

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

John Major Jenkins. August 3, 2014

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

My review-essay called "The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)" was recently published in the German peer-review journal *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (14), January 2014, pp 53-62. It was a review of the article by Kevin Whitesides and John Hoopes called "Seventies Dreams and 21st Century Realities", published in the same journal in mid-2012, which is available online on Academia.edu.¹ There are several additional essays I wrote that can serve as ancillary support for my corrections and critiques:

1. "Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities"
2. "Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes"
3. "Truth Deniers: How Scholars Exploit the Internet and Avoid Dialogue"²

The first item consists of the lengthy email exchanges between Hoopes, Whitesides, and myself, with some comments by the editor of the *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, between mid-December 2013 and late January 2014. It occurred after Hoopes and Whitesides were sent my peer-review approved piece (around December 18) by the journal's editors with an invitation to respond. This email communication, generally not required or advised in this critique-and-response process, was instigated by Hoopes's incessant requests that I send him by entire body of multi-genre works going back to the 1980s, as some kind of prerequisite for him making an informed response to my critique.

This was a ruse intended to muddy the waters, a bid by Hoopes to upset the editors so they might cancel the entire plan. And it almost worked. The compilation I've entitled "Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities" documents the bad behavior and resistance of two scholars to be corrected on simple points of factual error, and the absurd lengths to which they would go in order to maintain their flawed ideas and writings. Hoopes even sent me a last minute email, on the day of the deadline for their response, which I respond to in Appendix 1 below.

¹ https://www.academia.edu/2174066/Seventies_Dreams_and_21st_Century_Realities_The_Emergence_of_2012_Mythology.

² All three essays are online at <http://Update2012.com>.

The second item, “Mayanism: An Ideological Prison Invented by John Hoopes”, is a piece I wrote in May 2014 that clearly states the many problems with Hoopes’s “Mayanism” construct, and shares the detective work that revealed his collaborative collusions with his friend and *Archaeoastronomy Journal* editor, John B. Carlson. It appears quite clear that the several articles Hoopes published in Carlson’s “peer-review” journal, which all contain errors as well as unsupported defamatory assertions about a living author (myself), were approved not through a standard un-biased peer-review process, but through a “wink-and-a-handshake” strategy. The underlying reason for this appears to be the likelihood that Carlson himself wished me to be mitigated, quite possibility because he has known, for years, that my interpretation of what the ancient Maya thought about 2012 (world-renewal that must be facilitated by deity sacrifice) anticipated his own interpretations, which he began to publish in his own journals in 2011. My early communications with Carlson, going back to 1994, are supplied.

Item number three, “Truth Deniers: How Scholars Exploit the Internet and Avoid Dialogue”, is a compilation of the exchanges that took place on Whitesides’ Facebook group, “The 2012 Research Discussion Group”, in July of 2014. I was trying to open a dialogue with Hoopes, Whitesides, and Bill Hudson, and also wanted to share my ongoing 2012 research and ask some questions. In particular, I was seeking clarification on the difference between “Mayanism” and “the 2012 Phenomenon.” However, Hoopes had blocked me, followed by Hudson blocking me. So it became difficult to have a clear discussion with them. Then, after Geoff Stray provided some detective work on Wikipedia that revealed Hoopes’s aggressive construction of the Mayanism entry beginning in early 2008, which I built upon by sharing my email exchange with Hoopes in early 2008 to show that Hoopes was being deceptive, Whitesides deleted me from the group. And, in addition, they all ignored my separate emails and Instant Message attempts to communicate, which were professional and cordial. If one reads the exchanges one should note my cordial stance of inviting dialogue, compared to the hostility and *ad hominem* flippancy of others who were aghast at the questions and facts that were being presented.

There are many support files documenting exchanges, excerpts from my books, or previous articles that are freely available online and are cited in the footnotes of my essay. They are compiled here:

www.Alignment2012.com/the2012phenomenonMarch2004.html

www.Alignment2012.com/2012ology.html

www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/new3.htm#judge

www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz13.htm

www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/newz25.htm

www.Alignment2012.com/zap-jenkins-dialogue.html

www.Update2012.com

www.Alignment2012.com/Chapter3.html

www.Alignment2012.com/following.html

www.Alignment2012.com/lettoed.htm

www.Alignment2012.com/mc2012summary.html

www.Alignment2012.com/mc-dialectic.html

www.Alignment2012.com/summary-of-my-work-on-Izapa.pdf

www.Alignment2012.com/izapa-solstice-2006.html

www.mayaexploration.org (linking to http://mayaexploration.org/pdf/MEC_Facebook_Discussion_2010_Jenkins.pdf)
www.thecenterfor2012studies.com
www.Alignment2012.com/rationalapproachto2012.html
www.Alignment2012.com/Hoopes-Jenkins-Lawrence.html
www.Alignment2012.com/chapter3.html
www.Update2012.com/Jenkins-Guenter-Normak-Archaeological-Haeccities.html
www.Alignment2012.com/milbrath9.html
www.Alignment2012.com/Response-to-Mark-Van-Stone.html

There are more than 400 pages of material here, which thoroughly validate my interpretations and critique. Any thinking and unbiased reader who becomes familiar with my work, through these freely available sources or my books, cannot possibly agree with the skewed and denigrating assessments offered by Whitesides and Hoopes. But the task at hand is to offer, here, a summary and response to the critique-and-response now published in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, copies of which can be purchased by contacting the editors of that journal: www.anomalistik.de.

