

Hand-wringing in Maya Studies:

Approved Corrections to the Second Printing of

Anthony Aveni's *Apocalypse Anxiety*

John Major Jenkins. © October 5, 2016.

This new book by Anthony Aveni (*Apocalyptic Anxiety*, May, 2016, University Press of Colorado) demonstrates that the topic of “2012” is still relevant and subject to treatment by an academic scholar in Maya Studies. Aveni, primarily known as a pioneer of Native American archaeoastronomy, explicitly uses the 2012 episode in our recent history as the closing bookend of his treatment, which he compares to the Millerite hysteria of the 1840s. Aveni locks these two episodes together in a 168-year-long tale of America’s obsession with apocalypse. Like many other academic books on 2012,¹ Aveni doesn’t recognize the efforts of researchers who have worked to reconstruct what the ancient Maya thought about 2012. Instead, the entire topic is framed as millennial hysteria, anti-modernism, and New Age fantasy.

Focusing on the underinformed mass-appeal response to this misunderstood event or topic is certainly one way to look at 2012, but it ignores what should be of more interest, and relevance, to an archaeoastronomer and Maya Studies scholar like Anthony Aveni. Which is: What did the Maya think about it? Why does the most widely accepted correlation place the 2012 period-ending date on an astronomical solstice? Based on his previous 2012 book (*2012: The End of Time*, 2009) and his other statements in presentations at academic venues, for him it is very unlikely that the ancient Maya thought anything much at all about 2012. In this position he is allied with colleagues David Stuart, Stephen Houston, and now Michael Coe.² Never mind the growing body of research done by myself and five or six other Maya scholars, and never mind the direct communications I’ve had with Aveni about this work. That has no place in his book.

And yet there I am, referenced and treated in the final part of his book and a few other places throughout. Recognizing this contradiction (what my work is actually about versus how Aveni misrepresents it) will help us understand a major flaw in Aveni’s book, which signifies a widespread general flaw regarding how many Maya scholars disdainfully mishandled 2012. Part IV includes chapters on “Galactic Wisdom” and the “Perennial Philosophy” that address important aspects of my work. I am included but am introduced as following “in Argüelles’s footsteps”³ (202) and as a 2012 “prophet” who makes

¹ This includes virtually all of the “academic” books on 2012, which in varying degrees (usually almost *completely*) disregarded research and findings that treated 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. These incomplete books include Stuart (2011), Van Stone (2010), Restall & Solari (2011), Aveni (2009) and the 9th edition of Michael Coe’s *The Maya* (1966), co-revised with Stephen Houston (2015).

² After adamantly maintaining his original doomsday interpretation for some 49 years (compare Coe 1966 and Coe 2011; see also Jenkins 2015), Coe deleted his “Armageddon” interpretation of 2012 in the 9th edition of his book *The Maya* (1966), which was co-revised with Stephen Houston and released in June 2015. Addressing the evidence from two 2012 inscriptions, they incredibly claim they are unremarkable: they “tend, if anything, to be rather dull.” (Coe & Houston 2015:250).

³ With his “Dreamspell” in the early 1990s, Argüelles inspired about the closest thing to a cult that the 2012 Phenomenon produced, declaring himself the voice of a discarnate Maya king. I called out these

“prognostications,” not as someone who has proposed and argued for an unprecedented reconstruction of ancient Maya precessional cosmology related to 2012, in articles, books, and presentations given at popular as well as academic venues for over twenty years. I am force-fit into a narrative in which 2012 is/was a modern “invented mythology,”⁴ and Aveni is aided in this effort by anti-2012 critic John Hoopes. We’ll see how all this is cleverly crafted in Aveni’s book, and is effectuated by committing a dozen factual errors of various sorts.

A longer review-critique of Aveni’s book is necessary because I have already successfully facilitated a dozen corrections in Aveni’s book, after communicating with Aveni and his publisher, the University Press of Colorado. I assumed and followed the standard protocols offered by every reputable academic publisher, regarding errata, and Aveni has now, as of mid-August 2016, acknowledged and corrected all the errors.⁵ However, this unprecedented victory came after many emails, a phone call, and two months of effort, some three months after the book’s release, by which time the first printing was almost sold out. Consequently, according to the World Catalog online some 135 libraries around the world (mostly university, college, museum, and technical school libraries) are holders of the error-containing first printing. A useful primary purpose of this review is to report the corrections and to alert holders of the first printing to this misleading situation, as a recall of the first printing was not offered by Aveni’s publisher. I will also briefly discuss the implications of these errors for Aveni’s overall interpretations in his book, which short of a recall and complete rewrite could not be addressed in line-item editing. Although the second printing and the eBook will record the basic factual corrections, there will be logical contradictions in Aveni’s text because some of his interpretations and reasoning cannot be maintained in light of the errors that have been acknowledged and corrected.

Much of the first two-thirds of Aveni’s book runs through previous episodes of end-of-the-world hysteria in American history. It’s a standard litany that draws the typical narrative of dubious fringe-cults from books like Horowitz’s *Occult America*. All of it has the feel of setting up Part IV, where Aveni deals with what he sees as the most recent hysterical apocalypse episode, which is “2012.” Given the space limitations in my review, as well as my own intimate knowledge of and involvement with this particular episode, stretching over some thirty years, I will focus on this material. This is, after all, where Aveni brings together his arguments and offers his conclusions, based on the

shenanigans myself, critiquing his Dreamspell calendar system (*Tzolkin* 1992/1994), and received a lot of flack for doing so. For Aveni to imagine that I was following in Argüelles’s footsteps demonstrates a lack of knowledge of actual events, unsupported by the known and published facts.

⁴ Aveni adopts this concept from Hoopes (2011) and, through Hoopes, from Hammer (2001) and Hammer & Lewis (2008). In regard to the Perennial Philosophy, the “invented mythology” critique is flawed due to a fundamental misunderstanding about what the Perennial Philosophy is; see discussion below.

⁵ The circumstances of how this came to pass is a long story, and relates to my earlier request that many factual errors in Aveni’s 2009 book be corrected. After ten months of effort Aveni, his publisher (the University Press of Colorado), and the AAUP denied the errors and refused to take any action. However, my subsequent discussion with Peter Berkery, the Executive Director of the AAUP, allowed me to share Aveni’s admission to one of the errors, exposing a flawed assessment process, and a checkmate situation for Berkery. I believe that this precedent has, this time around, forced scholar, publisher, and supervisory agency to take seriously their academic obligations and avoid legal action or professional embarrassment.

evidence and citations he marshals. It is also, curiously, where all of the errors are concentrated and thus where a corrective review-critique should focus.

