

**The exchange began with the following email sent by me (John Major Jenkins) to Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes (sent by email June 22, 2013):**

Dear Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes,

In your article "Seventies Dreams and 21st Century Realities: The Emergence of 2012 Mythology" (Zeitschrift Fur Anomalistik, Band 12 (2012), S. 50-74) I appreciated learning of several details of the various elements of the "2012 phenomenon" that I wasn't aware of --- especially the Ojai event in 1985. I am aware of things that occurred with McKenna and Arguelles around that time that could have contributed. My own published critiques of the "2012 phenomenon" (as it was later called when Geoff Stray coined and used the term) goes back to the late 1980s with my comments on Arguelles and Waters. My critiques of the flaws in Arguelles's Dreamspell system were quite detailed in my 1992 book *Tzolkin*, published with BSRF in 1994. My ongoing critique continued with Calleman, Will Hart, L Joseph, Pinchbeck and others, and grew to include the work of professional scholars, who should be considered part of "the 2012 phenomenon". It's unfortunate that my contribution to elucidating the flaws of the popular marketplace were overlooked in your article, even while my own previously published observations and critiques are occasionally reiterated in your piece. But this has always been a problem, in recognizing the broad scope of my work and tending to portray me as a cardboard cutout, essentially a straw man useful for your under-informed denunciations.

Note 3 on the first page states that Sitler first used the term "the 2012 phenomenon." This is not correct, as I've shared numerous times with both of you in emails going back years. Your desire to reiterate this false notion, even when being informed it is incorrect, must be based on a strategy to re-frame the narrative so that all rational critique of the 2012 phenomenon --- even the coining of the term --- is safely within your own academic guild. This is indeed "rational" from the limited self-serving vantage point of guild protectionism, but it is not ethical and it is not accurate.

I'll limit my comments to the mention of my work, which doesn't occur until the Conclusion - itself an odd circumstance. I am described as "promoting" the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles (69). This is false in regard to Arguelles, as previously mentioned because of the years I spent correcting and critiquing his flawed day-count system. I not only did not "promote" the ideas of Arguelles, I critiqued them and forced an educational correction within the Dreamspell group such that by 1996 they came to acknowledge the traditional 260-day calendar's survival in Highland Guatemala. This occurred prior to email via the agency of hundreds of snail-mail letters responding to Dreamspell followers. I would think that, as educators, both of you would acknowledge and mention this, rather than assert the EXACT OPPOSITE, that I was "promoting" Arguelles' ideas.

As for McKenna, my 1998 book (which you cited as the place where I "promoted" his ideas) takes the approach of reconstructing what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, using the evidence at Izapa as the primary source of my interdisciplinary analysis. What I found evidence for is two ideas, one astronomical and one ideological: 1) the galactic alignment and 2) a doctrine of "sacrifice, transformation and renewal" applied to period-endings (including the 13-Baktun period-ending in 2012).

With the galactic alignment, I honestly acknowledged that McKenna had mentioned this astronomical idea in his 1975 book. There were thus precedents for an awareness of this idea in various places, going back to *Hamlet's Mill* (1969). The alignment is actually quite visible in the charts and maps in *Norton's Star Atlas*, beginning with the 1943 edition, which is where I confirmed it as a viable fact of astronomy. But McKenna's comments were limited to several sentences, a quite misleading definition of it, and he didn't connect it to the Maya calendar. In this regard, my 1998 book is fundamentally distinct from "McKenna's ideas." What I argued in my book is that the galactic alignment was an ancient Maya "idea" or, more accurately, discovery.

Regarding the ideological aspect of what I found in the evidence at Izapa (sacrifice, transformation and renewal at a great period-ending) McKenna's Timewave theory sort of vaguely rubs shoulders with this, but not at all if you look closely. But again, I wasn't drawing from or promoting Terence's "ideas" in this regard, I was reporting my findings from an interdisciplinary analysis of the archaeoastronomical and iconographic evidence at Izapa.

Could you please acknowledge that my stated approach to Izapa is that of an interdisciplinary analysis of evidence? This has NEVER occurred.