My Rebuttal to the Response of Whitesides and Hoopes

Despite my unambiguous corrections of several factual errors, they've managed to subvert honest scholarly process and wiggle their way around the corrections, invoking the sorcery of semantics and assertions that — not unlike many unsupported assertions in their original essay — are simply not true. Throughout their entire essay they avoid acknowledging even one of the corrections. It illustrates an unwillingness and a failure to correct themselves when demonstrably in error. This is not the behavior of honest scholars.

As the first example, we can look at my first point of correction, in which I provided the proof for Geoff Stray's earlier use of the "2012 phenomenon" phrase. The published *uses* by Stray were unambiguously *prior* to Sitler's 2006 essay. Recall that the authors credited Sitler with the *first use* of the phrase, as well as with defining the phrase. I also pointed out that there was no definition of the phrase in Sitler's essay. This could have been a simple matter of acknowledging a correction but, instead, Whitesides & Hoopes responded: "We were referring to its use *and* definition." No, they were referring to its *first use*. In my review I quoted their words, that Robert Sitler was "the first to use." They refuse to acknowledge the factual correction on this simple point by saying that Defesche (2007) was "the second" to use it, thus maintaining their demonstrably false position that Sitler was "the first."

Furthermore, they conclude that they "were following and extending this specific scholarly use, not its casual mention" (63). We are apparently suppose to believe that Stray's earlier use (at least four times since 2002 and prior to 2006) was merely a "casual mention" of the phrase and does not constitute a "use of" the term. This fallacious and deceptive way of dismissing a simple factual correction is emblematic of their other responses, and is why I have titled my rebuttal "Deceptive Scholars Refuse to Correct Factual Errors in Their Peer-Reviewed Study."

They also claim that Sitler did define the phrase, and we are suppose to believe that this constitutes a definition: "There is intense and growing speculation concerning the

significance of this date among many New Age aficionados and others interested in Mayan culture” (Sitler, 2006: 24). That’s a definition? If Sitler’s sub-title (“The New Age Appropriation of an Ancient Maya Calendar”) is meant to be taken as a definition of the phrase, as they suggest, then we are left with a contradiction in which Sitler himself calls me a “central influence on the 2012 phenomenon” (Sitler 2006:29), yet my work is seen by Sitler to be the most well-researched work on the topic, is recognized as being concerned with reconstructing ancient Maya beliefs and *not concerned* with “appropriating” the Long Count calendar, but with articulating the ancient Maya beliefs associated with it. Thus, Whitesides & Hoopes have misconstrued Sitler’s perception of a distinction to be made in the nature of my work, compared to those in the marketplace who have appropriated the Long Count/2012 calendar and have invented various models, doomsday devices, and so on.

In several other examples, Whitesides & Hoopes distort (or ignore) the actual context and *words used* in my corrections *and in their own essay*. Their responses are therefore not to my critiques, but to an imagined distortion or incomplete truncation of my critiques. For example, in their original essay they wrote that I “promoted” the “ideas” of McKenna and Arguelles. I showed proof that I actually critiqued and disagreed with the core 2012 ideas of both McKenna and Arguelles, that I was not *promoting* their ideas, that McKenna himself had made a distinction between our approaches and conclusions, and that my critiques of Arguelles’ ideas go back to my 1992 book *Tzolkin*. They responded by addressing NOT their assertion that I “promoted” the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles, but that I merely had an “association” with them and their ideas. See how that works? Obviously, there’s a huge difference between actively promoting the ideas of others and simply having some kind of association with those people and their ideas. You could say we were all writers, or males, or had once stood in the same room. That is the kind of chicanery that Hoopes has frequently employed, and it is deceptively employed many times in their responses to my critique of their paper.

But they go further in laboriously scanning through my writings for a discursive example of me agreeing with McKenna’s comment that “resonant relationships” between the microcosm and the macrocosm is a good and useful framework. And elsewhere (in a letter to the editor of the Dreamspell “Time Bandits” newsletter in the early 1990s) I offer to help the Dreamspell group understand the authentic Maya calendar and where errors in the Dreamspell system were committed. Instead of seeing this as my effort to educate and clarify a murky appropriation and distortion of the Maya calendar, Whitesides & Hoopes craft a denigrating and false assertion that I was collaborating with them to build the Dreamspell empire. I frequently identify my role, all through the 1990s and beyond, as being in service to “clarity and discernment.”

So, instead of recognizing the role I played in correcting the Dreamspellers and defending the authentic Maya calendar from their “appropriation”, Whitesides & Hoopes turn the tables and make me an accomplice and consultant in their agenda — even though I was the first to expose the errors of Dreamspell, received many nasty letters as a consequence, worked hard through the 1990s to point the disillusioned Dreamspell fallout to ethnographic sources for authentic Maya calendar information, confronted and questioned Arguelles in person in 1999 (Jenkins 2009: 109), and continued my efforts all the way through to my 2009 book with Tarcher/Penguin, despite the adversity involved.

