

November 17-20, 2009. Facebook comments, Hoopes, Whitesides, and others. I announced my Powell's Book Store event on Facebook, with link. Responses:

- [Corey Pein](#) Give my best to Powell's.
November 18, 2009 at 8:04am · [Like](#)
-  [Jeannie Drabek](#) · 4 mutual friends
check out Carlos Barrios .. "The Book of Destiny"
November 18, 2009 at 10:39am · [Like](#)
- [John Major Jenkins](#) Thanks Corey!
Jeannie --- I discuss Carlos Barrios's work in my new book.
November 18, 2009 at 2:53pm · [Like](#)
- [Zoe Calder](#) I'd like a reason for checking out Carlos Barrios book.
November 18, 2009 at 5:58pm · [Like](#)
-  [Susan Seymour Hedke](#) Well I suppose the truth one finds depends on where one looks for it, but if the Maya Age was thought to end at the winter solstice of 2012 because the solstice Sun was aligned with the Galactic centre (dark rift) then one should seek to find out more about the G. centre, as Jenkins has done, to some degree. If one finds however, as I have done, that the G. centre aligning with bodies like Sun, Moon planets in specific ways causes disasters on Earth, and has been involved in all the worst disasters on our planet, like the deadly earthquake on 26th December 2003 in Iran and 26th December 2004 in the Indian Ocean and on the same date 2006 in Taiwan, etc, then one might be led to the conclusion that December 2012 could bring a disaster, even if it is not the end of the world, which is just a way of making the whole thing sound ridiculous. But anyway didnt all of the previous four Maya and Aztec ages end in a disaster ruled by an element, and isnt the element ruling this age earth, so isnt it likely that the Sun's alignment with the Galactic centre in 2012 might cause diastrous earthquakes?
November 18, 2009 at 6:40pm · [Like](#)
-  [John Hoopes](#) Correction: The Maya age IS thought to end on a winter solstice. It hasn't been proven the ancient Maya thought that. Not by a long shot.
November 20, 2009 at 7:29am

Also on Nov. 17, I posted a link to my interview in *The Vancouver Sun*:

What does the Mayan prophecy mean?

Rather than it triggering Armageddon, one author says Dec. 21, 2012, will be a time of renewal

Jamie Portman, Canwest News Service
Published: Friday, November 13, 2009

John Major Jenkins is keeping a close eye on the year 2012. But don't assume that he's expecting doomsday.

At a time when people around the world are starting to panic in the belief that approaching astronomical alignments and Mayan prophecy will cause the planet's destruction on Dec. 21, 2012, Jenkins wants everybody to just relax and stay cool.

As an antidote to their fears, he suggests they read his latest book, *The 2012 Story: The Myths, Fallacies, and Truth Behind the Most Intriguing Date in History*. [Tarcher/Penguin, Oct. 2009.]

The book reflects the culmination of more than two decades of research into the elusive Mayan culture which has helped trigger the mounting 2012 furore. And while Jenkins concedes the date has significance, he sees it more as a symbol for "transformation and renewal" than as a promise of Armageddon.

He's chatting with reporters the day after he's had an early look one of the autumn's biggest movies -- 2012, which opens Nov. 13. This is the one in which director Roland Emmerich -- the disaster specialist who gave the world Independence Day and The Day After Tomorrow -- proceeds to decimate the planet as we know it with volcanic eruptions, lethal meteor showers, rampaging tsunamis and tectonic shifts that cause Los Angeles to crumble to dust.

"The film last night was an amazing spectacle, a striking visual spectacle depicting what a global cataclysm would look like, and that's something that we maybe need to think about," Jenkins says. "I enjoyed the movie. Hollywood does what Hollywood does. And it's particularly adept at these incredible visual masterpieces -- and that's definitely what this film is."

But as one of the pioneers of the so-called 2012 movement, with nine earlier books on the subject to his credit, Jenkins also wants to bring some perspective to a riddle which has seized the imaginations of millions of people.

He believes the media too often embraces a "kind of standard bumper sticker" theory that the Maya predicted the end of the world in 2012.

"I just can't reconcile that with what I know from my own research into the evidence," Jenkins says. "It seems to me that the Maya had quite a different idea of what cycle endings entailed, and the emphasis is more on the transformation and renewal and spiritual awakening."