As mentioned, marketplace and media hysteria was an unfortunate and large component of the “2012 phenomenon.”⁶ Before and during these distractions, I proposed and maintained a serious rational treatment of what the ancient Maya likely thought about 2012. Most scholars, however, chose to merely engage in a debunking of the media mess, rather than pursue their own 2012 research into Maya calendrics, astronomy, 2012 inscriptions, the Creation Mythology and other Maya traditions. This style of 2012 critique centrally involves Aveni, who was the only Maya scholar who published a book-length treatment of the topic with a peer-review university press (Aveni 2009). His 2009 book was also the *earliest* full-scale book treating the topic, and subsequent scholars often have cited his book as a viable assessment of 2012 authors and ideas.⁷

A major problem with Aveni’s overall approach, in both of his books, is the lack of distinction between evidence-based reconstruction efforts, such as my own, and the marketplace mess that usually had little to do with an accurate presentation of Maya traditions. The paradox which underscored Aveni’s misunderstanding of the nature of my work is that he falsely conflated me with the marketplace mess, used his perception of my religion against me, and his loose and unqualified associative statements sometimes insinuated that I was a “Y12er,” one of those doomsday prophets. Aveni’s misinformed convictions are largely maintained in his recent book. I pointed out the factual errors to him and his university press publisher in June of 2016. The process of error assessment and correction I initiated was identical to what I attempted in early 2015, regarding his 2009 book, which also contains many factual errors. That ten-month-long effort resulted in a denial of the demonstrable errors by Aveni, his publisher, and the AAUP (the Association of American University Presses, which ratifies and supervises their member presses). All involved are bound by academic and scientific policies of error acknowledgment and correction, but all involved did not abide by those policies.

This time around, to his credit, Aveni has acknowledged and corrected all of the errors I indicated in his recent book, including a few that were also present in his previous book. The reason why the process was smoother this time around is probably rooted in two things: an email exchange I had late last year with Peter Berkery, the Executive Director of the AAUP, and a phone conversation I had this year with Darrin Pratt, the Director of Aveni’s university press publisher, when I learned that they would simply rely on Aveni’s own assessment of the “alleged” errors, rather than initiate their own objective assessment. It was surprising to learn what it takes to get these professional academic establishments to effectively perform, and follow through with, what is after all a central mandate of scholarly writing and academic publishing.

⁶ Contrary to statements made by Robert Sitle (2010), Whitesides & Hoopes (2012), Whitesides (2015), and other scholars, and despite my explicit published corrections (e.g., Jenkins 2014a), Sitle did not coin and first use this phrase in his 2006 *Nova Religio* essay. Rather, it was demonstrably used as early as 2002 by Geoff Stray, on his extensive Diagnosis2012 website, as well as in his 2005 book *Beyond 2012*. It was frequently used by Stray, myself, and author Jonathan Zap for years prior to 2006.

⁷ E.g., Krupp (2015), Restall & Solari (2010), Van Stone (2010), Whiteside & Hoopes (2012, 2014).

With the errors confirmed, Aveni's publisher promised that the corrections would be added to the second printing and the eBook (see my Addendum after the bibliography for an update). Nevertheless, as mentioned the first printing was already sold out by the time the errors were finally honestly dealt with (in mid-August), with 135 copies already on the shelves of libraries around the world. So, the damage had already been done, as the saying goes. An offer to add an errata sheet to the remaining stock of the first printing was no longer on the table, because the first-printing stock was almost sold out. For anyone, or for any scientific institution or publishing venture that is concerned with the published record being accurate, it will therefore be valuable to document the errors in this review. It is a breakdown of academic publishing when such systemic errors pass fact-checking scrutiny at a very high level of scholarship and academic publishing, with the result being a very misleading and factually flawed book going onto the library shelves, unimpeded and without being retracted.

Many of the twelve demonstrable errors in Aveni's new book have severe repercussions for accurately understanding the ideas found in the "2012 episode" and my role in reconstructing ancient Maya traditions that relate to 2012 — particularly, Maya astronomy and Creation Myth beliefs. To be concise up front, I provide below my brief synopsis of the errors, which I sent to the author and his publisher in early July, 2016:

A Quick Summary of Selected Errors in Aveni's Book

Error 1. The assertion and mitigating construct that my perennial philosophy ideas drew heavily from the work of Mircea Eliade is false, is not evident in my work, and is not supported by the source Aveni cites for support (Hoopes 2011).

Errors 2 and 3. An explicit quoted phrase and paraphrased material from my 2009 book (*The 2012 Story*, Tarcher/Penguin Books) are incorrectly credited to Olav Hammer. Hammer concurs on my observations and corrections. Also: Aveni cites to a non-existing title that Hammer never wrote.

Error 4. (Actually, five related errors are packaged together here.) The Arguelles citation errors (a total of three), the un-indicated missing phrase from one of the quotes, and Aveni's demonstrably incorrect unqualified assertion, in square brackets, regarding Arguelles's intended meaning. The effect of these various errors is the imputation that Arguelles was aware, in 1975, of a central feature in my unprecedented reconstruction work on Maya astronomy, which I first published in 1994.

Error 5. The mis-portrayal of my work as "following" in "Arguelles's footsteps," in contradiction to the well-known published facts of my disagreements with, exposés of, and critiques of Arguelles's ideas, beginning early in my writing career (Jenkins 1992/1994).

Errors 6 and 7. My reconstruction work at Izapa does not offer "prognostications," as Aveni states. It is an interdisciplinary reconstruction based on evidence at the site from the fields of archaeoastronomy, calendrics, environmental determinants, anthropology, and iconography. Finally, the Izapa ballcourt alignment needs to be correctly stated, for Aveni states it, as he did in his 2009 book, 48° in error.

Error(s) 8. A related set of errors in the Index confuses me with the Rapture/Left Behind author of Christian doomsday fiction, Jerry B. Jenkins.

I also sent a more detailed treatment of these errors, with pointers to the supporting evidence. Some of these details are worth sharing, in order to show the unambiguous and non-negotiable nature of the errors. A major error involves Aveni's direct critique of my work, which he bases on his incorrect assertion that I "drew heavily on the work" of Mircea Eliade (202). As support for his assertion, Aveni cites an article by John Hoopes,⁸ where no statement of the kind can be found. (Aveni thanks Hoopes in his Acknowledgements, whose critiques of 2012 he states "directly influenced" his book.) In addition, a survey of my four primary books between 1998 and 2009 shows that the presence of Eliade is practically zero. In fact, there are no discussions, citations, or quotations from Eliade in any of them. My World Tree (*axis mundi*) knowledge began with readings in Hinduism, Carl Jung, world religions, and Finnish mythology in the early 1980s. In my book *Galactic Alignment* (2002), which deals most extensively with the Perennial Philosophy, I list a dozen Perennial Philosophers who have been important to me and Eliade does not appear, anywhere. Asserting (falsely) that my ideas drew heavily from Eliade was clearly an important critical point for Aveni to establish, because he had already criticized Eliade as a nostalgic anti-modernist "perennialist" who invented phrases like *axis mundi*, who thereby fed a "fantasy-loving, gullible, popular culture" (Aveni 2016:185), and whose work inspired a post-modernist trend toward anti-intellectualism (Aveni 2016:184).

