understood as a world-renewal facilitated by deity sacrifice. Again, this same interpretation was central to my work of the 1990s, submitted to Carlson for publication in his journal in the 1990s.

By the way, I never received any response from my essay proposals of 1994, 1995, and 1999 — not even a "no thanks." I think this all underscores an unethical, malicious, and juvenile attitude of Carlson, maintained and supported, unfortunately, in your anthology. It's not clear if Carlson directly plagiarized my idea, or if he was suspecting the same interpretation about 2012 that I had explicated, documented, argued, and published much earlier than he did (some early cite-able references for my work

would be my 1997 presentation at the Institute of Maya Studies, my five presentation-classes at Naropa University (1999), my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, my 2010 SAA paper, and others. If scholars are willing to cite *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* in order to falsely lampoon, denigrate, and dismiss it, they should also be willing to cite it for what it actually contains — namely, my reconstruction of what the ancient Maya thought about 2012.

Clemency Coggins' essay was very interesting. I had corresponded with her about my work in 1996. Her idea that the Polar Region was a cosmic center idea, with an associated deity, that had descended into the Tropics from an ancient Eurasian prototype precisely reflects my own model which I proposed in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. I appreciated that she cited the same academic sources and evidence (Hatch, etc) that I had cited for a pre-Classic awareness of the precession of the equinoxes. She also explicated a "rise-fall" dialectic in the Group A and Group B monuments from Izapa which I had also perceived. However, she missed understanding that the Big Dipper constellation rose over the northern horizon of Izapa, over Tacana volcano, at sundown on the winter solstice during Izapa's heyday. (Her Fig. 5.16 on page 128 shows the stars of the Big Dipper over the northern horizon, as viewed from Izapa, but neglects depicting Tacana Volcano, as I do in my diagrams in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*). She also neglected mentioning and incorporating Izapa Group F (with the Izapa ballcourt aligning to the December solstice azimuth and associated throne monuments) into her interpretations. As such, she is getting close to a full understanding of Izapa cosmology, partially replicating elements of my own work on the site. But, of course, she did not cite or mention my earlier work.

These omissions, despite my early communications with Carlson and Coggins, are disappointing enough. More so, Susan, in that you also have also been aware of my work and received a review copy of my book in 1998. But I can't really be sure, despite our email communications of 2000-2001 and our exchange in the pages of the IMS newsletter in 2007-2008, how clearly you understand what my work is about. (Again, it can be boiled down to a simple two-part interpretation involving astronomy and an ideology, as defined above in **bold**). And, of course, it's perhaps not your role as co-editor to help your contributors write their essays with proper citations to earlier work done by other researchers.

Disappointing as this is, it gets worse when we look at Krupp's preface. I had several snail-mail exchanges on my work with Krupp between 1996 and 1999, and he received a review copy of my book in 1998. But a follow-up letter in 1999 was ignored. That's the last I heard of him until his snidely slanderous *Sky & Telescope* article of November 2009, in which he called my book the primary cause of the 2012 mania (falsely fingering me as an architect of the doomsday mess, which in fact I've critiqued and spoken against many times; again my findings relate to a world-renewal doctrine, not doomsday). But Krupp was adept at malicious allusions and loaded lingo, eventually making me the chief choreographer of his "End Times Follies." We see this explicitly, and quite recently, in one of the articles he wrote for *The Handbook of Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy*, released less than a year ago with Springer Publications. In his preface for your anthology, released in May of 2015, he sneers at the End Times

Follies and cites Aveni's 2009 book *2012: The End of Time* (also published with the University Press of Colorado), as the preeminent source for debunking the Follies. Krupp doesn't mention me explicitly in his preface, but by referencing his earlier essays and presentation, we can understand his allusion. So, in Krupp's construct he sneers and dismisses me as the main architect of 2012 pseudoscience and/or the doomsday mess, bolstering his malicious viewpoint while citing Aveni's book for support.

Now for a really interesting sub-story. You should find this informative as well as amusing. A "corrected" version of Aveni's 2009 book was released by the UP of C Press (eBook only) in May of 2015 — the same month as your anthology. Months earlier, in January of 2015, I had contacted Darrin Pratt, director of the University Press of Colorado, and inquired as to their errata policy. He explained to me their standard process. The factual errors that I sought an errata for were in Aveni's 2009 book, which was almost out of print, so inserting an errata sheet was not a useful solution, but Darrin said that we could figure something out. I then sent him seven errors that I had carefully selected. The first two involved Aveni's mistaken assessment of Grofe's work, which he already acknowledged in a communication with Grofe in 2009 (and which Grofe corrected in his IAU article of 2011 and his *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. 24 article of 2012). I share below the other five errors, in brief. For more details see Appendix 2 below.

1. Aveni's supporting citation to a section of my 1998 book (*Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*) that does not, in fact, provide support for his demeaning assertion about my attitude toward Maya scholars and their critiques. Pages 23-24.
2. The use of religious bigotry as a critique: The false assertion that I belong to the religion called Gnosticism, packaged with his bigoted application of his belief, supposedly demonstrating that a Gnostic religious persuasion (or *any* religious persuasion) can invalidate ones scholarly work. Pages 15-16, 18, 23, 151, 158-159.
3. Factually incorrect statement regarding the Izapa ballcourt's horizon alignment, stated 48° in error. Pages 54-55.
4. Incorrect reporting of the McKenna brothers' 1975 book as a "booklet" published in "1971". Page 16.
5. Next is an error of astronomical understanding, in terms of his reading of my proposed method of tracking precession within the Tropics, and is on par with Aveni's mistakes regarding the precessional astronomy in Michael Grofe's work.

These were not trivial or meaningless errors. They have had damaging consequences that continue to this day. Some were explicitly cited by other scholars (e.g., Restall & Solari, 2011) as proof that my astronomical ideas about 2012 (involving precession) had been "debunked". Other scholars continued to cite Aveni as a viable critique of my work (Van Stone 2010, Grofe 2011, Whitesides & Hoopes, 2014). And now, Krupp

(2015), not to mention that your anthology is basically an homage to Aveni, with many laudatory citations to his 2009 book. And what of the “corrected” eBook, offered in May of 2015? While executed and finalized in April of 2015, it totally ignored all of my corrections.

The aftermath of sending Aveni’s academic publisher the unambiguous errors is illuminating. After four weeks of consulting with his “valued advisors,” Darrin Pratt responded to me in late February 2015 that *none of my errors could actually be confirmed as being errors*. Aveni didn’t agree that they were, and Pratt’s “valued advisors” didn’t either. Well, as a control I had included a fairly trivial guffaw, in which Aveni stated that the 1975 book by the McKenna brothers (published in hardback with book jacket) was a “booklet” of “1971.” A 7th-grader on Google could check and confirm that error in about two minutes. But no, not one of the errors I had explicated and supported with evidence could be acknowledged as being verifiable errors. (Actually, Aveni added a note on page 173 of the corrected eBook that addressed his mistaken readings of Grofe’s work, in which he claimed he had caught this before Grofe pointed it out to him (uh, no). I had listed these as two of my errors, but I was told that Aveni was already planning on correcting that, based on Grofe’s communication with him about it in 2009, so that was already in the pipeline and was not a function of my own noting of it).

Well, much like Carlson defending Hoopes, we have an AAUP-approved university press defending the factual errors and unethical bigotry of one of their authors — apparently because it supports the mitigation of my work, *even while my pioneering ideas are being reiterated in one of their other publications!* Yes, let’s state this clearly:

- Aveni’s corrected book of 2009, released in May of 2015, denies any corrections are necessary in his assessment of 2012 and my work, maintaining as valid his false debunking of my work and ideas about 2012.
- Also released in May of 2015, we have your anthology in which Carlson argues the “deity sacrifice and world-renewal” interpretation of 2012 that I pioneered in the 1990s, while Dowd suggests it to be “the beginning of a new cycle” and likens it to “repetitive seasonal transitions” at the winter solstice (p. 40; these are rather clinical articulations of the “world-renewal in 2012” idea), and Coggins echoes core elements of my reconstruction work on pre-Classic precession and shifting cosmic centers in Izapa cosmology (which is the foundation of my 2012 astronomy work).
- Krupp’s preface in the anthology favorably cites Aveni’s 2009 for debunking the 2012 “End Times Follies,” which I (if we reference Krupp’s previously published assertions) am the primary choreographer of.¹

¹ Krupp mentions the Xultun murals that Aveni and Saturno published on (2012), as proof against the “extravagant and pseudoscientific claims about the Maya calendar” (xxiii). (Again, the not-so-secret allusion here is to my work.) However, Krupp neglects noting that Aveni’s interpretations of the Xultun dates evolved with the 2014 publication he wrote with the Brickers. In it, they explicitly reconstructed the astronomy of three dates involving a lunar eclipse, full moon, and Mars positions — all being located at the two opposed

In a final irony that underscores the cognitive dissonance diagnostic of these shenanigans, we have the curious book cover for *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*. The Milky Way arches straight above a dawning sunrise horizon, with the Dark Rift and the nuclear bulge of the Galactic Center at or slightly below the horizon. The dawning light is beginning to enliven the sky; the sun must be on the ecliptic where it runs through the nuclear bulge, just below the horizon. And the vertical Milky Way is evocative of the Maya Sacred Tree of *Maya Cosmos* (1993), which Aveni has repeatedly disagreed with and that many other scholars follow him in dismissing. But more than an image of Schele’s vertical tree, the book cover design depicts the sun’s alignment with the Milky Way — a version of the “galactic alignment” that is the centerpiece of my much-denigrated and criticized reconstruction work! (Including Milbrath’s comments in her piece published in the *IMS Explorer*, December 2007, also posted on her Academia.edu page). I don’t know whether I should laugh or cry.

Appendix 1. Back story on my Tortuguero 2012 inscription essay (2010, 2014)

I read a paper at the 2010 SAA meeting, invited by Robert Benfer and Larry Adkins for their archaeoastronomy panel. My subject was the astronomy of the 13 dates in the Tortuguero monument 6 “2012” inscription, with a focus on the astronomical parallel between Lord Jaguar’s birthday and the 2012 date. I explicated collaborative work I did with Michael Grofe and Barb MacLeod in 2009, drawing (with his permission) from one of Grofe’s discoveries. My paper led to a discussion with Dr. Ed Barnhart. He and the scholars on the board of the Maya Exploration Center (MEC) subsequently approved and sponsored a unique online debate/discussion about my paper. I personally invited Maya scholars and astronomers, including my critics. It unfolded over four weeks in late 2010, and ultimately was quite revealing of certain prejudices and malicious mitigation tactics employed by three critics. It was much more vigorous than Barnhart had anticipated it would be, and a 92,000-word transcribed document was generated and posted on the MEC website in early 2011.

The entire episode provided a public peer-review debate of my SAA paper, orders of magnitude more rigorous than the normal peer-review process, that factored into revisions for the planned Benfer/Adkins archaeoastronomy anthology, which I was invited to contribute to. This essay was written, edited,

Crossroads of the Milky Way and the ecliptic. This significant sidereal backdrop of these eclipse and Mars positions (the Crossroads) *was not portrayed in the EZCosmos images employed by the authors*. The Crossroads is meaningful in many astronomical alignments on dates in the inscriptions, which provide a growing body of evidence for my “solstice sun aligning with Sagittarian Crossroads in 2012” reconstruction — including dates from Copan, Palenque, Tikal, La Corona, Chichen Itza, Quirigua, and Tortuguero. See, e.g., my 2010 SAA presentation and an early articulation of this alignment principle in my letter to Schele (1994), letter to Robert Hall (1994, sent to Carlson in 1995), my 1998 book and my IMS presentations (1997, 2011). See my essay at *The Center for 2012 Studies*.

revised, and reduced three times before completion in early 2012. By late 2012 I was informed by Benfer that my paper was rejected, with no good reasons given, by one malicious peer-reviewer, who went further to contact the University Press of Florida to demand that the anthology could not be published if it included my essay. By late 2013, even after Benfer's efforts to reconcile, he had to acquiesce to the press's request to censor my essay. He sadly informed me that, to be fair to the other contributors, my paper had to be removed from the anthology. He said he regarded it as the most unfair decision of his career, a travesty. He would not tell me who the malicious reviewer was; I later learned that there were two scholars involved. My completed 9200-word essay remains unpublished. However, a rewritten version based on it was published in the Arts & Philosophy journal called *Clavis* in late 2014.

Appendix 2: A Selection of Five Errors in Aveni's 2009 Book 2012: *The End of Time*

The following are all errors that unbiased readers can certainly agree are errors, but which Maya scholar/archaeoastronomer Anthony Aveni himself, his university press publisher (Darrin Pratt, director of the University Press of Colorado), and certain "valued advisors" have all denied are actually errors and thus they evade correcting them, in violation of basic academic ethics and errata policy.

1. Aveni's supporting citation to a section of my 1998 book (*Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*) that does not, in fact, provide support for his demeaning assertion about my attitude toward Maya scholars and their critiques. Pages 23-24.

He stated: "Jenkins' ideas have not been well received among mainstream Maya scholars, who place little stock in subjective analogies and knowledge acquired through revelation" (implying, falsely, that this is my *modus operandi*). Aveni continues: "Meanwhile, freelancer Jenkins responds by disparaging the academic community of Mayanists who, he says, have shut him out and ignored him."¹⁸

As his support for this statement, the superscripted end-note 18 refers to Appendix 5 in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (see the note on p. 168 of his book). Again, Aveni's assertion that I was "disparaging the academic community of Mayanists" and that I say I've been "shut out and ignored" **is not supported**. The issue here is that, in that entire appendix which he cites, *there is no statement or even an insinuation by me that I am complaining about being "ignored" or "shut out."* My appendix responds in a clear and cordial manner to Linda Schele's critique of 2012 ideas (which she wrote in 1994 and posted in 1996), including a few that are central to my work. My response is titled "Response to Counterarguments".

To heighten the irony, if we actually read my Appendix 5, which Aveni cites as support for his false and misleading comments, we find me supportively citing Aveni himself in my penultimate concluding paragraph (regarding the Maya awareness of precession). **So, there is NOTHING in that cited source to support Aveni's misleading and disparaging characterization of me. AND, in fact, the appendix shows**

me engaging the critical counterarguments in a productive, informed, reasonable, and fact-based manner while citing Aveni himself for a scholar's supportive perspective which is congruent with my own.

2. The use of religious bigotry as a critique: The false assertion that I belong to the religion called Gnosticism, packaged with his bigoted application of his belief, supposedly demonstrating that a Gnostic religious persuasion (or *any* religious persuasion) can invalidate one's scholarly work. Pages 15-16, 18, 23, 151, 158-159.

There is no wiggle room in this one, no matter how shocking it may seem. I am introduced in a list of modern writers (15-16) after Aveni defines Gnosticism and states: "These words fit today's 2012 wisdom seekers like a glove." He then uses this perceived religious persuasion as a frequently referenced discrediting label while he negatively judges my well-documented and argued scholarly work to reconstruct ancient Maya astronomy and beliefs. He uses "New Age Gnostic" (151) as a label applicable to me and others who are interested in the precession of the equinoxes and ancient mythology. He refers to me as "prophet Jenkins" (158) and (in counterposing me to scientist Frank Drake) alludes to me as a "Gnostic New Age prophet" (158). His guilt-by-association constructs of my work being allied with Arguelles and Blavatsky, in order to further consolidate his denigrating "Gnostic," "star-fixed," and mystically "galactic" associations, are twisted and forced (157-158) and rely heavily on flippant and presumptuous assertions.

3. Factually incorrect statement regarding the Izapa ballcourt's horizon alignment, stated 48° in error. Pages 54-55.

Aveni's entire discussion of my Izapa ballcourt alignment work is problematic on several fronts, but his wildly inaccurate statement of the ballcourt's alignment is a factual error with serious consequences (e.g., it could be cited as authoritative "proof" that the ballcourt does not align with the December solstice sunrise horizon). Even though Aveni & Hartung (2000) accurately echoed my earlier Izapa ballcourt calculation (1996, 1998), here in his 2009 book he remembers it and *states it incorrectly* — and a 48° error is not minor. Tellingly, he also evades correctly noting that I had discovered this independently and was the first to publish it. Instead, he directs the reader to Guernsey's Izapa book which in fact does not discuss the Group F ballcourt.

4. Incorrect reporting of the McKenna brothers' 1975 book as a "booklet" published in "1971". Page 16.

No, it was a full-scale hardback book published in 1975. This is a basic factual correction, which I decided to include as a reality check. Reality was indeed checked and left at the door, because this basic error is among the errors that the University Press of Colorado, their valued advisors, and the author, Aveni, all have denied are actually errors (emails of February 2015). It's more than a typo, and suggests that Aveni didn't even have the book in hand (instead, he apparently draws from Geoff Stray's website for a summary of the McKennas' ideas).

5. This is an error of astronomical understanding, in terms of my proposed method of tracking precession within the tropics, and is on par with Aveni's mistakes regarding Michael Grofe's work. In discussing how the Maya might have been tracking precession, Aveni writes:

Or you could track "one day of precession" by noting the slow shifting of the stars in the zenith, or the shifting dates of solar relative to stellar zenith passages, as some investigators have suggested¹⁰ (104).

The end-note 10 refers to Appendix 3 and other pages in my 1998 book. The reference is to my identification of the sun and the Pleiades conjoining in the zenith as a central element in the New Fire Ceremony, which I discovered was also embedded into the architecture and orientation of the Pyramid of Kukulcan at Chichen Itza. This was unprecedented work, argued over several chapters in my 1998 book, though Aveni characterizes it as being "suggested" by "some investigators" (plural).

The problem here is how he dismisses it in the next sentence: "Once again, however, the problem is that stars shift at a variable rate" (104). This is true for stars that *are not on or very close to the ecliptic*. My model utilizes the sun (which is by definition on the ecliptic) and the Pleiades star cluster, which is very close to the ecliptic. Unlike stars far from the ecliptic, both of these shift at a constant rate with precession. The model involves the fact that the sun will be at the nadir when the Pleiades pass through the zenith *at midnight* (in November, which defines the New Fire Ceremony and the 52-Haab Calendar Round). Consequently, I noted that this means the sun and the Pleiades will be in conjunction exactly six months later, in May. The timing of this sun-Pleiades conjunction shifts with precession and slowly approaches the date of the solar zenith-passage in late May. The specific date of the solar zenith-passage is a function of latitude, but at Chichen Itza it targets a precessional alignment of "the sun and the Pleiades in the zenith" that is occurring in the 21st century AD — thus coordinating, via a totally different method of precessional calculation, with the Long Count's era-2012 galactic alignment.

Thus, my work reconstructs how the Pyramid of Kukulcan, combined with the New Fire Ceremony, is a "precessional star clock set in stone" (Jenkins 1996, 1998). And the "forgotten galactic paradigm" (which I also refer to as "the galactic cosmology") involves the coordination of these two cosmologies at 9th-century Chichen Itza. This has nothing to do with Arguelles's "galactic" ideas, as Aveni earlier portrayed. Aveni's rationale for dismissing the relevance of this unprecedented work is totally flawed because the solar and stellar features are not subject to the "variable rate" that he states is "the problem." (Which, again, would only effect stars not on, or very close to, the ecliptic.)

The failure of Dr. Anthony Aveni and his university press publisher (the University Press of Colorado) to acknowledge errors and employ a strategy for registering corrigenda to correct the published record is diagnostic of a broken academic system. More specifically, it underscores the irrational, unscientific, cloak-and-dagger strategy that many scholars have employed in order to discredit my work. I've chosen Aveni as a

premier example of this unacceptable behavior by professional scholars and publishers because he is among the top Mesoamerican scholars (and his expertise is astronomy and archaeoastronomy, the areas of my own work). Myself and others have been labeled charlatans, "New Age Gnostics," or pseudoscientists by Aveni and other 2012 critics within Maya Studies. But where is the pseudo (false) science actually occurring? A scientist who does not acknowledge and correct his errors is not really practicing science. And a university-mandated press that protects the bigotry and factual errors of its author cannot honestly be considered a reputable and reliable academic publisher.

Final Note: The cognitive dissonance in the University Press of Colorado's behavior is underscored in their two releases of May 2015: 1) Aveni's allegedly corrected book of 2009 and 2) the new anthology, *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in ancient Mesoamerica* (edited by Anne Dowd and Susan Milbrath). The former refused to register timely corrections while maintaining false and damaging assertions about my religious persuasion and my scholarly work; the latter both cites Aveni's 2009 as a viable and reliable source of critique on the 2012 "follies" (Krupp) while other contributors echo my core interpretations of 2012, in both the astronomical and ideological aspects (Carlson, Coggins). And, strikingly, the book's very cover image depicts the same kind of solar alignment with the Milky Way, highlighting the Dark Rift in the Milky Way aligned with the sun, that is the centerpiece of my much denigrated and dismissed reconstruction work, published since the mid-1990s.

Okay, that's it. I'd be interested in your reply and thoughts on this extraordinary situation. The attention to it may end up being much more high-profile than you might imagine. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
the2012story@gmail.com
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

Item 6d. Ensuing emails with Milbrath

Susan Milbrath responded curtly:

June 4, 2015

Sorry John that you are offended by not being cited. Scholarship is always evolving and sometimes people even come up with the same ideas. I am not interested in getting into whether there is any truth to your claim that these scholars are stealing your ideas. Because you send scholars a self-published book does not mean that they ever read it. In fact, many people may just toss unsolicited materials or block the sender, in the case of email.

Susan Milbrath, Ph.D.
Curator of Latin American Art and Archaeology
Florida Museum of Natural History
Dickinson Hall, Museum Road

University of Florida, Box 117800
Gainesville, FL 32611-7800
[352-273-1918](tel:352-273-1918)

Susan, June 4, 2015
You wrote: "I am not interested in getting into whether there is any truth to your claim that these scholars are stealing your ideas."

I did not claim that these scholars were stealing my ideas.
Did you read my email? I didn't conclude or assert that Carlson or Coggins were "stealing" my ideas. I will be happy to re-quote what I actually stated in my email, if you need me to. What can be said is that both of them, having by their own admission been demonstrably aware of my work for many years prior to SAA 2012, forgot or, in Carlson's case, intentionally neglected to cite or mention my earlier interpretations which anticipated his own. That is demonstrable. Will the published record correct itself? Well, only if those editors, authors, and publishers who are responsible for upholding academic standards are willing to be fair, principled, and reasonable. So far the track record is pretty appalling.

One issue to raise with your anthology is that, given that your contributors are, by whatever route of their own research, echoing my long-ago published interpretation of 2012 and pre-Classic Izapa, how do you and your publisher reconcile the simultaneous denigration of my work, courtesy of Krupp and citations to Aveni's demonstrably flawed book of 2009? I provided the details in my email. Do you see the contradiction? That is one thing I'm trying to point out here, so the publishing record does not continue to write me out of the narrative while my work gets revived and adopted into the consensus through others.

It was proven that Carlson received my article submissions and proposals in the mid-to-late 1990s, because he had xeroxed a piece I had sent him and he sent that later to John Hoopes. Also, I talked to Carlson on the phone in 1998.

The spiral-bound book (and essays) I sent to you and other scholars in 1997-98 was the prototype that became, with a few alterations, the published book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998). It was a trade book, exactly like 4 of the 5 books on 2012 published by scholars that are frequently cited. It was not, like Van Stone's 2012 book, a "self-published" book. While you might not have read it, or even opened it, our email conversations in 2000 show that you were aware of my work. This kind of direct communication with other scholars also occurred with, for example, Carlson, Coggins, Krupp, and Aveni.

I'm sorry if this is an uncomfortable conversation. I feel I'm being diplomatic and my comments and questions are reasonable. I wouldn't bring them to your attention, or publish them in a review-essay, if they weren't well-grounded in facts and evidence.

So, while it's understandable you wouldn't want to address my supposed "claim" that my ideas were stolen (which, again, is NOT what I stated), perhaps you can suggest a proactive

process by which the ideas central to my work that are expressed in your anthology can be discussed and debated, as well as some way that my other concerns and observations can be addressed by responsible scholars in a professional way? For, the fact remains that your anthology simultaneously denigrates the 2012 "End Times Follies", for which (according to Krupp) I am supposedly the main choreographer, while my core ideas about 2012 and Izapa cosmology are being echoed in two other articles in the anthology (Carlson and Coggins).

Can there be any acknowledgment that you are hearing and understand my concerns and critique, or is there just going to be a flat-out rejection that they are reasonable and valid? Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Immediate response from Milbrath:

June 4

Sorry John, that is just what you do say below—you accuse John Carlson of stealing your ideas: “in Carlson's case, intentionally neglected to cite or mention my earlier interpretations which anticipated his own.” Then you say: “It was proven that Carlson received my article submissions and proposals in the mid-to-late 1990s, because he had xeroxed a piece I had sent him and he sent that later to John Hoopes. Also, I talked to Carlson on the phone in 1998.”

Then you accuse us as editors of not being fair and reasonable, suggesting we should have had John acknowledge a debt to you: “Will the published record correct itself? Well, only if those editors, authors, and publishers who are responsible for upholding academic standards are willing to be fair, principled, and reasonable.” In other words Anne and I are accused of not upholding academic standards. Then you go on to say: “how do you and your publisher reconcile the simultaneous denigration of my work, courtesy of Krupp and citations to Aveni's demonstrably flawed book of 2009?” I am copying this to John Carlson, as I do think he should know what you are saying about him. I won't copy this to Tony and Ed, as I am sure they long ago stopped communicating with you, and now I see why. Signing off for good.

Susan Milbrath, Ph.D.