The film does suggest the possibility of renewal -- but, he suggests, it also reflects a culture which likes to "portray things in very solid literal forms. The movie did a great job of portraying that."

As for much of the current Mayan scholarship, Jenkins doesn't have much use for it.

"Mayan scholars pretty much dismiss 2012. They haven't really done their jobs," he says.

"People will basically say that 2012 is all a hoax or something like that. Well, fundamentally, it can't be a hoax because it's a true artifact of Mayan tradition, so let's try to figure out what the ancient Mayans actually believed."

It was as a roving journalist in Central America in the early 1980s that Jenkins first fell in love with Maya culture -- and especially the remarkable Maya calendar and "the more philosophical aspects of Mayan tradition.

Page 2:

Rather than it triggering Armageddon, one author says Dec. 21, 2012, will be a time of renewal

Jamie Portman, Canwest News Service

Published: Friday, November 13, 2009

"So my career has been dedicated to reconstructing what the ancient Maya actually believed about 2012."

He explains the 2012 date marks the end of a major cycle in the Maya's "long count" calendar, a cycle that covers a period of some 5,125 years. Scholars have managed to reconstruct the Mayan calendar and correlate it with Western calendars, and have concluded the end of the cycle will occur on Dec. 21, 2012.

"My work has been oriented toward a kind of nuts-and-bolts reconstruction of the intent behind 2012. Why did they place the end of this cycle on Dec. 21 of 2012?"

He finds it significant that the date falls on a solstice -- and "that pretty much indicates that there is some kind of intentionality going on behind it."

A wide range of clues are available to investigators. "We have 'long count' dates and they relate to ritual and religion and history and beliefs about time and cosmology. We have texts, inscriptions, hieroglyphic

inscriptions that point to creation events of 3114 BC. This was the zero date of the current cycle that ends in 2012."

But Jenkins also argues that the Mayans' extraordinary understanding of astronomy is central to what is happening because of the galactic alignment which will occur.

"The key to 2012 is that the sun aligns with this 'dark rift' in the Milky Way -- the solstice -- and that's what makes it so rare. There's real astronomical science in this."

Jenkins's earlier book, *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, explains this conclusion in detail.

"It basically puts on the table this reconstruction -- that the 2012 end date of the long count was intended to target this rare alignment of the December solstice sun with this dark rift in the Milky Way. It's caused by this phenomenon called the procession of the equinoxes, which is the earth wobbling very slowly on its axis. One complete wobble is 26,000 years, and this kind of alignment occurs only once every 26,000 years.

"The Maya were apparently tuned into this astronomical process. It's real astronomy."

Jenkins warns against the huge amount of misinformation on what he calls "the Googlesphere."

Jenkins doesn't know if the approaching galactic alignment will have "demonstrable effects" on the world.

"I think it's an interesting question," he adds. "I think our scientists should look at this. The fact is that it seems to be the centrepiece of this long-count calendar. It seems to be the reason why the Maya picked Dec. 21 of 2012 to target some kind of transformational process on the planet."

Note: It wasn't accurate for the reporter to say that "I don't have much use for scholars" (and she overstated my appreciation of the movie). I've studied and built upon, and extended, the previous work of great scholars in Maya studies. My book has a section in which I give my appreciation and discuss their contributions. Nevertheless, Hoopes starts his assault. My friend Lorraine also challenged Hoopes on his misleading assertions, but she got upset and deleted her comments. As I mentioned elsewhere, I didn't have time to get into a debate as I was driving and flying and staying in hotels, and engaging dozens of interviews (radio, TV, web, print) between November 8th and November 22. I did manage to squeeze in one response (below)

- **John Hoopes** "Mayan scholars pretty much dismiss 2012. They haven't really done their jobs," he says. Good things are coming out? C'mon, John. When are you going to quit with that stuff?

November 18, 2009 at 7:52am

Note: Hoopes's name is not linked, because he blocked me on Facebook, in July of 2011, when I tried to get a response from him regarding his baseless, unsupported, and denigrating statements about me and my background, in his review-essay published in the Vol. XXII of *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (released in April 2011).