It was easy for lazy and undiscerning reviewers to conflate my work with McKenna's, since we both spoke of 2012 and Terence wrote the introduction to my book. For example, a review in *Magical Blend* did this. Both Terence and I sent letters to the editor, which were duly chopped and published. Terence wrote:

"While I was happy to write the introduction to Jenkins' book and while we both share an enthusiasm for the lost calendrical astronomy of the Maya it is not fair to John Major Jenkins to cast his work as derivative of my own. He has placed a number of new ideas on the table, among them the importance of the sun/zenith day in the thinking of Meso American peoples. His work is innovative and deserves to be encouraged and judged independently of my own ideas about the archeo-mathematics of the ancient Maya. " <http://alignment2012.com/lettoed.htm>

So there you have, in Terence's own words, that I was not "promoting his ideas." I suspect that this bit of polemical denigration comes from Hoopes, since his track record in regard to mischaracterizing my work in denigrating ways is unparalleled -- quite an art form you've mastered, I must say --- but as senior article author Whitesides should have called it into question. This is assuming, of course, that you both are familiar with my work. Apparently, neither of you are or you are simply consciously asserting misleading falsehoods based on a superficial understanding. You may be falsely informed by the refracted appearances of my work in the media and in other's books.

You qualify your comment above with the characterization that I "added" (to McKenna's and Arguelles's 2012 ideas) "an idiosyncratic interpretation of Maya iconography as archetypal "perennial" mythology." Rather than being "idiosyncratic," this is a *methodology of interpretation* which I use to understand the Maya Creation Mythology, one that has been used by other mythographers and historians of philosophy of religion and mythology - namely, the perennial philosophers whose works I have cited and discussed. And, to a certain degree, Maya scholars such as MacLeod, D Tedlock, Eva Hunt, Gordon Brotherston, and Carl Callaway. It is therefore not "idiosyncratic."

So, your sloppy characterization does not adequately convey my approach; rather, it delegitimizes it. This seems to be the intention, rather than offering your open engagement with what I've actually said and published. In this regard, I have been invitational and open about discussing my reconstruction work on the iconography, mythology, and archaeoastronomy at Izapa, so your further comments are likewise incorrect. For example, as you continue in your "conclusion" to your article with some afterthought potshots, you write:

"The hermeneutic technique of "unburdening" oneself from 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 (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."

The key words that underscore the falseness of your assessment of my work are "technique of unburdening", "immune from literary scholarship", and my "claim" that Maya monuments (especially at Izapa) can "only" be analyzed "archetypally." (By the way, a low resolution understanding of the term "archetype" is evident in your strange use of it here as an adverb - sort of indicates an unfamiliarity with the body of scholarship and analysis that recognizes archetypes within mythological narratives and an archetypal level of meaning. But "archetypally"? I don't think so.)

Can either of you cite a place where I have made the above stated "claim"? **I do not claim that Maya monuments can only be interpreted in a way that is immune from scholarly critique.** That is the farthest thing from my intention, and the farthest thing from my mind when I argued my interpretation of the Maya Creation Myth. The conclusion of my argument is that the Maya Creation Myth *contains an ideology (or spiritual teaching) which requires that deity sacrifice is performed so that transformation and renewal can occur at a period ending.* My interpretation is based upon the essential or "archetypal" characteristics of the various players in the myth, and the dynamics of their interactions. The subject of analysis is a literary narrative and requires this kind of literary analysis; it can't be held to the same standard of explicit hard-core proof as with basic archaeological artifacts. I employed this methodology and have elucidated results that aid our understanding of what the creators of such stories intended. I follow upon the methodologies employed by mythologists like Joseph Campbell, Heinrich Zimmer, Stella Kramrisch, and others.