These mistakes are breaches of sound scholarship, and they are just the tip of the iceberg. Another error was committed by Aveni's publisher, which reflected Aveni's negative characterizations of me. In the Index to Aveni's book my name is not found, but the pages in the book where I am mentioned and my work is discussed are listed under Jerry Jenkins, who is the Rapture/Apocalypse "Left Behind" Christian fiction author. Under his name, the pages that refer to my work (pp. 202-203) are delineated with the sub-heading "Maya end of world." So, the incorrect identification of my work as "Maya end of world" information that rubs shoulders with fictional Rapture-awaiting Satan smashers, is accomplished.

Aveni introduces me as "following the cosmic road in Argüelles's footsteps" (202). On the contrary, my critiques in the early 1990s of José Argüelles's ideas about the Maya calendar exposed how they do not accurately reflect Maya concepts and the traditional placement of the 260-day calendar. Based on my concern for accurately portraying the Maya calendar tradition, and trying to educate those who didn't share this value, I had an oppositional stance to Argüelles's attempts to craft a new dispensation that had cultic overtones, a new mystical calendar only loosely based on the authentic Maya calendar.⁹ As such, my work pioneered the critique of the 2012 Phenomenon in the early 1990s, long before scholars such as Robert Sitler and John Hoopes entered the picture.¹⁰ The

⁸ "Mayanism Comes of (New) Age" in Gelfer (2011). See <http://update2012.com/Gelferanthology.pdf>.

⁹ See, e.g., Jenkins (1992/1994) and "Following Dreamspell": <http://alignment2012.com/following.html>.

¹⁰ In his practice of selective academic ignorance, Hoopes has diligently avoided acknowledging my early efforts in the critique of the 2012 Phenomenon. In his many narratives about the "2012 Phenomenon" he

wide gulf of difference between Argüelles’s “galactic synchronization” concept and the astronomical facts of the galactic alignment is clearly explained in my work,¹¹ which Aveni ignores, instead suggesting that I have merely carried on Argüelles’ work — a flawed and baseless position that Aveni has repeatedly asserted for years,¹² despite my corrections. Although he has now acknowledged and corrected these problems, Aveni’s previous critiques show an undiscerning blending of terms and concepts, with little effort to understand his subject or to accurately cite my work on the matter.

As mentioned, Aveni writes in his Acknowledgements (xv), that he was “directly influenced” by the work of John Hoopes, who has constructed an anti-2012 critique of “eclectic and non-codified” New Age ideas that revolve around 2012. He calls it “Mayanism.”¹³ Curiously, an early working sub-title for Aveni’s book appears to have been “From Millerism to Mayanism.” Hoopes’s Mayanism has been repeatedly debunked as a flawed construct,¹⁴ on grounds of semantics and *inverting the meaning of the term* as it was used by anthropologists in the 1990s. The point of Hoopes’s efforts was to frame “2012” as an invented mythology, an *invented sacred tradition*. In doing so he indicts my work because I have identified, within Maya tradition, a World Age doctrine of period-ending renewal that points to 2012. You see, “renewal” means a New Era, a New Sun, a New Age, that was expected by the Maya in 2012. Since Hoopes’s Mayanism relies on the “New Age” concept as a sure hallmark of the Mayanism heresy, then my work must be part of Mayanism. See how that works?¹⁵ This rationale is malicious and fallacious. Hoopes indulges in this hostile fallacy and is unable to acknowledge my fact-based findings, which I addressed in my peer-reviewed essay of 2014:

My usage [of the New Era *renewal* concept] was not derived from McKenna, Argüelles, Blavatsky, or the New Age movement, as some critics assert (e.g., Whitesides & Hoopes, 2012; Hoopes, 2011: 54). It arose from my investigation of the evidence at the site of Izapa. That the ancient Izapans and Maya (and other cultures) had a World Age doctrine in which world renewal occurs at specific intervals should not be obviated by the fact that such ideas are superficially echoed in the modern New Age marketplace. Critics need to apply discernment to recognize the distinction. (Jenkins 2014a: 56)¹⁶

Great cognitive dissonance is Hoopes’s lot because my interpretation that “worldrenewal requires deity sacrifice in 2012” is completely reasonable, is in accord with known

also refuses to acknowledge that it was a phrase used by myself and Geoff Stray years prior to Sitler’s *Nova Religio* essay in 2006, who he and Kevin Whitesides (2012) credited with coining the phrase. See my review-essay here: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>.

¹¹ For example, Jenkins (2009:101-102) and <http://alignment2012.com/5misconceptions.html>.

¹² His Colgate presentation of early 2012 and his Penn Museum talk of Dec. 2012, both on Youtube.

¹³ See Wikipedia entry, especially the Talk pages, where the validity of the entry is challenged without any effective rebuttal. The page was called to be deleted. See also my critiques in Jenkins 2009 and 2014.

¹⁴ See, e.g., <http://www.alignment2012.com/Mayanism-John-Hoopes.pdf>.

¹⁵ And yet many other scholars have expressed this same basic notion about 2012, using terms like “renewal”, “new cycle”, “era transition.” For example, in February 2005 Barbara Tedlock stated: “2012 is an important date in the Maya long count. . . . It’s just the end of one era; the beginning of another. It is not the end of the world” (B. Tedlock 2005:42).

¹⁶ “The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon)” in *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* Band 14 (2014), No. 1: <http://update2012.com/Jenkins-Zeitschrift-fur-Anomalistik-1-2014.pdf>.

concepts of Maya period-ending ceremonies, and was echoed (albeit late in the game) by his friend John B. Carlson.¹⁷

During our email exchanges Aveni received the essays I sent him or summarized for him in mid-2014, including my exposé of Hoopes's Mayanism and my peer-reviewed *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* piece. Nevertheless, he must have ignored my peer-reviewed scholarship and pointed comments. Consequently, the important distinction between reconstructing a Maya concept of "New Era" renewal at a big calendrical period-ending and various free-form "New Age" expressions in the marketplace was lost on Aveni. For some reason he chose to ignore my own statements and instead employed Hoopes's flawed and hostile constructs, possibly because they would bolster his own dismissive attitude toward my work.

Hoopes also guided Aveni to the book called *Claiming Knowledge* (2001) by Olav Hammer, which critiqued the Perennial Philosophy as part of "constructing a tradition" (Hammer 2001:155, 170-176). This interpretation assumes the Perennial Philosophy to be a man-made system, which is counter to what Perennial Philosophers themselves describe: "The Primordial Tradition or *sophia perennis* is of supra-human origin and is in no sense a product or evolute of human thought."¹⁸ But Hammer's inversion (which is equivalent — not *in the meaning* but *by analogy* — to asserting that "atheists believe in God") was useful for Aveni because Aveni's Chapter 11 is titled "2012 and the Perennial Philosophy" and, there, he sought to critique the topic. This chapter would thus supposedly explore my proposal and long-argued position that the Maya "ideology" (or Creation Myth "teaching") that is associated with period endings like 2012 is also found in the Perennial Philosophy. Oddly, however, my name and my work are not found or cited anywhere in Aveni's Chapter 11. In addition, my central reason for making the connection between 2012 and the Perennial Philosophy — that **deity sacrifice is necessary for worldrenewal in 2012** — was never conveyed in Aveni's book.