- **Kevin Whitesides** my general problem with these types of criticism of scholarship is that as I interact with scholars (and play at one myself) they tend to be among the most open-minded people that I know-not the most dogmatically closed. Of course there are always individual exceptions. But, this seems to be an implication of Maya scholarship in general, which would somehow seem to imply that Maya scholars are either intentionally or out of ignorance failing or ignoring to really look at the evidence. This really doesn't make sense to me in the larger scale. If there really was compelling evidence it just doesn't make sense to me that an entire scholarly community would continue to deny it. You seem to paint Maya scholars as the great philistines of the day...while your own research is heavily reliant on their data and suppositions. I feel like it is so easy for us to talk about change without needing to focus on a specific contentious date...but then again, if you didn't specify a timeframe for people they might not pay as much attention. Terence had some great ideas about changes taking place, but his

Timewave itself is absurdly arbitrary. Doesn't it seem like focusing on actual changes is much more important and potentially fruitful than trying to specify a date for people to focus on, anticipate or worry about?

November 18, 2009 at 12:42pm · [Like](#)



Susan Seymour Hedke So far, John is the person who has come closest to understanding what 2012 is about in my opinion, he has gone perhaps as far as one can dare, if one is to be respected, and yet I am sometimes shocked by his cutting out a number of implications, or perhaps its just an incapacity, we have all been castrated, we are lost. People are left in the dark, they may panic or not, they believe or they dont, but no one has worked out what the alignment means, because to do so they would have to be an astronomer and an astrologer, and no one dares to be that, after astrologers have been burned at the stake by religion and ridiculed by science. Yet we have fallen far from the ancient understanding of the Great Year and the heavens that once existed and the only way to be redeemed is to reunite with it, and with the Mother of all. As long as we believe in free will we are lost, as long as we believe we can control what is coming we are afraid. In John's Pyramid of Fire from Matz on the Aztec Codex (p.5) we are told -please forgive my quoting" Man does not will when he wars, loves and reaps; it is the rhythms of the great gods, the planets, that act over him and make him do. When man comprehends that by himself he can do nothing, then he can learn to serve the gods; so he must become conscious.... THIS IS WHAT becoming conscious again and re-membering is about now - in my opinion

November 18, 2009 at 2:00pm · [Like](#)

John Major Jenkins In regard to the 2012 topic, specifically, my experience over the last 20 years has been that almost every professional Maya scholar has been incredibly closed-minded about treating 2012 seriously, despite compelling evidence that it was an intentional artifact of the calendar system, not least of which is the solstice placement of end date. And now that attention is going towards it, it is usually only in the context of debunking all the silly marketplace manifestations or addressing the psychology of millennial movements and madness, as Hoopes explores. But the examination of the role 2012 plays in Maya thought has not been pursued in professional academia, and the avenues of inquiry that I have opened up have been met with territorial reactions verging on obsessive mania. Luckily, there are now one or two professional epigraphers that are indeed exploring the complexities of Maya astronomy in the inscriptions, and finding supportive evidence for the idea that I put on the table 15 years ago --- that the ancient Maya intended 13.0.0.0.0 to mark the rare alignment of the solstice sun and the dark rift in the Milky Way. This is simply a case where, as often happens, a researcher outside of professional academia made the key breakthrough that opens up a whole new way of understanding.

November 18, 2009 at 2:52pm · [Like](#)

Sarah Gellner · Friends with Susan Seymour Hedke

For what it's worth - like this Jenkins I also spent quite a lot of time marvelling over Mayan relics in Central America, many years ago. There's no doubt they were amazingly sophisticated astronomers. But they weren't that great at everything else, including (shorter term) social prophecy.

So even if they did predict the end of the world on 21st Dec 2012 (which seems to be in doubt) - no disrespect to them, on the contrary - that does not make them right. Does it?

I haven't seen this one, so forgive me if I'm wrong here, but aren't Hollywood films generally assumed to be entertaining fiction rather than earnest prophecy?

November 18, 2009 at 3:07pm · [Like](#)

Kevin Whitesides but, I do remember a post (perhaps on the UT Maya forums) from a while back where Hoopes pointed out to you that Maya scholars, especially, understand the contributions that can be made by amateurs.