The two examples above were cited by Whitesides & Hoopes as evidence that I was “associated” with and agreed with the ideas of McKenna and Arguelles. This is yet another example of their deceptive approach, their insistence in maintaining a denigrating and false picture of my contributions, and their resistance to being corrected.³

The deceptive tactics of Whitesides & Hoopes are also clearly in evidence when they write: “Jenkins also claims that in *Tzolkin* he ‘discussed and critiqued various calendar correlations (including the Waters/Coe error).’ However, *Tzolkin* makes no mention of Coe” (65). It was not necessary for me to discuss or mention Coe in my 1992 book in order to later identify the end-date correlation of December 24, 2011 (that Waters got from Coe) as the “Waters/Coe error”. If I had only identified it as the “Waters error” that would be inaccurate because it derived from Coe’s miscalculation. The point was that I had addressed the fallacy of this correlation in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, which is one point of several that indicates I was contributing critical analyses to items that would much later come under the “2012 phenomenon” umbrella. Obviously, Whitesides & Hoopes are trying hard here to use deceptive tactics in order to disallow my early contributions and analysis of 2012-related matters. This kind of deceit is, again, emblematic of virtually every evasive defense they offered in their response.

Whitesides himself no doubt composed (p. 65) the response to the evidence I provided that obviates the charge that I employ a “hermeneutic” of “being immune” to scholarly discourse and process, etc. The alleged evidence for this denigrating charge is cited to, and supposedly is to be found in, my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. In the initial email correspondence with the authors, in July of 2013, Whitesides acknowledged that he composed this part of the paper and that the citation must be wrong. But then he begged off and was elusive for many months, finally in November refusing to respond to my emails in which I asked for clarification. The curious issue here is that Whitesides, in his official published response, *did not admit to the citation error that he had previously acknowledged*, and instead defended and re-asserted a twisted version of the same charge. He actually *did not* respond to the quotes I provided and the facts of my twenty years of efforts to communicate and debate with scholars about my work — facts which totally mitigate his assertions. Instead, the authors assert that I’ve “repeatedly” refused to send them my various multi-genre publications going back to the 1980s. This is a lie. In fact, I immediately responded to this request, on December 23, 2013, and for the following two weeks repeatedly reiterated my response, offering links, excerpts, jpgs of images from and explanations of my rare out-of-print books, and ordering information. I wrote over 15,000 words in this effort. Hoopes was mainly behind these extremely odd requests, which simply ignored that I had already responded and provided as much information as possible. Many of the sources he was requesting were poetry, experimental narrative, travelogue, and biographical. He was clearly setting up an impossible and irrelevant task so that he could later claim I was uncooperative (which itself is untrue). This is exactly what he did, effectively demonstrating, for people who can read, the sad state of his ethics.

Another tactic employed by the authors was to sift through my book, looking for singular out-of-context occurrences of the words “archetype” and “perennial,” each of which occurs in my 1998 book in one place, in separate chapters. Their charge that I employed a “perennial wisdom tradition” and a methodology of interpretation of the

³ See Appendix 2 for another example involving the Hunab Ku symbol.

Izapan monuments that proceeds “archetypally” is suppose to be vindicated by these two occurrences of these two words, in completely different chapters outside of my analysis of Izapa. The word “perennial,” for example, was used in a common way meaning “always ongoing” and “archetype” was employed to identify the symbolic motif of “Jonah and the Whale,” in my retelling of a Maya folktale. That has nothing to do with my method of analyzing Izapan monuments and cosmovision, which, as I demonstrated clearly with quotations drawn from my 1998 book, is rooted in archaeoastronomy, topography, and astronomy.

They similarly grasp at straws in asserting that I employed a “pure truth” reading of the Izapa monuments that doesn’t require analytic assessment or evidentiary support and argument, and their alleged proof of this is the occurrence of the word “True” in the subtitle of my book, which was selected by my publisher: “The True Meaning of the Mayan Calendar End Date in 2012”. Obviously, we have more evasive semantic sleight-of-hand happening here; “true meaning” in the sub-title refers to my findings *in studying the origin of the tradition*, the meaning being “true” because it is the meaning ascribed to 2012 by the creators of the 2012 calendar. And I believe my interpretations to be true and accurate ones regarding what the ancient Maya thought about 2012, based on all the research, evidence, and arguments laid out in my book. It can also be noted that my original and preferred sub-title was “Precession Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica.” We might similarly employ the Whitesides & Hoopes tactic in chastising the dire and dramatic titles of Restall & Solari (*2012 and the End of the World*) or Aveni (*The End of Time*). Their contempt and hostility is revealed in their decision to selectively target and misrepresent my sub-title in this way.

This lame bid to defend their baseless accusation also ignores a very clear point that I made in my review, which I suppose I must repeat here:

They further state that I utilized an “assumption of a pure truth (or insight into the nature of reality) attained prior to cultural dilution, corruption, and textual exegesis.” (69) This seems to be a grossly distorted reading of my view that it is best to study the origin, place and time of the Long Count (the pre-Classic “Izapan civilization”) because it would provide the clearest window into the undiluted original cosmology before historical degenerations inevitably occurred.[14] Their distorted reading of what is a rather commonplace observation about how the passage of time changes the original beliefs of a religious movement or cultural paradigm gives a pejorative slant on my actual approach – which was to study the evidence at the probable origin site of the calendar that gives us the 2012 period-ending date.[15] (Jenkins 2014:57)

I suspect that Whitesides employed his ridiculous and fallacious accusations about my methods and interpretations in his dissertation on 2012, apparently awarded to him in 2012 by the University of Edinburgh. Consequently, the validity of his PhD would come into question if he officially admitted asserting false and denigrating things about a living author, *using for support a citation to a source that does not provide evidence for what he asserted*. And yet, he already *unofficially* admitted this during our email exchange in July 2013 (see Item 1 above, “Scholarly Dreams...”).