Now, what is unavoidable in such an approach is the recognition that the core "archetypal" structure of such Creation Myths are universally shared among many religions. This is where the "perennial philosophy" comes into play. Identifying the Maya Creation Myth as an expression of the perennial philosophy does not mean that I am "unburdening [my]self from the need to be an expert" and that I am trying to make myself "immune to literary scholarship" --- which is explicitly what you claim I am doing or "employing" as a methodology! To the contrary, I have presented documented and argued evidence for a reconstructed paradigm at Izapa and I am and always have been more than willing to discuss it and have it subjected to informed scrutiny. The problem this doesn't happen too often - almost never. It did happen in the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion of late 2010, which neither of you participated in after I directly invited you. That resulted in an amazing expose of the selective and irrational debunking techniques of Guenter and Aldana -- the 206-page transcript is published on The Maya Exploration Center website and was NEVER cited or mentioned in subsequent 2012 articles by scholars. David Stuart, in his well-timed "2012" book of May 2011 wilyly dismissed my Izapa work as "nonsense." But he, like you, did not engage [or even mention] one shred of the large amount of evidence that feeds into my interdisciplinary analysis and that I present and discuss at great length in my books and in the 30+ essays posted freely at *The Center for 2012 Studies* website. In this regard you overlooked that my Izapa work does not only involve the iconography of the monuments and the related Hero Twin Creation Mythology, but also the well-known symbolism of the ballgame and, most importantly, the archaeoastronomical alignments of the ballcourt and the other monument groups. This includes my own discovery and first publication of the alignment of the Izapa ballcourt to the December solstice sunrise horizon, a fact that Van Stone, Aveni, and others are careful to not mention. They dance around it.

Your final comment is a projected assumption onto my methodology, which is essentially denigrating and totally incorrect:

"In both cases [McKenna and Jenkins], there is an assumption of a pure truth (or insight into the nature of reality) attained prior to cultural dilution, corruption, and textual exegesis. When the burdens of academic training and scholarship are set aside, fertile imaginations and fringe ideas are given free-reign."

It is denigrating and, I would add, completely false, for reasons that I just explained. Now that I think of it, it doesn't even apply to McKenna. I do not consider academic rigor a burden, I enjoy

and employ it as a core value in my reconstruction work. I have rather experienced that academic critics are burdened and bothered by engaging me with the same level of scholarly rigor that I bring to the discussion. As an anticipatory "for example" I expect that neither of you will offer a detailed and considered response to my review of your article. The pattern has been for scholars to launch false pot shots, ignore engaging me in a clarifying discussion, then turn their backs only to launch another (or the same) pot shot later. That's how scholars operate? Well, I'm certainly glad I didn't waste my time and money getting a degree just to prove that I can think. In your paradigm, it seems that only people with degrees can think rationally. Ironically, most of the degree-holding Maya scholars I've encountered do not think rationally, nor do they behave ethically.

There is something important, nevertheless, that your comment above gropes to comprehend. It involves different but interrelated ontological approaches to knowledge. Some are more limited than others, and are therefore a subset of larger cognitive frameworks of knowledge/understanding. For example, scientific materialism is a quite limited paradigm for understanding reality. It works for a small slice of reality, but not so well within the full spectrum of dimensions of reality and how they interface when collective and individual human needs and experiences are considered. Ultimately, polarized conflicts come into play that scientific materialism does not reconcile. What is needed is a non-dual approach to understanding reality, and I maintain that such an approach applies to understanding cultures. I do believe that Maya scholars should at least have an intellectual understanding of what a non-dual philosophy is - since there is abundant evidence that the Maya were employing a non-dual philosophy. Alas, this is the main failure of your critique of my work. You throw out the baby with the bath water, and deny a useful rationally defensible framework of understanding or methodology (the non-dual vision of the cosmos which is a hallmark of the perennial philosophy). You don't have to be in an ecstatic shamanistic state of direct perception of non-duality to at least intellectually understand what it is. The ancient Maya clearly did. But that knowledge is invisible to you because your framework doesn't allow for it, at least in your "professional" lives. If you do have a sense for a non-dual level that integrates lower dimensional (that is, incomplete) aspects of knowledge, then you must be devoting a lot of energy to keeping that out of your professional analysis. Especially since it is so useful for accurately understanding ancient Maya cosmology. Probably you fear being slapped down by mentors or employers for treading outside the box of the allowable, low resolution, and ultimately ineffectual, frameworks of knowledge. Cognitive dissonance results. I maintain that these things can be analyzed and discussed rationally, you claim that I require magical invisible and unreal knowledge. That's a philosophically and intellectually naive position. Try to represent in your critiques what I actually believe and say, repeatedly, in my words to you and in my published works.