Dear Susan, June 4
You have fully misunderstood my statements and have jumped to a wrong conclusion ... [Here is the email I sent to Milbrath and John Carlson, which is in full in **Item 5e** above. There was no response from either Milbrath or Carlson to this.]
—end of email

I found Milbrath's irrational insistence on misreading my actual words, and her unwillingness to acknowledge what I'd actually stated from the very beginning of our correspondence, to be perplexing and unprofessional. I tried to help her perceive what I'd actually stated by restating what I actually stated and which she refused to acknowledge:

June 5

Briefly, it may be helpful if I do re-quote a passage from my review-essay, sent in my first email to you:

"It's not clear if Carlson directly plagiarized my idea, **or if he was suspecting the same interpretation about 2012 that I had explicated**, documented, argued, and published much earlier than he did..."

If you could get past the erroneous fixation that I've unambiguously claimed that "stealing" of my ideas occurred, we could probably have a productive conversation.

John Major Jenkins

June 13

Email to Milrath and Dowd, sharing Krupp's words

Dear Susan and Anne, June 13, 2015
I recently communicated with Ed Krupp, and confirmed that he does indeed see me as being part of the 2012 Maya calendar "End Times Follies" that he alluded to in his Preface to your anthology. He wrote in his email to me (June 9, 2015):

There is ample documentation to associate your first book and related activities with all of what I actually called the "2012 Maya Calendar End Times Follies." ... If I were to write another piece specifically on the 2012 theme, it would be folly to omit you.

His 2014 article in *Handbook of Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy*, as well as an updated version of his 2009 *Sky & Telescope* article (published in *iQ Magazine*, December 2012), also make it clear that he believes my work was a primary foundation and player in this "End Times Follies." While he qualified that this doesn't necessarily mean I advocated doomsday, his Beckman Center talk of November 2009 certainly gives this impression.

He didn't explicitly mention me in his Preface, apparently due to brevity considerations and his focus on Aveni's work. But, my point is that, his allusion to the End Times Follies is simply a short-hand nod to the allegedly dubious work of myself and others. The issue here is that he's constructed a category that disallows my work on 2012 to be relevant to "real" academic work. No contribution to our understanding of 2012 can be found there. However, as I've tried to convey to you, the main point of me contacting you was to underscore a contradiction that exists in your anthology. That being the fact that two of your other contributors echo my long-ago published ideas on 2012, Izapa cosmology, and pre-Classic precessional cosmology (Carlson and Coggins). These are facts. You either disagree with the facts or won't acknowledge this contradiction, both of which I find unacceptable.

Importantly, I'd like to get your assurance that you understand that I was not accusing Carlson or Coggins of "plagiarism," as you insisted I did. My position was explicitly clear in passages that I wrote in my email to you, such as:

"It's not clear if Carlson directly plagiarized my idea, or if he was suspecting the same interpretation about 2012 that I had explicated, documented, argued, and published much earlier than he did..."

"...in a recent cordial communique with Coggins about her article, she acknowledged that she apparently overlooked how some of her ideas reiterated my own, and offered to acknowledge my work in a future publication."

I also sent Carlson the full review-essay I had sent you, so he can be fully informed of my observations (I wasn't sure if you had forwarded the entire thing to him when you said you were informing him of my supposed "accusations"). I also queried him regarding the similar ideology we both found, that relates to 2012. As I already mentioned, I feel this could be fleshed out as pre-Classic and Classic Period inflections of the same underlying period-ending doctrine (deity sacrifice and world-renewal). But no response, as usual, from Carlson. His huge ego apparently prevents him from acknowledging my work so that Maya Studies can progress. Instead, he and his buddy Hoopes continue to craft mitigations and work-arounds so that my prior pioneering work gets buried.

I was hoping that other scholars would not abet or participate in this deception, and that at least a few scholars might be able to be honest and fair, and could respond to facts and evidence as to the sequence of discovery and publication of certain ideas about 2012. One need look no further than my own SAA presentation, in 2010, which preceded by over two years the SAA 2012 presentations that comprise your anthology. But if you wanted to look further, we could trace my interpretations on 2012 back to *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998) and my 1997 *Institute of Maya Studies* presentation ("The Astronomy of Baktun 13"), which is now transcribed.

So, the un-answered question remains, as I wrote in my earlier email:

"One issue to raise with your anthology is that, given that your contributors are, **by whatever route of their own research**, echoing my long-ago published interpretation of 2012 and pre-Classic Izapa, how do you and your publisher reconcile the simultaneous denigration of my work, courtesy of Krupp and citations to Aveni's demonstrably flawed book of 2009?"

The bolded part emphasizes, again, that I wasn't assuming plagiarism. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

Item 6e. Report sent to University of Colorado Press director Darrin Pratt

Since the entire effort with Milbrath was preceded by my concern sent to Darrin Pratt, as to whether its contributors — the usual suspects in the JMJ character assassination plot (Krupp, Aveni, Carlson) — might abuse the auspices of Pratt's publishing house, I felt it incumbent upon me to share with Pratt the results of communications with Krupp, Coggins,

Carlson, and Milbrath. The bulk of the report consists of the actual exchanges, all previously recorded above, and a brief cover letter.

The intent was to be informative, rather than to request some action be taken, since Krupp's reference to my work was cleverly indirect. However, the publication does illustrate how Aveni's book continued to be cited as a viable debunking of the 2012 "folly" of which I was a central choreographer, thus bringing us full circle back to Aveni's book — the foundation of the collapsing house of cards that is the Ivory Tower of Maya Studies. At least, to be fair, Maya Studies as it relates to the reception of breakthroughs in understanding Maya astronomy and calendrical cosmology that were triggered by investigating 2012 and that an accurate understanding of my work would fairly acknowledge.

7. Other files:

- a. My review of Michael Coe's 9th Edition of *The Maya*
- b. My 1995 review-essay of Houston & Stuart (1994)
- c. Letter to Robert Hall (1994), sent to Carlson in 1994
- d. Correlation essays

Item 7a.

The 9th Edition of Michael Coe's *The Maya* (released June 2015)

June 14, 2015 © John Major Jenkins

Before the June solstice of 2015 there have been several publications and revised editions of previous books this year that are critical to understanding how scholars and the "Maya Studies phenomenon"¹ have been integrating (or rejecting) 2012 into the consensus. By "2012" I refer to it in all its multifarious manifestations, which can be boiled down to two areas: 1) the marketplace "pseudoscience" and doomsday mess (under the heading "the 2012 phenomenon") and 2) efforts to reconstruct what the ancient Maya actually thought about 2012.

I met Coe at the 1995 Texas Hieroglyphic meeting, and saw him again at the 2010 SAA meeting. I tried several times to reach him through email, even through the introduction of a mutual friend, but he has never responded. In this review-essay of the 2015 9th edition of Michael Coe's classic book (released June 2015, \$26.95 cover price), I'll compare and discuss some previous statements about 2012 and evolving attitudes. Many other sources could be included in a larger treatment.²

My primary focus here, however, will be on the 9th edition of Coe's classic book *The Maya*. This book, first published in 1966, is now recognized as containing the earliest clear reference to the 13-Baktun period ending, in any publication. It was published with a respected U.K. trade publisher (Thames & Hudson), not a peer-review press or journal. But the credentials of its author give it authority, in a book accessibly written and periodically revised through multiple editions for the lay public. This popular format is convenient for review purposes because it clearly reveals Coe's opinions and attitudes without the technical jargon and arguments of more academically oriented publications.

The 9th edition is a departure from previous editions in a number of ways. It is now significantly revised with the help of Maya epigrapher Stephen Houston, who is given co-author credit and copyright co-ownership. Coe's passage about 2012 being the Maya "Armageddon," which was retained in all previous editions, has now been deleted (without explanation). This is curious, because in his preface to *Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (Gelfer, 2011), Coe wrote that, in the 1980 second edition of his book "...as in all five subsequent editions, I saw no reason to change the wording of my destruction scenario, and will not for the eighth, which is now [in 2010] in preparation" (Coe 2011:xiii). That 8th edition was released in January of 2011.

Houston's voice comes through in a number of areas of the revised 9th edition. There are now plentiful references to his friend David Stuart, who is cited as "proposing" that the 13-Baktun cycle was embedded within a larger Grand Cycle (249). There is no citation given, but perhaps Stuart's 2011 book *The Order of Days* is intended (which is listed in the Further Reading section with the description: "A thorough account of the function and meaning of Maya calendar, with critical comment on the "2012" phenomenon" (312). Or perhaps Stuart's proposal just occurred in personal conversations between them. You see, any conversation scholars have among themselves is a valid reference. In any case, that Stuart "proposed" this seems a stretch, as it's simply a fact of the structure of the Long Count, the higher levels of which have been known for more than a century (Geoff Stray explored this in his "13 vs 20" monograph, released as a fascinating small book in 2012). Houston's intention seems to be to deflate the doomsday notion that time and the Maya calendar stop in 2012. And this desire to mitigate "2012" (in whatever form it appears) clearly underlies Houston's and Stuart's long-held irrational position that 2012 meant nothing to the Maya (except a dull and boring period ending).³

Houston is clearly behind the statement on page 250, to the effect that "the few" explicit 2012 inscriptions now known to scholars are "dull." The full passage:

Much hinges on the meaning of a date mentioned in several sources, 4 Ajaw 8 Kumk'u 13.0.0.0 (14 August 3114 BC). Some scholars describe this as a moment of Creation. When a similar cycle comes to an end, as indeed happened on 24 December AD 2012, it was thought to anticipate another cycle of destruction and creation. (Coe and Houston 2015:249)

Note the passive, cautious, indirect language. "Some scholars ... similar cycle... It was thought to anticipate..." Who is speaking here? "Several" sources? The 3114 BC Era Base date is, according to Callaway's exhaustive study, mentioned in over 20 places, in both Classic Period and post-Classic sources. Houston/Coe continue:

The problem is that the events of 4 Ajaw 8 Kumk'u, although esoteric and difficult to interpret, seem benign rather than catastrophic (ibid. 249).

Here, the authors are embracing an assumed parallel of meaning between the 3114 BC period-ending (or Era Base) and

the 2012 period-ending (or new Era Base). I articulated this idea in my 1995 book *The Center of Maya Time*, maintained and defended it for many years while it was being denounced as an unwarranted assumption until Carl Callaway re-nounced it in his 2011 IAU article. The authors continue to note that the 3114 BC Creation involved “a new hearth place” consisting of “three stones” at “the edge of the sky” (249). The most coherent and compelling Creation Myth statements are, in the authors’ view (probably mainly Houston writing here), at Palenque. Stuart is cited describing the Maya deity GI in at least two inscriptions “ascending to the heavenly throne” (250) followed, “strangely enough,” by the “rebirth of GI” (250).

Now I’ll add some context they neglected to report. This rebirth or “earth touching” of GI occurred on November 8, 2360 BC (584283 correlation, Julian). This date places the sun at the Milky Way/ecliptic crossroads, at the southern terminus of the Dark Rift in the Milky Way, and the iconography on the Tablet of Palenque’s Temple of the Cross (where the Creation Myth inscription is located) reflects this solar placement (Grofe 2011). This means that, significantly, GI was born on a galactic alignment, though some 61 days before the solstice. I reported this in my lengthy review of Stuart’s 2011 book (Jenkins 2011: <http://update2012.com/review-stuartsbook.html>). The authors continue, and here’s the nub:

These are momentous yet hardly horrific events. The few Classic-period citations of 24 December AD 2012, tend, if anything, to be rather dull. They note the expected completion of a cycle but nothing like the prophecies found in Colonial Maya books or among the Aztecs (Coe and Houston 2015:250 – Coe’s *The Maya*, 9th edition).

So, “if anything,” the two 2012 inscriptions are “dull” (otherwise, they are just nothing). This astoundingly irrational and closed-minded position reflects the sentiment of Houston’s statement of 2008, made to the *Maya Decipherment* blog run by his friend David Stuart, that the 2012 inscription from Tortuguero was “truth be told, a bit boring.”⁴ I contributed a comment to Houston’s blog post, which emphasized an important thing about the date relations in the text that were, in fact, quite striking. They suggested that the 2012 date, like the building dedication date it was linked to with a large Distance Number, was thought of as a cosmological renewal (a cosmos re-dedication, just like the building re-dedication it was linked to). A cosmos is a big building or house, and a house is a little cosmos — this is an analogy that Houston himself had written about.

Furthermore, by analogy to the sacrifice rites involved in building dedications, one could logically understand that the idea of ceremonial sacrifice was required for this world-renewal, or cosmos re-dedication. Boring? Dull? On the contrary, it’s quite amazing and — here’s the problem for Houston — it totally supports what I’ve been saying about 2012 for two decades.

Houston did not respond to my comment on the blog. However, an email exchange between him and Mark Van Stone unfolded at the same time, which was later shared with me by a friend who Van Stone had shared it with. My presence, making a comment on Houston’s blog, was compared to being a bothersome “mosquito,” and Houston murmured that it

wouldn’t be worth his time to engage my comments, since I wasn’t an epigrapher. (But my comment didn’t involve epigraphy, it involved a well-known Maya analogy between house and cosmos.) In any case, my comments were re-printed in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (Jenkins 2009:220-222).

Continuing with our fascinating journey into the nooks and crannies of the Maya Studies Phenomenon, we have now seen that in *The Maya* (9th edition), Houston and Coe ignore these two very important inscriptions, apart from dismissing them as “dull” (I assume Coe concurs, since it is, after all, his book). The sites where they were discovered, Tortuguero and La Corona, were not even mentioned. This passage occurred in a section of Chapter 8 that was completely rewritten over several pages, so the opportunity was there for the authors to update the 2012 discussion by — wait for it — discussing academic sources! But they ignored them all. Yes, *all* of the many publications on these two intriguing 2012 inscriptions were ignored. For example, the comprehensive discussion and epigraphic translation by MacLeod and Gronemeyer (Wayeb no. 34, August 2010), based on re-analyzed photos of the text, was ignored. My earlier paper read at the *Society for American Archaeology* (SAA, April 2010) was ignored. Stuart’s own blog posts on Tortuguero (October 2011) and La Corona (June 2012) were conveniently ignored. I could also cite my article on Lord Jaguar’s 2012 date (“Rulership and Rhetoric”) in the Institute of Maya Studies *Explorer* (December 2010), the extensive debate about my SAA paper, sponsored by scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center* (December 2010, transcript published online in early January 2011), my three essays on the La Corona 2012 inscription (*The Center for 2012 Studies*, June and July 2012), the essays by Carlson, MacLeod, Callaway, and Grofe in *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. 24 (2012) and similar essays in IAU Vol. 7 no. 278 (2011), my presentation at the Institute of Maya Studies (January 2011, videotaped and quickly posted to Youtube), my discussions in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* and, most significantly for this discussion, my chapter in *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011), an anthology **for which Michael Coe wrote the preface**. That chapter clarified the correlation, responded to my critics, and discussed the breakthrough work being done on the Tortuguero Monument 6 “2012” inscription.

Another thing has changed in the 9th edition: the Maya calendar correlation used. Coe and Houston write that they now prefer the correlation devised by Martin & Skidmore (an essay posted online in October 2012), which makes the 2012 cycle-ending fall on December 24, 2012.⁵ This is called the 584286 correlation. Coe’s book is known for wildly miscalculating the 13-Baktun period-ending several times, even though he was supportive of the GMT family of correlations. He first (in 1966) offered the date as December 24, 2011. Then in the 2nd edition of 1980 it was re-miscalculated as January 11, 2013. Later he settled into Lounsbury’s December 23, 2012 date (as also reported in Coe’s popular book *Breaking the Maya Code*).

Revealingly, in Coe’s preface to the *Decoding* anthology, we see why he had reservations about giving his endorsement to the December 21 correlation:

So why do all the amateur 2012 doomsday prophesiers cling to the third Thompson correlation? [December 21, 2012]. Because by using it, 21 December 2012 falls on a winter solstice, whereas 23 December has no discernible astronomical meaning, either to the ancient Maya or to us moderns! (Coe 2011:ix)

The problem is that the only other contender (prior to the new Martin & Skidmore correlation) was Lounsbury's December 23rd date, and Lounsbury's arguments are demonstrably flawed. I summarized my long-ago articulated solution to the problem in my own chapter in the *Decoding* anthology (yes, that same anthology Coe wrote the preface for). For this excerpt, see Appendix 1.

We can see that scholars like Coe and Houston would like to avoid the December 21, because the “doomsday” people like it. The evidence doesn't matter; the memo dictates that “they” must be mitigated. This is where *consensus trumps evidence*, which turns out to be a primary mandate within the Maya Studies Phenomenon. This position is utterly ridiculous and presumptuous. It's not good science. First of all, most of the 2012 doomsday writers who invoked astronomy didn't really care about the specific date. The year 2012 was good enough for their purposes, and they also couldn't follow the technical correlation debates anyway.⁶

In my own work, I became interested in the correlation question quite early on, seeing discrepancies in how it was reported in the popular and academic literature. It was an important question for me, because in early 1987 I'd sat at the side of day-keepers counting the days in Guatemala, and they were tracking the 260-day calendar. What day-count did they use, and was it congruent with the Classic Period day-count? This question became a focus of my awareness and research between 1986 and 1992, when I published my conclusions in my book *Tzolkin* (republished with BSRF in 1994).

By 1992 I had settled the correlation question in my own mind, drawing from an interdisciplinary approach to the evidence. Significant to Coe's critique, *this was before I launched into the 2012 research* that led to my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. I settled the December 21 correlation question *first*, on its own terms, *and then* looked into what it might mean. So, the December 21, 2012 date was not preferred *because it was a solstice and therefore supported a solstice-galaxy alignment within the precession of the equinoxes* (as under-informed critics have presumed), it was selected because it fit with all of the interdisciplinary tests — most importantly, the ethnographic evidence (the survival of the 260-day calendar in highland Guatemala), which I've characterized as a litmus test for any proposed correlation.

In November of 2012 I quickly replied to the Martin & Skidmore “286” correlation proposal, and also wrote an essay which re-stated and honed my previous arguments and findings (see all essays freely posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies* website). It must be said that the only reason these diversionary shenanigans have any currency among scholars is because they support their anti-2012 predilections. Or it justifies their antipathy for my presence in the discussion. This may sound surprising, but simply read the contemptuous comments by scholars, notably in e-lists and blogs (e.g., Normark's *Archaeological Haeceities* blog, Stuart's 2012 Q & A page on

his *Maya Decipherment* blog, and the Aztlán e-list) — or in their books (Aveni's book and Stuart's book), not to mention the articles by Hoopes and Whitesides & Hoopes.

Incredibly, through the four different correlations proffered through nine editions of *The Maya*, none of them actually side with the only correlation that meets all of the interdisciplinary criteria that any proposed correlation must pass. That correlation (the 584283 December 21, 2012 correlation) is supported by many Maya scholars (the Tedlocks, the Brickers, Milbrath, Carlson, etc), and — most importantly — it is supported by the surviving 260-day calendar placement among millions of Maya in Guatemala, Mexico, Belize, and Honduras. This last item is all too often overlooked. Most scholars, living in an Ivory Tower of mathematical, epigraphic, or calendrical abstractions, don't believe that the modern Maya retain any continuity with their ancient traditions. Or, as Coe himself said, those “ancient Maya savants” have not “survived into our own time” (Coe 2011: xi). The full quote reads:

I think it is true that the ancient Maya savants, had they survived into our own time, would have been seriously disturbed by the close of our particular Great Cycle of 5,125 years... (ibid. xi).

This sentiment is retained in the 9th edition of *The Maya*: “The Maya savants were, of course, astrologers not astronomers” (263). Well, actually, the contemporary Maya savants (day-keepers, wisdom-keepers, or “Spiritual Guides” as they prefer to call themselves) were less disturbed than accepting of the stupidity and antipathy leveled against their 2012 date — for they have long been resigned to their traditions being ignorantly misunderstood by the Western European invaders. But it can be observed that modern Maya traditionalists, teachers, and guides, have embraced a commonsense attitude towards the 2012 period-ending. Like all period-endings, it could be understood as a time of transition and renewal that required ceremonies and sacrifices. This is made very clear at the conclusion to the documentary *2012: The Beginning* (Wildheart Vision Films, 2012), which featured my work and the words of modern Maya calendar priests and spiritual guides. (See <http://www.2012thebeginning.com> or Google it.)

I should note that there is a contradiction in these sentiments expressed by Coe, which give the impression of him having a superficial or even denigrating understanding of the modern Maya's survival. Not so elsewhere. The final 10th chapter in the 9th edition, which was a lengthy add-on to the earlier editions, goes to great lengths to celebrate the Maya tenacity for adaptation and endurance: “There is now a pan-Maya movement in eastern Mesoamerica, and a profound sense among these people of their glorious past” (300-301). This commendation was well and good, and an appropriate homage to the modern Maya. However, the pan-Maya movement is not just found among the Quintana Roo traditionalists who still hear the Talking Cross prophecy of a new Maya king to awaken to take his throne at Chichen Itza — it is more widespread than that. It is in fact found throughout Mesoamerica, with an ascending movement called pan-Mayanism in Guatemala. Yes, a pan-Mayanism movement.

Here we encounter another one of those toxic cognitive dissonances within the Maya Studies Phenomenon — for the

term “Mayanism” has been appropriated and distorted by Maya Studies propagandist and narrative-revisionist John Hoopes, in order to categorically denigrate myself and other writers on 2012. In other words, his distorted use of the term Mayanism, beginning around 2008, distorts and inverts the meaning of the term, *as used previously by anthropologists Kay Warren and Victor Montejo* (beginning in the late 1990s). I exposed these Denigration Games (a central feature of the Maya Studies Phenomenon, along with the Guilt-by-Association Game) in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* and in my review-essay of Whitesides & Hoopes (see Jenkins 2014, “The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)” in the German journal *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, posted also at *The Center for 2012 Studies*).

So, let’s take stock of what we have found so far. My observations about the 9th edition of Coe’s *The Maya* include:

- Deletes the Armageddon statement, with no reason given, even though in his preface to Gelfer (2011) Coe stated he didn’t see any reason why this should be changed for the forthcoming 8th edition.
- New correlation preferred (Martin & Skidmore, 2012) which is rooted in looking at only one criterion (astronomy), and only one piece of evidence (one eclipse date) within that discipline.
- Asserts that the two 2012 inscriptions are “dull” and ignores the many academic papers written on them, including MacLeod & Gronemeyer (2010), my SAA paper (Jenkins 2010) and my chapter in same anthology in which Coe’s preface appears (2011).

Apart from these items, the 9th edition also mentions archaeologist Takeshi Inomata’s opinion that the Izapan monuments are no earlier than 100 BC, and are mostly from the two centuries following 100 BC. This position ignores the Brigham Young University C₁₄ dates and pottery time-lines, as well as the Olmec-style monument in Izapa Group B that is stylistically concurrent with La Venta monuments. Like other items relevant to my 2012 research, this item asserts a mitigating opinion which appears valid only because they ignore the relevant evidence. This strongly suggests a selective agenda-driven reframing of the narrative through which my contributions can be dispensed with,⁷ even while my interpretations of Izapa and 2012 are being echoed in new publications (e.g., in the anthology *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*, eds Milbrath and Dowd, Univ. Press of Colo., released May of 2015).

Conclusion

It’s curious to note that Michael Coe’s book has followed a similar trajectory, in its treatment of the 2012 date, that Sylvanus Morley’s book *The Ancient Maya* did (which may have served as the inspirational prototype for Coe’s book). Morley’s book, first published in 1946, went through many editions. From the first an Appendix included a table of Katun endings, calculated with the December 23 correlation (the

584285) but stopped short of providing the 2012 period-ending. Of course, it could be easily extrapolated to December 23, 2012, so it was indirectly there, but the 2012 Baktun-ending was oddly neglected until Robert Sharer stepped in as editor and added it to the 1983 edition, when it was also corrected to the December 21 correlation (the 584283). Meanwhile, by the early 1990s Coe was using the December 23 correlation in both *The Maya* and his book *Breaking the Maya Code*. And, like Frank Waters’s 1975 adoption of Coe’s miscalculation of December 24, 2011,⁸ popular writers also adopted from Coe the flawed December 23, 2012 date (cited in Hancock’s *Fingerprints of the Gods*, 1995; since corrected in his follow-up book *Magicians of the Gods*, 2015).

From *The Ancient Maya* to *The Maya* — we could continue the sequence and posit that the next book should simply be called *Maya*, and we could embrace this term in the Hindu sense of “illusion”. This next book in the sequence, titled *Maya: Illusion and Deception in the Maya Studies Phenomenon*, would focus on all the *illusions* that scholars have generated, propagated, defended and maintained about the 2012 date. The Coe-Houston collaboration for the 9th edition is a step in this direction, which leaves the 2012 topic more inaccurately presented than the 1st edition. We have gone, truth be told, from 2012 being a dramatic and alarming Maya “Armageddon” to it being merely “dull”, or nothing at all. Apparently, 2012 must be dismissed as dull and boring, because if it were treated honestly and accurately it would blow the lid off the adamantly maintained boxes of professional Maya Studies. Such a position is indeed an illusion, and can only be maintained with the administration of a healthy shot of ignorance — literally, in that over a dozen relevant sources on the two 2012 inscriptions were totally ignored in the 9th edition of Coe’s *The Maya*. You’d think a meaningful update could spare a paragraph or two to honestly discuss (or even just mention) these sources, considering that Coe’s 1st edition of *The Maya* (1966) launched the 2012 doomsday meme.

