

Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes

John Major Jenkins. © 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 doomsday) or that it was just a mathematical and calendric marker. This reveals that, for Hoopes, legitimate books

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>.

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 Cosmogenesis 2012* as a supporting premise of my work. But Hoopes cannot allow the Maya to have formulated this doctrine 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).

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).

Appendix 1

My Critique of Hoopes's Mayanism in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*

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

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.”⁶ 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.”⁷ 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: Jakalte 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 Jakalteq 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. (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).

Appendix 2:

Early Emails to John B. Carlson and a Revealing Track Record of Communications

It may seem odd to include this dossier on my communications with John B. Carlson. However, it is relevant to Hoopes’s chicanery because Hoopes published his false and defamatory assertions about me and my background in Carlson’s “peer-reviewed” *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (University of Texas Press), in the Vol. XXII issue released in April 2011, where Carlson is the Editor in Chief. We can understand why Carlson allowed this (and has repeatedly published Hoopes’s dubious 2012 critiques, including his Mayanism prison), if we look at Carlson’s own reasons for wanting to ignore and/or eliminate me from having any validity in the 2012 discussion.

There was no response to my first three inquiries (below), 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; and I was sending him some of my articles and booklets):

Inquiry # 1 (Nov 22, 1994), general proposal:

The Journal of the Center
For Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box "X"
College Park, MD
20741-3022

John M. Jenkins
P.O. Box 3
Boulder, CO 80306
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

Inquiry # 2 (March 19, 1995), addressed directly to Carlson:

The Journal of the Center
For Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box "X"
College Park, MD
20741-3022

John M. Jenkins
P.O. Box 3
Boulder, CO 80306
March 19th, 1995

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 13.0.0.0.0. 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 # 3 (May 12, 1995), two months later:

The Journal of the Center
For Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box "X"
College Park, MD
20741-3022

John Major Jenkins
P.O. Box 3
Boulder, CO 80306
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 May 1994
- Correspondence to Dr. Robert Hall (see Appendix 5)
- My two-booklet offering called *The Center for Mayan Time* (1995)

- A third article which must have been my “Maya Creation: The Stellar Frame and World Ages” article (written in early 1995).

Years later, around 2007-2008, John Hoopes, a friend of Carlson, mentioned that he had a copy of my 1995 book *The Center of Mayan Time*. I was quite surprised, as I’d sold only about 40 copies through my mail order catalog. He said it was a Xerox copy sent to him by John B. Carlson. This confirms that Carlson was indeed receiving my letters.

In July of 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* (see Appendix 6). Several scholars responded, but not Carlson. 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 I sent another proposal to *Archaeoastronomy Journal*, after they had linked up with the University of Texas 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, promising my new findings including the Group F ballcourt’s alignment to the December solstice sunrise. No response. Meanwhile I was communicating with Susan Milbrath, Timothy Laughton, and one or two other scholars. But clearly Carlson did not want to talk to me.

Flash forward eleven years; Carlson gives a talk in Massachusetts in May of 2010. Someone in attendance records it and sends me the mp3. I listen and note that Carlson says he read my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, and asserts that I don’t know certain things about Maya astronomy, such as the year-drift formula. I email him and point out that I discussed the year-drift formula in my books *Tzolkin* (1992/1994) and *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998), and in both books the phrase is even listed in the Index. I inquire if he can acknowledge the correction. He does not engage an email correspondence but rather accuses me of illegally recording his talk (the person who recorded it said there were no postings or statements forbidding recording) and directs me to resolve the issue with the Robbins Museum directors (where he gave his talk). Then unfolds a ridiculous series of baffles with the museum directors, with Carlson apparently responding through them by proxy. He only once sent me a few words directly, when he said to resolve it with the museum. He basically made a mountain out of mole hill because he couldn’t fess up to asserting a false and denigrating thing about my knowledge of Maya astronomy.

A similar debacle unfolded in the summer of 2011 over John Hoopes’s defamatory and unsupported statements in *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXII (released in April 2011 despite the earlier stated publication date). Carlson’s poor standards of fact checking and “peer-review” process were exposed in this, since he’s the Editor in Chief of the journal and he let pass the baseless and defamatory comments from Hoopes. And, again, he evaded responding to my request for evidence for the statements, let alone correct the error, while Hoopes also refused my request that he send me any

citations or proof for his comments. Carlson tried to turn the tables and made it about me defending my work; but I was requesting that Hoopes defend his unsupported assertions.