Rather, it is in Chapter 12 (p. 202) that Aveni mentions my 2012/Perennial Philosophy proposal. Apparently trying to represent my thoughts on the matter, he proceeds to put together a series of truncated cherry-picked quotations from my 1998 and 2009 books, separated by ellipses, to create some disjointed paraphrases. It's a blatant and disconcerting display of academic fiddling with source material. And, in any case, the material he selected *does not* explain why I have proposed a connection between Maya concepts of 2012 and the Perennial Philosophy. That is found in my 2002 book, in numerous places in my 2009 book (e.g., Chapters 8 and 9; pp. 75, 228), and I summarized it *in eight words*, bolded in the previous paragraph above.

¹⁷ Carlson 2011. My work is based on my reading of the Maya Creation Mythology on the monuments of the Izapan ballcourt. However much my interdisciplinary methodology may be criticized, Hoopes has never explained how my 2012 ideas were echoed much later by Carlson and other scholars, who came late to the rational treatment of 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. For example, see essays by Carlson and Callaway in the Oxford Archaeoastronomy IX papers. See <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/2012center-note10.pdf> and <http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/astronomy/astronomy-general/archaeoastronomy-and-ethnoastronomy-iau-s278-building-bridges-between-cultures?format=HB>. Not to mention the serious treatment of the galactic alignment by Grofe (2011a, 2011b) and MacLeod & Van Stone (2012).

¹⁸ *The Betrayal of Tradition*, p. xii (2005, ed. H. Oldmeadow, World Wisdom Books).

Aveni's use of Hammer's book *Claiming Knowledge* is problematic, for three reasons:

- Hammer inverts a basic premise of the Perennial Philosophy and frames it as a constructed tradition (the topic appears under the section “Constructing a Tradition” in his 2001 book).
- Hammer projects his own dualistic bias onto the non-duality of the Perennial Philosophy in order to explain how the *many* exoteric expressions are reconciled with an underlying *unity*.
- Hammer ignores the primary voices of the Perennial Philosophy, instead allowing it to be represented by the various cult figures within the Theosophical Movement and many other distorted derivations of Vedanta / Perennial Philosophy.

Hammer's later books and anthologies drop the Perennial Philosophy emphasis and focus on the secondary historical distortions propagated through the Theosophical Movement. This suggests that he began to understand that it was inappropriate to project the secondary distortions back onto the original inspiration. For example, in *The Invention of Sacred Tradition* (a title Aveni cites in a grand conclusion to his Chapter 11 critique of the Perennial Philosophy), Hammer & Lewis wrote: “Theosophy, a religious current with roots in the nineteenth century, claims to be an expression of perennial wisdom” 124-125). There's only one other reference to the “*philosophia perennis*” in that entire book, in an article on Sufism.

Hammer is the author who Aveni mistakenly credits (178, 233) with a specific quotation from my work, as well as with a paraphrase of my four-point summary of the Perennial Philosophy. In yet another incorrect citation performed by Aveni, he cites these to a book by Hammer titled *Philosophia Perennis*. But Hammer tells me he never produced a book or article with that title (p.c. June 2016). My literary forensics on Aveni's citation mess shows that he was intending to cite pages 172-173 and 175 from Hammer's *Claiming Knowledge* book, in the sub-section called “The Perennial Philosophy.” Here, Aveni (178) summarizes Hammer's notion that Perennial Philosophers must believe that practitioners of the *exoteric* rites of a religion are self-deluded, because it is the inner *esoteric* symbolism that has the deeper, unified meaning. This is a ridiculous and unwarranted assessment. It bespeaks the Cartesian either-or dualism that many scholars are stuck in, when in fact Perennial Philosophers employ a non-dual understanding of the relationship between object and subject, exoteric and esoteric.¹⁹ There is no *inherent conflict* between the Relative and the Absolute that requires a deceptive rationalization.

Nevertheless, Aveni uses Hammer's assessment, probably because he too is intellectually challenged by the concept of non-duality. Aveni asserts in his preface that “the two basic ways of knowing — reason versus revelation — are irreconcilable” (xiv). Take note that to *intellectually understand* the concept of non-duality does not require that one has had a revelation of God, or an initiation into Secret Holy Mysteries. Clearly, Aveni is hostile to the concept and employs Hammer's misleading “more radical” (Hammer, 173) notion that attempts to explain how Perennial Philosophers reconcile the many various exoteric

¹⁹ See, e.g., Nasr's *Knowledge and the Sacred* and Coomaraswamy's collected essays (Princeton, 1977).

religious expressions with an underlying unified source. But, as mentioned, Hammer's interpretation is fundamentally flawed as he projects his own either-or dualism into a non-dual worldview that does not fall prey to such a limited cognitive framework.

So, Aveni cites Hammer's pages 175 and **319** for an explicit quote and for a four-point summary of the Perennial Philosophy. These are not found anywhere in Hammer's book, and instead can be demonstrably traced to pages 292 and **319** in my book *The 2012 Story*. Aveni cites my book elsewhere in his book, and another paraphrase crafted by Aveni (178) closely reflects my words on page 290 of my book, under the heading "What is the Perennial Philosophy?" This occurs just before Aveni launches into "his" four-point paraphrase (178). Paraphrasing specific sentences from another author's work is Aveni's style, as we can see in how he paraphrases Hammer in two examples (pp. 177-78). (I will here remind the reader that Aveni did, ultimately, acknowledge and agree with my decipherment and correction of these citation errors.)

There are other fundamental problems with Aveni's assumptions. He confuses perfection and wholeness (10-11, 185). This is relevant to "wholeness" being an attainable goal of spiritual awakening whereas "perfection" is a Christian guilt-trip mandate that is basically impossible to achieve. Aveni adamantly holds to an anti-World Age bias, evident in his discussion of *Hamlet's Mill* (Chapter 9), and so he doesn't recognize recent Maya Studies scholarship that shows evidence for the ancient Maya being aware of the precession of the equinoxes (the two concepts go together in Maya thought). In fact, he doesn't even mention any of these new breakthroughs in his book.²⁰

Next (pp. 204-205) we have a paragraph that is densely populated with errors and misleading assertions, all of which have the effect of distorting and misrepresenting my work at Izapa. Given my previous direct communications with Aveni and his academic publisher, in which I corrected several of these same errors in his 2009 book, it is difficult to avoid the impression that Aveni is, here, just repeating known errors. In any case, his repeated errors violate the principles of responsible science and scholarship. Let's take a look, for this provides another iconic example of what is so factually misleading about Aveni's book. Please note that it has nothing to do with his inability to understand "spirituality" or the Perennial Philosophy; it has to do with his repeated assertions of factual errors and maintaining a skewed, inaccurate, and incomplete portrayal of my work. A very distorted picture is presented regarding what my work at Izapa is about, which I have clearly presented in all three of my primary books (1998, 2002, 2009), presentations at the *Society for American Archaeology* (2010) and the *Institute of Maya Studies* (1997, 2011), as well as in various essays and presentations that I freely shared online.²¹

²⁰ MacLeod (2008, 2012); Callaway (2011); Grofe (2011a, 2011b, 2012-2013); Jenkins (2010; 2011a; 2011b).