Am I being unfair? I don’t think so. Unlike career-careful vocational scholar-teachers, consensus doesn’t trump evidence for me. Most of those who count themselves as contributors to Maya Studies still need to learn how to look at Maya traditions, and the Maya world, through Maya eyes.⁹ The misleading cMd¹⁰ conceit of many scholars is clear, and signals an indelible blight on Maya Studies. The “2012 debacle”¹¹ is not so much about how the media and the marketplace exploited and distorted Maya traditions, but how Maya scholars treated an authentic artifact of ancient Maya thought and those who sought to examine it rationally. “The Maya,” as Michael Coe wrote, “had a rudimentary naked-eye astronomy, but their mystic take on the end of the present world is trumped any day by what modern science has to tell us about these matters” (Coe 2011:xi). Uh, yeah ... got it. And so it goes.

Appendix 1: Lounsbury’s Correlation: Excerpt from my chapter in *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011)

There is a much touted “disagreement” about the exact cycle ending date, it being presented as either 21 December or 23 December 2012. J. Eric S. Thompson had tested and confirmed and slightly adjusted the earlier work of Joseph T. Goodman

and arrived at the final “GMT2” correlation in 1950, making 13.0.0.0 fall on 21 December 2012. A two-day adjustment to Thompson’s 1950 determination of the correlation was argued by linguist Floyd Lounsbury (1983, 1992), which would theoretically shift the cycle-ending date to December 23. Critics who analysed Lounsbury’s 1983 argument pointed out that his astronomical criterion (Venus’s morning star appearances) could not support the proposed two-day distinction (Tedlock 1992). My critique of Lounsbury’s 1992 paper exposed a circular argument which, when carefully analysed, showed greater support in his data for the December 21 correlation.[7]

In addition, Lounsbury had to address the ethnographic evidence from the survival of the 260-day calendar in highland Guatemala. Ethnographer and trained day-keeper Barbara Tedlock argued convincingly that this daycount was very likely an unbroken survival from the Classic Period (Tedlock 1982). According to Classic Period creation texts, the beginning of the current 13-bak’tun cycle (13.0.0.0) was coordinated with the date 4 Ahau in the 260-day tzolkin calendar, which runs concurrently alongside the Long Count. Since 260 divides evenly into the 13-bak’tun period, the end of the current 13-bak’tun period would also need to coordinate with 4 Ahau. The surviving day-count among the Quiché Maya and other groups in Guatemala could then be used as a litmus test for any proposed correlation. This test supports 13.0.0.0 = 4 Ahau on December 21, not December 23. Lounsbury’s proposed alteration to Thompson’s GMT2 correlation fails this test.[8]

Lounsbury responded to this difficulty by suggesting that there must have been a universal two-day shift in the day-count at some point just before the Conquest. It would need to have been universally coordinated throughout all of Mesoamerica, because as Edmonson summarised (1988) we have three ethnohistorically documented Conquest-era date correlations from three widely separated regions (Yucatán, Central Mexico, Highland Guatemala) which support the December 21 placement. Furthermore, it is almost inconceivable that such a simultaneous and universal two-day shift could have been coordinated. Nevertheless, if we accept Lounsbury’s proposal of a two-day shift, then all post-Conquest dates must—according to his own theory—in practice point to a December 21 cycle-ending date. Prominent and highly visible academic supporters of Lounsbury (Schele, Freidel, Coe) have continued to report December 23 as a viable alternative to December 21, without apparently understanding the details of Lounsbury’s theory. So, the December 23 date is a red herring, often invoked by those who seek to mitigate the astronomical importance of December 21 falling on an accurate solstice.[9] (Jenkins 2011:167-168). See full essay: <http://alignment2012.com/Jenkins-in-Gelfer-anthology2.pdf>.

Appendix 2: The Curious Case of the La Corona Frontispiece

The frontispiece of the 9th edition of Michael Coe’s *The Maya* depicts a full-page photo of a carving from La Corona. The caption tells us that it shows a La Corona vassal of Calakmul. It depicts the dancing Maize God with the Principle Bird Deity above and the snake (symbol of Calakmul) below. The date is October 28, 677 (Gregorian, in the new-fangled 584286

correlation used by Coe & Houston). If we convert this to 584283 we get October 22, 677 (Julian), 4 Kan 9.12.5.7.4 (that this is the correct Tzolk’in & Long Count for this dated carving is confirmed from other sources).

If we look at the sky on this date we see the waning moon is two days past Saturn at the Gemini Crossroads. In fact, one day earlier, at 1 a.m. on October 21, the moon was much closer to Saturn, which is slightly east of the Crossroads. On October 20, the moon was just as close to Saturn but on the other side of it and right on the Galactic Equator. On October 22, the date of the carving, just before sunrise around 5 a.m., the moon has shifted away from Saturn near the Gemini Crossroads, to a position on the ecliptic that is pointed to by Castor and Pollux. A fuller treatment of this process, with three sky-pictures, is here: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/LC-677.pdf>.

So, the 4 Kan date of the carving is, in essence, one day past a close conjunction of the moon and Saturn near the Gemini Crossroads. Is there any significance to this kind of alignment for Calakmul and La Corona? Why, yes there is. Saturn-Moon in conjunction: This is diagnostic of the birthday astronomy of the Calakmul king who commissioned the 2012 inscription at La Corona, in 696 AD. Yuknoom Yichaak K’ahk was his name, and he compared his birthday astronomy (October 4, 649 AD) to the 9.13.0.0 Katun ending in 692 AD, when Saturn and the moon were aligned with the Sagittarian Crossroads at the southern terminus of the Dark Rift. This provided a conceptual link to the 2012 date cited on Block V. His birthday is recorded elsewhere while the 13-Katun ending and the 2012 period-ending are recorded on the Block V “2012” text from Calakmul. The moon’s position on the October 22, 677 AD date is pointed to by Castor and Pollux, just like the moon-Saturn conjunction on his birthday (October 4, 649 AD Julian). See my essay that I wrote in early July of 2012:

<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/LaCorona2012-StepbyStepguide.pdf>.

It’s rather striking that the frontispiece chosen for the 9th edition of Coe’s book provides a nod to my 2012 galactic alignment astronomy work. It may be that the La Corona vassal was honoring the 28-year-old future king of Calakmul, by dancing the Maize God’s rebirth at a propitious time that reflected his birthday astronomy, uniting the bird and snake symbols of above and below. The fortuitous choice of this carving for the frontispiece is much like the image of the galactic alignment selected for the cover of the recently published Maya Studies anthology called *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (2015). But the support that the astronomy of such dated carvings provide for my 2012 alignment theory must not be seen, and this cognitive dissonance is a primary characteristic of the Maya Studies Phenomenon.

Appendix 3: The Maya Studies Phenomenon

Some comic relief here, folks. Sort of. Definition of *The Maya Studies Phenomenon (MSP)*: “The set of contradictory and unprofessional behaviors that ensue when a field of studies must mitigate an outsider who made discoveries and pioneered interpretations that the field must integrate in order to progress.” Performative contradictions can occur, as well as

double standards, elitist exclusion, deceptive citations, bigoted assertions, refusal to correct errors, baseless opinions, censoring or blocking publication of contributions, guilt-by-association critiques, plagio-excoriation,* and cognitive dissonance.

The MSP will abort the integration of the new ideas, if intolerance and hubris among the upholders of the status quo are adamant enough. It might also craft work-arounds to acknowledging the pioneer of the new ideas, crediting colleagues with the same ideas while ignoring or mitigating prior publications, personal correspondence, and disallowing or ignoring the independent outsider's peer-review essays and presentations at academic venues — achieved despite being an independent researcher.

With personal career considerations being more important than conceptual progress or advancing their field of study, improving terms and old models, and supporting new discoveries, a primary tenet of the MSP is that *consensus trumps evidence*. Curiously, a gangster mentality prevails, including the internalization of such tacit codes as “you don't rat on your colleague,” “we're gonna get you,” and “so-and-so must be mitigated.” These unprofessional tactics are well known in academia, generally speaking. In Maya Studies, the said Phenomenon (the MSP) has been especially rampant in the relation of Maya Studies to the topic of 2012, such that many scholars in Maya Studies to this day will not acknowledge that 2012 is a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought.

*Plagio-excoriation is the simultaneous plagiarizing and excoriation of an outsider, who is often an autodidact not beholden to the limiting structures of academia, who first published ideas that scholars later realize are essential to the evolution of their field.

End Notes:

1. I'm being semi-satirical here, to play on the way that scholars have used “the 2012 phenomenon” in a categorically dismissive way. While I don't mean to mock or dismiss Maya Studies, one can argue that the coherent entity known as Maya Studies has obeyed certain patterns, limitations, prejudices. For example, it has gone through cycles of antipathy and enthusiasm for astronomy. Also, certain elder scholars in Maya Studies toward the end of their careers prevent, by sheer irrational stubbornness and authority, real progress from happening. I think here specifically not of Michael Coe, but of an analogy between J. Eric S. Thompson and Anthony Aveni. Russian “commies” (Knorosov, Proskouriakoff) were personally problematic for Thompson, while Aveni clearly has personal problems with those he perceives as belonging to Gnosticism (see his unprofessional bigoted put-downs in his 2009 book *2012: The End of Time*. Commies and Gnostics — vilified enemies of elder Mayanists. (See my article in *The Heretic Magazine*, Vol. 1: <http://Alignment2012.com/Heretics-as-Truth-Tellers.pdf>, released in August of 2012). See also Appendix 3 for definitions.

2. A larger treatment, which I won't pursue in this brief treatment, would include lengthy discussion of other recent academic publications, such as:

- The corrected edition (eBook) of Aveni's 2009 book *2012: The End of Time* (the only book on 2012 by a professional Mayanist published with a university press). Released in May of 2015. Published by the University Press of Colorado.
- An anthology of academic writings, including numerous references to 2012, titled *Cosmology, Calendars, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica* (eds Susan Milbrath and Anne Dowd), also published by the University Press of Colorado, May 2015.
- *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. 25 (ed. John B. Carlson, University of Texas Press). Released March 2015 (given a 2012-2013 publication date). The item of interest here is Michael Grofe's article on the Copan Baseline, based on his 2010 SAA presentation. It was intended for publication in collusion with my Tortuguero astronomy essay (expanded from my own 2010 SAA paper) in an archaeoastronomy anthology edited by Drs Robert Benfer and Larry Adkins. Grofe edited it for the *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (2015).
- *Archaeoastronomy and the Maya* (eds Ed Barnhart and Gerardo Aldana, Oxbow Press, 2014). Contains several references to 2012, and a curious theory about Pakal, Orion, precession, and 2012 offered by Mendez & Karasik.
- My “Lord Jaguar” article, *Clavis Journal*, Vol. 3. Released November 2014. Due to my Benfer & Adkins chapter being censored, I re-wrote my findings for this impressive esoteric arts & philosophy journal, published under the discerning eye of scholars at Three Hands Press.
- My review-essay in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, released July 2014. A peer-review exposé of irrational anti-2012 detractors Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes. Adjunct essays also posted at <http://www.update2012.com>.
- Article on Xultun by Aveni and the Brickers (mid-2014). Amazing indirect support form my 2012 alignment astronomy, which I explicate in a review posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>).
- “Deathly Sport”; an interesting note posted by Stephen Houston to David Stuart's *Maya Decipherment* blog, July 2014. My comment was posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>).

Really, all critics of 2012 and my work should read my chapter in the anthology that I contributed to, which Michael Coe wrote the preface for (*2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, ed. Joseph Gelfer, 2011). My chapter is freely posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>). I could also draw from email correspondence with Darrin Pratt, the Director of the University Press of Colorado (in early 2015), Susan Milbrath (early 2015), Victoria Bricker (early 2015) and Ed Krupp (June of 2015). But these items will be reserved for a larger treatment in a forthcoming publication.

3. In his comment on the 2012 topic, in an NPR interview of early December 2012, Stuart stretched a bit to say “It [2012] was thought to be the turn of an important cycle, or as they put

it, the end of 13 bak'tuns" (echoing my own published perspectives on 2012) (<http://Alignment2012.com/12-3-2012.html>). He also previously allowed that it was, for the Calakmul king who commissioned the 2012 text at La Corona, a "literary device." But previously (in the NPR *Earth Sky* interview, April 4, 2012), Stuart asserted in no uncertain terms that 2012 didn't mean anything to the ancient Maya. This seems to be the position maintained by many members of the Maya Studies Phenomenon.

4. See Houston's blog post, and my comments, at: "What Will Not Happen in 2012": <http://www.decipherment.wordpress.com/2008/12/20/what-will-not-happen-in-2012/>.

5. Martin & Skidmore (2012). See my review, with link to their essay: <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/Review-Martin-Skidmore.pdf>. See also my "Steps in Verifying the Maya Calendar Correlation": <http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com/2012center-note18.pdf> and my response to Aldana's 2010 correlation essay: <http://update2012.com/response-to-Aldana-on-the-correlation.pdf>. See also my exposé of Lounsbury's correlation error: <http://alignment2012.com/fap9.html> and my discussion of Lounsbury's work in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies*. (The 1994 reprint was published by Borderland Sciences Research Foundation, Garberville, CA.)

6. The Horizon Project™ (invented by exploitative doomsday showman Brent Miller) hitched its wagon to the December 21 solstice date, and thoroughly appropriated and distorted my galactic alignment work. In my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, I thoroughly critiqued the Horizon Project's doomsday fetish and distorted understanding of the galactic alignment. Coe's criticism (shared by Van Stone and Marc Zender) of those who prefer December 21 because it's a solstice became a quick and easy talking point against the December 21 solstice date. No clarifying context was ever provided to distinguish my own work from the rest, and so the denigrators succeeded in propagating a guilt-by-association insinuation. This happens either as a conscious effort to mitigate an outsider or as an unconscious conceit against a perceived category of ideological foes. Loose lingo, mudslinging, and turf protecting abound in this domain of the Maya Studies Phenomenon. Either way, both of these motivations are fueled by under-informed academic arrogance, turf-protecting, envy, and elitism.

7. Houston doesn't seem to understand how his own observations, in other publications, provide support for the ongoing work that relates to the 2012 astronomy and world-renewal ideology that I've articulated since the mid-1990s. For example, he made an interesting blog post on July 29, 2014, regarding ballcourt alignments to tombs in Classic Period sites. He overlooked the temple tomb's relationship to its celestial corollary, the Dark Rift in the Milky Way, and he therefore missed how his presentation supported my reconstruction of the Izapa ballcourt's alignment to the Dark Rift, over the December solstice sunrise horizon (see Jenkins 1998 and Houston 2014).

8. The book was *Mexico Mystique*, which Waters wrote under an academic research grant administered by Colorado State University. (With typical hubris, some scholars have dismissed Waters as merely being a "mystic" or a "novelist"). Most students of 2012 don't realize that in the late 1980s Waters updated his thoughts on the 13-Baktun period-ending. His essay was published posthumously in a 2002 collection edited by his wife, Barbara. See my Frank Waters essay at *The Center for 2012 Studies*.

9. This is a fundamental and complicated topic, beyond the scope of this review-essay. I can only direct readers, hopefully some of whom are Maya scholars, to the concept of non-duality and the danger of the Pre-trans Fallacy, as explicated in Part 2 of my book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin Books, 2009). Real-time examples of the cognitive dissonance that occurs among Maya scholars who can't process evidence that contradicts their prejudiced assumptions can be found in the 206-page MEC-Facebook debate / discussion of my 2010 SAA paper — online at the *Maya Exploration Center* (Director Ed Barnhart, <http://www.mayaexploration.org>) and also at *The Center for 2012 Studies* (<http://www.thecenterfor2012studies.com>).

10. As I explained in my chapter in *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (Gelfer 2011), a circum-Mediterranean-derived (cMd) bias (see Aldana 2007:3, 11-14) runs rampant through many areas of Western science, particularly in ethnographic and anthropological treatments of Native America and other non-Western cultures. It is typified by filtering Native cultures and their knowledge systems through a Western, Eurocentric mind-set that is insufficient for the task. The problem is embedded within scholars being educated by Western universities, which enforce interpretive biases that are unhelpful and distorting, and result in inaccurate and clichéd interpretations.

11. A term used by Gerardo Aldana in regards to archaeoastronomy and 2012, in his introduction to *Archaeoastronomy and the Maya* (Eds. Barnhart and Aldana, 2014).

General notes: The 1 through 9 editions of Michael Coe's *The Maya* were published in 1966, 1980, 1984, 1987, 1993, 1999, 2005, 2011, and 2015. A U.S. release of the first edition (which was published only in the U.K. in 1966) happened around 1972. A 7th edition of Coe's book *Mexico* (1961) was published in 2013. Amazon currently describes the anthology *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (ed. Joseph Gelfer) as being released with Routledge, Kegan & Paul on August 20, 2014. This must be a reprint right acquired by Routledge, as the anthology was originally released with Equinox Publishing Ltd in late 2011.

Selected References:

Aldana, Gerardo. 2007. *The Apotheosis of Janaab' Pakal*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Aveni, Anthony. 2009 (revised eBook edition executed in April 2015, released May of 2015). *2012: The End of Time*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Callaway, Carl. 2011. "Cosmogony and prophecy." Oxford: *IAU*, no. 278.

Coe, Michael. 2011. Preface for Gelfer (2011) (see next item).

Gelfer, Joseph (ed.). 2011. *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*. Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Grofe, Michael J. 2011a. "Tropical and Sidereal Year." Oxford: *IAU*, no 278.

—2011b. "Celestial Caiman." *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, Vol. 24 (pub date 2011, released August 2012).

Houston, Stephen. 2008. "What Will Not Happen in 2012." Maya Decipherment blog. (December 2008).

Houston, Stephen. 2014. "Deathly Sport." Maya Decipherment blog (July 2014).

Jenkins, John Major. 1998. *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Co.

—2009. *The 2012 Story*. New York: Tarcher/Penguin Books

—2011. "Approaching 2012: Modern Misconceptions vs. Reconstructing Ancient Maya Perspectives." In *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, ed. Joseph Gelfer. Equinox Publishing Ltd.

—2014a. "Coining the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)". In *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, Band 14 (Nr 1), January. Germany: Society for Anomalistiks.

—2014b. "The Astronomy of Three Dates in the Xultun Tables." *The Center for 2012 Studies*. <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

—2014c. "Maya Ballcourt Alignments: Comments on Stephen Houston's Article." *The Center for 2012 Studies*. <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

MacLeod, Barbara and Sven Gronemeyer. 2010. "Tortuguero Monument 6." *Wayeb* no 34.

Milbrath, Susan and Anne Dowd (eds.). 2015. *Cosmology, Calendars and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Stray, Geoff. 2012. *Mysteries of the Long Count*. Glastonbury, England: StrayDog Books.

Stuart, David. 2011. *The Order of Days*. Three Rivers Press.

Waters, Frank. 1975. *Mexico Mystique*. Chicago: Sage Books.

7040 words. This entire piece was written on June 14, 2015, with the 1st and 9th editions of Coe's *The Maya* in hand. Edits and sources compiled June 15.

Item 7b. Review of Houston & Stuart (1994)

Here: <http://alignment2012.com/fap11.html>. Note that I never claim that the "Black Hole" hieroglyph refers to the astrophysical Black Hole in the center of the Milky Way. My actual position is clear from the first section heading, in large font on the first page: **The Black Hole = the Dark Rift in the Milky Way**. The same view is restated in the summary paragraph:

If my own work is on the mark (Jenkins, 1994, 1995a and 1995b), it would seem that the birth canal of the Great Mother is an extremely important "mythological" location which, as is the convention, has an astronomical counterpart. Stuart and Houston's identification of the mythological placename called "Black Hole", with attendant contexts relating to ballcourts, mythological "birth" events, Ahau rulership, underworld doorways, and the beginning date of the current era (with likely reference to the astronomical events that actually occur on the end date), strongly suggest that the Black Hole concept refers to the dark-rift in the Milky Way in Sagittarius. As a result, we can begin to examine how this prevalent Mesoamerican concept, central to Mesoamerican cosmogenesis and calendrics, transforms from its realistic representations on Izapan Stelae, through its Classic Period abstractions, to its later pictorial expression in Central Mexican codices.

This review-essay originally was posted on my first website, in late 1995. It was slightly expanded and appeared as an appendix in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. In it, we also see my noting of the conceptual parallel between 3114 BC and 2012, which Carl Callaway later adopted and which Barbara MacLeod credited him with (ignoring my early work).

Item 7c. Letter to Robert Hall (1994), Sent to Carlson in 1994

One thing to note about this letter is that it contains a mention of the 1507-year / 1508-haab Year-Drift Formula, which Carlson, in his Robbins Museum lecture, claimed I didn't know anything about. He also said he had read my books and was aware of my work "from the beginning" — alluding to my early article pitches to him containing my articles, early booklets, and a copy of this letter I sent to Hall.

Robert L. Hall
Dept. of Anthropology - m/c 027
University of Illinois / P.O. Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680

Nov. 21st, 1994

Dear Robert L. Hall,

As a student of the Mesoamerican Calendar, I read with interest your article and book review published in the most recent

Archaeoastronomy Journal. Edmonson's *Book of the Year* was extremely useful in my research, and helped clarify the correlation question. At the same time, much of his statements about various proposed calendars seemed speculative, although he seemed to be working with the right criteria and, as you say, was asking the right questions. Other details, such as reporting 3113 B.C. rather than 3114 B.C. as the beginning year of the 13-baktun cycle, were frustratingly unclear; thanks for clearing that one up.

I have been exploring the properties and possible origins of the Long Count for a number of years, and was happy to see your articles. With all the progress being made in epigraphy and archaeological field work, amazing as it is, it does seem as if studying Mayan calendrics is rather unfashionable right now. I feel that part of the difficulty in this field has to do with the continuing debate, in some quarters, between the 584285 and the 584283 correlations. Floyd Lounsbury has been very set on his arguments for the 584285 since at least 1982, continuing into his recent essay in *The Sky in Mayan Literature*. As you know, he argues for a two-day shift in the 260-day count sometime during the post-classic period, thus bringing it into alignment with counts still being followed in Guatemala. As Dennis Tedlock and John B. Carlson point out (in a note to Tedlock's *Popol Vuh*), this is a highly unlikely proposition. Also, on close examination, I've found Lounsbury's arguments in both "The Base of the Venus Table in the Dresden Codex..." (1983) and the recent essay in *The Sky in Mayan Literature* to be lacking and at times, outright deceptive. I can send you my analysis of Lounsbury's arguments if you like - it amounts to about 9 pages.

So, when you write "The 584285 correlation constant, which moves Maya dates two days later into the tropical year, is more agreeable with the Maya Venus and eclipse tables of the Dresden Codex, posing a dilemma no one has yet resolved" (Arch. 118), I wonder if most of that dilemma comes from the work of Lounsbury and, perhaps, the dilemma is primarily political. Anyway, this problem is not extremely important for what I'd like to share with you here, it's just initially frustrating to sort it all out.

Assuming the 584283 correlation, the end of the 13-baktun Long Count cycle is December 21st, 2012 A.D. I have tried to approach the Long Count by first deciding on the relevant criteria. What we know about the Long Count comes from its beginning and end dates, and possibly significant astronomical dates in between. The feeling is that its inauguration must have coincided with a significant astronomical event or process. I'm unsure if this was as important as its projected end date. Archaeological data points to a probable range of dates for its inauguration. Edmonson's methods were in terms of finding a likely juncture of the various cycles in use around 6.10.0.0.0. Your own approach is similar and includes correcting Edmonson on some conceptual errors. These questions are geared toward establishing when the Long Count was inaugurated. My concern, as an essential criteria, has been to decipher why the Long Count was inaugurated. In your review of Edmonson's book, in the final paragraph, you obliquely refer to a rather controversial idea: "...and I would add to this a concern for the day on which the sun was at the longitude of the Pleiades in each century, moving through April and into May one day each 71 years with the precession of the

equinoxes" (121). Let me say that I agree with you, and the Long Count was probably employed to track precession. The Pleiades is a good background feature against which to track precession. However, the day that the sun "conjuncts" the Pleiades must be measured in relation to some absolute marker of the solar year: a solstice or an equinox. Obviously, this would not have been a difficult task for early Mesoamerican skywatchers. What I'm trying to present is the thinking that went into the formulation of the Long Count. The solstices and equinoxes were important in the early adjustments made to Calendar Rounds, New Year beginnings and so forth. Some distinct asterism or other "background" feature must be used to measure the precessional movement of the sun in relation to the equinoxes or solstices. Better, the sun's equinoctial or solstitial position against the "background" feature could be used to track precession. The Long Count, with all its cycles within cycles, is quite capable of tracking precession in many different ways; for example, 73 tuns = 72 haab = 71.95 years, approximating a one-day precessional shift. But I'd rather avoid getting into this question right now, as it is somewhat irrelevant at this point. The question to answer is *why?* Why did the pre-Maya create the Long Count and why did they place it where it is, with an end date in 2012 A.D.? Well, if the answer to the first question is "to track precession", then the answer to the second question begins "because the parameters of the Long Count have something to do with precession." Knowing how much Mesoamerican astronomers enjoyed calculating future events, as with the morningstar risings of Venus, perhaps we should look closely at the end date in 2012 A.D. The fact that the end date of this calendric cycle, put in place at over 2000 years ago, occurs on a winter solstice presents a question producing vector. With the well known 1507/1508 "solar era" formula, we know that this kind of calculation was possible (even at a time when Old World astronomers could not do it so accurately). But why the year 2012? Is that year the culmination of some astronomical process related to precession, and was it a process easily observed by the ancient Mesoamerican skywatchers? The answer is yes.