Again, I'd appreciate your response. If you have time to write the piece and register your critiques of my work, you should have the time to respond to my rebuttal. The non-dual stuff at the end was just a bonus - you can focus on my earlier proofs that your comments and characterizations about my methodology and motives are false. Best wishes,

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

second email, minutes later:

I forgot to mention that an important distinction in describing the legions of 2012 books is this:

- 1) Books devoted to attempting to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012.
- 2) Books devoted to "debunking" or "critiquing" 2012 ideas but NOT devoted to reconstructing what the ancient Maya thought about 2012.
- 3) others (virtually everything else, including summaries, guides, novels)

The four books by "scholars" that you cite in your article fall into the second category (Aveni, Restall & Solari, Van Stone, and Stuart). Critical reviews of the rather glaring flaws in these books have not been offered by their scholarly colleagues, as far as I know. Hoopes's "review" of Aveni and Van Stone, for example (in *Archaeoastronomy XXII*, released in April 2011 but magically predated as if had an earlier publication date), was merely a pleasant puff piece that did not see or did not report Aveni's flawed and incorrect assessment of precession, Grofe's work, and my work. Aveni's supposed "debunking" of this important point of precession (perhaps the only important point in his book since it deals with the work I've done to reconstruct what 2012 meant to the Maya, and that should be the primary legitimate approach to 2012 undertaken by scholars) was simply parroted in Restall & Solari. So, their book is flawed by proxy. Stuart ignored Gronemeyer's & MacLeod's analysis of TRT Monument 6 and wanly dismissed my work without summarizing what it is about. And it has other factual flaws and presumptuously asserted opinions. Van Stone ignored my galactic alignment work but critiqued it, indirectly, through the flawed definition of Gregg Braden. So, these were debunkery books, and flawed ones at that.

My work belongs in the first category - all the way back to *The Center of Maya Time* (1995), and earlier articles. There are no BOOKS by degreed Maya scholars in this category. We do have the important monograph by Gronemeyer & MacLeod (August 2010) - which could be formatted as a small book. Their findings ultimately support a "great return" or "era renewal" interpretation that I offered almost two decades ago, based on my work at Izapa. But they chose not to incorporate the astronomical evidence in the text, which was already presented by me at the SAA meeting (April 2010), summarized in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, and subsequently described by Michael Grofe in *The MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion* (published online in January 2011). And the astronomical evidence in the TRT Monument 6 inscription, treated by Grofe in his later articles of 2011 and 2012, points to Sidereal Year reckoning and an awareness of the solstice sun's alignment with the Dark Rift / Crossroads on 13.0.0.0.0 in 2012 --- my "galactic alignment theory."

So, when describing books of the "The 2012 Phenomenon", this distinction effectively points up how my work is different from the vast morass of other books in the marketplace as well as the work of scholars. Of course, the result of making this distinction is that [critics would need to acknowledge that] for two decades I have offered and have been testing and augmenting a *reconstruction* where scholars (until 2010) offered none, and my Izapa work is now gaining support from recent scholarly assessments of what they see as the available evidence (mainly TRT Mon 6).

As I've pointed out before, we can consider Waters (1975) and Cotterell & Gilbert (1995) as books that also attempted a reconstruction, but they were misinformed as to the correct end-date (Waters, courtesy of Coe) or they were seriously flawed (Cotterell & Gilbert, see my review of 1995). Stray's book summarizes previous work, including my own, and other cutting-edge science to offer a unique synthesis of what it may all mean. Arguelles and Calleman both had/have Phds so they should be added to your list of the four books by "academics." However, as we know, both writers were seriously skewed in their treatment of the Maya calendar. By 2001, long before scholars gave any attention to 2012 and The 2012 Phenomenon, I had already engaged and critiqued their ideas and exposed their flaws. I know you are both aware of this, so find it odd that you never have acknowledged my pioneering critiques of The 2012 Phenomenon, undertaken long before scholars took the topic seriously.