²¹ Such as: <http://alignment2012.com/monuments-Izapan-ballcourt.pdf>.

As part of what he inaccurately calls my “prognostications” (204)²² he introduces Izapa as “early classic ruins” (no, its heyday was in the pre-Classic, before 100 AD). He states Izapa was peripheral (no, it was the most prominent central site of the Izapa-Soconusco Isthmian civilization). He states Izapa was “non-Maya.” Although semantically true, Izapa contains some of the earliest depictions of the Maya Creation Myth (the Hero Twin story). A continuity into the Guatemala Highlands and with the iconography of the Classic Period site of Copan in Honduras (on the same important latitude as Izapa) is well-documented, which Aveni doesn’t consider. As such, Izapa could be said to have pioneered central ideological traditions of the Classic Maya. This is to say nothing of the probable origin of the Maya calendars within the Izapan culture, which Aveni chides when I talk about it,²³ conveniently ignoring the fact that his colleague Prudence Rice came to concur with this same position (she wrote the Intro to his 2009 book). Perhaps the Izapans *became* the Maya, and thus were “early Maya”; certainly their ideas and traditions were adopted into Classic Maya civilization.

Aveni repeats his mistaken reading of the Izapan ballcourt alignment, which I was the first to publish in my 1996 *Izapa Cosmos* monograph and in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*. Aveni & Hartung published the Izapa ballcourt alignment, correctly, two years later, in 2000, as part of a general survey of Pacific Coast sites.²⁴ My priority on the publication of this information has clearly become a sore point for Aveni, and it is a central piece of evidence in my reconstruction of the cosmological interests of the Izapan skywatchers.²⁵ Fact: The Izapan ballcourt is aligned to the December solstice sunrise horizon. The direction of viewing, towards the sunrise, is confirmed by several factors, all of which Aveni neglects to acknowledge:

1. The throne on the west end of the ballcourt has a head on its front face, facing the sunrise direction, and a person sitting on the throne would of necessity face the eastward sunrise.
2. Behind and on a rise above the throne, one finds six flat “seating stones,” backed up against a wall of the temple mound to the west. The only direction of viewing for those who sat or stood on these flat stones is toward the east.
3. The westward direction is blocked by Mound 125a, which probably also had a wooden structure on the top, further blocking any unimpeded view of the westward sunset horizon from the ballcourt. This is unlike the *clear view* of the eastward sunrise horizon.

Despite all this, which is presented in *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012* (1998), a chapter in my *Galactic Alignment* book (2002), and is summarized in *The 2012 Story* (2009), Aveni states that I “discovered building alignments [at Izapa] with the **winter solstice sunset position**” (204, emphasis added). This incorrect statement repeats one of Aveni’s

²² Aveni’s use of loose and loaded lingo seems to be his specialty. There are many examples in his 2009 book that border on slander. One qualifies as bigotry, because he identified me as belonging to *the religion of Gnosticism* and then used that (I am a “Gnostic” New Ager, etc) when critiquing my scholarship.

²³ See his Penn Museum presentation of Dec. 2012: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4roz-DGShmc>.

²⁴ Aveni & Hartung, 2000. “Water, Mountain, and Sky: The Evolution of Site Orientation in Southeastern Mesoamerica.” In *Precious Greenstone, Precious Quetzal Feather*, ed. E. Q. Keber. Labyrinthos.

²⁵ Curiously, although at least a dozens scholars have published critiques of my 2012, none of them ever mention my Izapa ballcourt alignment discovery, which is an important centerpiece of my evidence.

mistakes in his 2009 book, where he stated that the Izapa ballcourt is aligned to the “**December solstice sunset**/June solstice sunrise direction” (Aveni 2009:54, emphasis added). These statements dislocate the factual orientation of the ballcourt, and so provide an orientation that is *48 degrees in error*. I had informed Aveni of this mistake in an email I sent him in mid-2014, also sending a mini-essay about it and other errors that I had just posted on my website.²⁶ My cover letter to him was dated 6/27/2014 and had the subject line “My review of your comments on the Izapan ballcourt alignment.” The cover letter reads, in part: “I don’t know if anyone ever pointed out to you several errors in your comments on the Izapan ballcourt, in your 2009 book. Notably, you wrote that the ballcourt alignment is to the December solstice sunSET and June solstice sunRISE. This is no doubt just a guffaw, but I think it would be important to correct.”

To this, Aveni had no response (despite an ongoing email exchange). Some six months later, in early January of 2015, I filed a formal complaint with the University Press of Colorado, enumerating a half dozen or so factual errors in Aveni’s 2009 book. His mistaken reporting of the ballcourt alignment was one of them. Aveni was sent my list of errors by Darrin Pratt, the press Director, whereupon he denied this and the other errors pertaining to my work. Later, in October I asked him to tell me which of his ballcourt orientations was correct, and which one was in error. As mentioned, he had published the correct orientation in his article with Hartung (in 2000), but his 2009 book gave a wildly different orientation. He confirmed that the earlier statement was correct, and thus the 2009 statement was a “mistake” (his word). So, he finally sort of grudgingly acknowledged the mistake. But here, in his 2016 book, we have Aveni returning to the wrong statement, even going further to state that as being *what I had found*.

In the very next sentence Aveni’s errors continue. He states that I do not “subscribe to conventional interpretations of the Izapa monuments” (204-205). This is false. For Stela 60, Stela 69, Stela 67, MM 25, and Throne 2 and related monuments, I completely subscribe to the basic interpretations of the Brigham Young scholars and other iconographers who have studied the site (Milo Badner, Virginia Fields). I also concur with Timothy Laughton, Dennis Tedlock, Barba Piña de Chan (and others) that the Izapan monuments depict episodes from the Hero Twin Creation Myth, involving the Hero Twins, Seven Macaw, and “First Father” (One Hunahpu). What I have added to the interpretations, as an evidence-based extension of the existing standard readings, is the astronomical orientation data that I have discovered and documented.²⁷ As such, the ballcourt’s winter solstice *sunrise* orientation provides an interpretative basis for deducing that the rebirth of the First Father deity that is portrayed, for example, on Stela 67 — who is acknowledged as a solar deity — represents the December solstice sun. This is logical and is based on *the evidence*. Furthermore, the ballgame itself is about a World Age level of solar rebirth, and the orientation of the ballcourt with its throne indicates which “sun-face” or “day-god” is getting reborn.

²⁶ <http://update2012.com/Review-Aveni-Izapa-ballcourt.pdf>

²⁷ A few of these interpretations might be seen as “unconventional,” but that’s because they integrate new facts and reflect my consideration of this new evidence, mainly from archaeoastronomy, which previous commentators had overlooked. The earlier “conventional” interpretations are based on incomplete data.