Shifting over to the recent book by Schele and Freidel, *Maya Cosmos*, perhaps the most exciting discovery in this book is Schele's identification of the astronomical meaning of the Mayan Sacred Tree. (The Sacred Tree is one of the oldest motifs of Mayan mythology/cosmology, and probably goes back to the Olmec; however, we don't know exactly when the understanding of it presented by Schele came about - it could be very ancient). Schele explains that the Sacred Tree of the Maya was symbolized by the crossing point of the Milky Way and the ecliptic. This occurs in Gemini and Sagittarius. The area where the ecliptic crosses the Milky Way in Sagittarius is the location of the so-called "dark rift" in the Milky Way, a dark cave-like breach in the Milky Way's continuity. Dennis Tedlock, in notes to his translation of the *Popol Vuh*, identifies this "dark rift" as the "xibalba be", the road to the underworld. This area of the sky is also called "crossroads" by the Quiche Maya and is recognized as an important mythological/cosmological feature by other Indian groups, as explored by Gary Urton in *Crossroads of Earth and Sky* (?) Like the Pleiades, this "dark rift" in the Milky Way provides an excellent "background" feature, ripe with mythological overtones, against which the precession of the solstitial sun

could be tracked. If, some 2600 years ago, Mesoamerican astronomers were tracking precession, they would note that the sun was entering "xibalba be" (or the "Sacred Tree") around November 15th (Gregorian), some 36 days before the winter solstice. In time, the interval to winter solstice was observed to be narrowing. Precession may have been tracked and a forward calculation was made to the time when the sun at winter solstice would conjunct the dark rift in the Milky Way. I've found that this precession-related celestial process is most exact around 1998. However, this depends on the time of day used (sundown, sunrise?) and the latitude/longitude chosen; being such a slow process, a range of possible years would be acceptable. This is a simple and elegant explanation for the 13-baktun Long Count I have not encountered elsewhere in the literature.

Another question to consider is the probability that the 260-day count was already in place before the Long Count end date was calculated, so how did they manage to have an Ahau day occurring on the winter solstice of 2012? Perhaps they understood the approximate nature of the slow process they were charting, and simply isolated an Ahau-winter solstice day within range of their calculations. That became the end date and the beginning date is a consequent back-calculation, a product of the internal math of the Long Count itself. They also may have seen themselves in the "center of time", half-way between the "end" date and the "beginning" date; thus, if it was x number of cycles to the "end" of the process, it was the same x number of cycles backward to the beginning.

In Mesoamerica as elsewhere, World Age doctrines always come hand-in-hand with dawning knowledge of the precession. Precessional knowledge among Mesoamericans over 2000 years ago, as mentioned, is controversial and is often dismissed out of hand. In fact, Mesoamerican astronomy has rarely been credited with knowing about precession at any time - really absurd considering its detail-oriented sophistication. Mayanists like Brotherston consider precessional knowledge among Mesoamerican skywatchers to be highly likely. Other scholars like G. Severin seem to have had the right idea, but went overboard in trying to find justification for it. However, Michael Coe's review (I think it was Coe [no, it was Closs]) of Severin's work, which flat out states that the Maya did not know about precession, seems to be a case of throwing the baby out with the bathwater. I think there is a lot of mythological support for the idea of World Ages and shifting rulers, such as the Tzutujil/Quiché god Hurakan (transforms into hurricane, hunab ku, hun ahpu, hun ahau, One Ahau). Hura Kan means "one foot," and is a spinning deity, said to be caught in a whirlwind, and is a world age ruler in the *Popol Vuh*.

The scenario I present in explaining why the Long Count was created and why it was placed where it is, is based on the simple astronomical event that occurs on the Long Count end date: On December 21st, 2012 A.D., the winter solstice sun occupies the dark rift of the Milky Way in Sagittarius. Considering Schele's identification of the crossing point of the ecliptic and the Milky Way, we could just as well say that the winter solstice sun conjuncts the Sacred Tree on that day. According to the belief that Mayan deities manifest via periods of time rather than via objects (for example, the full moon and new moon are ruled by different deities), the winter solstice sun

was probably understood as a once-a-year manifestation of a particular deity. This deity's slow approach to the Sacred Tree, to *Xibalba be*, was no doubt a much anticipated event, certainly worthy of the hard task of calculating it and then being called the end of a world age. I can't help but respect the cosmological knowledge of these Mesoamerican astronomers; their perspective is so different than ours, our primary problem is learning to recognize what is right in front of us. Unfortunately, my reconstruction of the nature of the Long Count is pre-empted by assumptions and biases, and will probably require years to flesh out with exhaustive citations and documentations from all quarters. Nevertheless, I think the essential idea is correct.

The article I am enclosing [the 5-23-1994 *MA* article] provides an early version of my argument, and I'd greatly appreciate your thoughts. So few researchers are working on these questions, I think it is best to work together and compare notes when possible. I'm taking a close look at your Archaeoastronomy contributions, and may have more to say in the near future. Until then, have a great Thanksgiving ...

Sincerely,
John Major Jenkins

No typos were corrected; this is the verbatim letter. I didn't receive an immediate response from Dr. Hall. However, several years later Dr. Hall did send me an interesting and informative letter, even apologizing for neglecting to respond in a timely way. Then, for my part, I dallied in responding until we exchanged emails after one of my Aztlan posts caught his attention. He then sent me several off-prints of his very interesting essays, and I reciprocated by sending some articles of mine.

Item 7d. Correlation essays

The calendar correlation has been a major aspect of my work since the 1980s. Essays can be found at *The Center for 2012 Studies* website: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>. And: <http://alignment2012.com/fap9.html>. The bottom line is what I've called the Equation of Maya Time:

$$13.0.0.0.0 / 0.0.0.0.0 = 4 \text{ Ahau} = \text{December 21, 2012}$$

Item 7e. Letter to Owen Gingerich, June 2016

To augment my letter to Robert Hall sent 22 years ago, I copy below my cover email and introductory letter I sent to Astronomy Historian Owen Gingerich at Harvard. I had re-read his wonderful book *The Book Nobody Read* and watched several of his interviews and presentations on Youtube. I noted that he seemed sensitive to the difficult process of breakthroughs in science and the plight of trailblazers. Although now in his 80s, he was still quite active at events and online, so I decided to reach out.

Here's my cover letter:

Department of Astronomy
Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics
60 Garden Street
Office: A-208
Cambridge, MA 02138
MS 9
p: 617-495-7216
ogingerich@cfa.harvard.edu

Dear Owen Gingerich,

June 2, 2016

I hope this finds you and your family well and happy.

I'm reaching out with a friendly hello, and to share a brief sketch of my work in Maya astronomy. I greatly admire and appreciate all your work, including your more philosophical writings. In recent years there has been a series of breakthroughs that helps us understand how the Maya tracked things like the Sidereal Year and the precession of the equinoxes. Myself and several other scholars are involved in this work, but as you might expect official acknowledgement in the field has been slow in coming. I thought you might be interested as there are some distinct parallels with the resistance, and persecution, felt by the adherents of the heliocentric model in the 16th and 17th centuries. I'm going to attach my letter as an MSWord document for your ease in printing. I hope you get a chance to read it, and I hope you have time to send me some thoughts.

Best wishes,
John M. Jenkins

The letter:

Dear Owen Gingerich,

June 1, 2016

I recently re-read your wonderful book *The Book Nobody Read* and want to thank you for writing such an engaging and interesting account of your fruitful detective work. I've been familiar with your scholarship for several decades but decided to do some pointed sleuthing and found some of your writings, interviews, and presentations online. I was delighted to learn of several things that cause me to feel you will be receptive to my story. First, your work on the Copernican Revolution identifies and is sensitive to the often unusual process by which major breakthroughs occur in science. The adherents of the heliocentric model experienced great opposition. You've also noted that people doing creative research and edge-work --- pursuing new models and discoveries --- need time and resources at their fingertips.

I will now try to be brief, and hope we can communicate more about this work, which is about the history of astronomy in the ancient New World civilizations. Particularly, among the Maya. Since the mid-1980s I've been studying Maya culture, calendars, hieroglyphic writing, and astronomy. I've carved out a path as an independent scholar that has resulted in numerous invited presentations at academic institutions, peer-review papers and anthology chapters, as well as trade books and media interviews.

My work, long ago, examined the 2012 date in the Maya Long Count calendar, based on one simple fact about it: it falls on an accurate solstice. (The calendar correlation is largely settled on the JD 584283 correlation, making the end of the 13th Baktun fall on December 21, 2012). I know this is a controversial topic, and most scholars and scientists are still likely to roll their eyes at the very mention of 2012. And this is the problem. Even 70 years after the publication of *de Revolutionibus*, Galileo had a hard boat to row. In my research, I began with the curious fact of the solstice placement in 2012 and engaged a rational process of data-gathering and study that has resulted in my reconstruction of certain aspects of ancient Maya astronomy. I reconstructed two methods used by the Maya for tracking the precession of the equinoxes. This work was largely completed and published in my 1998 book, *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. ("cosmogenesis" in the title was intended to reflect the Maya World Age doctrine of world-renewal, which I had identified in the Maya Creation Myth.) The original sub-title was "Precession Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica," but that was nixed by my trade publisher.

The reason why the 2012 date is a focus for the precession question is because I reconstructed how the solstice date in 2012 (the end of the 13th Baktun in the Long Count, written, 13.0.0.0.0) targets a rare alignment within the precessional movement of the solstices. (It's not simply the Tropical Year position of the solstice, but the sidereal position of the solstice sun as well.) My findings stem primarily from my examination of the early Maya culture and site that is largely credited (by scholars) with the formulation of the Long Count calendar, a site called Izapa in southern Chiapas. That was a defensibly rational way to pursue the investigation, and by visiting the site many times I discovered archaeoastronomical alignments in the monument groups that had not been previously noted by any of the scholars who had studied the site. I even brought an azimuth-measuring device of my own design to the site, to measure the solstice sunrise in the ballcourt. My work was published in my 1998 book, and also years later in peer-reviewed papers and at the *Society for American Archaeology* conference in 2010.

To give you a sense of the academic and scholarly basis of my studies, please view the bibliography for my 1998 book: <http://alignment2012.com/bibbb.htm>. Those are mostly academic sources, some quite obscure but important, that I studied and ordered through interlibrary loan, in the pre-Internet days. I was able to accomplish this work over a ten-year period of study because I made a choice in my life to focus on it --- not without personal sacrifice and financial struggle. It was an edge topic that clearly was not going to receive any support from official channels in academia, so I pursued it on my own.

The reason why I published my book with a trade publisher is because in the mid-1990s, every academic publisher I contacted did not believe that 2012 was a legitimate topic of rational investigation. They wouldn't even take a look at my evidence or arguments, just like the officials who refused to look through Galileo's telescope.

As a personal aside, I learned astronomy with my father with our backyard telescope. He was a polymath of a sort, and I inherited an ability and a love for math and physics. I internalized a lot of science at a young age. I particularly was attracted to cosmology and astronomy and worked out celestial movement formulae in my notebooks, just for the fun of it, in high school. Kepler and Galileo were fascinating figures for me. Two family circumstances, at age 12 and 18, derailed what might have been an easy scholastic career via university programming, but fate pulled me in a more radical direction. I'm glad for that, in retrospect, because the self-directed scholarly work I've pursued would have been hindered by towing the party line, which I would need to do to protect my "career." (Some of my friends in academia have done precisely this, at the expense of moving the field forward by putting forward their breakthrough ideas; *fear* hinders progress.) By the 1980s I was doing service work among the Maya in Guatemala and by 1990 (my fourth journey) I had visited all the major archaeological sites in Mexico and Central America. My book on the Maya Venus calendar was published in 1992/1994.

Fast forward to the year 2012. We now have two hieroglyphic inscriptions mentioning the 2012 date and there are three or four progressive Mayanists who are examining the new evidence. Two of them, Barb MacLeod and Michael Grofe, basically agree with the core premise of my astronomical reconstruction. However, there are heavy-handed and quite unreasonable senior scholars who have, for years, been on a crusade to discredit my work, and me personally, using standard inquisitorial techniques like *ad hominem* character assaults, misrepresenting my ideas, lying, bigotry, and guilt-by-association constructs. Sadly, these shenanigans have involved respected Maya Studies scholars and several university presses. I've recently documented their false statements and misleading critiques of my work in a thoroughly documented 250,000-word study. Since no one currently cares, at least future historians will have the low-down on that story.

But some scholars were supporting my work. Yes, late in the game (circa 2010) a few scholars started publishing their work on 2012 --- in its astronomical and ideological inflections. And their statements echo my own pioneering ideas and "theory" of the 1990s, which was done at a time when 2012 was not a legitimate topic (unless you were just going to lampoon the doomsayers or the New Agers). There have been additional breakthroughs and findings since 2012, but no scholar will touch the topic anymore, unless it's in the context of dismissal. Even the progressive scholars who once cited and mentioned my work have been handed a gag-order, and in order to protect their careers they have acquiesced. I am being written out of the narrative of discovery, relegated to the charlatan bin in footnotes without any kind of accurate engagement with my evidence or arguments.

Scholars have ignored my corrections to their critiques and have unremittingly crafted false denunciations of me and my work in their peer-reviewed papers, and are getting away with it, despite my efforts in asking reputable university publishers

to apply their stated errata policies. For years this was all quite baffling and demoralizing. It caused great distress for me and my wife, who witnessed it all, and has adversely effected my ongoing career. The pain and suffering inflicted is all the more unbearable since my wife of 14 years died last year of cancer.

I wanted to share these events because there are direct parallels between what I've experienced and another time of change in the history of astronomy --- the Copernican Revolution. My work identified key methodologies that are unique to tropical astronomy and Maya cosmology. They are methods for tracking and calculating astronomical movements, in particular the precession of the equinoxes. Yet I've been denounced and reviled as a "charlatan," *even while my ideas are being appropriated and echoed in recent academic writings*. I can send you all the documented details on who, how, and when, if you doubt my general comments.

That the Maya were aware of precession and centrally used it in a World Age doctrine is, alone, a heretical notion for many orthodox Maya Studies scholars. For example, Anthony Aveni. However, the work of Michael Grofe (PhD, University of California 2007) has built upon my work and has offered some very important new discoveries and insights, such that we must accept that the ancient Classic Period Maya demonstrably had a very accurate knowledge of the Sidereal Year, the Tropical Year, and the precession of the equinoxes. Their astronomy on these points was more precise than what was current simultaneously in Europe and Asia, and was not superceded in Western astronomy until the 1600s --- some 800 years after the Classic Maya florescence. This is breakthrough stuff, for it puts New World astronomy on the map as a significant contribution to human knowledge about the cosmos --- though Western education tends to be Eurocentric in its valuation of what is relevant.

Unfortunately, Michael Grofe learned some lessons about being brilliant and rocking the boat, and had to endure battering by "mentors" and anonymous publishing blockades such that he has now found it prudent to mute his efforts. He has yet to try to publish an important discovery he made four years ago, on a Copan stela, and I'm thus prevented from talking about it until he does. The climate in Maya Studies in regard to the implication of these revolutionary new findings is not leading to progress. It's intellectually constipated. In some small but significant way, this isn't just about a "new model" based on the evidence (which I've offered), but it is also about slightly shifting our cognitive framework in order to appreciate the sometimes counter-intuitive way that the Maya were processing and calculating celestial movements (and I've also carefully articulated this in my writings.) This seems to be what is anathema to established scholars, who insist that the Maya must have calculated precession with horizon-based reference points (as in Western astronomy). But that is demonstrably not an absolute requirement, and it's not what the Maya were doing. This Western astronomy bias is akin to the biases Galileo had to deal with, from those who were trying to maintain an inadequate cognitive framework. In addition, I sadly suspect that a bias against the innate intelligence of

Native Americans probably also effects the judgments of some scholars, albeit perhaps unconsciously.

I am fairly uncomfortable with having to toot my own horn regarding my role in all this. I've spent a lot of time correcting critics, and the inquisitor mentality loves to get you into a defensive position, by whatever unethical means necessary. But intellectual jousting and gotcha journalism just distracts us from the work at hand, and the facts and evidence. So I'm trying to find allies who understand these kinds of dynamics, and can help me determine whether or not science is still being practiced in Maya Studies. I realize it is difficult for a field of study to accept or allow major breakthroughs to be made by an outsider, but that is exactly what has happened, if the facts and events are accurately understood. For this to happen, the negative talking points and false propaganda currently in vogue and enshrined in the published record --- about my work and (still) about "2012" --- must be seen for what it is: Disinformation from turf protecting bullies who didn't get there first. For the fact is that my ideas are being echoed now in official Mayanist circles even while the mitigation machine continues to push me aside.

I can direct you to my articles and responses to critics if you are interested, and perhaps you can suggest an avenue through which my work can receive the recognition it deserves. I hope you find all this interesting; I thought you might because it reflects similar dynamics that were at play in the late 1500s and early 1600s, regarding those pioneering scientists and philosophers who I have admired as paragons of courage and intellectual integrity, committed to advancing our knowledge about the cosmos.

All my best wishes,

John Major Jenkins
Windsor, Colorado

p.s.: I do woodcuts and printing as a hobby:
<http://alignment2012.com/home-shop.html>

My primary research site is *The Center for 2012 Studies*:
<http://theCenterfor2012Studies.com>. Selected writings:

My chapter contribution to *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, (2011, ed. Dr. Joseph Gelfer, preface by Dr. Michael Coe)
<http://alignment2012.com/Jenkins-in-Gelfer-anthology2.pdf>

A good intro to my work, based on my presentation at NEARA (*New England Antiquities Research Association*):
<http://theCenterfor2012studies.com/Recon2012-Nov2012-slight-edit.pdf>

Summary and info on my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*: <http://alignment2012.com/mayacosmo.htm>

My Tarcher/Penguin book of 2009, titled *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies, and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History* (paperback released in 2010).

<http://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/305289/the-2012-story-by-john-major-jenkins/9781585428236/>

On the Tortuguero Monument 6 "2012" inscription, from the *Institute of Maya Studies Explorer* magazine:
http://theCenterfor2012studies.com/Dec_IMS_2010.pdf
(begins on page 3)

My review-essay in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, correcting the errors of Hoopes & Whitesides. (They responded by denying or wiggling around admitting any of the errors.)
<http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>

"Lord Jaguar and the Astronomy of Tortuguero Monument 6." Presentation at the *Institute of Maya Studies*, January 19, 2011. In six parts, posted on Youtube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZE_WBfEXLnc

Exchange with Dr. Ed Barnhart of the *Maya Exploration Center*: <http://theCenterfor2012studies.com/Email-exchange-Barnhart-Jenkins.pdf>

Correction to Anthony Aveni's error on the Izapa ballcourt alignment:
<http://update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>
(Sent to Aveni in 2014, then to his university press publisher in 2015 --- everyone denied this simple, demonstrable, error). Aveni wrote the one and only book by a Maya scholar that was published with a peer-reviewed university press (The University Press of Colorado). His book was riddled with errors of varying types, many of which were clearly intended to discredit me and my work. I selected seven easily proven errors for errata correction, and Aveni and his publisher denied them all. Taking it to the higher level of the AAUP (Association of American University Presses), their Standards committee likewise denied my complaint without any rational explanations. Quite disappointing, sadly resulting in my unavoidable evidence-based conclusion that these scholars and their publishers are unethical and corrupt.

My review of the revised 9th edition (2015) of Michael Coe's book *The Maya*, which introduced 2012 as an "Armageddon" in 1966. This interpretation was demonstrably false, in terms of what the Maya believed, but was not revised through eight editions over 49 years, until this 9th edition, released in 2015.
<http://theCenterfor2012studies.com/Coe9-2015.pdf>

Item 7f. Response to Thomas Frank's 2012 Editorial in his "Easy Chair" Column in *Harper's Magazine*

I was alerted to Thomas Frank's denigrating comments about my work by my friend, author and poet Bill Tremblay, who commented that Frank was clearly "taking me to the woodshed" (for a sound thrashing) and unfairly treating my work. Bill commented to Frank's Facebook page, in a thread begun by Frank to announce his 2012 piece in the December issue of *Harper's Magazine*:

I agree that the 2012 doomsday predictions have drawn attention away from real problems in a maelstrom of chicken-little squawking, i.e. your main thesis in "Appetite for Destruction." But I think you're being very unfair to John Major Jenkins by setting him up as the representative straw man. While he argues that the Maya themselves should be listened to even more so than American anthropologists as to what their tradition is in regard to the extant glyphic evidence, he never says December 21, 2012 is the end of the world, only the end of an eon or era. He's a guy without a college education who went down to Maya country and taught himself a tremendous amount. Sometimes his lack of a PhD gets thrown in his face in the form of "who do you think you are" sorts of challenges. In another context, you would champion Jenkins as an academic underdog, Tom. I know you can't go back and fix this--though if you could you should--by differentiating Jenkins from the doomsday types. In defense of the view that our intellectual elite shouldn't be ignored in favor of populist "know-nothingism," you've taken him to the woodshed for something he hasn't done.

I called and talked to Harper's editor Jason Chupik and registered my concern over the misrepresentation in Thomas Frank's "Easy Chair" editorial on 2012, in the December issue. Here's my letter-to-the-editor suggested by, and sent to, Harper's in early December.

To: Jason Chupik / jason@harpers.org

Dear Harpers,
I would like to address two areas of my work that were not clearly reported in Thomas Frank's piece on the Maya 2012 date in December's issue. First, my work was discussed at length, citing passages from my twelfth and latest book on Maya cosmology. The title of this recent book, which is a comprehensive study of the 2012 topic from all relevant angles, was not mentioned, whereas the titles of six or seven other books and movies, which were more briefly treated and often not even quoted from, were cited. The title of my book is: *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies, and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History* (Tarcher/Penguin 2009). Second, Mr. Frank alluded to my "2012 alignment theory" as an "invention." My approach since the early 1990s has been to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, and I have utilized primary sources with a main focus on the evidence at the early site of Izapa, which is credited by many scholars with having been involved in the formulation of the Long Count / 2012 calendar. That was a rational approach to the effort, with meaningful results that have nevertheless been largely overlooked by reactionary professional scholars and an under-informed media fixated either on doomsday or simply treating 2012 as a joke. My work should be correctly identified as a reconstruction rather than an "invention." And the 2012 date should be treated as a true artifact of ancient Maya thought, which can be and should be investigated on its own terms. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins

I probably should have framed my comments as a needed correction of factual error and oversight (in Frank's neglecting to cite the several quotes he took from my book.) My letter to the editor was not published, and my follow-up inquiry a few months later was ignored. So much for the Fairness Doctrine. Oops, forgot ... they already did away with that.

Sent this to Thomas Frank's website "contact form" on August 23, 2014:

Dear Mr Frank, this is long overdue but since Harper's didn't publish my corrective letter-to-the-editor, as they said they would, here it is for your consideration. It's regarding your Easy Chair editorial from December 2012, on the "2012" topic. In insinuating that my work was part of some anti-intellectual know-nothingism, I think you utterly misrepresented it. You're free to disagree with my work, but I offered the following two corrective observations in my letter. Feel free to email with your thoughts. Best wishes.

[and I repeated my letter-to-the-editor, see above]

No response, ever, as of June 2016.

Item 7g. Letter sent to Dava Sobel

Dear Dava Sobel,

2-11-2013

I've very much enjoyed your books over the years. *Longitude* was a special favorite of mine, and I can relate to the efforts of John Harrison, Galileo, and other pioneers in the field of astronomy. I saw you speak in Denver last year, and also heard you interviewed on David Sirota's radio program --- a program that I have also been on. I was struck, in that interview, when you said you were interested in the motivations and processes of the independent outsider who hits upon breakthroughs yet experiences endless onslaughts of mitigation, misunderstanding, ostracizing, and attacks. John Harrison and Galileo are perfect examples. I too have been interested in the lives of these pioneers, and I am hopeful that you might consider taking a moment to acquaint yourself with my work.

At this stage I've been published by Tarcher/Penguin and five other publishers since 1992. I have given presentation at academic and popular conferences. I have been researching ancient Maya cultures, calendars, and astronomy since the 1980s. I was on an anthropology track but was swept into my concern for the atrocities against the Maya in the 1980s, and so dedicated several years to volunteer work and travels in Guatemala. I began writing articles and in 1992 found a publisher for my first book, on the Venus calendar in the Maya Dresden Codex. I've been on an "independent researcher" track ever since, for better or worse.

My work took a focus on certain unresolved enigmas of Maya cosmology, notably the 2012 period-ending date in the Long Count calendar. I am painfully aware that most people treat "2012" as a synonym for "doomsday." In my research, I have not found evidence for this. Instead, I examined the evidence at the pre-Classic site called Izapa, which many scholars had acknowledge was probably involved in the

formulation of the Long Count calendar. That's a rational approach to the question, which no one had taken, before or since. As a result, my findings were solidly documented and I identified evidence for astronomy and an ideology of "solar renewal."

My approach, I should emphasize, was to try to *reconstruct what the ancient creators of the Long Count/2012 calendar thought about 2012*. I should also emphasize that, in the 1990s when I was publishing my findings, professional Maya scholars were not giving 2012 a second glance. In fact, my work was met with un-discerning, opinionated, scoffing skepticism. In 2006, new evidence for my reconstruction came from a Classic Maya monument called Tortuguero Monument 6 --- which actually references the 2012 date. This was exciting, and promised a pass-or-fail test for my thesis. It passed with flying colors. By 2009 I had an ally in academia, Michael Grofe, and together we worked out the astronomy of the dates on the monument. We found striking support for my "2012 alignment reconstruction." I gave a presentation on this at the by-invitation-only academic conference of *The Society for American Archaeology* (St. Louis, April 2010). I should mention that none of this should be confused or conflated with the misinformation about 2012 and "alignments" and "pole shifts" and doomsday in the marketplace. Last month, I was with Michael Grofe and veteran Maya scholar Barbara MacLeod in Copan, Honduras, and we determined something new and striking on one of the Copan monuments that adds more support to my work.