Can you direct me toward these Maya epigraphers who are finding supporting evidence for your propositions? I would love to add their opinions to my info-base.

November 18, 2009 at 3:09pm · [Like](#)



• **John Hoopes** John, you write, "almost every professional Maya scholar has been incredibly closed-minded about treating 2012 seriously, despite compelling evidence..." If the professional Maya scholars aren't convinced, it seems incredibly disingenuous to claim that the evidence is "compelling." If it's only compelling to you and people who don't know much about the ancient Maya, then its not really "compelling," is it?

November 18, 2009 at 9:18pm



• **John Hoopes** "This is simply a case where, as often happens, a researcher outside of professional academia made the key breakthrough that opens up a whole new way of understanding." You don't seem to have any hesitation in claiming that you have made a "key breakthrough" while, at best, the jury is still out. It seems to me that's a claim someone else should be making. I just haven't heard anyone but you say that yet.

November 18, 2009 at 9:22pm



• **Susan Seymour Hedke** I would say that Jenkins has made more than one key breakthrough, and it is those who dare to make breakthroughs that tend to be remembered, for good or bad.

November 19, 2009 at 4:29am · [Like](#)



• **John Hoopes** I mean no disrespect, Susan, but what are your qualifications for deciding what's a scientific "breakthrough" and what's just a speculative hunch?

November 19, 2009 at 6:13am



• **Susan Seymour Hedke** Hi John. The definition of science is "knowledge attained through study or practice," or "knowledge covering general truths of the operation of general laws.. I would say that five years of intensive independent study and research including the Mayan artefacts and John's books give me that qualification, with no disrespect back;-)

November 19, 2009 at 7:18am · [Like](#)



• **John Hoopes** Well, if you're only reading JMJ's books, you're getting a highly biased perspective. Intensive independent study can be deeply flawed if it's not informed by keen skills in critical thinking. Most people don't appreciate that learning how to evaluate and critique theories and evidence--not learning "dogma"--is the main thing one learns in a good graduate program in anthropology (or any other discipline). There is some amazing scholarship out there, a lot of it done by independent scholars. This blog, by Erik Boot, is an excellent example:

<http://mayanupdates.blogspot.com/>

November 19, 2009 at 7:39am



Susan Seymour Hedke Thanks for your concern and the blog - looks interesting but I will have to put on my critical glasses before I risk saying more.
November 19, 2009 at 10:03am · Like



• **John Hoopes** Graham Hancock? Puh-leeze. Have you read his book about the Lost Ark?The "Face on Mars"? You probably think Erich von Daniken is a genius. Sorry. This stuff just doesn't hold up to careful scrutiny.
November 20, 2009 at 6:49am

• **Michael Geselowitz** · Friends with Elaine Schele
Even Steve Williams figured this out...thirty years ago!
November 20, 2009 at 11:14am · Like



• **Susan Seymour Hedke** I would never have found out what caused the tsunami in 2004 if it had not been for Graham Hancock's travels and Fingerprints of the Gods and John's discovery through Linda Schele that it was all about the Galactic Centre and the nearing alignment to our winter solstice point, so I am thankful to them, even if my own adventure takes me beyond them and means that for me they turn also into closeminded people.
November 20, 2009 at 2:54pm · Like



• **John Hoopes** What do you (and Hancock) think caused the tsunami in 2004?
November 20, 2009 at 7:32pm



• **John Hoopes** Are you aware of the significant problems with Freidel & Schele's interpretations.
November 20, 2009 at 7:34pm

I did send the new work of Grofe and MacLeod to Whitsides, and my own SAA presentation of April 2010; we discussed it several times by email but he never subsequently addressed it in his articles --- even after it was published or presented at academic venues or discussed by scholars (as in the [MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion](#) of late 2010). If Hoopes would simply read my books, he'd have the answers to his various questions. He was primarily concerned with being a disruptive energy vampire, motivated by envy due to my success. And he was just beginning his unethical campaign of JMJ mitigation, as future events revealed. My most recent exposé of Hoopesian chicanery (and his buddy, Kevin Whitesides), is my peer-reviewed essay published in the January 2014 issue of *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* --- see the discussion at <http://Update2012.com> --- JMJ.

Compiled, with comments, September 26, 2014. John Major Jenkins.