Aveni reports wrong descriptions of my work, ignores relevant material, and overlooks the evidence I discovered and was the first to publish (1996, 1998), which naturally factors into my astronomical interpretation of the meaning of the Izapan ballcourt monuments. My augmented interpretations are completely congruent with the accepted dialectic in the Hero Twin Myth (between Seven Macaw and One Hunahpu) and the ballgame symbolism. Seven Macaw is shown on Stela 60 being defeated by the Hero Twins — that interpretation comes from Laughton, Piña de Chan, and Garth Norman (who studied the site with Brigham Young University and did detailed drawings of all the monuments).

Aveni then (still in the same problematic paragraph) emphasizes Julia Guernsey's new perspective that the Izapan characters represent actual rulers at Izapa. *This* was unconventional, as earlier scholarship noted that most of the monuments contain an upper and lower frame representing the open mouth of a snake or jaguar. It is a stylized frame that means 'this scene happens in the Otherworld,' which is to say, that they are essentially *mythological* depictions. It may be that the mythological First Father dialectic with Seven Macaw — clearly a central dynamic in the ballcourt carvings — served as a mythological prototype for the sacrificial obligations of actual rulers at Izapa, and Guernsey's work emphasizes this *unconventional* possibility. That's fine. However, her 2006 book on Izapa, which Aveni cites for the "standard" interpretation of Izapa (which it was not), analyzes only one ballcourt monument! Her book is frequently cited by my critics for the better, more comprehensive, interpretation of Izapa, supposedly obviating my analysis of the Izapa ballcourt monuments, but *she doesn't even examine the ballcourt*.²⁸ My work remains the most thorough and comprehensive treatment of the Izapan ballcourt, its fifteen stone artifacts and astronomical orientations, and Aveni doesn't acknowledge this. Rather, he crafts a misleading and incomplete send-up.

Aveni's paragraph on my Izapa work contains multiple errors and misleading assertions, after which, to top it off, he claims that my late-stage 2012 strategy was to hedge my bets "like Argüelles" did, just in case "no global transformation took place on December 21, 2012" (205). This shows that his cognitive processing and presentation of my work is distorted and disingenuous. Virtually every statement Aveni makes (pp. 204-205) about Izapa and my Izapa work is factually false or misleading. Furthermore, he simply repeats his previous errors, which were explicitly pointed out to him and his publisher in early 2015, *while he was working on his new book*.

Aveni's misleading assumptions continue. He asserts I am "hostile to critics" (p. 212). No, not all critics. I welcome and have long encouraged informed critique and dialogue. I am hostile to and critical of degreed scholar-critics publishing peer-reviewed articles or books who refuse to acknowledge or correct their factual errors and refuse to adjust their views based on presented evidence, thereby violating science and the principles of sound

²⁸ Apart from a picture caption showing Tacana volcano, Guernsey mentions the Izapan ballcourt only once (2006: 172), merely as the location of Stela 67, which she elsewhere (137) interprets as "the transportation of an individual" (a ruler) who is "clasping scepters" while imitating a deity. Echoing *my own earlier interpretation* (1996, 1998), she notes that it "anticipates Classic Maya portrayals of the Maize God's [First Father's] rebirth" (137). She *briefly mentions* Stela 22 (which was found by the road outside the ballcourt).

scholarship. I am hostile to scholars publishing in peer-reviewed journals or books who falsely portray me and my work, repeatedly ignore dialogue and facts, pollute the published record with incorrect falsehoods that are potentially damaging to my work and livelihood, despite my seeking resolution through proper official channels.

Aveni's book contains not only the factual errors I just enumerated, but loose opinions and baseless assertions, much in the way that his 2009 book was (*2012: The End of Time*), which Kevin Whitesides pointed out in his Amazon review.²⁹ Aveni concludes his Chapter 11 with judgmental fervor, saying that:

...as long as **the perennialists** choose to turn a deaf ear to the solid evidence that reveals our ancient human ancestors to be as flawed as we, our fantasy-loving, gullible, popular culture will continue to be influenced by **their** artfully crafted "**invented sacred traditions**" (Aveni 2016:185, citing the title of Hammer & Lewis 2008, emphasis added).

This statement recapitulates Aveni's misunderstanding of the Perennial Philosophy as being "invented" (following Hoopes and Hammer) and furthermore ignores 2012 as a valid artifact of ancient Maya thought. I was onto this approach early on and engaged a rational investigation of 2012 back in the early 1990s, at a time when Aveni and his colleagues considered 2012 to be a joke. He, and several other hold-outs in academia, still depict it as such. But properly understood, my work and that of a few other progressives in Maya Studies, rally evidence that the ancient Maya were aware of the precession of the equinoxes as well as the precessional alignment that culminates on December solstices in the years around 2012.³⁰

I am, of course, concerned with my work being accurately treated in peer-reviewed publications by Maya scholars, even while critiques are being offered. My work is, first and foremost, about an evidence-based reconstruction of ancient Maya astronomy and period-ending beliefs. These period-ending beliefs touch upon profound ideas reflected in many religious traditions, and this is where scholarly critics like Aveni bump their heads as they consider my work. They can't seem to get past the fact that the ancient Maya possessed "spiritual teachings," and critics like Aveni dislike that I express admiration and respect for such ideas (such as non-duality, which is stripped down to be "reciprocity" in the clinical terminology of un-philosophical anthropologists).

Meanwhile, that part of my work can be treated separately from my astronomical reconstruction work, which is an interdisciplinary argument integrating evidence from archaeology, astronomy, calendrics, archaeoastronomy, iconography, and Creation Myth symbolism. In the realm of fact-based assessment (which is his turf), Aveni's critiques utterly fail, despite a plethora of clearly written summaries, evidence, and detailed arguments in my work that even High School students can understand and accurately report.³¹ Aveni's book is conceptually biased and contains many errors of citation and

²⁹ See also <http://update2012.com/ResponsetoAvenisarticle.html>. And others at <http://Update2012.com>.

³⁰ Grofe 2011a, 2011b; MacLeod and Van Stone 2012, Jenkins 2010, 2011b, 2014b.

³¹ I refer to an impressive paper I received from a High School student named Jack Mazza in 2010, which I have posted on my website: <http://alignment2012.com/JackMazza-paper-on-2012.pdf>.

attribution. He draws from Hoopes's hostile and flawed studies, *which have already been corrected in the peer-reviewed literature*.³² Like Hammer, he ignores the primary voices of the Perennial Philosophy. He appropriates and distorts my own definitions and cherry picks quotes and bits of information taken out of context in order to bolster his baseless convictions. The rational and accurate processing of information, even by a degreed officer of the Academy, is quite broken here. Over 135 college and university libraries have rushed to order his book, not knowing or perhaps not even caring about all the conceptual deceptions and factual errors that it contains.