Well, it seems like things are looking up. But, in fact, the vast majority of status quo scholars have torched me (personally) and my work, and the media has confused it with all the doomsday propaganda. (This despite me being interviewed on CNN, NPR, Fox News, NY Times, National Geographic, etc etc) Grofe and MacLeod have had to bite their tongues when discussing my work, because 2012 is a hot potato and any association with my name meets with immediate attacks. I have been critical of the inability of most Maya scholars to treat 2012 rationally. I have documented my twenty years of interactions with scholars in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin). I am concerned with moving the discussion of ancient Maya astronomy forward, but there is a huge stop-gap in place, still being reinforced by debunker-scholars who never have summarized what my work is actually about, and never cite the evidence that I bring to bear on my work. This, despite twenty years of direct communications with them. It's quite astounding. It's the game of elitists using polemical rhetoric to mitigate an outsider. Now, as Maya scholars finally begin to say things about how the ancient Maya may have thought about 2012 (as of August 2010), they are echoing the ideas I published two decades ago, in both the astronomical and ideological aspects. And yet I am still repeatedly identified as the purveyor of "nonsense." It's quite ugly, and scholars I used to respect are now revealed as incredibly unethical, capable of stooping to very low places.

I am reaching out to you because I hope you may be interested in understanding this story, and perhaps help move things forward in the ongoing discussion. In academia and in the public marketplace, 2012 remains a completely distorted and misunderstood topic. The very idea that we can, and

should, be trying to figure out what the Maya thought about 2012, is buried under 40 layers of obfuscation. Beginning in 2009, four books were published by Maya scholars on 2012. They were reactionary and debunking in nature; none of them attempted to say anything about what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. Most scholars believe "it's a hoax." NASA astronomers, science guy Neil deGrasse Tyson, and Ed Krupp at Griffith Observatory do not even acknowledge that the astronomical alignment I write about is even real astronomy. (I'm not talking about astrology, but astronomy.) And yet high-level astronomers such as Jean Meeus and Patrick Wallace have calculated this alignment (and I cited them in my 2002 book). Cyber-stalkers have hijacked my Wikipedia page.

I've offered a longer summary than I wanted to. I hope we might try for a conversation, via email or phone, about these things. I'm saddened by the lack of rational treatment of my work and the 2012 topic generally. I just wanted to make the introduction. I could direct you to reliable info on my background and work, and would be happy to send you a few articles, and my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*. In the realm of pure research, you might take a look at my essays at *The Center for 2012 Studies*: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>. Much more to share, Dava. Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope 2013 finds you well and happy. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

author of:

Tzolkin (1992/1994)

Maya Cosmogenesis 2012 (1998)

Galactic Alignment (2002)

The 2012 Story (2009)

Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions (2011)

Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy (2012)

Note: No reply received. After 2012 I was interested in reaching out to other intelligent authors and science historians who I thought would be interested in the experiences I was having. Those focused on the Heliocentric Revolution --- a fascinating period in the history of Western Astronomy --- were obvious candidates. Sadly, it didn't seem that they were willing or able to recognize that the kind of persecution experienced by trailblazers like Galileo could (rather obviously) be experienced in modern times by other kindred souls who were trying to break open the constipated and irrationally intractable stagnation of a field of scientific endeavor. The fact that Sobel and others did not respond to my letters suggests a rather bizarre situation of, how shall I say, temporal aphasia. They could offer compassion and understanding to a progressive thinker who lived centuries ago, but could not recognize a like-in-kind situation in the modern world, in real time. I'm not sure if this is/was a courage issue, a perception issue, or just plain apathy, but it does seem unfortunate that trailblazers must die in poverty, without recognition, before their contributions can be recognized.

Item 7h. Letter sent to Arthur Versluis

Dear Arthur Versluis,

February 10, 2015

I've been reading your Inquisition book, and greatly appreciate your insights into this dynamic that occurs in professional discourse on profound topics. I wanted to share a sketch of an essay I'm working on that explores similar territory. My area of study for almost thirty years has been Mesoamerican cultures, the Maya calendar, and ancient cosmology. I've had to work around the fringes of academia but based on the merits of my work I have published peer-reviewed papers, chapters in academic anthologies, and have been a guest teacher at colleges, universities, and academic institutes. By the early 1990s my research focus became the 2012 date within Maya cosmology and belief, and my books include *Tzolkin* (1992/1994), *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998), *Galactic Alignment* (2002), and *The 2012 Story* (Tarcher/Penguin, 2009). Other research essays are freely posted at *The Center for 2012 Studies*: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

The "inquisition" story that I hope will interest you is about how writers on "2012" were treated by professional Mayanists, as well as by general scientists (astronomers and anthropologists). This includes derogatory frameworks being crafted by scholarly "debunkers" in which myself and others were associated with astrological charlatanism, doomsday pseudoscience, Theosophy, and Nazis. Yes, you heard that right. Broadly speaking, there were two categories of writers on 2012. First, there were those, myself included, who were genuinely trying to reconstruct what the Long Count calendar period-ending (December 21, 2012) meant to the ancient Maya, following scholarly principles of investigation and documentation. Within this category there was a spectrum of cogency, as one might suspect, and in fact apart from my own work there wasn't much of this that was reliably based on the basic facts of Maya culture and calendars. The bibliography for my 1998 book shows my concern with drawing from a spectrum of valid high-level academic sources: <http://alignment2012.com/bibbb.htm>.

The second category is comprised of the popular writers, doomsday exploiters, and marketplace strategists who were manifestly not concerned with having a scholarly approach to the Maya and 2012. The Maya have long suffered from receiving all kinds of projections from imaginative theorists, novelists, and popular writers, all of which have effected the zeitgeist of public opinion.

There are a few special circumstance with the 2012 topic that help us understand why things happened in the way they did. In the 1990s scholars and academic publishers believed 2012 was a non-topic, largely a joke that "dubious" people like Jose Arguelles and Terence McKenna were saying things about. Among a small handful of scholars, the 2012 period-ending date was known to be a function of the calendar math, and so was, in some sense, an artifact of the calendar. But to what extent it was an intentional artifact was not explored. Prior to 2006, there were only three statements about 2012 offered by Maya scholars. One was what seemed an off-hand, tongue-in-cheek comment by Michael Coe, in his 1966 book *The Maya*, in which in one sentence he alluded to it as the Maya "Armageddon." Unfortunately, his computation of the date was

incorrect by almost a year, which was repeated by a few popular writers in the 1970s and 80s. The other comment was from Latin America literature specialist and Mayanist Munro Edmonson, in his book called *The Book of the Year: Middle American Calendar Systems* (University of Utah Press, 1988). He noted that, by the correct correlation, the 13-Baktun cycle-ending fell on an accurate solstice in 2012. It was something pointed out to him by his Tulane colleagues Victoria and Harvey Bricker, so such things could indeed occur to the scholars (but the published academic record was bereft of any other statements). This one slipped into print, and in three sentences Edmonson speculated that the ancient Maya who created the Long Count calendar (in 355 BC according to Edmonson) may have been aware of the Tropical Year, in order to project an accurate solstice date far into the future. That's it. The Brickers, in their massive study of 2011 called *Astronomy in the Maya Codices*, don't mention 2012,¹ and Edmonson died in 2003.

The third note about 2012 by scholars came from a footnote in an essay by epigraphers Stephen Houston and David Stuart (1998). They mentioned the Tortuguero Monument 6 "2012" inscription, and asserted that there was no "prophecy" — it was just reflex connected a contemporary date to a big period-ending. (This important text was known to only a very few specialists, who didn't fess up about its existence until 2006.) They adopted a position in which the date was not meaningful to the Maya, and this was vociferously repeated to the media by David Stuart through 2012 despite the Tortuguero text being minutely analyzed by veteran epigrapher Barbara MacLeod (with Sven Gronemeyer), overturning the earlier views and flawed translation of the text by Houston and Stuart. This episode is an emblematic example of how scholars adamantly clung to the bias that 2012 could not have had any meaning to the ancient Maya, that it was a hoax and a joke. Stuart's reactive 2012 Q & A page remains on his blog, filled with errors and uncorrected to this day. One of his assertions is that 2012 was the invention of "New Age hacks." <http://update2012.com/responsetostuartsblog.html>.

For most scholars, attitudes toward 2012 were informed by glancing at the marketplace and the internet. Consequently, a consensus developed that 2012 was a joke, and was not a valid topic of investigation. My own approach was to investigate the origin-time and place of the Long Count calendar, which brought me to study the pre-Maya Izapan culture in southern

¹ They do, however, critique the work of Michael Grofe, who demonstrated in his 2007 PhD dissertation how the Sidereal Year, the Tropical Year, and the precession of the equinoxes are recorded in the Maya Dresden Codex. Regarding the astronomical part of Grofe's argument, which they "suspect is problematic", they direct the reader to the critiques of professional astronomers (most likely alluding to the forthcoming book of their close colleague, Anthony Aveni, which as of 2015 is the only critique of Grofe's work by an astronomer). The Brickers themselves offer a critique of Grofe's epigraphic readings. Grofe pointed out to me several flaws in their critique of his epigraphic readings, and he published, in the 2011 Cambridge IAU anthology on archaeoastronomy an official correction to three errors in Aveni's published critique of his astronomy. [My own chapter in an academic anthology \(2012: *Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*, ed. Joseph Gelfer, 2011\)](#) corrected two of these errors, which I had also noticed.

Mexico. I'd been there in 1990, during one of my trips, and by 1995 I had some striking results. One could also study the Maya Creation Mythology and other traditions to understand their ideas about World Age time cycles, ceremonies performed at period-endings in the calendar, and cosmology. No scholar had approached the investigation of 2012 in this systematic way. I was seeking publishing options for my work by 1996 and produced a completed book-length study in 1997. University publishers were unanimous in immediately rejecting 2012 as a legitimate topic of publication. Phone conversations I had with directors or acquisition editors at three university publishing houses lasted about 30 seconds before the hand went up. The proposal didn't even get to the point of me needing to show credentials or explain how I was an independent self-taught student of Maya Studies. The rejection wasn't based on that; it was based on 2012 being an illegitimate topic within academic publishing, a joke.²

Years later, beginning in 2006, we can even see that *the first publication* on 2012 in a peer-review context by a scholar³ (and as it turned out, most of the subsequent publications on the topic by scholars), took the *sociological approach* of critiquing "millennial" movements, the "phenomenon" of 2012 as a growing topic of hysterical interest, and "Gnostic New Age" prophets who pollute the marketplace with noxious irrational pseudoscience.⁴ And there was a lot of that to critique, a messy situation of wrong assertions, personal "guru-style" agendas and prophecies, bad writing, and disinformation. The earliest critiques of this mess, taking to task the fantastical "Dreamspell" system of Jose Arguelles, can be found in my own books and writings, namely my 1992 book *Tzolkin* (republished by Borderland Sciences Research Foundation in 1994).

Subsequently, and still long before any professional scholar took up the task, I had also critiqued the errors of Carl Calleman, Zechariah Sitchin, and others. (I even critiqued McKenna's unlikely idea that something sudden was slated to happen on the morning of December 21, 2012.) I did so by citing errors in their premises and assumptions by referencing the basic facts of the Maya calendar. I didn't demonize or create superficial categories of dismissal (such as "[Mayanism](#)," courtesy of academic debunker John Hoopes), as later professional scholars would do. I critiqued their work on their own terms and pointed out their conceptual and factual errors. The fact is that they weren't interested in reconstructing what the ancient Maya believed, although that was sometimes the veneer of their presentations.

My own work was explicitly directed to reconstructing what the creators of the Long Count believed about 2012. The fact that the cycle-ending date fell on a solstice was a good indication that it was an intentional artifact of the system. As it

would turn out, none of my critics in academia have ever stated that this was my approach. They never accurately summarized my work before torching it, and me personally, often tossing me into the same category of New Age Gnostic prophets, doomsday theorists, members of "[Mayanism](#)" or the "Maya Prophecy Movement" (MPM) that other writers were sequestered in.

My work offered a simple two-part interpretation of 2012. The creators of the Long Count/2012 calendar wanted to target a rare alignment within the cycle of the precession of the equinoxes. Secondly, they linked this alignment to their Creation Mythology to express an idea, or doctrine, of period-ending renewal that required deity sacrifice for its successful fulfillment. No doomsday, no insta-enlightenment, not any kind of predetermined, fated, "thing" slated "to happen to us."

Now, holding this in mind, I will note that there have been many denigrating critiques and statements about me and my work offered by Maya scholars and other scientists, in their sanctioned government web pages, peer-reviewed articles and books. What we find is a very ugly chapter in the annals of professional academia, one in which our trusted intelligentsia was seized by a kind of inquisitorial fervor. The fact is that 95% of what appeared in the popular literature on 2012 was fictional, imaginative, of deeply flawed, and so could be dismissed as not being relevant to understanding ancient Maya cosmology. But my own work was singularly unique in presenting, at a time when 2012 studies was a wasteland, a well-documented and argued reconstruction. Here's the crux of the cognitive dissonance within Maya Studies: we now have confirmation that I was barking up the right tree because, beginning eighteen years after my first brief exploration of 2012 calendrics was published in 1992, we had a small group of progressive scholars — those concerned *not with sociological critique of millennial madness* but with understanding what the ancient Maya believed — echoing my own ideas. This is seen in the monograph by Gronemeyer and MacLeod (2010), articles by MacLeod (2011, 2012), MacLeod & Van Stone (2012), Carlson (2012), Callaway (2011, 2012), and the work of Michael Grofe (2010, 2011, 2012). I managed to speak at a few conferences alongside scholars, in April of 2010, June of 2012, and December of 2012,⁵ but I was like a thorn in the side, an outsider. It could not be allowed, and in the official published record my work is largely disparaged, usually through some *ad hominem* tactic, even while my ideas are being echoed, explored, or repeated.

Arthur, that's a quick summary of the story. The dossier of corrections I've assembled can be seen and read at <http://www.Update2012.com>. In my effort to rectify the bad

² I was also submitting the book to trade publishers, and it was published with Bear & Company in Santa Fe, in 1998, just before they were acquired by Inner Traditions. Title: *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. The modest advance was a windfall to me at the time, as I'd been working a part-time job and living in a renovated garage without running water for 3 years in order to have time to do my research.

³ Sitler, 2006, "The 2012 Phenomenon." *Nova Religio*.

⁴ Even the phrase "the 2012 phenomenon" was appropriated from a prior use by myself and author Geoff Stray. See Jenkins 2014.

⁵ The December 2012 conference was a great exception, in which myself, Barbara MacLeod, and Michael Grofe shared a view that 2012 was indeed a "Great Return" in the cycle of Maya time, and that the precession of the equinoxes was known to the ancient Maya. However, they have both experienced retribution from their colleagues for daring to entertain and expand upon ideas about 2012 that I was enunciating, before any professional Maya scholar did, in the 1990s. More to the point, they weren't actively ignoring or disparaging me, as that was the tacitly (or perhaps not so tacitly) agreed approach to me taken by the vast majority of other scholars.

behavior of malicious inquisitors, I have recently selected three perpetrators because their agencies or university press publishers have policies in place for correcting errors. This pertains to the false and slanderous assertions by Dr Ed Krupp, Anthony Aveni, and NASA scientist David Morrison. As you might suspect, I'm getting the runaround. Aveni, for example, crafted a critique in which myself and others were identified as "Gnostics". He defines Gnosticism, associates it with mystical mumbo-jumbo, and references the moniker throughout his book, often under the denomination of "New Age" Gnosticism. Even if I did belong to the church of Gnosticism, and was a Gnostic, since when is ones religious affiliation grounds for criticizing ones scholarship? That's bigotry. If he had used being a Jew or a Muslim in the same way as he uses being a Gnostic, the ACLU would be alerted and he'd be sitting in court right now.

I did succeed, last year, in getting published a peer-reviewed essay-critique of a deeply error-riddled and contemptuous piece by 2012 critics John Hoopes and Kevin Whitesides. It is here: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>. Their invited response succeeded in wiggling around acknowledging any need to correct at least four factual errors, each having denigrating consequences in how my work was to be understood. I thus responded with an unofficial rebuttal called "[Deceptive Scholars Refuse to Correct Factual Errors in Their Peer-Reviewed Study](#)." Because I referenced a few private email exchanges we had had, in order to demonstrate their tactic of simply lying in their official response, they went on the attack and accused me of using private correspondence without permission, and succeeded in bringing the wrath of the German editors at the journal down on me. I can only say to any doubter: please read the actual essays and exchanges. Again, it's a sad example of the unethical behavior that scholars are willing to employ in order to protect their guild or their own baseless convictions. The special situation with my story, which explains the extreme vitriol employed by these turf protectors, is the emerging fact that I had succeeded in reconstructing something centrally profound about ancient Maya cosmology, on a topic that scholars denied for years and only recently came to acknowledge as a valid topic, namely through the appearance of two hieroglyphic inscriptions that contain the 2012 period-ending date (from Tortuguero, in 2006, and La Corona, in 2012). So, the agenda seems to have one arm of academia mitigating me through unfair and devious tactics while the other arm begins echoing my ideas and work. Plagiarism and excoriation wrapped up into one package.

My hope is that you can offer some advice as to where I might publish an account of this story. No matter what the outcome is with the corrections I've recently registered with university presses and the NASA.gov website, there is a story here which rubs shoulders with your work on totalitarian thinking throughout history. I appreciated your angle on it; I hadn't quite thought about it that way.

I don't mean to impose on your time but I've read some of your various works through the years and felt you would be sympathetic to the attacks I've endured. We often look to the past for examples of these disturbing episodes in the history of science and scholarship, but overlook when they are unfolding right now, right next door. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins / The2012story@gmail.com

p.s. A good interview with me on Berkeley KPFC "Against the Grain": <http://www.kpfa.org/archive/id/69285>. 2014 Retrospective, with links to publications and interviews: <http://www.update2012.com/2014update.html>. Other items: <http://alignment2012.com/Two-year-retrospective.html>

Preface to next Item. Kevin Whitesides visited me at my home in April, 2016. He spent the night at my invitation. When he left I gave him a print out of the following item on Terence McKenna and the Galactic Alignment, and most of my *Ivory Tower, House of Cards* book. Haven't heard from him since. Email sent to him on April 17:

Kevin, I hope you had a safe trip home. I've been archiving various interviews and readings I've done over the years. Many of these are not online, as I became discerning about posting everything to the Internet. Hundreds of hours of it. I ran across a few things that you might be interested in. I attach an mp3 --- about 6 megs, hope your hotmail account can receive this. At about the 19:30 mark I address the 20 Baktun vs the 13 Baktun thing that you brought up in conversation. This "critique" against 13 Baktuns goes way back to Linda Schele, which I addressed in 1996 and which I also mentioned and addressed in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. It is thus a quite worn-out trope, although critics still believe it is a valid critique --- largely because they don't understand the argument or framework that surrounds it. Her piece is online, with my recent comments: <http://alignment2012.com/Schele-commentscreationdate1996.html>

Since the early list-serve archives that hosted Schele's comments are long gone, it's likely that her statements are not preserved anywhere else. Hope we can continue the conversation about interests we share. Best wishes, John. BTW, I ran across a copy of an email Terence sent to me in 1995. I determined he was sending emails to my aol.com account. I would compose my responses separately, and thus my half of the exchanges are preserved. However, it was apparently not easy to save or copy incoming emails at that time. Apart from this one, which I copied out long-hand on a piece of paper, I suspect that most of Terence's emails to me between 1994-ish and 1997-ish may be lost. Unless I can dig them out of an old hard drive --- if they are there. Prior to 1995, we exchanged snail-mails so those are largely preserved.

Item 7i. Terence McKenna and the Galactic Alignment**John Major Jenkins. October 2015**

I want to arrange here some excerpts and quotations from the work of Terence McKenna, in an attempt to clarify to what extent, and when, he believed the “galactic alignment” was the reason why the ancient Maya picked 2012 to end a vast cycle in their calendar. (This specific association is to be emphasized as distinct from merely noting the alignment and also mentioning 2012 in a non-Maya calendar discussion, as happened in his 1975 book.) In the process, some things will become clear. I don’t at all wish to take anything away from Terence in this process; he was a forward-thinking visionary who read widely and deeply, and ideas that struck home as curious were like beacons for him that needed to be reported. He befriended me, a young writer, and through his example I was emboldened to speak publicly about my work.

Such was how he came to report some information that “sort of” gets at the heart of the “galactic alignment” concept. Terence & Dennis cited and quoted from the 1969 book *Hamlet’s Mill*, which is where they encountered the idea. However, that book does not connect it with 2012 or the Maya calendar. Likewise, when Terence quoted and briefly discussed *Hamlet’s Mill* in the 1975 book he co-authored with his brother, Dennis, the phenomenon was not connected with 2012 in the Maya calendar. The Maya calendar was not even mentioned in the first edition of that book. A brief update was inserted, however, into the 1993/4 second edition. (I write 1993/94 because although it was given a 1993 pub date the new introduction and acknowledgements state they are for “the 1994 edition” and Terence’s new foreword is dated November 1993 --- thus quite unlikely that it was *de facto* off the press, bound, and in the stores before 1994; my communications with Terence were in the Spring and Summer of 1993.)

I speak solely of Terence in reference to this topic, because it doesn’t seem that Dennis had, or has, any interest in it, despite professing to have long been interested in astronomy. Email attempts haven’t result in a dialogue, and when he briefly and dismissively treated 2012 as the Maya calendar date in his book *Brotherhood of the Screaming Abyss*, he didn’t mention my work or the galactic alignment. I suspect that alignments within the precession of the equinoxes tasted a bit too much like some kind of astrology, and his astronomical interests --- as with many scientists --- runs toward astrophysics, deep space telescopes and radio signals, and so on. In *Brotherhood of the Screaming Abyss* he explicitly stated that Terence’s formulation of Time Wave Zero had nothing to do with the Maya calendar:

“His [Terence’s] theory and the Maya calendar have nothing to do with each other, the delusions of the current zeitgeist notwithstanding. While most credible Mayanists agree that the Maya did have a calendar that ends, so to speak, on the winter solstice in 2012, there’s little evidence the date was imbued with great significance” (Dennis McKenna 2012:318).

This is an unfortunate and under-informed statement from Dennis, despite my attempts to clearly communicate my work to him at events we shared, in emails, and in my 2009 book which I sent to him. No “Maya calendar” ends, in any way of speaking. It is very easy to understand and state what the traditions actually is about: A 13-Baktun cycle within the Long Count ends on December 21, 2012. Dennis’s other statement is totally true, however much this may be surprising to Terence’s fans. Terence’s analysis and ideas about 2012 were based on the King Wen sequence in the I Ching, with a resulting theory about time. Terence was transparent in stating that the posited “zero date” of the “wave”, which is suggested twice as coming in 2012, in the 1975 first edition of *The Invisible Landscape*, was only later realized to correspond with the Maya calendar cycle ending.

We can look to Terence’s 1991 collection of interviews and essays to get a sense for the ideas, concepts, and things that Terence found most important to share with his readership, at that time. This will provide a window into how relevant the galactic alignment was in his thinking. I should preface what follows by noting exactly how Terence (with, presumably, Dennis’s concurrence) characterized the alignment in their 1975 book. Following *Hamlet’s Mill*, it wasn’t primarily characterized as an *alignment* but as a “heliacal rise” of the Galactic Center in front of the dawning December solstice sun. This was, technically, a pretty misleading characterization. A heliacal rise of a celestial object requires the visibility of that object --- such as the heliacal rise of Venus occurring some 4 days after inferior conjunction with the sun. It takes four days of separating movement for Venus to be visible in the pre-dawn sky. If heliacal rise is taken to merely mean that a body has reached a point just west of the sun, then the heliacal rise of Venus would be understood to occur 1 second after its moment of precise inferior conjunction with the sun.

Furthermore, Terence prudently noted that it is difficult to measure where the precise center of the Milky Way is located. This is true, but it disregards two important criteria of the galactic alignment. One is that, to naked-eye astronomers in ancient cultures, the Galactic Center is a “nuclear bulge” --- it is quite large. It gains a mythological value not via some modern scientific need to precisely measure its exact center, but because of its status as a single visual unit and its conceptual place in a cosmological paradigm. Said another way, the amorphous space occupied by the Galactic Center is a visual oneness to naked-eye observers, which also has a conceptual and visual center. Two: the Milky Way itself is a road in the sky, and a Dark Rift feature runs along its lengthwise axis, pointing right into the nuclear bulge of the Galactic Center. The “target” for precessional calculations would be this “line” along the Milky Way. The abstract midline is called by astronomers the galactic equator. The Dark Rift itself is, of course, much wider than an abstract line, but it provides a target that is visible to the naked eye.

With this, three concepts were introduced by me as being important for a discussion of the galactic alignment, and these were not discussed in *Hamlet’s Mill*, nor in Terence McKenna’s writings prior to my discussions with him in the early 1990s. These are: the mythologizing of the Galactic Center, by the ancient Maya, as a “womb”; the Dark Rift in the Milky Way (as a birth-cleft); and the nearby cross formed by

the Milky Way and the ecliptic (both being alignment targets). Now, the Milky Way/ecliptic “cross” concept certainly may have occurred to McKenna and others, but understanding it as an authentic Maya concept, in relation to a discussion of the precession-based galactic alignment astronomy, is not found. There may have been speculations loosely thrown around, but that’s not the same as investigating and documenting the validity of any speculations.