John Major Jenkins

Hoopes's email in response, two days later: June 24

If the complaint is about not getting the facts straight about priority of interpretation, part of the problem undoubtedly lies in the extreme difficulty of obtaining copies the following books:

- *Journey to the Mayan Underworld* (Four Ahau Press, Boulder, CO: 1989)
- *Mirror in the Sky* (Four Ahau Press, 1991)
- *Tzolkin: Visionary Perspectives and Calendar Studies* (Borderland Sciences Research Foundation, Garberville, CA: 1992)
- *Mayan Sacred Science* (Four Ahau Press, Boulder, CO: 1994)

I know that both Kevin and I would appreciate having copies of any or all of these, whether in hardcopy form or digital facsimiles, in their original editions. How can we obtain them?

John Hoopes

Response to Hoopes:

Dear John Hoopes,

First, there is no "complaint." I've pointed out factual errors in your article, as well as baseless mis-characterizations, and provide evidence that you did publish comments that are untrue. Now, the ball is in your court to behave like an ethical and responsible scholar and 1) retract those errors, and 2) not commit them, or similar errors, in the future; or 3) explain or defend your position.

Again, as a reminder and an example, to reiterate here: in the piece authored by you and Whitesides you stated that I "promoted" the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles. I gave you a quote from McKenna and reminded you of the years I spent critiquing the ideas of Arguelles. Your statement is absurd and false, but clearly intended to paint a disparaging appearance regarding my motivations and ideological alliances.

You also claimed I was employing a methodology intended to "unburden" myself from rational and academic scrutiny, and that I "claimed" Maya monuments could "only" be interpreted "archetypally." I invited you to provide me with a citation to my works in which I made this claim. I also pointed out that I've been inviting rational dialogue on my work for many years, and engaged the exhaustive MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion with scholars in late 2010, which you chose not to participate in. Your evasive diversionary response is typical of why a fact-based and rational dialogue breaks down. And yet you accuse me of avoiding this.

Your request for my earlier books is a total diversion and is irrelevant. The problem does not "undoubtedly" lie in your supposed lack of having those books on hand. First, I know you have both Tzolkin and *Mayan Sacred Science* (previously titled *Jaloj-Kexoj* and PHI-64). You cited Tzolkin in your Gelfer piece, and you told me Carlson sent you a xerox copy of *Jaloj Kexoj* and PHI-64. Second, I've handed you the relevant references which address your flawed understanding. For example, in my critique of your false accusations in your Gelfer piece, I supplied a full page quote from Tzolkin (to give the proper context) - a page that you yourself must have had on hand since it contained the little item that you were referring to (without a page citation). The accurate context of which you chose to ignore. <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>

John, please, I really need you to hold you a higher standard of ethics. A standard that is not very high at all, but what any scholar should be expected to exhibit. You didn't address any of my well-considered and documented comments and arguments in my rebuttal to your article, co-authored with Whitesides. Instead you diverted into an irrelevant side-track. This is unprofessional. You see what you've done, don't you? You are responding to a question with a question, delaying the obligation you have to address my critique of your false and erroneous statements about me, my work, and my supposedly questionable methodologies and motivations. Would you like me to boil down my detailed rebuttal to a more digestible summary? I'd be happy to do that if it will initiate an actual dialogue. I suspect this is going to be difficult, because you harbor an agenda of mitigation that proceeds via the polemics of disinformation, so it has to begin with you agreeing to respond to what I am actually saying. Can we agree to that? Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

## Kevin's email:

John, if you're going to try to hold me to the nose over some completely insignificant choice of word (i.e. "archetypally"), at least have the good sense to check a dictionary:

Some OED definitions:

archetypal, adj

1. Of the nature of, or constituting, an archetype; of or pertaining to an archetype; primitive, original.

archetypally, adv

In the archetype; originally.

archetypal, adj

= archetypal adj. 1.