It is curious that the errors in Aveni's book are found almost exclusively in the final four chapters, where my work and the ideas I pioneered are treated. This suggests a prejudicial bias that is rooted in baseless preconceptions or a perhaps unconscious reflex to mitigate or denigrate. This can be explained as the gatekeepers in a field of study trying to exclude an outsider who made valid contributions on a topic (2012 astronomy) that was mishandled and misunderstood by professional scholars until new data (e.g., Tortuguero Monument 6 and La Corona Block 5) forced them to reverse their previous assumption that 2012 was unworthy of serious rational consideration, essentially a non-topic or worse, a joke. For many years it could be justifiably said that *Maya scholars never dropped the ball on seriously treating 2012, because they never picked the ball up*.

Aveni's books will reinforce a negative picture of my work and contributions so long as Aveni, his publisher (the University Press of Colorado), the press Director (Darrin Pratt), and Peter Berkery at the AAUP refuse to acknowledge and correct the errors. However, unlike my efforts to correct his 2009 book, this time around all of the errors I indicated were acknowledged by Aveni and his publisher. The exact same procedure and process that didn't work last year, worked this year. This can only be explained by persistence on my part as well as a repeated appeal that they rationally engage the non-negotiable factual nature of the problems, which one assume scholars and their university press publishers should be capable of doing.

But, notwithstanding this recent victory, for many years scholars have constructed hostile judgments of the 2012 topic, while ignoring or misrepresenting evidence-based research and findings. I selected Aveni's books to illustrate something that has consistently infected the attitude toward 2012 within Mayan Studies. He is a pioneer of archaeoastronomy (which is the primary field of evidence for my 2012 work); he is a senior scholar well respected among his colleagues and his conclusions and judgments are often followed without question (e.g., Restall & Solari, 2010; Van Stone 2010; Krupp 2015). The recent corrections to Aveni (2016) require that certain errors in Aveni (2009) be likewise corrected, as well as all the undiscerning citations to Aveni's errors made by his colleagues, who mistakenly thought they were viable critiques of 2012 and my work.

In the comparison between his denial of the errors in his 2009 book and the acknowledgement of all the errors in his 2016 book, we have a rare and valuable lesson to be learned. We have, here, evidence for what was basically a communication problem, where the problem was completely on the end of the receiver — a scholar who could not

³² Jenkins 2014a.

or would not receive evidence. This is now clearly identified as the problem that has afflicted the accurate reception of my work in Maya Studies. I've made defensible evidence-based arguments, have sent my work to scholars for comment for some twenty years, inviting dialogue, have played the game by publishing in peer-reviewed publications and presenting at academic venues, but have largely received murky dismissals, knee-jerk judgments not based on what I've actually written, and snarky, baseless, character assassination attempts. An uncomfortable situation of cognitive dissonance was thus the unavoidable outcome among stubborn scholarly critics when their colleagues (such as John B. Carlson) began to echo the very same interpretations about 2012 *that I pioneered*, many years ago. It has been a revealing episode in the field of Maya Studies that demanded a clear and informed correction of the published record, which has now, finally, in this particular case, been achieved.



John Major Jenkins (b. 1964) is a pioneering voice in reconstructing Maya cosmology, astronomy, religious beliefs, and the meaning of 2012, with nearly three decades of experience defining and debating the issues. Informed by his own innovative field work at archaeological sites and inspired by living among the Maya, Jenkins' comprehensive work covers media misconceptions, 2012 theories, consciousness studies, Maya shamanism, archaeoastronomy, Perennial Philosophy, academic misconceptions, and the crisis of the modern world. His "2012 alignment thesis" (an evidence-based reconstruction of ancient Maya cosmology relating to the calendrical period-ending in 2012) is supported by recent discoveries in the Maya inscriptions, and professional Mayanists are now echoing his earlier work. While integrating the scientific and spiritual viewpoints, Jenkins articulates and honors contemporary Maya calendar tradition and the universal worldview of a unified cosmos — the interdependence of all things.

John's writings have appeared in magazines, newspapers, peer-reviewed journals, and book anthologies, including: *The Mystery of 2012*, *Towards 2012*, *New Dawn* magazine, The Institute of Maya Studies, *Society for American Archaeology*, *Clavis* (2014), and *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik* (2014). His major works include *Journey to the Mayan Underworld* (1989), *Tzolkin* (1992, 1994), *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012* (1998), *Key to the Kalevala* (1999, editor and introduction), *Galactic Alignment* (2002), *Unlocking the Secrets of 2012*, (audio, 2007), *The 2012 Story* (2009), *Lord Jaguar's 2012 Inscriptions* (2011), *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Cosmology* (2012), and the forthcoming *Ivory Tower*, *House of Cards: How Scholars and Their Publishers Violate Science*. He is a founding member of *The Maya Conservancy*. Websites:

<http://TheCenterfor2012Studies.com> / <http://JohnMajorJenkins.com> / <http://Update2012.com>

Primary Sources and References Not Detailed in the Foot Notes

- Aveni, Anthony. 2009. *2012: The End of Days*. University Press of Colorado.
- Callaway, Carl. "Primordial Time and Future Time: Maya Era Day Mythology in the Context of the Tortuguero 2012 Prophecy." In *Archaeoastronomy*, Vol. 24. J Carlson, ed. Stated publication date 2011, released August 2012. University of Texas Press.
- Carlson, John B. 2011. "Anticipating the Maya Apocalypse: What Might the Ancient Day-Keepers Have Envisioned for December 21, 2012?" In *Archaeoastronomy*, Vol. 24. J. Carlson, ed. Stated publication date 2011, released August 2012. University of Texas Press.
- Coe, Michael. 1966/2015, 9th edition w/ Stephen Houston). *The Maya*.
- Grofe, Michael. 2011a. "Measuring Deep Time: The Sidereal Year and the Tropical Year in Maya Inscriptions." In *Ethnoastronomy and Archaeoastronomy: Proceedings from the Ninth Oxford International Symposium on Archaeoastronomy*. C. Ruggles, ed., pp.214–230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011b. "The Sidereal Year and the Celestial Caiman." In *Archaeoastronomy*, Vol. 24. J. Carlson, ed. Stated publication date 2011, released August 2012. University of Texas Press.
- . 2012-2013. "The Copan Baseline and the Outlier Stela." *Archaeoastronomy*, Vol. 25. J. Carlson, ed. Stated publication date 2012-2013, released March 2015. University of Texas Press.
- Guernsey, Julia. 2006. *Ritual and Power in Stone*. University of Texas Press.
- Hammer, Olav. 2001. *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age*. Brill Publications.
- Hammer, Olav and James R. Lewis (eds). 2008. *The Invention of Sacred Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, John Major. 1998. *Maya Cosmogenesis 2012*. Bear & Company.
- . 2002. *Galactic Alignment*. Inner Traditions International.
- . 2009. *The 2012 Story*. Tarcher / Penguin Books.
- . 2010. "Astronomy in the Tortuguero Inscriptions." Paper presented at the 75th Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. Paper posted at *The Maya Exploration Center* and <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Astronomy-in-TRT-SAA.pdf>.
- . 2011a. "The *Maya Exploration Center* Facebook Discussion on the Astronomy of 2012 and Tortuguero Monument 6." Published at the *Maya Exploration Center* and <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/MEC-Facebook-Discussion-2010-ON-Jenkins-SAA-TRT-Astronomy.pdf>.