So, here’s what we have in the work of Terence and Dennis (1975):

It is a coincidence that in our own time the winter solstice is placed in the constellation of Sagittarius only about 3 degrees from the galactic center which also coincidentally, is within 2 degrees of the ecliptic. Because the winter solstice node is precessing, it is moving closer and closer to the point on the ecliptic where it will eclipse the galactic center. This will occur sometime in the next 200 years. It is difficult to be more accurate, since the term “galactic center” is ambiguous. A degree covers a larger area in space, and the galaxy may be presumed to have a gravitational center, a radio center, and a spatial center. Nevertheless, we suggest that the transition from one zodiacal era of approximately 2200 years duration to the next may be hinged on the conjunction of the solstice node with the galactic center. It is useful to examine winter solstices on which solar eclipses will occur over the next 200 years, during which the earth’s solstice node will be slowly transiting the area of the galactic center. **[When this is done the most likely heliacal rising of the galactic center with the solstice sun occurs on December 21, 2012.]** --- **[This sentence was added to the 1993 second edition, p. 196]** The eclipse of the galactic center by the solstice sun, which is itself in eclipse relationship to earth, might be an event unusual enough to signal the onset of conrescence. ... The relation of a time of renewal to the conjunction of the solstice nodes and the galactic center has been noted by others: [*Hamlet’s Mill* (p. 244) quote given here].

-end T.M. quote, pp. 189-190 (1975 edition; additions from the 2nd edition in **bold**)

Then they segue to the I Ching and Chinese philosophy. There are important perspectives and statements in the quote given above, as well as confusions. One important thing to note is that the phenomenon might be thought of as a “conjunction,” although it was previously described as a “heliacal rise.” Another is that the authors recognize that the conjunction phenomenon was noted earlier by the authors of *Hamlet’s Mill*, and it can be assumed to indicate a “time of renewal.” Another is the authors’ suggestion that the said alignment may correspond to a cusp transition in the 12-sign zodiac of Western astrology (stated as roughly 2200 years each), although the constellation divisions actually don’t work that well for the solstice-galaxy alignment and this is not explained.

A rather large problem is how *one sentence* was inserted in the 1993/94 edition (which I’ve bolded above), apparently in order to anchor the earlier statements explicitly to December 21st of 2012. (In the 1975 first edition, the specific date of December 21 was never mentioned.) The problem is that the

new sentence begins “when this is done” and “this” refers to the previous sentence which describes how it would be “*useful to examine winter solstices on which solar eclipses will occur over the next 200 years, during which the earth’s solstice node will be slowly transiting the area of the galactic center*” (emphasis added). The problem is that December 21, 2012 is NOT a winter solstice on which a solar eclipse occurred; not even close. An interesting full lunar eclipse occurred on the December solstice of 2010, as well as a few days after the June solstice of 2010. A solar eclipse occurred on the June solstice of 1991. A solar eclipse happened in November of 2012. The phenomenon the authors sought involves, properly defined, times when the lunar nodes align with the solstices, coordinated with the actual occurrence of an eclipse. These are 1991, 2001, 2010, etc. I wrote about this in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*.

In a talk on Hermeticism, Terence recalled his process of identifying solar eclipses on December solstices, and how December 21, 1973 was his original end-date for his time-wave (8:45 mark, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pAcQS-0ge4A>). This was two lunar node cycles prior to the lunar eclipse of December 21, 2010. Theoretically, the next eclipse in this series will be in December of 2047 AD. (Happens on December 16, 2047.) See also the June and December solstices of 2029.

More than once I’ve seen commentators (e.g., Defesche 2007) refer to this sentence, inserted without comment into the 1993/94 second edition, as indicating that the specific December 21 date was understood by the authors at the time the first edition was published. But Terence himself explains that this was noted later (see his “Temporal Resonance” article in *Revision*, volume 10, no. 1, summer 1987), reprinted in *Archaic Revival* (McKenna 1991:110-111). He wrote: “Later I learned to my amazement that this same date, December 21, 2012, was the date assigned as the end of their calendrical cycle by the classic Maya, surely one of the world’s most time-obsessed cultures.” This one sentence in his 1987 article is a clear indication that Terence understood how his preferred zero-point date corresponded with the cycle ending of the Maya calendar. Some observers (Hoopes & Whitesides) have noted that Terence may have understood this after sharing an event with Jose Arguelles at the Ojai Institute in 1985; elsewhere I heard he knew it by 1980. It’s hard to tell exactly when the connection occurred for McKenna. (He mentions in one talk that he heard it from Henry Munn.) The additional step, of connecting the galactic alignment with 2012 in the Maya calendar, as an artifact of ancient Maya thought that was defensible and arguable from presented evidence, was not taken by McKenna (or, for that matter, Arguelles).¹

¹ This may seem surprising to some observers and historians, but it is very much the case based on published statements and evidence as well as direct conversations (e.g., my question to Arguelles in 1999 and conversations with Terence). Astrologer Ray Mardyks, in a brief side-bar mention of 1987 in “The Great Return” issue of *Meditation* magazine published for the Harmonic Convergence, recognized the galactic alignment (not using that term) within a discussion of the Harmonic Convergence of 1987, and conflated it misleadingly with Arguelles’s mystical “galactic synchronization” idea, connecting it to 1999, not 2012. Mardyks mentioned, in a 1991 article in *Mountain*

That such a direction of inquiry was of little interest to McKenna is seen in how none of the references to the Maya (p. 151), the Maya calendar (pp. 18, 110-111, 249), or 2012 (pp. 21, 101, 110-113, 215, 249 in the Index) throughout *The Archaic Revival* (1991) mentions the galactic alignment scenario. It's not mentioned anywhere in the book. Neither *Hamlet's Mill* nor any books on the Maya are listed in the Bibliography. My book *Tzolkin* was self-published and mailed to Terence in the summer of 1992. In it, I presented my model of how the Long Count could be used to track the shifting dates of the seasonal quarters, culminating on the winter solstice of 2012. I re-emphasized this part of my book in correspondence with Terence soon thereafter, and my book was reprinted with Borderland Sciences Research Foundation in 1994. My model did not use the galactic alignment, but in our correspondence of the spring of 1993, it was put on the table.

In the early 1990s my position on Terence's comments in his book was, frankly, in a quandary. Astronomers I talked with would not affirm such a scenario, as described by Terence in the 1975 edition of his book. My Maya research was for the most part focused elsewhere, and it wasn't until 1993 and early 1994 that I did some head-scratching and it finally clicked. It wasn't useful to understand it in the way described by Terence, which was fairly misleading (though partially useful). *Hamlet's Mill* was a bit misleading too. Rather, it was the Dark Rift feature that was the key to connecting it to known Maya concepts. THAT was the beginning of a completely new approach to 2012, showing evidence for how the Maya encoded it into their traditions and how they thought about it, argued *from the evidence* in Maya Studies. This important shift point in the "2012 story" or "the galactic alignment narrative" (as Whitesides, 2015, notes it in passing) has been completely overlooked by commentators on the 2012 phenomenon and the related historiography of ideas and approaches. More to the point, my realization wasn't a flash in the pan; by 1998 my large study, *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*, was completed and published --- more than a decade ahead of any dedicated study published by any professional scholar regarding what the ancient Maya thought about 2012.

Astrologer, the galactic alignment with a brief reference to the Maya but largely through the lens of Western astrology. The phrase was also used in a 1997 article by James Roylance. I didn't use it in my 1994 article because I was not familiar with it at that time, but later recognized it as a simple, good, and descriptive phrase for the astronomical alignment. Critic of 2012, John Hoopes, has forced a "pseudoscience" insinuation onto the galactic alignment by asserting it to be astrology --- and we see this preserved today in the discussion in The 2012 Phenomenon entry on Wikipedia. Hoopes's interpretation is motivated by a desire to debunk 2012 but is a logical fallacy as it confuses an applied astrological interpretation of the astronomical basis of the galactic alignment with an assertion of "what it is." The Galactic Alignment is thus, in Hoopes's distortion, astrological pseudoscience because some apply an astrological reading to it. The fallacy is like saying sex is a crime because the illegal act of rape is an application of a sexual act. It is also like saying that the full moon is astrology. No, the full moon is an *astronomical* configuration as viewed from earth at a certain time, just like the galactic alignment is --- but neither are, in their fundamental identity, "astrology." The distinction is relevant to treating the galactic alignment as a viable topic of rational investigation, which Hoopes refuses to do.

Efforts to communicate and clarify with Dennis, years later, involved my detailed explanation and his brief reply:

From: Dennis McKenna [djmkenna@mac.com]
To: John Major Jenkins
Subject: Re: Hi Dennis, from John Major Jenkins

John,

Thanks for your email. Yes I would love to have a copy of your new book. Please send it to PO box 224 Marine on St Croix MN 55047. I am buried in writing right now but will read with interest. Your selection of 12/21/12 for the date based on the alignment always made the most sense to me.

All best

Dennis

My response: John Major Jenkins wrote:

Dennis, I hope you are doing well --- it's been many moons since seeing you in Brazil. I know you must be deep into writing the book on the adventures of the McKenna brothers. I'd like to send you a copy of my recent book, *The 2012 Story*, as promised. Please send your current mailing address.

There is currently a great deal of highly politicized disinformation on my work to reconstruct how the solstice-galaxy alignment was embedded into Maya traditions. Scholars are shifting the mitigation machine into overdrive, even while they begin to reiterate my findings (as in the Cambridge University Press publication in July of this year, *International Astronomy Union*, Vol. 278). The new evidence comes from Monument 6 from Tortuguero, a Classic Period site near Palenque. The 2012 date is on that monument, as well as 12 other dates. A Maya king named Lord Jaguar commissioned the monument in 669 AD, and he made a special claim on the 2012 date. Why? Because he was born in late 612 AD when the sun was lined up with the Milky Way-ecliptic Crossroads. This provides a parallel to the 2012 alignment. The difference is that the 2012 alignment happens on the solstice, whereas Lord Jaguar's birthday occurred some 20 days before the solstice. Nevertheless, the alignment image is maintained. For this and various other reasons, the Tortuguero inscriptions are providing great support for the "2012 alignment theory" I laid out in *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998), which Terence so kindly wrote the introduction for.

I have written about the role played by *The Invisible Landscape* in planting the seed of the alignment in my brain, when I read it in 1985. It led me to *Hamlet's Mill*, and I went deep into Maya academic literature to tease out the evidence for it. This was mainly accomplished by studying the early Maya site of Izapa, ballgame symbolism, and the astronomy within the Maya Creation Myth (the *Popol Vuh*). Links to my Izapa research are on the front page of <http://Alignment2012.com>. Links to my papers on Tortuguero are at <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>. My responses to academic naysayers are at <http://update2012.com>. In my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*, I discussed other occurrences of the alignment concept in the early literature, including in David Frawley's writings and in the 1975 book, *The Gnostic Circle*, by Patrizia Norelli-Bachelet. There are even Neoplatonic

antecedents, I believe, in Macrobius and Porphyry, and I've traced how it is a concept that may go back to Vedic India.

If there's anything you'd like to discuss with me, please let me know. The 2012 topic is now on the table among Maya scholars and the solstice-galaxy alignment, the "galactic alignment," is gaining ground as the reason why the ancient Maya astronomers selected December 21, 2012 to end the 13-Baktun cycle in the Long Count. But it's been a long battle in the trenches with the elitist scholars. Beyond the astronomy, I've shown how a paradigm of transformation and renewal can be identified in the Maya Creation Myth, and was connected with the 2012 cycle ending. Shamanism and ceremonial rites of sacrifice and renewal come into play, and Lord Jaguar utilized all these references. I'll be happy to also send you my recent booklet, "Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions." Best wishes,

John

Unfortunately, Dennis's comments on the 2012 date as an artifact of the Maya calendar, in his *Brotherhood of the Screaming Abyss*, were dismissive, and he didn't cite or mention my work. Terence mentions and discusses the galactic alignment in 2012, at the 4:06 hour mark:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x8UMFMM7pww> The talk was given in the summer of 1998, after my book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* came out (which he wrote the Intro for). "This coincidence of calendrical synchronism that we're undergoing..."

Terence summarizes the Maya calendar connection to the alignment. 4:06:20 --- "What does this mean? Well if you're a Jungian, or believe in the larger dynamics of the unconsciousness, it means that in the wheel of cosmic time, somehow the appointment of the end of a World Year has arrived. Why is it keyed to the Galactic Center? Well, I wouldn't at this point care to speculate --- I could be dragged into it, but it's probably not the best way to spend our time. But the point is, this phenomenon of Novelty conservation is..." So, Terence resisted being "dragged into" the astronomy of the galactic alignment, as he prioritized his now disconfirmed Novelty theory. Here we see another fundamental difference between how Terence and I thought about 2012 and the galactic alignment. To my mind, the point is NOT the immanent conclusion of "Novelty conservation." It is about identifying why 2012 was important to the people who left us the 2012 / Long Count calendar. See also 4:26:40, speaking about the internet, ten years closer to the end date.

Note. Again, to emphasize the timing of the revisions / additions to the "1994 edition" of *The Invisible Landscape*, we need to recognize that, technically, the publisher retained a "1993" statement of publication even while the new acknowledgments and introductions are stated to be for "the 1994 edition." Most revealing is that Terence dates his new foreword as "November 1993." Even if these were the very final words written for the new edition, it still had to go through proofing, printing, and binding. My recollection that the book was not released and available before 1994 is thus born out by these facts. Consequently, my communications with Terence about 2012 and the Galactic Alignment, which occurred in the Spring and Summer of 1993 (with my model of

Long Count period-endings and seasonal quarters targeting December 21, 2012 having been sent to him, and discussed, in mid-1992), certainly occurred early enough for my influence to have occurred, if only in that Terence realized he should slip in an addition that would more clearly connect his "heliacal rise of the Galactic Center" speculation (a.k.a., the Galactic Alignment), with his Novelty Theory and the specific December 21 date in 2012 (in earlier publications Terence states it to be the 22nd). However, as I point out in my essay above, the inserted new sentence wasn't congruent with the context of the previous sentence (2nd edition, p. 196).

Addendum: I also sent this file to Graham Hancock on May 19, 2016, thinking he'd be interested. Here's the cover email:

Thanks for your response, Graham. Conferences continue to occur. One thing I've become conscious of is that the Maya and their cosmology have gone missing. I see the rosters and topics at these conferences that occur all around me --- in Minnesota, Chicago, New Mexico, Arkansas, California (many of which repeatedly feature you, Bauval, Schoch) --- and the focus is primarily Egypt, Ancient Aliens, UFOs, or UK Megaliths. Maybe sometimes elongated skulls from Peru. But the Maya and their pyramid science and astronomy are gone. I find this to be bizarre, as there have been many new discoveries and breakthroughs in Maya Studies since 2012, and my website *The Center for 2012 Studies* has posted dozens of essays about them. Carmen Boulter is doing a documentary on the Maya, but did she call me? No. She'll probably just use some more of the footage she got from interviewing me at CPAK 2006, when she told me she was just putting something together for her students and it (*The Pyramid Code*) wasn't a commercial project.

I'll attach two documents you might find interesting. One is the new preface for the impending re-issue of my 1989 travelogue called *Journey to the Maya Underworld* --- my first book. It contains my early thoughts on 2012 and Maya calendar science, and much else. The second is a brief essay on Terence, Dennis, and the Galactic Alignment. Also, my review of Coe's much revised 9th edition of *The Maya*, which launched the 2012 doomsday meme in 1966:

<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Coe9-2015.pdf>

Best wishes,

John



This ends **Appendix 3** of *Ivory Tower, House of Cards: How Scholars and Their Publishers Violate Science*.

Total word count to here, including appendices: 253,350 words. Additions 6-5-2016 (and more below). All rights reserved. © John Major Jenkins

Addendum to Appendix 1:

Reviews of Aveni's new book, *Apocalyptic Anxiety* (released May 2, 2016), and resulting attempts to communicate and correct Aveni's new, all-improved errors

Update July 4, 2016. It is with a sense of both irony and history that I add, on this particular day, an unexpected and unplanned new addendum to this book. For today marks the 40th anniversary of being introduced to the mystery of a calendar down in Mexico, made by the Maya, that was going to culminate in the near future. (Actually, it seemed to me at the time like it was a far-off future.) I was 12 years old, and as I've recounted elsewhere (e.g., in *The 2012 Story*, 2009) it occurred on the 4th of July Bicentennial Celebration in my home town of Elmhurst, Illinois, through the auspices of my friend Joe. His Dad was reading *Mexico Mystique* by Frank Waters, and he showed it to me that day. Although I didn't have much of a concern for things Native American for five or six years (and didn't start planning a journey to Mexico until late-1984), that was the seed in my young mind. Forty years ago, today.

And what has 40 years of efforts and miracles, loves and deaths, books and presentations and travels, brought to my life? Unremitting piles of adversity, baseless critique, character assassinations, aggressive misunderstandings and thievery of my work. And the chief bully-tyrant of Maya Studies, Anthony Aveni, is at it again. It is now quite easy to spot and expose his sloppy scholarship --- truncated quotations, baseless assertions, wrong attributions, and loaded lingo designed for denigration. That's what he does. There is an old etymological definition of where the word "satan" comes from, and it is basically "that which impedes forward motion." I know that will seem to be a shocking comparison to Aveni's efforts, but that is demonstrably what is going on.

Perhaps this is how a field of study usually goes through cycles of stagnation and progress --- an old, no-longer serviceable way of thinking is tenaciously maintained at all costs by an old, no longer serviceable scholar. Perhaps my efforts to clear the path for progress are irrelevant, because perhaps it's just a matter of time, and progress really does happen funeral by funeral. That certainly seems to be the case in Maya Studies, for Aveni follows in the role of J. Eric S Thompson. Like Aveni, Thompson produced breakthroughs and an impressive legacy of studies and ideas. But as he approached life's end he impeded progress in his field of study by maintaining a biased attitude and a prejudice against certain scholars and their ideas.

After Thompson died in 1975, the dam burst and a quantum leap occurred in Maya Studies. Stirrings in that direction were already in motion, in the waning twilight of Thompson's life. The first Palenque Round Table happened in 1973; just check out the topics of presentation and study: http://www.mesoweb.com/pari/publications/RT01/RT01_00.html. The second and third Round Tables (1974, 1975) made huge strides as well, leading to an incredible period of decipherment and a new understanding in the 1980s. One thread, a very important thread, in all this was the perspective seemingly led by Linda Schele, but actually shared by many of her colleagues, such as David Kelley, Merle Greene Robertson,

and Peter Mathews. And it is this: Maya writing and the machinations of statecraft are intimately interwoven with Maya religion and mythology. By 1990, with *The Forest of Kings*, Schele was taking this further by examining the astronomical underpinnings of Maya mythology and traditions. This, too, was built on the work of other scholars, such as David Kelley and Raphael Girard. It wasn't Schele's wild upstart notion, coming out of nowhere.

By 1993 this particular branch of the revolution, which was increasingly seeming to be the main trunk, was boldly presented in the book *Maya Cosmos*, co-written with David Freidel and with the help of Joy Parker. Mythology and astronomy worked together in ancient Maya thought. And this is where the buck had to stop, courtesy of Anthony Aveni. You see, you can't pollute science (astronomy, *his* field) with myths (fantastical lies). For those whose reality processing is superficially stuck to materialism, a myth is a lie. Aveni would thus emerge as a primary critic of Schele and Freidel, and all others who argued for concepts like the World Age doctrine, an interface between mythology and astronomy, and the precession of the equinoxes.

This dynamic is clear in the literature of the time, namely the *Archaeology Magazine* debate of 1993, with Peter Mathews, Schele, the Tedlocks, and Aveni contributing. In 1996 Aveni's official review of *Maya Cosmos* appeared, and the hopeful adherents to progress in Maya Studies got a serious slap down. Luckily for Aveni's cause of blocking forward motion (satan, anyone?), Schele was battling cancer, and died in early 1998.

My own first direct exchange with Aveni occurred in early 1996, when I sent him my article on the Maya doctrine of World Ages, relating it to precession and the galactic alignment. Aveni did respond, and expressed disagreement with the idea that the Maya had a World Age notion. This was a fundamentally bizarre position, and it would come out through the years that Aveni associated this notion with "Gnosticism" and "emotional revelations" and so, as a stalwart scientific materialist, he would have none of it. In fact, his main critique against Schele & Friedel was that they sometimes let emotional excitement and appreciation for the modern Maya, who they visited, slip into their narrative. This kind of petty, personal distaste is the foundation of Aveni's biased attitude toward the kind of progress that was blooming in the 1980s and early 1990s, and that he has been blocking ever since.

I occupy a unique place in all of this. In the early 1990s my work picked up the baton and was immune from the Aveni slap down. As an independent scholar I was focused on the deeper explication of Maya cosmology, and in my research into Maya traditions I had found the key. (This is called scholarship.) This was, probably, the direction that Schele and Freidel were going, but they got the memo and Freidel became bitter over the treatment he received at Aveni's hands. So bitter, that he projected the same kind of undiscerning judgment against me in a 2009 news interview, calling me a "charlatan" because I was (supposedly) preaching the doctrine of astrological causality to a gullible public. No, I never did and I do not --- Freidel might have tried to read my books before he engaged in

such mudslinging. I engaged an email exchange with him, sent him my corrections to his underinformed and baseless accusation, and he never responded. Aveni taught Freidel how to be a mudslinger. And that's how the transmission of abuse works, on down the line, from one to the next.

My challenge has been to not likewise become embittered by the vile, toxic, splenetic and malicious behavior of cantankerous old coots who have forgotten how to be good scholars. Oops, see, I'm starting to go there. But, well, that's more of a satire on the laughably pompous, and what this all means is that Aveni is ready to be rolled out into the garden where the birdies are tweeting. Maybe, like Thompson, he'll be knighted by the Queen of England in the final year of his life, or whatever equivalent honor might be bestowed on him by Queen Hilary or King Trump.

In any case, this most recent episode, which is unfolding as I write, must signal the final stages of the downfall of the Era (Error) of Aveni. That error, which has been infecting Maya Studies for years (I'd say about 20-22 years, in my direct experience), is that 2012 had and has no meaning to the Maya people. It was not a true artifact of ancient Maya cosmology or thought (despite all the new evidence from Tortuguero and La Corona, which Aveni ignores in his new book and treats dismissively in his previous book), and there is no astronomy or World Age tradition that can be associated with it. Also --- and this is Aveni's speciality --- Izapa has nothing to do with the origin of the calendars or the Hero Twin Creation Mythology. His recent two books mis-report the factual alignment of the Izapa ballcourt, which is an important element of my reconstruction work. This is all quite incredible and irresponsible.

We would be a lot further on in Maya Studies if these blockades weren't being set up some twenty years ago, countering the revolution triggered by the work of Schele and her associates. There has been some very important breakthrough work done by two scholars, on Maya precessional astronomy, presented and published between 2003 and 2012, but they prefer that I do not speak openly of it in relation to Aveni's critiques. This is one of the more unfortunate, and desired, effects of Aveni's style of "scholarship" --- the muzzling of others for fear of reprisals against their work or career.

Aveni hasn't been alone in his efforts. His anti-2012 sentiments are echoed and maintained by other scholars, such as Stephen Houston, John Hoopes, and David Stuart --- and even, yes, David Freidel. They got, or perhaps co-wrote, the memo.

Aveni's new book is the latest in the inquisitorial critique of myself, my pioneering work, and other ideas connected to 2012. Certainly, much of the 2012 nonsense in the marketplace deserved *rational* critique and "debunking." And, in fact, I myself have produced a lot of these critiques --- often years before Aveni and other allegedly "real" scholars gave it a second glance. The primary problem with Aveni's critiques of my work is that they are *irrational*, baseless, unsupported, and misleading. If you read the sources he cites for support for his contentions about me, *the support isn't there!* His "critiques"

are not validly performed according to principles of citation, argument, and evidence. They are, ultimately, just imperiously expelled hot air. They are draped with *the appearance* of sound scholarship, but, here, appearances are very deceiving.

Given my direct communications with, and corrections sent to, Aveni and his publisher, it would now seem that these misleading portrayals are being *intentionally* repeated, even while Aveni knows what the facts are. That signals a shift in what can be said and done upon these statements. There's a difference between accidental errors and intentional errors. And something gets revealed when a scholar cannot or will not provide accurate, factual information that supports their contentious critiques.

I have selected eight or nine representative errors in Aveni's new book. We will see if Aveni can acknowledge even one of them. He should, because I have the concurrence from a scholar who was the co-victim of one of Aveni's citation errors. While academia might not care if Aveni repeatedly kicks me in the gutter, when his loose and sloppy scholarship effects one of their degreed colleagues, that should mean something. But, then again, Aveni is notorious for skewering anyone who gets in his way. He's like a drunken canon wandering to and fro, firing off shots at his ideological opponents, a postmillennial Don Quixote heresiologist jousting at the windmills of his imagination. And academic rigor as well as rational processing of facts goes by the wayside.

I provide, below, two of my three reviews and associated correspondence. These were written in mid-to-late June of 2016. They were designed for different purposes, mainly involving the speed and ease with which the reader can grasp the nature of the errors. The first is a brief 2500-word summary, which does not include many of the details. This can be read in a few minutes so that the severity of the problems can be quickly grasped. The second is more thorough and documented, at 6000 words. If one has doubts that the errors are real and demonstrable, this provides *or points to* the evidence. I say "points to" because, if I assert that a quotation that Aveni cites to a certain page in a certain source cannot be found there, the reader will have to look on Google books or in a library or elsewhere in order to absolutely confirm it for themselves. I cannot operate the reader's eyeballs for them.

The third item is not included here, as I will be publishing it separately. It was actually the first piece I wrote, and at 29,000 words it goes deeply and exhaustively into related material, discussions, events, previous communications with Aveni, background history, and full quotations.