Whitesides & Hoopes also tried to explain away my noting of their oversight of including Sitler’s 2010 book called *The Living Maya: Ancient Wisdom in the Era of 2012*

in their list of official, *bona fide* books on 2012. They explained that: “This was not an oversight. We consider that work to be in a different category and therefore did not treat it – as we did not treat many other popular trade books – as being equivalent to those by noted epigraphers, archaeoastronomers, ethnohistorians, and art historians.” Significantly, they neglect to point out that Van Stone’s book (2010) was a messily revised Power Point presentation and was self-published (and poorly edited, with many errors),⁴ the Restall/Solari book (2011) and the Stuart book (2011)⁵ were trade publications (which, elsewhere, in discussing my research being published with trade publishers, Whitesides & Hoopes claim are not valid academic contributions because they haven’t gone through peer-review), and Aveni’s 2009 book (which is the only one published under a peer-review process with a university press) contains critical errors⁶ and opinionated anecdotal assertions *that Whitesides himself took to task in his review of it on Amazon!*

In addition, in his book Sitler reported an important discovery made by Geoff Stray: that Maude Makemson, in her 1951 book *Jaguar Priest*, noted a possible 13-Baktun reference in the Books of Chilam Balam.⁷ The exchange between Stray and Sitler occurred in early April of 2006, and led directly to Tortuguero Monument 6 coming to widespread attention with Stuart’s early translation (following Sitler’s query to him)⁸ on April 6, 2006. In his book, Sitler also updated his views about my work, following open-minded conversations with me regarding the evidence that supports it, writing of the Maya’s knowledge of the astronomical aspect of my work that “...such a supposition seems quite plausible, I would even say likely” (Sitler 2010:21).

I submit that Hoopes and Whitesides decided to dismiss the relevance of Sitler’s 2010 book precisely because it lends support to my work. If they allowed it, they would appear to contradict themselves in stating, as they did, that my work “has been repeatedly rejected by academic specialists in the very areas in which he claims expertise (cf. Aveni, 2009; Malmström, 2003).” Furthermore, that statement should be qualified and adjusted to “under-informed and biased scholars have repeatedly rejected Jenkins’ work on demonstrably flawed grounds.” Hoopes and Whitesides failed to perceive the flaws in those critiques by Aveni (2009) and Malmstrom (2003). I’ve respond to both of them, and both of them have utterly failed to adjust their assessments to the facts and corrections. Aveni, for example, asserted that I use Izapa Stela 25 as a “star map” for the galactic alignment. This is totally false. He also incorrectly assessed Michael Grofe’s work on precession which lends support to my reconstruction work, and Aveni got the precessional motion backwards. Grofe has corrected Aveni on this,⁹ and Aveni privately

⁴ http://www.update2012.com/Review_Mark_Van_Stone-book.html

⁵ <http://update2012.com/review-stuartsbook.html>

⁶ <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoAvenisarticle.html>

⁷ Very important document revealing Stray’s role in the impending introduction of Tortuguero Monument 6 into the 2012 discussion: <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/sit.htm>.

⁸ Sitler also asked me if I knew of pre-Columbian references. On March 17, 2006 I replied via email that I thought Schele referred to one (<http://update2012.com/3-17-06.html>), and I thought it might be from Coba. I couldn’t locate it, but I was probably vaguely recalling her note in *Forest of Kings* (1990) that briefly mentioned the 2012 date on Tortuguero Monument 6. It was a failure on my part as, somehow, with my focus on Izapa, I didn’t consider how important such a date might end up being. In my “Mayan 2012 Statements” essay, dated March 18, 2006 (<http://www.alignment2012.com/mayan2012statements.html>), I wrote “...of all the Long Count dates preserved in the archaeological record, why are there only one or two that could be construed as referring directly to the 2012 end date?”

⁹ https://www.academia.edu/3894959/Measuring_Deep_Time_The_Sidereal_Year_and_the_Tropical

(but not publicly) acknowledged the correction. Aveni also vaguely and inaccurately summarized my pioneering work on the Izapa ballcourt alignment (Aveni 2009: 54), and even stated the alignment direction of the ballcourt totally incorrectly (by some 48°), surely causing confusion in the reader's mind about the veracity of my ideas.¹⁰

As for Malmstrom, his 2003 critique was totally directed to my brief, 900-word "open letter to astronomers," first presented to the Aztlan e-list in 1999, then in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter in 2002. In it, I presented two simple facts from Maya star lore (the Dark Rift and the Milky Way/ecliptic Crossroads) that showed the Maya thought of the visually perceivable nuclear bulge of the Galactic Center to be a "center" and "source" (or birthplace). In Malmstrom's much cited essay (in which he incorrectly states the 2012 date in his title), he did not even address these two simple points in my essay. I repeat: *he did not even address these two simple points in my essay*. I repeat, again: **he did not even address these two simple points in my essay**. I engaged an email discussion with Malmstrom in 2006, but he stopped responding after I cordially presented him with facts and corrections.¹¹ This is virtually how it always happens with under-informed and under-handed critics who initially see me as an easily flayable straw man of their imaginations, a target for their sadistic or bullying tendencies. When I respond with intelligent discussion, facts, citation, evidence, invitations-to-dialogue, and corrections, they hang up the phone without acknowledging they were mistaken. The same thing has happened with David Freidel¹² and Aveni¹³ (and many, many other scholars).