This may be a very similar to your previous critique of me for using (in a private conversation) the term "esoteric" in a way that differs from your particular theological use of it. Again, just because you've never heard anyone use esoteric or archetypally in the ways that I did doesn't mean they aren't real words that can be used properly in other conventions outside of your perennial/neo-Jugian framework (in fact, just with a simple google search, I found many essays on Jung and Jungian psychological analysis which use the term 'archetypally'). I find it odd that you would spend so much time debating my use of "archetypally" to describe the way you analyze the Izapan monuments at the same time that you turn around and tell me, 'No, I don't analyze it archetypally, I use an archetypal analysis'. Is this what perennial philosophers are concerned with....whether or not an adverbial form of a term should be applied to a particular syntax within a sentence?

Also, on your castigation regarding the term '2012 Phenomenon' (something I also consider largely unimportant, though it's certainly worth getting right if for no other reason than so I don't get swamped with unimportant critique), you suggest that we MUST have listed Sitler as the source for ideological reasons to bolster our inner circles (conspiratorial thinking at all?). The truth is much more mundane. The truth is, this article was written in like 2009 (early 2010 at the latest), even if it wasn't published until 2012. The very earliest that you mentioned to me that Geoff Stray had used the term prior was early in 2012. So, I couldn't possibly have used that information from you in this article as I didn't have it. I was actually following Defesche, who I found prior to Sitler, but who cited Sitler as the source of his use of the term. (btw, you have only told me this perhaps twice in the past and fairly recently--so don't make it seem like it's been some major message that you've been feeding me for ages).

The rest will have to come later. I genuinely don't have time for this (not being dismissive---I have, as I've mentioned, a wedding to plan, a honeymoon to plan, a phd to start, and other papers and projects piling up). If we can drop the tone down again and speak reasonably and openly (and slowly...I honestly can't respond to long point-by-point e-mails like this at this point in time--I just have to much else going on that is more important), rather than phrasing things in such a propagandistic fashion, we may actually find some unexpected common ground. You always say that it's ok if people don't agree with your interpretations, but I'm not under the impression that that is the case. You seem so adamant that you are correct, that it makes dialog difficult.

## My Response to Kevin:

Kevin,

Well, that word-challenge thing was just an aside. The more relevant issue is that you (and/or Hoopes) made a statement that I "claim" Maya monuments can "only" be interpreted "archetypally". I know what you were trying to say with the word "archetypally," I was just pointed out it was used inaccurately. Even your cited definition indicates this. For you used it as in "a method employing an archetypal interpretation." But the definition of being "in the archetype, originally," is not congruent with your intended use. It's not an important issue, as we all evolve our language and understandings. And I did not spend "a lot of time" on this point; it was an aside in parentheses consisting of about 50 words.

Now, as for The 2012 Phenomenon issue. Well, I suppose I am leaning toward castigation because I know we have discussed this before and you and others are going to great lengths to not give proper credit to Stray, and my own uses of it prior to Sitler. But I see what you mean about you writing this in 2009; my apologies [note – I didn't believe they wrote it in 2009 because they cite sources from 2011, but I was trying to

extend a laurel wreath of conciliation.] So now you know, at least. Interesting you mentioned Defesche - what a joke of a piece of writing. I recall him stating that my book MC2012 didn't contain much of anything new. Hilarious.

I'm not sure what you mean by "perennial/neo-Jungian." I reference the Perennial Philosophy and sometimes the Primordial Tradition. Archetypes are Jungian, but not sure why I would be "neo-Jungian" --- like, in some way that is not reputable, beyond an orthodox Jungian approach? The concept of Archetype is much like the Platonic Ideas and can be found in Oriental Metaphysics - i.e, it is Perennial Philosophy without the help of Jung.