—John Major Jenkins
July 4, 2016, 8 Batz
40th Anniversary of July 4, 1976



Concise Summary of the Errors, Composed for Pratt (Draft); Not Yet Sent

To Darrin Pratt, (written July 1, 2016)

I want to talk with you about Aveni's new book. You stated in your email to me that the book wasn't really much about 2012. Did you read it? 2012 is the second bookend of Aveni's entire presentation. 2012 ideas and authors, and several of my primary proposals, come under fire in four chapters of Part IV (including his long Conclusion), and a bad paraphrase of my astronomical theory associates it falsely with a doomsday prophecy, right off the bat in his Introduction (pp. 3-4). I'll address Aveni's errors in a moment, but there's one problem in particular that seems to be the sole responsibility of the University Press of Colorado, unless Aveni does his own Indexes, which I highly doubt.

The End-of-World Index

Although I and my work are discussed in several sections of the book, my name doesn't appear in the Index. Instead, the pages where Aveni discusses my work appear under "Jerry Jenkins," (Index, p. 246), who is the Rapture/Apocalypse "Left Behind" Christian fiction author. A sub-heading under his name, "Maya end of world," is where the page references to one of Aveni's discussions of me and my work appears: pp. 202-203.

Aveni discusses my work on these pages (202-203), but he does not portray it as Maya end-of-the-world information. There is no mention of 2012 being an "end of the world." The phrase "end date" is mentioned by Aveni but only as the conventional reference to the end of the 13-Baktun period in the Maya Long Count, which is like saying "at day's end" --- it carries no connotation of "end of the world." Properly and fully articulated, "end date" is short-hand for "the end of the 13th Baktun period in the Maya Long Count calendar." These distinctions have been discussed and made clear in my previous work and are generally understood by everyone involved. The so-called 2012 "end-date" is a calendrical marker within ever-repeating time periods, not an apocalyptic alarm clock. If your Index person somehow took this one phrase, despite all the other surrounding contextual discussion, as definitely indicating that my work was about the "end of the world," you need to hire a better indexer. You probably should anyway, considering the name-entry error. Aveni certainly wasn't using it in such a way, and there is nothing else on those two pages that would reinforce such a supposition.

To depict my work as "Maya end of the world" information totally contradicts what my interpretations and my position are about. In addition, I have actively *argued against* the 2012-doomsday interpretation, for over two decades, and have loudly stated that this is a baseless position, unsupported by the evidence in Maya traditions. I have advocated, instead, that the Maya had a doctrine of deity sacrifice, transformation, and world-renewal. Because of the climate of judgment against doomsday-2012 advocates, as well as the false insinuation that something drastic was definitely slated to happen (which never

did, thus confirming a "prophecy fail" for such advocates), this false depiction of me and my work as being an "end of world" (doomsday, apocalypse) position is damaging to my reputation and my work, and needs to be immediately corrected.

Since it occurred in the Index and is not supported by what the author actually said on the referenced pages, this error is solely within the jurisdiction of the publisher, the University Press of Colorado. There is also the rather obvious first-order error that Jerry Jenkins, another author altogether, is being listed as the source of my own ideas and work, which in itself requires correction.

Factual Errors in Aveni's Book, which Negatively Impact my Reputation and Work

Now we come to Aveni's errors. Sadly, as with his 2009 book, *2012: The End of Time*, there are many. I've selected just a few, and these are ones that are provable as factual errors; they are also ones which are most damaging to my reputation and work. I have concurrence from another scholar on two of them, who Aveni cites as a reputable source, if that means anything to you. These errors are "damaging" in ways we can't even anticipate, if the record goes uncorrected. They are harmful, in the here and now and potentially in the future if they remain uncorrected, by virtue of how they are used to support the false, negative, and misleading characterizations and assertions about my influences, methods, and ideas in Aveni's narrative.

Apocalyptic Anxiety by Anthony Aveni contains factual errors that mischaracterize my work in negative ways and which therefore blight my reputation and my work in the published record. There are errors of citation, attribution, and assertions of fact which are easily shown to be incorrect and unsupported. **I'd like to set up a meeting with you and your fact-checkers to go over these in person.**

Given that this book was released less than two months ago, and sales are now happening to bookstores, distributors, individuals, and libraries, I would like you to insert an errata sheet in this book in a timely way --- namely, ASAP. Is that likely to happen? I'm really trying to extend you a courtesy here, to deal with this in an honesty and upfront way.

The Errors in Brief. Note: I have a 29,000-word review-exposé of these errors, as well as a 6000-word detailed review. Rather than sending you these writings of mine digitally, I would prefer to meet with you and your fact-checkers in person to go over the details. I will provide you with print-outs of those reviews when we meet.

Error 1. Citation (attribution) error, combined with false assertion. No support for false, mitigating, construct. An assertion about the influences on my work is made, which is the linchpin of a negative critique, but no evidence for the assertion is found in Aveni's cited source and neither is evidence found for it in my own published works.

The critique involves my argument that Maya period-ending Creation Mythology teachings express core principles in the

Perennial Philosophy. Aveni inaccurately presents Mircea Eliade as the premier Perennial Philosopher, constructs a negative picture of his ideas, his motivations, and the legacy of his work as inspiring an anti-intellectual postmodernism. With this as the set-up, Aveni asserts that my ideas drew heavily from Eliade, and for support he cites an article by John Hoopes which allegedly states and supports this assertion. This article is “Mayanism Comes of (New) Age” (2011), which can be found on Hoopes’s Academia.edu page. **Nowhere in that entire article is it stated that I favored or drew heavily from Eliade.** Nothing even comes close. There is, perhaps, a tacitly implied chain of influence from Schele & Freidel’s *Maya Cosmos* (1993, which Hoopes asserts without any evidence was influenced by Eliade --- his end note 14, p. 189, even points out the lack of evidence) to my book *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies*. Hoopes cites this book to the 1994 reprint edition by Borderland Sciences Research Foundation. But I had published this book myself, with my Four Ahau Press, in September of 1992. Copies were distributed and sold. This was prior to *Maya Cosmos* (1993), so even the most remote possible rationale of connecting me with Eliade is disproven. (The reprint edition of 1994 was a virtually identical reprint of the first edition of 1992, except for a few typo corrections and re-formatting the lengthy calendar charts. *Eliade appears nowhere*).

More to the point, we can look at my six primary books about 2012 (published between 1998 and 2012) and find that I never cite or quote or discuss Eliade. His book on Rites of Initiation appears in an end note to my 2009 book, which lists many books on that topic, and his book *Shamanism* was included in my encyclopedic and exhaustive bibliography to *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. The Perennial Philosophy was not discussed in that book, and Eliade nowhere appears in the text, because my sources for my shamanism discussion were largely within the academic literature on the Maya. Most importantly, my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment* --- which is where my 2012/Perennial Philosophy proposal was made --- contains zero references or mentions of Eliade, even while I list and discuss a dozen other important Perennial Philosophers who I considered to be of primary importance.

So, Aveni’s associative construct fails on grounds that his cited source does not contain any support for his assertion, which was falsely asserted as if it were true and supportable, and it fails on the grounds of *not finding evidence for it in my own work*. In addition, this false associative construct is damaging to my work and reputation because of the way he negatively portrays Eliade and falsely links my work to him.

Error number 2. Aveni cites, to another author, an explicit quoted passage that is clearly taken from my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*. I had to piece together Aveni’s citation mess for this. He cites the passage to a title allegedly written by Olav Hammer, who confirmed with me that he didn’t produce such a title (p.c., June 2016). The passage is not found on page 319 of the imaginary source, as cited, nor anywhere within Hammer’s *Claiming Knowledge* book (which Aveni cites elsewhere and thus hand at hand), but on page 319 of my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* --- which Aveni also cites elsewhere in his book. Upon

sharing with him my reconstructed literary forensics, Olav Hammer concurred with the likelihood of my solution to Aveni’s citation mess.

Error number 3. Similar to Error number 2, Aveni writes a paraphrase of four points that summarize the basic principles of the Perennial Philosophy, which he credits to Olav Hammer who in turn he claims was drawing from Huxley’s book *The Perennial Philosophy* (1945). A four-point summary does not appear in Huxley’s book of that title; neither does Hammer ever seem to have produced such a concise four-point description of the Perennial Philosophy. He is not able to point me to anything he wrote like this, and the Perennial Philosophy is only very marginally treated in his later works. Rather, Aveni’s source can be traced to a discussion and four-point summary that I wrote, based on Huxley’s introduction to *The Song of God, Bhagavad Gita*, in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story* (pp. 290-292). My forensic reconstruction here is likewise acknowledged by Hammer, who concluded that “Aveni mixed up a couple of sources.”

Both of the above errors are serious because Aveni attributes an explicit passage and a defining summary, which he paraphrases, to the wrong author. Any scholar should be concerned when defining information and explicit quotations are mistakenly attributed to them. Aveni’s error thus neglects to properly credit my work, incorrectly credits it to Hammer, and thus also has bearing on the perception and/or misperception of Olav Hammer’s work.

Error number 4. Aveni provides a statement from the work of Jose Arguelles, and cites it to his 1975 book *The Transformative Vision*. Aveni’s quote of the statement left out a rather defining phrase. This, if included, impacts Aveni’s own reading of Arguelles’s words which Aveni intrusively inserted into the quote with square brackets. The passage is presented (and misattributed and manipulated) as a means to assert that Arguelles was aware of a key aspect of my own pioneering reconstruction work, way back in 1975. This is false on several fronts. First, this vague mystical passage is not found in Arguelles 1975 book. Second, Aveni’s asserted reading of Arguelles’ intended meaning is baseless and has no support in anything else Arguelles wrote until about 2002, and it is contradicted by Arguelles’s own remembrance of what he knew when. Aveni’s entire construct, which is built upon the incorrect 1975 attribution and by leaving out a critical phrase of the quote, undercuts my own priority in reconstructing the era-2012 precessional alignment in Maya cosmology. The incomplete citation and the incorrect attribution needs to be corrected; the correct source is Arguelles’ 1987 book *The Mayan Factor*. (The same misattribution issue also applies to an earlier quote in Aveni’s book.) In addition, the hostile *discrediting* implication of Aveni’s baseless inserted reading of Arguelles’s meaning should be honestly addressed.

Errors number 5 and 6: The Izapa discussion. Virtually every characterization and statement in this dense paragraph about my work at Izapa is false or misleading. Aveni states that my work offers “prognostications.” This is a hostile and denigrating and, quite simply, an incorrect word to use. It’s as

misleading as saying a brain surgeon is a meat cutter. It's as false as claiming I belong to the religion of Gnosticism, which Aveni did in his previous book. It shows Aveni's desire to cast aspersions through false and loaded lingo. My work at Izapa is an interdisciplinary reconstruction of evidence at the site, including an integration of previous scholarship about the site and my own field work.

Aveni's primary error in his distorted and error-riddled presentation of my Izapa work (and the one which I will here underscore as the one that definitely needs to be addressed), is his mistaken description of the ballcourt's alignment, repeated here again as in his 2009 book. He does this through the statement that I "discovered building alignments with the winter solstice sunset position." Even in these somewhat generalized terms, it is still a false statement. I never have claimed to have discovered a winter solstice sunset orientation for Izapa "buildings," including the ballcourt. He uses the term "buildings" to loosely refer to the ballcourt structure and associated walls and mounds. The item I have discovered and was the first to publish involves the Izapa ballcourt's lengthwise orientation to the December solstice sunrise horizon. This has a 114 degree azimuth orientation, whereas Aveni's "winter solstice sunset" orientation is to a 246 degree azimuth (thus a 66 degree / 246 degree directional axis for the ballcourt "building"). Aveni's axial orientation is in error by 48 degrees, and so he maintains the same error that is in his 2009 book, despite my explicit correction sent to Aveni in mid-2014, and included in my complaint filed with his publisher in January 2015.

Aveni's error, this time, is more serious than his previous assertion in his 2009 book, which indicated his own mistake about the Izapa ballcourt's orientation, because here he is saying that *I believe (and discovered it to be)* oriented to the winter solstice sunset. This is a false statement about the degree of orientation, and also falsely states that I believe it to be so. Consequently, this error asserts something demonstrably false about another researcher's beliefs and findings, and will misinform his readers about my work.

Last year (January to November, 2015): I confirmed with Aveni the ballcourt error (October 3). He called it a "mistake." This was after he and Darrin Pratt's "advisors" at the University Press of Colorado denied this was an error. The AAUP and Peter Berkerey also refused to take any action, closing the file on my complaint in late September. They either refused to find any errors, including this one that Aveni admits to, or they confirmed errors but refused to take any disciplinary action. Both of these scenarios are unacceptable and indicate that something has become broken in academic publishing. Now, Aveni reverts to re-asserting the same ballcourt alignment error, in his new book of 2016. Aveni was informed of this error, by me, in June of 2014, and again with my officially filed complaint to Darrin Pratt in January of 2015 --- prior to the completion of his new book, which contains a source note to late March of 2015 (p. 236). In addition, Darrin Pratt informed me that the final editing was completed after the issues I raised in 2015 (p.c., June 2016). It's amazing that the issues I raised were not cross-checked with Aveni's new book,

but that's probably because they were never seriously looked at to begin with; they just accepted Aveni's denial that there were any errors --- although he later admitted to one.

Note: This is an urgent matter because Aveni's book is recently released and is selling copies every week that goes by. His book contains factual errors that misrepresent my work, which will have lasting damaging consequences if they go onto the shelves of libraries and into bookstores uncorrected. This is already happening, every week that goes by. These errors need to be immediately addressed and corrected --- I cannot wait weeks and months like happened last year.

Q: Darrin, do you, as an academic publisher, support the publication of factual errors that misrepresent a living author's work?

In order to resolve this as quickly as possible, I am offering to meet with you and your fact-checkers in person, in Boulder, to point out these errors so that they can be immediately corrected with an errata sheet. Please prioritize this. You tell me a time to call.

Hand-wringing in Maya Studies: A Review of Anthony Aveni's *Apocalypse Anxiety* June 26, 2016. 6000 words

This new book by Anthony Aveni (*Apocalyptic Anxiety*, May, 2016, University Press of Colorado) demonstrates that the topic of "2012" is still relevant and subject to treatment by an academic scholar in Maya Studies. Aveni explicitly uses the 2012 "phenomenon" episode in our recent history as the closing bookend of his book, which he compares to the Millerite hysteria of the 1840s. Aveni locks these two episodes together in a 168-year-long tale of America's obsession with apocalypse. Like many other academic books on 2012,¹ Aveni doesn't seriously consider the efforts of researchers who have worked to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. Instead, the entire topic is framed as millennial hysteria, anti-modernism, and New Age fantasy. That certainly is one way to look at it, but it ignores what should be of more interest, and relevance, to an archaeoastronomer and Maya Studies scholar like Anthony Aveni. Based on his previous 2012 book (*2012: The End of Time*, 2009) and his other statements, for him it is very unlikely that the ancient Maya thought anything much at all about 2012. Never mind the growing body of research done by myself and other Maya scholars, and never mind the direct communications I've had with him about this work. That has no place in his book.

¹ This includes virtually all of the recognized "academic" books on 2012, which in varying degrees (usually almost *completely*) disregarded new research and findings that treated 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought, including Stuart (2011), Van Stone (2010), Restall & Solari (2011), Aveni (2009) and the 9th edition of Michael Coe's *The Maya* (1966), co-revised with Stephen Houston (2015).

And yet there I am, referenced and treated in the final part of his book and a few other places throughout. Part IV includes chapters on “Galactic Wisdom” and the “Perennial Philosophy” that address important aspects of my work. I am included but only as following “in Argüelles’s footsteps”² (202) and as a 2012 “prophet,” not as someone who has proposed and argued an unprecedented reconstruction of ancient Maya precessional cosmology, related to 2012, in articles, books, and presentations given at popular as well as academic venues for over twenty years. I must be force-fit into a narrative in which 2012 is/was a modern “invented mythology,”³ and Aveni is aided in this effort by anti-2012 crusader John Hoopes. We’ll see how all this is cleverly crafted in Aveni’s book.

Much of the first two-thirds of his book runs through previous episodes of end-of-the-world hysteria in American history. It’s a standard litany that draws the typical narrative from books like Horowitz’s *Occult America*. All of it has the feel of setting up Part IV, where Aveni deals with what he sees as the most recent hysterical episode, which is “2012.” Given the space limitations in my review, as well as my own intimate knowledge of and involvement with this particular episode, stretching over some 40 years, I will focus on this material. My full review (in 27,000 words) is in a separate monograph.

There are several demonstrable errors that have severe repercussions for accurately understanding the “2012 episode” and my role in reconstructing ancient Maya traditions that relate to 2012. One is that Aveni provides a verbatim quote (178), which should have been cited to my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, and credits it to another author. Another error is that Aveni paraphrases (and distorts) a four-point defining summary of the Perennial Philosophy (178), also found in my book, and credits it to another author. Another error is that Aveni provides a vague and truncated quotation (197) that he credits to the 1975 book by Jose Argüelles, where the passage is NOT found, and claims that the passage certainly indicates that Argüelles was aware of the galactic alignment (which is central to my work) at that time. This is a demonstrably false and misattributed reading of Argüelles’s words, with Aveni’s own words inserted into it, designed to undercut the unprecedented nature of my pioneering work on Maya astronomy in the 1990s.

Another error involves Aveni’s direct critique of my work, which he bases on his incorrect assertion that I “drew heavily on the work” of Mircea Eliade (202). As support for his

² With his “Dreamspell” in the early 1990s, Argüelles inspired about the closest thing to a cult that the 2012 Phenomenon produced, declaring himself the voice of a discarnate Maya king. I called out these shenanigans myself, critiquing his Dreamspell calendar system (*Tzolkin* 1992/1994), and received a lot of flack for doing so. For Aveni to hallucinate that I was following in Argüelles’s footsteps demonstrates his total lack of knowledge of actual events as well as a tendency in his finger-pointing toward the ludicrous, utterly unsupported by facts. Is that the mark of good scholarship? See my discussion on page 3.

³ Aveni adopts this concept from Hoopes (2011) and, through Hoopes, from Hammer (2001) and Hammer & Rothstein (2008). In regard to the Perennial Philosophy, it is flawed. See discussion below.

assertion, Aveni cites an article by John Hoopes,⁴ where no statement of the kind can be found. In addition, a survey of my four primary books between 1998 and 2009 shows that the presence of Eliade is practically zero. In fact, there are no discussions, citations, or quotations from Eliade in any of them. I included his book *Shamanism* in my exhaustive bibliography to *Maya Cosmogony 2012*, but it’s not cited anywhere within the book. Where Eliade’s book converges with the Perennial Philosophy and World Tree symbolism, he is citing traditional ethnographic reports and Ananda Coomaraswamy; he offer a standard interpretation already well-known in earlier sources. My World Tree knowledge came from readings in Hinduism, Carl Jung, world religions, and Finnish mythology in the 1980s and early 90s. In an end note to *The 2012 Story* (2009), I mentioned his book on initiation in a list with many other books on that topic. In my book *Galactic Alignment* (2002), which deals most extensively with the Perennial Philosophy, I list a dozen Perennial Philosophers who have been important to me and Eliade does not appear, anywhere. Asserting (falsely) that Eliade is my God was important for Aveni’s critique of my work, because he had already criticized Eliade as a nostalgic anti-modernist “perennialist” who invented phrases like *axis mundi*, who thereby fed a “fantasy-loving, gullible, popular culture” (Aveni 2016: 185), and whose work inspired a post-modernist trend toward anti-intellectualism (Aveni 2016: 184). The picture Aveni paints is a splenetic, under-informed, and misleading send-up of the topics and people he examines.

These items alone are very serious breaches of sound scholarship. And there are other minor and perhaps accidental errors. For example, in the Index to Aveni’s book my name is not found, but the pages in the book where I am mentioned and my work is discussed are listed under Jerry Jenkins, who is the Rapture/Apocalypse “Left Behind” author. Under his name, the pages that refer to my work (pp. 202-203) are delineated with the sub-heading “Maya end of world.” So, the incorrect identification of my work as “Maya end of world” information that rubs shoulders with fictional Rapture-awaiting Satan smashers, is accomplished. Curiously, the page entries for historian Philip Jenkins are not likewise confused in such a curious way.

Aveni introduces me as “following the cosmic road in Argüelles’s footsteps” (202). On the contrary, my critiques in the early 1990s of José Argüelles’s ideas about the Maya calendar exposed how they do not accurately reflect Maya concepts and the placement of the 260-day calendar. Based on my concern for accurately portraying the Maya calendar tradition, and trying to educate those who didn’t, I had an oppositional stance to Argüelles’s attempts to craft a new dispensation that had cultic overtones, a new mystical calendar tradition only loosely based on the authentic Maya calendar (e.g., see: <http://alignment2012.com/following.html>). As such, my work pioneered the critique of the 2012 Phenomenon in the early 1990s, long before scholars like Hoopes entered the

⁴ “Mayanism Comes of (New) Age” in Gelfer (2011). See <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>.

picture.⁵ I have also shown that the “Galactic Synchronization” idea of Argüelles is likely rooted in the mystical Photon Belt idea. His synchronization beam is defined and explained several times in his 1987 book, including by Brian Swimme in the preface, and it is clearly NOT the same as the precession-based galactic alignment (the astronomical alignment of the December solstice sun with the Dark Rift in the Milky Way).

The wide gulf of difference between Argüelles’s Galactic Synchronization concept and the astronomical facts of the Galactic Alignment is clearly explicated in my work,⁶ which Aveni ignores, instead suggesting that I have merely carried on Argüelles’ work — a very flawed, baseless, and ridiculous position that Aveni has repeatedly asserted for years,⁷ despite my corrections. If academic critics cannot bring themselves to accurately engage the details and facts of the topics and people they seek to criticize, they should do science a favor and move on to other pursuits. Aveni shows his sloppy blending of terms and concepts, with little effort to understand his subject or to honestly cite my work on the matter. My book *The 2012 Story*, which Aveni clearly had at hand, would be a start.

As he says in his Acknowledgements (xv), Aveni relies on the anti-2012 work of John Hoopes, who has constructed a critique of “eclectic and non-codified” New Age ideas that revolve around 2012. He calls it “Mayanism” (see Wikipedia entry). Hoopes’s Mayanism has been repeatedly debunked as a flawed construct,⁸ on grounds of semantics and *inverting the meaning of the term* used by anthropologists in the 1990s. The point of Hoopes’s efforts was to frame “2012” as an invented mythology, an *invented sacred tradition*. In doing so he indicts my work because I have identified, within Maya tradition, a World Age doctrine of period-ending renewal that points to 2012. You see, “renewal” means a New Era, a New Sun, a New Age, that was expected by the Maya in 2012. Since Hoopes’s Mayanism relies on the “New Age” concept as a sure hallmark of the Mayanism heresy, then my work must be part of Mayanism. See how that works?

Hoopes indulges in this hostile fallacy and is unable to acknowledge my fact-based findings, which I addressed in my peer-reviewed essay of 2014:

My usage [of the New Era *renewal* concept] was not derived from McKenna, Argüelles, Blavatsky, or the New Age movement, as some critics assert (e.g., Whitesides &

⁵ In his practice of selective academic ignorance, Hoopes has diligently avoided acknowledging my early efforts in the critique of the 2012 Phenomenon. In his many narratives about the “2012 Phenomenon” he also refuses to acknowledge that it was a phrase used by myself and Geoff Stray years prior to Sitler’s *Nova Religio* essay in 2006. See my <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>.

⁶ For example, Jenkins (2009:101-102) and <http://alignment2012.com/5misconceptions.html>.

⁷ His Colgate presentation of early 2012 and his Penn Museum talk of December 12, 2012, both on Youtube.

⁸ See, e.g., <http://www.alignment2012.com/Mayanism-John-Hoopes.pdf>.

Hoopes, 2011; Hoopes, 2011: 54). It arose from my investigation of the evidence at the site of Izapa. That the ancient Izapans and Maya (and other cultures) had a World Age doctrine in which world renewal occurs at specific intervals should not be obviated by the fact that such ideas are superficially echoed in the modern New Age marketplace. Critics need to apply discernment to recognize the distinction. (Jenkins 2014: 56)⁹

Great cognitive dissonance is Hoopes’s lot because my interpretation that “worldrenewal requires deity sacrifice in 2012” was echoed in his friend John Carlson’s 2011 article.¹⁰

Aveni received the essays I sent him or summarized for him in mid-2014, including my exposé of Hoopes’s Mayanism and my peer-reviewed *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* piece. Nevertheless, he must have ignored my peer-reviewed scholarship despite the email exchange we were having. Consequently, the important distinction between reconstructing a Maya concept of “New Era” renewal at a big calendrical period-ending and various free-form “New Age” expressions in the marketplace was lost on Aveni. He probably also found it useful to ignore my clarifications and instead employed Hoopes’s flawed construct because it would serve his own mishandling of my work.

Hoopes also guided Aveni to the book called *Claiming Knowledge* (2001) by Olav Hammer, which critiqued the Perennial Philosophy as part of “constructing a tradition” (155, 170-176). This interpretation assumes the Perennial Philosophy to be a man-made system, which is counter to what Perennial Philosophers themselves describe: “The Primordial Tradition or *sophia perennis* is of supra-human origin and is in no sense a product or evolute of human thought.”¹¹ But Hammer’s inversion (which is like asserting that “Christians hate Jesus”) was useful for Aveni because Aveni’s Chapter 11 is titled “2012 and the Perennial Philosophy” and, there, he sought to critique the topic. This chapter would thus supposedly explore my proposal and long-argued position that the Maya “ideology” (or Creation Myth “teaching”) that is associated with 2012 is also found in the Perennial Philosophy. Oddly, my name and my work are not found or cited anywhere in Aveni’s Chapter 11. In addition, my central reason for making the

⁹ “The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)” in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* Band 14 (2014), No. 1: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>.