I emailed Carlson a cordial laurel wreath in the summer of 2012, as I noted that one of his upcoming talks was going to address the galactic alignment; in my email I directed him to my various articles (including the SAA and the MEC-FACEBOOK Discussion) and clarified for him my position on the galactic alignment. No response. Meanwhile, the papers for the forthcoming *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol XXIV (released in August 2012 despite, again, an earlier stated publication date) were being prepared.

Here's the rub. Carlson's own viewpoint on 2012 came to echo my own, regarding the Maya "Lord of Creation" who would return in 2012, and the necessity of deity sacrifice for worldrenewal in 2012 — ideas already articulated in my own work which he knew about. I'm not sure how much more clear I can be on this curious circumstance in academia; the reader can draw their own conclusions. To recap: I contacted and sent my work on 2012 to Carlson in 1994-1995 and again proposed writing an article for his journal about it in 1999; he responded to none of this. He refused receiving a review copy of my book during a phone conversation of early 1998, saying he didn't want to be influenced by anyone's work on 2012. Perhaps he didn't want there to be any indication that he received my book or was aware of my ideas; perhaps he had already been working out interpretations similar to my own and instead of collaborating and acknowledging my similar interpretations he instead chose to ignore and/or mitigate. He definitely ignored my attempts to dialogue with him on my ideas and he definitely became intent on keeping me out of the published record, as far as he controlled it (see below).

The next time we hear of him is when he denigrates my knowledge-base of Maya astronomy in his museum talk of 2010 *and he acknowledges having read my 1998 book!* The next time I deal with him is when he defends the false and unsupported assertions of his article contributor (and friend) John Hoopes. Next, in mid-2012, I sent him an email with links to my work with some clear reminders as to what my work is about (see Appendix 3 below). No response. I then hear that, as editor of the 2012 issue of *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXIV, he strongly suggested to at least one of his contributors that references to me and my work should be eliminated. Then, when the Vol. XXIV issue was published and released (in August 2012), Carlson's reading of what 2012 meant to the ancient Maya is revealed in terms boldly echoing my own work, which I worked out and published and sent to him in the 1990s: renewal, the 13-Baktun period as a *creation cycle*, the return of a "lord of Maya Creation" and the importance of deity sacrifice for instigating a cosmological renewal. John B. Carlson: the track record of evidence speaks for itself.

Appendix 3.

A "laurel wreath" email to Carlson in June of 2012

The reformatting of this email document is proving difficult. Best to access it in its original form here: <http://alignment2012.com/email-to-Carlson-June14-2012.pdf>. As

usual, no response from Carlson. I had a friend email him a general inquiry and confirmed that he could receive email and promptly respond to the address I was using.

Appendix 4.

My Attempt to Rectify the Unsupported Defamation in Carlson's Journal (by requesting the facilitation of the University of Texas Press's Journals Manager)

My Exchanges with John Carlson and Sue Hausmann September 2011:

I called Sue Hausmann on September 8, 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, although I plan to confirm this. Carlson's first response came four days later.

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 Planetarization 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

2:

-----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 friend’s house in coastal Oregon without (thankfully) internet. I thereafter traveled to my brother’s house in Washington state and responded on the 18th.

3:

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

4:
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.

5:

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.

6:

September 20, 2011:

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

[p.s.:] 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 was traveling to events in Toronto, Little Rock, New England, and elsewhere and was busy writing and doing interviews. I then called Sue Hausmann asking for an update; she played dumb 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.”

Appendix 5

Letter to Dr. Robert Hall of November 21, 1994, also sent to John B. Carlson

Robert L. Hall
Dept. of Anthropology
m/c 027
University of Illinois
P.O. Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680

John M. Jenkins
P.O. Box 3
Boulder, CO 80306
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/Quiche 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.

Appendix 6.

An Invitation to Receive My Book and Dialogue, Sent to Scholars in July of 1997

This 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. I use the John B. Carlson letter as an example:

The Journal of the Center for Archaeoastronomy
P.O. Box X. College Park, MD 20741-3022

July 7th, 1997

Dear Mr. Carlson,

My name is John Major Jenkins. We briefly talked on the phone a few weeks ago.³ I have been researching the 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 synopsis⁴ and respond with the enclosed SASE. Thank you for your time and careful consideration of my invitation.

Sincerely,
John Major Jenkins

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

-----Please detach and send in enclosed SASE -----

_____ I would like to review and comment on your book. Please send it to the following address:

_____ I have read your enclosed synopsis. However, I am not interested in commenting on your findings, because:

-----Please detach and send in enclosed SASE -----

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.



This compilation and my comments are intended for informational purposes of review, invitation to dialogue, and critique and is composed of verbatim exchanges, scholarly critique, corrections, and commentary