I think this is a bit of a sore point for scholars because it underscores how researchers outside the guild were critiquing The 2012 Phenomenon - even using that term - well before scholars were, who would like to claim it as their own special province. If you consider this issue unimportant, why was it stated in Note 3, and credited to Sitler? Term coinage and concept origination are very important as far as I can tell. I think we can agree on that.

It's a curious item of interest, and so I went back to old files and found the original paper that Sitler wrote, in May 2004, which he presented at a conference in Las Vegas in October 2004. He sent it to me sometime after May. It's very interesting how he uses the phrase, twice. And it's interesting that it wasn't in the title. Also, neither in this paper or in his Nova Religio piece of 2006 did he "define" the phrase as your Note 3 states. Rather, he treated it as if it was already a known phrase. So, again, there's a level of credit given when the evidence isn't there for it, and meanwhile the correct credit continues to go unreported, courtesy of Defesche or whoever (who I give a D+), and on down the telephone line. Without a correction, the incorrect statements just keep propagating. Kind of like Hoopes's uncorrected statements in his Archeo 24 "review", or Aveni's in his 2009 book. The ideological mitigation is achieved.

In my original preface to Stray's book, which I wrote in April 2004, there was a section in which I use the phrase The 2012 Phenomenon but suggest that we need a sub-category to include the scholarly treatment of 2012. At that time, there was a total and aggressive disregard among scholars in seriously treating 2012. Even the sociological analysis that you and others employ (which became THE primary method of approach to 2012 after Sitler's piece in 2006) was nowhere to be seen. This sociological critique was already employed by Stray and myself for years before 2006, and the approach of trying to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 was being employed by myself. So, my suggested sub-category to "The 2012 Phenomenon" was proposed to be "Academic Myopia." Written in March 2004, before I'd even heard of Sitler, I had to chop down my word-count and, alas, I cut that section. I've suspected that I sent this to Sitler when he was first in contact with me some months later, and that's where he got the phrase. Or he saw it used on Geoff's website? Nevertheless, in my very first two paragraphs we find retained in the published preface (U.K. edition 2005), albeit indirectly, a decent definition on the growing phenomenon of a "plethora of writings" on

2012 and my conceptual awareness and reference to 2012 and the body of writings on "2012" as being a "phenomenon":

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

It is for this reason that the Dire Gnosis website has been valuable to the ongoing discussion. Since 1998, Geoff Stray has collected and organized a wide spectrum of writings, reports dreams, sci-fi and non-fiction of the 2012 theme."

That's the published version. Curiously, the last two sentences are closely similar to a section of a piece I had previously written, intended for ReVision magazine. This was piece that was never published which is dated March 8, 2004 - the month before I was working on Stray's preface. And in it, that last sentence above is echoed and concludes "and he is in a unique position to weigh and comment on the spectrum of writings on the 2012 phenomenon."

Well, all this is a bit moot anyway, since Stray used the term in 2002, the link to which I shared with you on Facebook last week.

I know you might find this tedious, and yet I note and applaud your attention to so much detail and minutiae in other areas. Areas which, for me, seem distracting to the real issues. In fact, the entire sociological critique of the 2012 Phenomenon has always seemed to me to be less of a priority than trying to figure out what the Maya actually thought about 2012. That's been my stated primary approach to 2012 since day one, and my focus on this has NEVER been stated by my critics. (My comment here applies to the distinctions I suggested in the second email I sent the other day.)

I respect that you don't have time now for this - I didn't even expect a response. I don't have a "tone" - I am within my rights to strongly register my corrections which, please notice, are fact-based and documented. I can, if humor allows, endeavor to exhibit the high-minded and polite tone of a Victorian gentlemen who only wishes, my dear man, to cultivate a cordial parlay with like-minded and jolly-good citizens of the Republic, albeit perhaps peppered with biting witticisms.