Whitesides & Hoopes next write that "Jenkins notes that only his 1998 book is cited as support for several assertions. This is correct. Academic citations are expected to be sufficient, not comprehensive" (64). When I noted that they cited *only* my 1998 book, I was noting that the proof for their assertions must therefore be found in that book; they provided no other citations to sources where evidence for their assertions might be found. However, *there is no proof in that book for the assertions they made and cited to that book*. I underscored this clearly in my review, stating: "To be clear, the *appearance* of support for their contentions is suggested by the citation to my 1998 book, but is not confirmed when that source is actually consulted" (60). My intention in using the word "only" was crystal clear, in a sentence that is apparently the sentence they were paraphrasing: "The one and only cited source that allegedly supports these assertions is my book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998)" (57). They have cleverly misconstrued the obvious point that I was making, the point being that my 1998 book is certainly *not* a "sufficient" source to support their claims; in fact, that book is *a good source for statements that contradict the accusations they made*, which I cited and quoted in my response. They have evaded responding to the evidence I provided and by which a functioning peer-review process would require that an *errata* be made. They inappropriately and deceptively used a reference to my 1998 book as a source that supposedly provides supportive evidence for the (unsupported and demonstrably false) statements that they made, when in fact it does not.

[Year in Maya Inscriptions](#)

¹⁰ <http://update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>

¹¹ <http://alignment2012.com/Malmstromexchangeon2012.html>

¹² <http://www.update2012.com/May2009.html> and <http://www.update2012.com/response-to-freidelMay.html>.

¹³ <http://update2012.com/Responseto-Aveni-on-my-TRT-essay.pdf>

There is the matter of the authors (probably Hoopes) claiming that they did indeed cite and discuss the work of professional scholars, in their critique of the 2012 phenomenon. They cite my own reference, in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*, to Hoopes noting that Michael Coe conveyed a doomsday notion about the cycle-ending date (mistakenly given as December 24, 2011) as long ago as his 1966 book *The Maya*. And Hoopes exclaims that this is supposed to be a contradiction. Well, what I actually stated was that their treatments “omit inclusion of *recent* academic writings of scholars” (54, emphasis added). Much progress has happened *recently*, and much of that goes toward supporting my reconstruction work. For example, Grofe’s work on the evidence that the Maya could accurately calculate the Sidereal Year and the precession of the equinoxes.

Furthermore, their definition of the 2012 phenomenon (which I quoted on page 54) clearly precludes scholarly writings. Elsewhere I’ve stated that Hoopes “largely” omits including scholars in his “Mayanism” box, which is true. In my 2009 book I charitably noted Hoopes’s observation about Coe’s “Armageddon” reading, even though I’d noted the same thing years earlier, because it was a point he was particularly happy to emphasize. I’ve also been generous in reporting, with credit, Hoopes’s discovery of a possible use of 2012, in the mid-1960s, by novelist William Burroughs. Giving credit where credit is due, even to someone you often disagree with, is a fairness principle I embrace. In comparison, Hoopes demonstrably lies¹⁴ and goes out of his way to discredit me and never report the original contributions I’ve made (such as the Izapa ballcourt alignment, for one example among many). A specific example of one of my contributions to Hoopes’s own research, which he absconded with and never credited me for, is discussed in Appendix 2.

I could continue with a point-by-point rebuttal, to each and every comment they made, but obviously this would be futile in terms of an honest due process according to the principles of good scholarship. It takes honesty and discernment for this to happen, and Whitesides and Hoopes have demonstrated that they aren’t interested in being scholars, but in being something more like inquisitors, gatekeepers, or turf protectors willing to dishonor their profession and employ deceptive tactics in order to distort and mitigate my pioneering role in the unfolding 2012 discussion (or the “2012 phenomenon” if you prefer, used in its originally intended sense).

But I can offer two points of discussion that should be taken to heart by anyone who is following this demolition of science by alleged scholars, and who still cares about the injustice done to this 2012 topic.

1. The narrative they have tried to construct is a false and forced framework that does not accurately reflect the sequence of discovery and my own intentions and role in the process. They paint a picture in which my advent into the 2012 discussion, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, was merely a smooth continuation of earlier ideas and efforts from the 1970s. Although in any burgeoning field of study there are likely to be associations and contacts among the few who are drawn to a new topic (certainly true of one so compelling as “2012”), a sharp distinction must be recognized in my contribution,

¹⁴ A lie and libel are demonstrated when a critic knows the truth but nevertheless makes defamatory assertions. Email exchanges with Hoopes often reveal his acknowledgment of certain facts about my work that I’ve presented to him, but then later, in official peer-review contexts, he will assert the opposite to affect a denigration of me.

