

Two Camps in the Academic Arena Debate Whether or Not the 2012 Date is “Something” or “Nothing.”

In November 2011, [a currently unresolved exchange unfolded](#) on Stuart and Houston’s Maya Glyph Decipherment blog, during which Gronemeyer and MacLeod re-summarized their already published arguments (from Gronemeyer and MacLeod, 2010) and pointed out that Stuart had neglected part of the hieroglyphic text (and, by the way, his line-drawing rendering of the right flange of Monument 6 also neglected to depict that important part). The exchange occurred in the “comments” section to Stuart’s essay titled “[More on Tortuguero’s Monument 6 and Prophecy That Wasn’t](#).” This titling was apparently suppose to follow upon and reinforce Houston’s previous blog essay (from 2008), which was similarly titled “[What Will Not Happen in 2012](#).”

Of course, this was all reactionary to the ubiquitous marketplace refrain regarding “doomsday in 2012,” but it seems Houston and Stuart adamantly fixated on an opposite at the expense of accurately and rationally treating the epigraphic evidence in the text. For it is quite clear that a blanket dismissal of the importance of the 2012 date in the text does not do it justice, and the Maya did indeed reference “something” they believed “would happen” on that date. Note, in the comments section, that Stuart begs off and never follows up on what Gronemeyer and MacLeod pointed out.

These are, unfortunately the two polarized camps in the scholarly discourse. Oddly, in December of 2011 *National Geographic* ran a piece that drew from the blog article, but neglected to mention Gronemeyer and MacLeod’s unresolved query to Stuart. The exact same thing happened in January 2012, with a piece in *The Explorer Journal*. This seems a bit stacked against the actual evidence that the Maya did expect something — even if only a period-ending ceremony! Stuart’s odd reactionary treatment of all-things-2012 is readily apparent in his 2011 book, [which is reviewed here in detail](#).