¹⁰ This is based on my reading of the Maya Creation Mythology on the monuments of the Izapan ballcourt. However much my interdisciplinary methodology may be criticized, Hoopes has never explained how my 2012 ideas were echoed much later by Carlson and other scholars, who came late to the rational treatment of 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. For example, see the essays by Carlson and Callaway in the Oxford Archaeoastronomy IX papers. See <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/2012center-note10.pdf> and <http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/astronomy/astronomy-general/archaeoastronomy-and-ethnoastronomy-iau-s278-building-bridges-between-cultures?format=HB>. (Not to mention the serious treatment of the galactic alignment.)

¹¹ *The Betrayal of Tradition*, p. xii (2005, ed. H. Oldmeadow, World Wisdom Books).

connection between 2012 and the Perennial Philosophy — that **deity sacrifice is necessary for worldrenewal in 2012** — was never conveyed in Aveni's book.

Rather, it is in Chapter 12 that Aveni mentions my 2012/Perennial Philosophy proposal (p. 202). Apparently trying to represent my thoughts on the matter, he then proceeds to slap together a series of truncated cherry-picked quotations from my 1998 and 2009 books, separated by ellipses, to create some meandering disjointed paraphrases. It's an astounding display of academic fiddling with source material. And in any case, the material he selected *does not* explain why I see a connection between 2012 and the Perennial Philosophy. That is found in numerous places in my 2009 book (e.g., Chapters 8 and 9; pp. 75, 228), and I summarized it *in eight words*, bolded above.

Aveni's use of Hammer's book *Claiming Knowledge* is problematic, for three reasons:

- Hammer inverts a basic premise of the Perennial Philosophy and frames it as a constructed tradition (the topic appears under the section "Constructing a Tradition" in his 2001 book).
- Hammer projects his own dualistic bias onto the non-duality of the Perennial Philosophy in order to explain how the *many* exoteric expressions are reconciled with an underlying *unity*.
- Hammer ignores the primary voices of the Perennial Philosophy, instead allowing the various cult figures within the Theosophical Movement, and many other distorted derivations of Vedanta / Perennial Philosophy, to represent it. This is basically like interviewing pimps and hookers in order to understand Tantric Yoga.

Hammer's later books and anthologies drop the Perennial Philosophy emphasis and focus on the secondary historical distortions. This suggests that he began to understand that it was inappropriate to project the secondary distortions back onto the original inspiration. For example, in *The Invention of Sacred Traditions* (a title Aveni cites in a grand conclusion to his Chapter 11 critique of the Perennial Philosophy), Hammer & Rothstein wrote: "Theosophy, a religious current with roots in the nineteenth century, claims to be an expression of perennial wisdom" 124-125). There's only one other reference to the "philosophia perennis" in that entire book, in an article on Sufism.

Hammer is that "other author" I mentioned who Aveni mistakenly credits (178, 233) with a specific quotation from my work, as well as a paraphrase of my four-point summary of the Perennial Philosophy. In yet another incorrect citation performed by Aveni, he cites these to a book by Hammer titled *Philosophia Perennis*. But Hammer tells me he never produced a book or article with that title (p.c. June 2016). My literary forensics on Aveni's citation mess shows that he was intending to cite pages 172-173 and 175 from Hammer's *Claiming Knowledge* book, in the sub-section called "The Perennial

Philosophy." Here, Aveni (178) summarizes Hammer's notion that Perennial Philosophers must believe that practitioners of the *exoteric* rites of a religion are self-deluded, because it is the inner *esoteric* symbolism that has the deeper, unified meaning. This is a ridiculous and unwarranted assessment. It bespeaks the Cartesian either-or dualism that many scholars are stuck in, when in fact Perennial Philosophers employ a non-dual understanding of the relationship between object and subject, exoteric and esoteric.¹² There is no *inherent conflict* between the Relative and the Absolute.

Nevertheless, Aveni likes Hammer's assessment and uses it, because he too is intellectually unwilling to understand the concept of non-duality. Take note that to *intellectually understand* the concept of non-duality does not require that one has had a revelation of God, or an initiation into Secret Holy Mysteries. Clearly, Aveni is hostile to the concept and employs Hammer's misleading "more radical" (Hammer, 173) notion that was intended to explain how Perennial Philosophers reconcile the many various exoteric religious expressions with an underlying source that is one.

So, Aveni cites Hammer's pages 175 and 319 for an explicit quote and for a four-point summary of the Perennial Philosophy. These are not found anywhere in Hammer's book, and instead can be demonstrably traced to pages 292 and 319 in my book *The 2012 Story*. Aveni cites my book elsewhere in his book, and another paraphrase crafted by Aveni (178) closely reflects my words on p. 290 of my book, under the heading "What is the Perennial Philosophy?" — just before he launches into "his" four-point paraphrase (178).

There are other fundamental problems with Aveni's presentation. He confuses perfection and wholeness (10-11, 185) — this is relevant to "wholeness" being an attainable goal of spiritual awakening whereas "perfection" is a Christian guilt-trip morality mandate that is basically impossible to achieve. Aveni adamantly holds to an anti-World Age bias, evident in his discussion of *Hamlet's Mill*, and so he rejects recent Maya Studies scholarship that shows evidence for the ancient Maya being aware of the precession of the equinoxes (the two concepts go together in Maya thought). In fact, he doesn't even mention any of these new breakthroughs in his book.

Next (pp. 204-205) we have a paragraph that is densely populated with errors and misleading assertions, all of which have the effect of completely distorting and misrepresenting my work at Izapa. Given my previous direct communications with Aveni and his academic publisher, correcting several of these same errors which Aveni had previously asserted in his 2009 book, it is difficult to avoid the impression that Aveni is here being intentionally belligerent. In any case, his errors violate the principles of responsible science and scholarship. Let's take a look, for this provides an iconic example of what is so wrong with Aveni's scholarship. Please note that it has nothing to do with his inability to understand "spirituality" or

¹² See, e.g., Nasr's *Knowledge and the Sacred* and Coomaraswamy's collected essays (Princeton, 1977).

the Perennial Philosophy; it has to do with his repeated assertions of factual errors and maintaining his skewed and incomplete portrayal of my work. It seems important to Aveni that his readers receive a totally distorted picture of what my work at Izapa is about, which is clearly presented in all three of my primary books (1998, 2002, 2009), as well as in various online essays such as: <http://alignment2012.com/monuments-Izapan-ballcourt.pdf>.

As part of what he inaccurately calls my “prognostications” (204)¹³ he introduces Izapa as “early classic ruins” (false, its heyday was in the pre-Classic, before 100 AD). He states Izapa was peripheral (false, it was the most prominent central site of the Izapa-Soconusco civilization). He states Izapa was “non-Maya.” Although technically true, Izapa contains some of the earliest depictions of the Maya Creation Myth (the Hero Twin story) and a continuity into the Guatemala Highlands and with the iconography of the Classic Period site of Copan in Honduras (on the same important latitude as Izapa) is well-documented, which Aveni doesn’t consider. As such, Izapa could be said to have pioneered central ideological traditions of the Classic Maya. This is to say nothing of the probable origin of the Maya calendars within the Izapan culture, which Aveni laughs at when I talk about it (see his Penn Museum presentation of December 2012), conveniently ignoring the fact that his colleague Prudence Rice came to concur with this same position (she wrote the Intro to his 2009 book). Perhaps the Izapans *became* the Maya, and thus were “early Maya”; certainly their ideas and traditions were adopted into Classic Maya civilization.

Aveni repeats, unremittingly, his mistaken reading of the Izapa ballcourt alignment, which I was the first to publish in my 1996 *Izapa Cosmos* monograph and in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. Aveni & Hartung published the Izapa ballcourt alignment, correctly, two years later, in 2000, as part of a general survey of Pacific Coast sites. My priority on the publication of this information has clearly become a sore point for Aveni, and he has repeatedly muddled the published record on this point, most likely because it is a central piece of evidence in my reconstruction of the cosmological interests of the Izapan skywatchers. The Izapan ballcourt is aligned to the December solstice sunrise horizon. The direction of viewing, towards the sunrise, is confirmed by several factors, all of which Aveni neglects to acknowledge:

1. The throne on the west end of the ballcourt has a head on its front face, facing the sunrise direction, and a person sitting on the throne would of necessity face the eastward sunrise.
2. Behind and on a rise above the throne, one finds six flat “seating stones,” backed up against a wall of the temple

mound to the west. The only direction of viewing for those who sat or stood on those flat stones is toward the east.

3. The westward direction is blocked by Mound 125, which probably also had a wooden structure on the top, further blocking any unimpeded view of the westward sunset horizon from the ballcourt. This is unlike the *clear view* of the eastward sunrise horizon.

Despite all this, which is presented in *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998), a chapter in my *Galactic Alignment* book (2002), and is summarized in *The 2012 Story* (2009), Aveni states that I “discovered building alignments [at Izapa] with the **winter solstice sunset** position” (204, emphasis added). This incorrect statement repeats one of Aveni’s mistakes in his 2009 book, where he stated that the Izapa ballcourt is aligned to the “**December solstice sunset**/June solstice sunrise direction” (Aveni 2009:54, emphasis added). These statements dislocate the factual orientation of the ballcourt, and so provide an orientation that is *48 degrees in error*. I had informed Aveni of this mistake in an email I sent him in mid-2014, also sending the following mini-essay about it, and other errors, that I had just posted on my website: <http://update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>. My cover letter to him was dated 6/27/2014 and had the subject line “My review of your comments on the Izapan ballcourt alignment.” The cover letter reads:

Greetings,
I don’t know if anyone ever pointed out to you several errors in your comments on the Izapan ballcourt, in your 2009 book. Notably, you wrote that the ballcourt alignment is to the December solstice sunSET and June solstice sunRISE. This is no doubt just a guffaw, but I think it’s important to acknowledge and correct. . . .

I tried to keep my corrections and clarifications brief in the enclosed 3-page review. The review addresses more than the several factual errors. There’s an odd way that you and other critics apply selective, vague, or loose language to insinuate things. It’s pretty clear this is intended as a passive-aggressive way to cast aspersions on me. For example, your vague and very incomplete description of my own ballcourt findings and, elsewhere in your book, your insinuation that I was following Blavatsky’s Theosophy ideas. It’s a polemical strategy that is *ad hominem*, unfair, and inaccurate. Let me ask you, in all sincerity, did I do something to you, personally, that deserves this kind of unprofessional treatment of me and my work? Or is it that the implications of my findings threaten your personal beliefs? Or perhaps, as with [John B.] Carlson, that I was on to a perspective that is likely to be true, but that cannot be allowed? Best wishes,

John

To this, Aveni had no response. Some six months later, in early January of 2015, I filed a formal complaint with the University Press of Colorado, enumerating a half dozen or so factual errors in Aveni’s 2009 book. His mistaken reporting of the ballcourt alignment was one of them. Aveni was sent my list of errors by Darrin Pratt, the press Director, whereupon he denied this and the other errors pertaining to my work. Later, in

¹³ Aveni’s use of loose and loaded lingo seems to be his specialty. There are many examples in his 2009 book that border on slander. One qualifies as bigotry, because he identified me as belonging to *the religion of Gnosticism* and then used that (I am a “Gnostic” New Ager, etc) as a basis for critiquing my scholarship.

September I asked him to tell me which of his ballcourt orientations was correct, and which one was in error. As mentioned, he had published the correct orientation in his article with Hartung (in 2000), but his 2009 book gave a wildly different orientation. He confirmed that the earlier statement was correct, and thus the 2009 statement was a “mistake” (his word). So, he finally sort of grudgingly acknowledged the mistake. But here, in his 2016 book, we have Aveni belligerently returning to the wrong statement, even going further to state that as being *what I had found!* This is an amazing display of irresponsible academic malpractice.

In the very next sentence Aveni’s errors continue. He states that I do not “subscribe to conventional interpretations of the Izapa monuments” (204-205). This is false. For Stela 60, Stela 69, Stela 67, MM 25, and Throne 2 and related monuments, I completely subscribe to the basic interpretations of the Brigham Young scholars and other iconographers who have studied the site (Milo Badner, Virginia Fields). I also concur with Timothy Laughton and Barba Piña de Chan (and others) that the Izapan monuments depict episodes from the Hero Twin Creation Myth, involving the Hero Twins, Seven Macaw, and “First Father” (One Hunahpu). What I have added to the interpretations, as an evidence-based extension of the existing standard readings, is the astronomical orientation data that I have discovered and documented.¹⁴ As such, the ballcourt’s winter solstice *sunrise* orientation provides an interpretative basis for deducing that the rebirth of the First Father deity that is portrayed, for example, on Stela 67 — who is acknowledged as a solar deity — represents the December solstice sun. This is logical and is based on *the evidence*. Furthermore, the ballgame itself is about a World Age level of solar rebirth, and the orientation of the ballcourt with its throne indicates which “sun” is getting reborn.

Aveni spews bad descriptions of my work, ignores relevant material, and misreports the evidence I discovered and was the first to publish (1996, 1998), and which naturally factors into my astronomical interpretation of the meaning of the Izapan ballcourt monuments. My augmented interpretation is completely congruent with the accepted dialectic in the Hero Twin Myth (between Seven Macaw and One Hunahpu) and the ballgame symbolism. Seven Macaw is shown on Stela 60 being defeated by one or both of the Hero Twins — that interpretation comes from Laughton, Piña de Chan, and Garth Norman (who studied the site with Brigham Young University and did detailed drawings of all the monuments).

Aveni then (still in the same offending paragraph) emphasizes Julia Guernsey’s new perspective that the Izapan characters represent actual rulers at Izapa. *This* was unconventional, as earlier scholarship noted that most of the monuments contain

¹⁴ A few of these interpretations might be seen as “unconventional,” but that’s because they integrate new facts and reflect my consideration of this new evidence, mainly from archaeoastronomy, which previous commentators had overlooked. My interpretations are informed by a more complete data set.

an upper and lower frame representing the open mouth of a snake or jaguar. It is a stylized frame that means “this scene happens in the Otherworld,” which is to say, that they are essentially *mythological* depictions. It may be the case that the mythological First Father dialectic with Seven Macaw — clearly a central dynamic in the ballcourt — served as a mythological prototype for the sacrificial obligations of actual rulers at Izapa, and Guernsey’s work emphasizes this. That’s fine. However, her 2006 book on Izapa, which Aveni cites for the “standard” interpretation of Izapa (which it was not), analyzes only one ballcourt monument! Her book is frequently cited by my critics for the better, more comprehensive, interpretation of Izapa, supposedly obviating my analysis of the Izapa ballcourt monuments, but *she doesn’t even examine the ballcourt!*¹⁵ My work remains the most thorough and comprehensive treatment of the Izapan ballcourt, its 15 stone artifacts and astronomical orientations, and Aveni can’t bring himself to acknowledge this.

Aveni’s paragraph on my Izapa work contains multiple errors and misleading assertions, after which, to top it off, he claims that my late-stage 2012 strategy was to hedge my bets “like Argüelles,” just in case “no global transformation took place on December 21, 2012” (205). His cognitive processing of the facts and my published statements is astonishingly dissonant, contemptuous, and under-informed. Here is my interpretation of the cosmology in the Izapan ballcourt:

At Izapa, we see a dialectic between Seven Macaw (ego) and One Hunahpu (Self), expressed on Stela 60 and the ballcourt throne *which are opposite each other in the ballcourt*. It is a period-ending, World-Age-ending dynamic well known in the Maya Creation Myth, and nicely expressed in the iconography of the carved monuments in the Izapan ballcourt, which points to the December solstice sunrise horizon (thus reinforcing the solar Era rebirth reading). Seven Macaw is depicted being sacrificed, which is the prelude to One Hunahpu’s resurrection or rebirth, which signifies an Era renewal, a world-renewal, a New Sun, or, to reference a term I like, a cosmogenesis. I point to this dynamic as expressing a core principle within the Perennial Philosophy — that ego can be placed back into right relationship with the whole psyche (the “Self”) through sacrifice. Said in the terminology of Mesoamerican religious studies, at period-endings (which generally, and specifically in this case at Izapa, compare solar astronomy cycles with calendrical period-endings) *deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal*. —JMJ

Virtually every statement Aveni makes (pp. 204-205) about Izapa, and my Izapa work, is factually false or misleading.

¹⁵ Apart from a picture caption showing Tacana volcano, Guernsey mentions the Izapan ballcourt only once (2006: 172), merely as the location of Stela 67, which she elsewhere (137) interprets as “the transportation of an individual” (a ruler) who is “clasping scepters” while imitating a deity. Echoing *my own earlier interpretation* (1996, 1998), she notes that it “anticipates Classic Maya portrayals of the Maize God’s [First Father’s] rebirth” (137). She *briefly mentions* Stela 22 (which was found by the road outside the ballcourt).

Furthermore, he simply repeats his previous errors, which were explicitly pointed out to him and his publisher *while he was working on his new book*. Consequently, any rational observer of these events must conclude that Aveni is intentionally repeating errors in order to muddy the accurate portrayal of my work in the published record. His behavior is that of a bully. His publisher, the University Press of Colorado, has supported his efforts by actively denying his easily corrected factual errors of concept, citation, and attribution.

Aveni's misleading portrayal of me continues. He asserts I am "hostile to critics" (p. 212). No — not all critics. I welcome and have long encouraged informed critique and dialogue. I am hostile to and critical of degreed scholar-critics publishing in peer-reviewed journals or books who refuse to acknowledge or correct their factual errors and refuse to adjust their views based on presented evidence, thereby violating science and the principles of sound scholarship. I am hostile to scholars publishing in peer-reviewed journals or books who falsely slander me and my work, repeatedly ignore dialogue and facts, pollute the published record with uncorrected falsehoods that are damaging to my reputation, my work, and livelihood, and who upset my loved ones with a sense of being unfairly and unremittently persecuted despite my seeking resolution through proper official channels.

Aveni's book is filled with not only the factual errors I just enumerated, but loose opinions and baseless assertions, much in the way that his 2009 book was (*2012: The End of Time*), which Kevin Whitesides pointed out in his Amazon review.¹⁶ Aveni concludes his Chapter 11 with judgmental fervor, saying that:

...as long as **the perennialists** choose to turn a deaf ear to the solid evidence that reveals our ancient human ancestors to be as flawed as we, our fantasy-loving, gullible, popular culture will continue to be influenced by **their** artfully crafted "**invented sacred traditions**" (Aveni 2016:185, citing the title of Hammer & Rothstein 2008, emphasis added).

This statement recapitulates Aveni's misunderstanding of the Perennial Philosophy as being "invented," and furthermore ignores 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. You see, I was onto this and engaged a rational investigation of it back in the 1990s, at a time when Aveni and his colleagues considered 2012 to be a joke. And he is still trying to depict it as such, because Aveni does not like admitting when he is wrong.

I am, of course, concerned with my work being accurately treated in peer-reviewed publications by Maya scholars, even while critiques are being offered. My work is, first and foremost, about an evidence-based reconstruction of ancient Maya astronomy and period-ending beliefs. These period-ending beliefs touch upon profound ideas reflected in many religious traditions, and this is where scholarly critics like

Aveni bump their heads as they consider my work. They can't seem to get past the fact that the ancient Maya possessed "spiritual teachings," and critics like Aveni grow livid if they detect that I express admiration and respect for such ideas (such as non-duality, which is stripped down to be "reciprocity" in the clinical terminology of un-philosophical anthropologists).

Meanwhile, that part of my work can be treated separately from my evidence-based reconstruction work, which is an interdisciplinary argument integrating evidence from archaeology, astronomy, calendrics, archaeoastronomy, iconography, and Creation Myth symbolism. Here, in the realm of fact-based assessment (which is his turf), Aveni's critiques utterly fail because, despite a plethora of clearly written summaries, evidence, and detailed arguments in my work that even High School students can understand and accurately report,¹⁷ Aveni can't seem to do that. Aveni is clearly committed to injecting as much distortion as possible into his portrayals of my work. This is not the work of honest scholarly critique, but of a flippant, misleading, and poorly supported demolition.

So, the primary purpose of Aveni's book seems to be to hurl another grenade into the heart of progress in Maya Studies, just like J. Eric S. Thompson before him, when Maya Studies got stalled in the 1960s. Aveni's book is conceptually biased and riddled with errors of citation and attribution. He draws from Hoopes's hostile and flawed studies already corrected in the peer-reviewed literature. Like Hammer, he ignores the primary voices of the Perennial Philosophy. He appropriates and distorts my own definitions and cherry picks bits and pieces of disinformation in order to bolster his deeply flawed convictions. The rational and honest processing of information, even by degreed officers of the Academy, is utterly broken here. And now the college and university libraries will rush to order his book, not knowing or perhaps not even caring about all the conceptual deceptions and factual errors that it contains.

Aveni's book will reinforce a negative picture of my work and contributions so long as Aveni, his publisher (the University Press of Colorado), the press Director (Darrin Pratt), and Peter Berkery at the AAUP refuse to acknowledge and correct the errors. If so, it will be a replay of what happened when I asked science and academic publishing to do its job, when I pointed out many errors in Aveni's 2009 book. They denied the errors and refused to take any action, tossing it back onto me to do something about it. And so I have. This lengthy and edifying episode occurred in 2015 and is fully documented in my forthcoming book *Ivory Tower, House of Cards: How Scholars and Their Publishers Violate Science*. My full review of Aveni's hand-wringing new book, *Apocalyptic Anxiety*, runs to some 29,000 words and will be released as a separate monograph.



¹⁶ See also <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoAvenisarticle.html>. And others at <http://Update2012.com>.

¹⁷ I refer to an impressive paper I received from a High School student named Jack Mazza in 2010, which I have posted on my website: <http://alignment2012.com/JackMazza-paper-on-2012.pdf>.

Brief Email exchange with Darrin Pratt

Note: My suggestion, below, that John Hoopes was working with Darrin and the UP of Colorado on a book was a hunch. I put out the question as a certainty in the event that evasive shenanigans might be employed, should I merely ask the question.

Dear Darrin, June 15, 2016
An acquaintance alerted me to the new book by Aveni --- looks like it came out in May. I was wondering how the writing of this coordinated with my efforts, early last year (2015), to request your assessment of the errors in Aveni's 2009 book. In other words, when was the writing and final editing of his new manuscript completed? I'm just curious about the sequence of events, as I had no idea he was writing another book relating to 2012 and our communications on the matter of the errors in his previous book remained, to say the least, unresolved.

I also understand you are working on a project with anthropologist John Hoopes, whose ideas apparently Aveni liberally references in his new book. (As you may recall, I reviewed UP of Colorado titles for *Colorado Libraries* magazine back in the 1990s, so feel free to send me a review copy). Was wondering about the nature of the Hoopes book/project, publication date, etc. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies -
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

I received an auto-reply that he would be out of office until June 29, and one could contact his assistant Diedra Patefield with queries. So I sent her my questions:

Dear Deidra Patefield, June 15, 2016
Apparently Darrin is out of office for two weeks so I'm forwarding my query to you, as directed by his auto-reply. I have a couple of simple questions about the new book by Anthony Aveni called *Apocalyptic Anxiety*, which an acquaintance tells me discusses and cites my work:

When was the writing and final editing of his new book completed? Looks like it came out in May. I'm just curious about the sequence of events, as I had no idea he was writing another book relating to 2012 when I was in email communication with him last October.

I also understand you are working on a project with anthropologist John Hoopes, whose ideas apparently Aveni liberally references in his new book. I was wondering about the nature of the Hoopes book/project, publication date, etc.

I reviewed UP of Colorado titles for *Colorado Libraries* magazine back in the 1990s, am a contributor to the *Explorer* magazine of the Institute of Maya Studies (which does book reviews). What is the possibility of receiving a review copy of Aveni's new book?

Thanks for your time and consideration. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies -
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

She responded:

Good morning Mr. Jenkins, June 17, 2016
Darrin will be in touch with you about this when he gets back.

Best,
Deidra Patefield

June 29 came and went so I sent a concise version of my questions to Darrin, as a reminder:

Darrin, June 30
Your assistant Deidra said you could address my quick questions (of June 15) after you returned from away time, so I'm resending, as a reminder...

1. When was the writing and final editing of Aveni's new manuscript, *Apocalyptic Anxiety*, completed? I'm just curious about the sequence of events, given our communications last year.
2. I also understand you are working on a project with anthropologist John Hoopes, whose ideas Aveni liberally references in his new book. I am wondering about the nature of the Hoopes book/project, publication date, etc.
3. I reviewed UP of Colorado titles for *Colorado Libraries* magazine back in the 1990s. Can you send me a review copy of Aveni's book?

Thank you. Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins
The Center for 2012 Studies -
<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>

Darrin curtly responded and cc'd Peter Berkery:
pberkery@aaupnet.org

Hi John, June 30
Here are your answers:

1. The final editing was completed after the issues you raised last year. I don't really know when he started writing it. Although he addresses the Maya 2012 phenomenon in the book, that is far from the focus of the new work.
2. I have no record of a project with John Hoopes being on our forthcoming list. So at best he may be a contributor to something we are publishing, but not a main author.

3. I'm sorry, but that does not make you a current reviewer, and we have a limited budget for review copies. You are free to purchase a copy directly from us on our website or through some other bookstore or online vendor.

For the record, I'm copying in Peter Berkery, executive director of the AAUP, on my reply, just so he knows you have been in touch with us about this new title.

Best,
Darrin

And that is where it is hanging through the 4th of July weekend, through Monday. I am, however, preparing my strategy. I will send Darrin my question about the Index error on July 5th. And here's the first email to be sent solely to Aveni:

This concludes Appendix 3 to *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*. The print book is available on Amazon.com. Appendix 2 is on page 156 of the print book. Appendix 1 is online at <http://www.Update2012.com/app1-IvoryTower.pdf>

120,760 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.