which should be thought of as a fundamental shift, a breakthrough. My work legitimized 2012 as a rational topic of extended inquiry by showing how the astronomy associated with 2012 involved known Maya concepts. I therefore lifted 2012 out of a generalized popular milieu of speculation. If we take a snapshot of the state of the topic in 1992-93, we find the two primary 2012 figures at the time were McKenna and Arguelles, whose ideas were based in I Ching mathematics and the idiosyncratic Dreamspell mysticism. There were also the Western astrological ideas of Ray Mardyks, who likewise was not concerned with reconstructing ancient Maya paradigms and beliefs.¹⁵ My work was singularly unique in this way, and proceeded with the eminently reasonable approach of studying the pre-Classic site of Izapa — the culture which relevant scholars believed was involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar that gives us the 2012 date. Critics like Whitesides & Hoopes might disagree with my findings, but they've never exhibited an ability in debating my arguments and the evidence that underlies them, or in even accurately summarizing what my work is about. Nor have they ever accurately presented this distinctive quality of my work and how it introduced the concept that "there is evidence that the Maya did think something about 2012" into an academic discourse that rejected that notion for years and years (until 2010).¹⁶ Instead, Whitesides & Hoopes employ a standard tactic of sifting through my writings looking for marginal comments or speculations about larger provisional implications which they falsely represent as being my core convictions. That, too, is the dishonest tactic of polemical sophistry which seeks to denigrate rather than identify and understand the central intention and meaning of an investigator's work. It's dishonest, deceptive, and mean-spirited — and does not at all dignify the scientific and scholarly professions. Hoopes is particularly crafty at finding and using one-word occurrences (such as "Blavatsky") and blowing them up into an insinuation of secret influence.

2. There is an insurmountable problem for the "Mayanism" framework that Hoopes has worked at developing since early 2008.¹⁷ Several of the key identifiers of Mayanism are presented as being idiosyncratic modern inventions of the marketplace and a New Age 2012 mythology. One of these is the concept of the impending advent of a New Era or New Age. The conceptual contradiction here, which seems lost on Hoopes, is that the ancient Maya had a World Age doctrine in which world-renewal happens at distinct intervals timed by the Long Count calendar. The year 2012, the end of the 13-Baktun cycle in the Long Count, is a New Era. And now, beginning around 2010, many scholars are agreeing with this notion. But Hoopes clings to his false Mayanism construct, which

¹⁵ Mardyks stated that he "did first make up the fantasy that the 'ancient Maya', whomever the fuck that might be, believed in a future galactic alignment." See <http://www.update2012.com/Hoopes-Mardyks-Collaboration.pdf>. This document also proves that Hoopes was deriving his deceptive ideas about the galactic alignment being "astrology" directly from Mardyks. In addition to the dubiousness of his claim, Mardyks tied the galactic alignment not to 2012 but to 1999 and barely mentioned the Maya, in a construct that adapted the Harmonic Convergence in a numerological model that drew largely from Western astrology and constellations. See, e.g., <http://www.update2012.com/HC-1987.pdf>.

¹⁶ Gronemeyer & MacLeod's Wayeb no. 34 paper on Tortuguero Monument 6 — the first "peer-reviewed" and "official" academic publication that unambiguously acknowledged that the ancient Maya thought *something* would happen 2012. They identified themselves as "Independent Scholars."

¹⁷ Proven by looking at the major additions made to the Mayanism topic on Wikipedia, by Hoopes in January of 2008.

he crafted as a way of mitigating and containerizing unwanted ideas and independent writers, and a lynch-pin of his ideological prison, guaranteed to imprison anyone who espoused the notion, is his belief that 2012 representing the dawn of a New Era is merely a New Age idea. It might be lamentable how this idea was expressed in many New Age books and so on, but my work was oriented to reconstructing Maya ideas and the core idea I found was that 2012 was thought of as a time of worldrenewal that must be facilitated by deity sacrifice. Hoopes will smear out the accurate phrasing here into a generalized and silly parody, in order to affect an association with the contestable pseudo-science of irrational New Age spiritualism. In so doing, he distorts and denigrates the research and evidence that led me to my interpretations that emphasize how such renewal concepts are found in ancient Maya thought and do not derive from some invented Blavatskian influence or 1970s “dreams”, courtesy of the misleading narratives of Whitesides and Hoopes. Discerning critics need to recognize the accurate sequence of events in a historical context; unlike those two critics I was there during the process and was aware of what was going on, of who said what and when. Despite many exchanges with both Hoopes and Whitesides, they’ve never accurately conveyed anything I’ve shared with them about my influences, ideas, history, motivations, and discoveries. Scholars like Hoopes should use their intelligence to identify and differentiate these distinctions rather than wasting time in guild protection and crafting denigrating narratives through the sorcery of semantic tricks.

Appendix 1: My Response to Hoopes’s Last Email, of January 31, 2014

In the lengthy exchange with Hoopes and Whitesides, while they were trying to subvert the critique-and-response process approved by the editors of *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (see Item 1 above, “Scholarly Dreams and Factual Realities”), Hoopes’s desperate grasping at straws continued to the very last day of the deadline for their response. I composed the following response to him the next day, when I received it, but decided not to send it because the deadline had passed and he was just re-re-repeating his requests, to which I’d already responded. He was clearly trying to craft a complaint that I was refusing to send him the materials he requested, and sure enough, we find this complaint in their rebuttal to my critique. It’s a totally fallacious and dishonest complaint, as can be seen from the 15,000 words of responses and explanation and excerpts and jpgs I sent to them in December and January (see, again, the “Scholarly Dreams” compilation). In any case, I include my final response to Hoopes below because it encapsulates and concludes quite nicely this episode, a sad episode which documents and reveals the pathetic attempts of scholars to abuse their academic credentials in order to denigrate and distort my work and, generally, to maintain a view that 2012 is a joke and an invented “mythology” — thus muddying the process of scholarly reconstruction and discovery, regarding what the ancient Maya actually did think about 2012.