I'm totally okay with critics having good reasons for disagreeing with my work. You have to admit, though, that your characterizations are little more than jabs based on inadequate summaries - parodies - of my ideas. In fact, my ideas were not even summarized and engaged. Instead, I was indicted through imagined affiliations and an incorrect and denigrating assertion as to my methodology. That's what I have a problem with, and no doubt Hoopes was behind a lot of that. We can't even begin a dialogue until critics employ basic principles of critique: 1)

accurately summarize and/or quote what you intend to critique (this is indispensable); 2) offer fact-based counter-arguments or objections. It's hilarious, this just doesn't happen. It didn't happen in your article, so like so many other "critiques" of my work it's not only worthless as the basis of dialogue (until corrections are made), but paints a totally false and misleading picture for your readers. You should be amazed that I'm not outright livid.

We can have common ground, I welcome it. The common ground we share is the critique of The 2012 Phenomenon. That's where the circles of our work intersect. My circle, beyond that shared ground, also includes, as a primary goal, the reconstruction of what the Maya thought about 2012. Your circle beyond the critique of 2012 includes all your other history of religion interests. I've tried to emphasize that my critique of the 2012 phenomenon is extensive, informed, and goes back two decades. But you avoid acknowledging that's been part of my contribution (for example, it was much covered in my Gelfer piece, but not acknowledged in your review of Gelfer). And it was an unprecedented contribution to a nascent conversation since I virtually initiated the effort, and I have ever since been doing it longer and more prolifically than most others (with the exception of Stray). So, we could have this common ground, but it seemed you decided to exclude me (and Geoff) from being acknowledged as the pioneers of the critique of the 2012 phenomenon.

So much of your attention goes to minutiae of 2012 critique, and you or Hoopes often cite the very same books that contain my early critique of 2012 writers (such as Arguelles in my book *Tzolkin* (1992/1994)). It's hard to have common ground if you are banished from the ground you settled. Okay, enough for now but I always welcome dialogue, although for most of the 2012 critics, the field has been plowed and it's on to other things. Meanwhile, my work to reconstruct Maya cosmology and what they thought about 2012 continues, and new evidence comes in. It's tiring that I'm now left to pull up the weeds planted by others and have to revive the little flowers that were so carelessly trampled by those who didn't care about what the ancient Maya thought.

I wish you well on your new adventures. Sorry this had to get rolling during a busy time for you. Best wishes,

Hoopes, you might benefit from reading this too.

John

Later, I emailed another comment:

Dear Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes,

I just have one more thing to share, which makes a very clear point. One of your primary critiques in your article is that I seek to free myself from the burden of engaging in

rational fact-based debate with trained scholars about my findings and interpretations. This is clearly false, based on the example I previously offered (the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion of late 2010, sponsored by scholars at The Maya Exploration Center, the transcription of which is posted on their website and on my Center for 2012 Studies website).

Another example that clearly shows my willingness to discuss, and my effort to clearly present the evidence upon which my interdisciplinary analysis is based, is the page on the Izapa ballcourt monuments and archaeoastronomy that I posted on my website in January 2006: <http://www.alignment2012.com/ballcourt-schematic-and-description.html>

It is linked on the front page of my main website: <http://www.alignment2012.com> and has been there for 7.5 years.

Please notice that my email address is stated by my name at the top of the essay.

Please notice the simple presentation of the essay

Please notice the invitational statement at the end of the essay, reproduced here:

"I am very interested in having a dialogue with progressive Mayan scholars on my reconstruction of Izapan cosmology, as this synthesis of the accepted data is straightforward. The assemblage of different lines of evidence, all converging on the same conclusion, seems to me to eliminate coincidence as a viable alternate explanation for the integrative continuity of these symbol complexes. Please share your thoughts."

My name and email address is repeated again, under this invitation.

So, your characterization of me as professing to have a higher truth that is unassailable and not subject to scholarly critique, and my desire to employ a "hermeneutic technique of unburdening" myself from "being an expert", with the intention of being immune from literary scholarship, is completely false. There are many other examples, including emails with scholars such as Malmstrom, Aveni, and Stuart and others that ended precisely at points that I brought up evidence and citations in support of my arguments. I'd appreciate your comments and a statement of retraction. You can certainly disagree with my findings and interpretations, but you cannot make a demonstrably false statement about something like this.

Sincerely,

John Major Jenkins



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