John Hoopes,

You've sent me a last-minute email (sent January 31) requesting a PDF file of my 2008 IMS essay "Some Rational Deductions." In your email, which I just received today (February 1), you wrote:

Dear John [Jenkins],

Kevin and I are working on our response and we realized that, among the items that you have cited in your comments that we do not have, there is also this one:

Jenkins, J.M. (2008). December 21, 2012: Some rational deductions. In Reed, J. (Ed.), *Institute of Maya Studies Newsletter*. Miami, FL: www.instituteofmayastudies.org.

Do you have a PDF version that you could provide us via email?

Thanks,

John Hoopes

The deadline for your response was yesterday so you've created a circumstance in which you can claim that I didn't respond to your requests on time. Very clever. However, you already have this piece. In Note 24 of my critique of your 2012 *ZfA* essay with Kevin Whitesides, I provided two online links. One is to the piece I wrote in late 2007, at your suggestion. It is part of this file that I adapted (and added my response to Milbrath) and sent to IMS for publication, which happened in early 2008. Consequently, you were informed of the information directly, in early 2008. The other link in my Note 24 is the exchange we had in the Lawrence, Kansas newspaper's "online comment section," also late 2007/early 2008. In this exchange you acknowledged receiving my "Rational Approach" piece, writing "I think this is one of the clearest pieces you've written," and then commenting on some of its contents.

So, my point is threefold: 1) I have been concerned with engaging in dialogues with scholars about my work (this mitigates a charge made by you and Whitesides in your piece), and have gone to great lengths to respond to their (in this case, *your*) requests for clear summaries of my work. 2) You, in particular, have been informed with a clear statement of the evidentiary basis of my arguments and interpretations. You may not agree with them, but a scholarly critique would accurately summarize what my work is actually about. 3) Contrary to your assertions in your rebuttal to my review, I did respond to your insistence that I submit a concise essay on my work, and I then got an expanded version of it, custom tailored to Milbrath's critiques, published in the Institute of Maya Studies newsletter (early 2008). Furthermore, you may recall that I asked you to put in a word for me with Dr. Joseph Gelfer, which helped him to accept my submission for his anthology called *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* (2011). The breakthrough, however, really came when, out of the blue, Dr. Robert Benfer and Dr. Larry Adkins invited me to present my research at the *Society for American Archaeology*. This led to the open and public peer-review of my work through the auspices of the scholars at the Maya Exploration Center — a rigorous process extending over almost four weeks that resulted in a 206-page transcribed document of the debates and exchanges, with me fielding, defending, supporting, and debating my work.¹⁸ I submit that this was

¹⁸ Online for free at www.mayaexploration.org and <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>.

orders of magnitude more rigorous than anything you had to go through in any of your peer-review papers on 2012, most of which seem to have been approved via a wink-and-hand-shake with your editor/friend John B. Carlson. The essay resulting from the four-week-long peer-review process I triumphed through was a 7500-word essay that, having been through the mill already, was expected to be readily approved for Benfer's archaeoastronomy anthology.

And here is a striking thing about your so-called critiques of my work over the years. You have never accurately summarized or represented my work in your various articles and essays. I used the early 2008 example of a direct conversation and communication with you, because the material is preserved and has been posted online for other readers to see for themselves. I also have an exchange we had in, I believe 2011 — just before your Austin conference talk. You had contacted me, saying you wanted to be accurately informed to represent my work. You sent me a dozen or so questions; I responded clearly and concisely. Several weeks later, in your Austin presentation, you insinuated that modern “New Age” writers on 2012 were inspired by Theosophy and occult symbols, just as Hitler was. You had not, in fact, used anything I had sent you. This is the repeated pattern, and you are doing it again here.

I can point to your grossly inaccurate and totally false statements about me and my work in virtually everything on 2012 you have written, and underscore that what I have offered you, and you have requested, has never been accurately presented by you. This became clear to me in your April of 2011 *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXII “review” of Aveni and Van Stone, in your Gelfer piece¹⁹ (*Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse* 2011), in your *Fortean Times* article, in your *Archaeoastronomy Journal* Vol. XXIV (2012) essay, and in this *ZfA* piece with Whitesides.

You approach with a statement of concern for being accurately informed. But you don't utilize anything that I've directly communicated. And you never accurately draw from what I've actually stated in my books. (An example of this would be your idiotic parody of my Dark Rift work in your *Fortean Times* article, ignoring the evidence and citations I offered in my 1998 book for the Dark Rift being thought of as a birth place.) Like a bad scholar, you don't use any direct quotes from my work.²⁰ You are a wolf in sheep's clothing. And your intent is now clear after many years of giving you the benefit of the doubt and believing that you would be an honest scholar, and you were interested in playing by the academic rules. But you are not. You are a dishonest pseudo-scholar; you abuse the privilege conferred by your degree, you manipulate the peer-review publication system, and craft false and misleading narratives about my work. I have clearly shown this in my critique of your *ZfA* piece.

I suspect that your response is going to continue with your ongoing evasion of the facts and your continuing effort to misrepresent my work.²¹ You are crafting a false narrative. But more to the point, you are clearly now exposed as a biased, unethical, and dishonest writer. The most egregious example is your totally unsupported assertions in

¹⁹ <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>.

²⁰ His response (with Whitesides) to my review is the first time, but the quotes are selectively drawn out of context to insinuate denigrating things that are not congruent with my central concerns and interpretations. For example, my poetic speculations about the visions of Maya shamans is not, obviously, where the arguments and evidence for my reconstruction work is going to be found.

²¹ This is precisely what occurred, as I suspected.

your *Archaeoastronomy Journal* (Vol. XXII) piece, which I tried to rectify by communicating with you, with the journal editor, and with the journal's university publisher back in 2011. The actual exchanges are revealing. The protectionism afforded to you by your editor and your publisher worked for you that time, which underscores the corruption and failure of academia in doing what it is actually supposed to do: accurately and fairly presenting and assessing facts, and correcting statements when proven wrong.

I succeeded in getting an official response to your ongoing unethical brand of "scholarship" in my critique-review of the piece you wrote with Whitesides. I've corrected a half-dozen or so factual errors. Let's see if you can be a scholar and respond to those corrections, or if you are going to craft some other distractive and irrelevant indictment of me personally. I suspect the latter, because that has been your pattern. My conclusion that you are a confused and arrogant person, and a deeply biased and sub-standard scholar/teacher, is reinforced by the comments of your students on RateMyProfessor.com.

What I wrote in my critique-review:

I have had numerous discussions and debates with scholars, including John Hoopes, who I invited to participate in the debate about my work sponsored by Dr Edwin Barnhart and the scholars at the *Maya Exploration Center*.²² He declined, and avoided a discussion about it when I sent him the 206-page transcript of the debate afterward.²³ Years earlier, after a lengthy discussion with Hoopes in late 2007 I responded to his suggestion that I write a concise summary of my work. The draft was titled "A Rational Approach to 2012" and was sent to him, which he read in early 2008.²⁴

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

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

So, as with my lengthy responses to your previous requests, on December 23 and in early January, I can reflect back to you here the exact same response: *You are trying to construct a narrative that you are not informed enough to make a considered response to my critique, but in actual fact I have already provided, in my critique, everything you need.* Your request evades the actual point I was making, which can be confirmed by reading the two online links I provided in Note 24. Your critiques proceed based upon ignoring the relevant material and the supportive evidence I have repeatedly provided. As a scholar, you basically practice ignore-ance (ignoring what I've actually written) and exploit the ignorance of your readers (who are not informed about my work and are relying on you to accurately represent it in your critique). But because you are a dishonest and unethical writer concerned primarily with crafting false and damaging narratives, you don't do that. This is demonstrable now many times over in your various articles. I'd like to engage with an honest and informed critique of my work, but you are demonstrably not able or willing to do that. My critique published in *ZfA* shows this, and calls into question all of your statements about my work, which display a consistent strategy of mitigation you have been employing.

Please cease and desist from spreading and publishing demonstrably false and denigrating assertions about me and my work. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com> / <http://update2012.com> /
<http://alignment2012.com> / <http://JohnMajorJenkins.com>

Appendix 2: The Hunab Ku symbol

In their response the authors note that, in my 1992/1994 book *Tzolkin*, I mistakenly stated the Hunab Ku symbol was found in the *Codex Nuttall*. It's actually in the *Codex Magliabecchiano*. Hoopes was involved in the actual turn of events that led to this correction.²² He emailed me with a question about the pre-Conquest use of this symbol, and said he couldn't find it in the *Codex Nuttall*. His angle was a bit of a "gotcha" challenge, for many believed that Arguelles himself had designed the symbol. I looked into my notes and found I had indeed mistakenly mixed up my sources, and reported it in my book incorrectly. I gladly acknowledged the correction — something that Hoopes can never bring himself to do. In addition, since he was interested in the history of this symbol, I offered to Hoopes the item of trivia that the symbol was used on the book cover and frontispiece design of a novel by Mariah Ellis Ryan called *House of the Dawn*, published long ago, in 1914. This certainly proved that it was not a design created by Arguelles. Hoopes later mentioned this use by Ryan, without credit given to me in contributing it to his research. He misrepresented this episode in his response in order to craft a demeaning picture of me, which pretty much underscores the unreliable, mean-spirited, unprofessional and deceptive nature of Hoopes's critiques.

A related issue with the Hunab Ku symbol is my interpretation that, like the Chinese yin-yang symbol, it represents the concept of "polarity reversal". An interpretive framework I articulated in my book *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* involved Jung's concept of enantiadromia (the historical process by which things evolve into their opposite), and I offered that the Hunab Ku and yin-yang symbols nicely represented this concept. (That there was an authentic Hunab Ku deity in Yucatan is now accepted by scholars.) In Hoopes's critique he spins my interpretations into being somehow derived from and promoting of Arguelles' ideas, who also used the "Hunab Ku" symbol, as it came to be called. This once again illustrates Hoopes's unwillingness, or inability, to discern the actual content and context of my writings, and instead craft irrational guilt-by-association accusations that actually have no merit.

²² Stray summarizes the episode: <http://www.diagnosis2012.co.uk/new10.htm#hunab>.