- . 2011b. "Approaching 2012: Modern Misconceptions versus Reconstruction Ancient Maya Perspectives." In *2012: Decoding the Countercultural Apocalypse*. J. Gelfer, ed. Equinox Publishing, Ltd.
- . 2012. *Reconstructing Ancient Maya Astronomy*. Four Ahau Press.
- . 2014a. "The Coining of the Realm (of the 2012 Phenomenon): A Critique of the Whitesides and Hoopes Essay." In *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*. Band 14, Nr. 1. The Society for Anomalistik. Germany.
- . 2014b. "Lord Jaguar's 2012 Sacrifice: Astrotheology and Magical Invocation in a 7th-century Maya Inscription." *Clavis Journal*. Three Hands Press.
- . 2015. "Review of the 9th Edition of Michael Coe's *The Maya* (released June 2015)." At: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com/Coe9-2015.pdf>.
- . *Ivory Tower, House of Cards*. n.d. (written 2015-2016).
- Krupp, Ed. 2015. Preface to *Cosmology, Calendrics, and Horizon-Based Astronomy in Ancient Mesoamerica*. S. Milbrath and A. Dowd, eds. University Press of Colorado.
- MacLeod, Barbara. 2008. "The 3-11-Pik Formula." Paper presented at the Maya Hieroglyphic Meetings in Austin, Texas, March 2008. Posted with the author's permission: <http://alignment2012.com/3-11PikFormula.html>.
- . 2011. "Holding the Balance: The Role of a Warrior King in the Reciprocity between War and Lineage Abundance on Tortuguero Monument 6." *Archaeoastronomy*, Vol. 24. J. Carson, ed. Stated publication date 2011, released August 2012. University of Texas Press.
- MacLeod, Barbara and Mark Van Stone. 2012. "The Great Return." *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*. Band 12. The Society for Anomalistik. Germany.
- Restall, Matthew and Amara Solari. 2011. *2012 and the End of the World*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Sitler, Robert. 2006. "The 2012 Phenomenon." *Nova Religio*. Vol. 9, No. 3. The University of California Press.
- . 2010. *The Living Maya*. North Atlantic Books.
- Stuart, David. 2011. *The Order of Days: Unlocking the Secrets of the Ancient Maya*. Three Rivers Press.
- Tedlock, Barbara. 2005. Comments (in a transcript of the interview for the film): <http://www.nightfirefilms.org/breakingthemayacode/interviews/TedlocksTRANSCRIPT.pdf>. From *Breaking the Maya Code*, Night Fire Films.
- Van Stone, Mark. 2010. *2012: Science and Prophecy of the Ancient Maya*. Tlacaelel Press.
- Whiteside, Kevin. 2015. "2012 Millennialism Becomes Conspiracist Teleology." *Nova Religio*. Vol. 19, No. 2. The University of California Press.

Whitesides, Kevin and John Hoopes. 2012. "Seventies Dreams and 21st-Century Realities. In *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*, Band 12. The Society for Anomalistik. Germany.

—. 2014. "Mythology and Misrepresentation: A Response to Jenkins." In *Zeitschrift für Anomalistik*. Band 14, Nr. 1. The Society for Anomalistik. Germany.

Addendum/Update: Did it Happen Yet?

September 29, 2016. After waiting a month for any news from the publisher that the promised corrections were being added to the second printing and the eBook, I made a simple inquiry. I received a response that the press Director (Darrin Pratt) didn't know, and would ask his production department. The next day I received a compiled list of the errors that were incorporated into the revised book, and a PDF of the revised book. The "last save" date-stamp on the press-ready PDF was the previous day, so I suspected they got on this as a consequence of my inquiry. In briefly comparing the two documents I immediately noted that a few things were omitted, which I'd pointed out in emails to Darrin while the process was unfolding in July and August. To re-engage and re-check the material in Aveni's book seemed an onerous re-immersion into the toxic soup, and I was just finishing some editing work on a friend's book, eyes bleary, so I set the latest challenge aside for a few days. I then engaged it with focus and found that perhaps the most important correction had been overlooked. I composed the following corrections and sent it to Darrin:

Cover email:

Hi Darrin,

September 21, 2016

Thank you for including me in the process of corrections. I think you'll be happy that I caught a few things, including one item where one of Aveni's requested corrections was actually not done in the corrected PDF you sent me, which resulted in an incorrect end note sequencing. I have very carefully explicated the needed corrections in clear language, but feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I trust these additional items will be helpful and will be added.

Also, I think it would be important to distinguish this corrected second printing by added a phrase to the front matter, something like "Corrected second print, September 2016." Can this be done? Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Corrections File (pasted into email and attached as an MSWord document:

Dear Darrin,

September 21, 2016

I am going on a combination of the correction list you sent me on 9-14 and what is represented in the revised PDF of the book that you sent me, as well as Aveni's original emails with his corrections. There are several points that have not been entered into the

PDF correctly, according to what Aveni himself stated, and none of my corrective points have been included. Therefore, I went back through our email exchanges to find the pertinent points.

I refer to pagination in the PDF you sent. Note 11 on page 234 includes the page reference “94” which is indeed what Aveni stated should be added to correct the originally erroneous citation. However, as I indicated in an email to you (August 1) this page in Argüelles’s book is a full-page diagram with no text and is meaningless as a page reference for the passage that Aveni quotes. The correction was achieved by also citing the correct page for the quote, 184, and that is all that is needed. So it’s just a matter of removing the p. 94 reference. So, in note 11 on page 234, remove page 94 from the reference:

Argüelles, *The Mayan Factor* (Santa Fe: Bear & Co. 1987), ~~94~~, 184.

The second correction in your email of 9-14 was entered, in the PDF, on the top of page 196:

p. 196, l. 1: ---we will reconnect the the "psychically received" heliotropic octaves" in the "solar activated magnetic field."

Two problems here. In the corrected PDF, your editor replicated the double “the” so you might want to remove one of them. More importantly, Aveni added “psychically received” to this quotation string, when in fact it needs to be added to the quotation at the top of page 197. I suggested in an email how Aveni’s passage (on page 196) could be re-structured but the point is that “psychically received” does not belong there. Instead, it needs to be inserted into the Argüelles quotation at the top of page 197, which apart from this has been correctly revised. From the PDF:

As José Argüelles explained: “Amidst festive preparation and awesome galactic-solar signs ***psychically received***, the human race, in harmony with the animal and other kingdoms and taking its rightful place in the great electromagnetic sea, will unify as a single circuit. Solar and galactic sound transmissions [Is this perhaps a relic of the McKenna brothers’ experiments?] will inundate the planetary field. At last, Earth will be ready for the emergence into interplanetary civilization.”¹²

I added the phrase (in ***underlined bold italic***) where it needs to be inserted. That is the correct quotation from Argüelles, which end note 12 now correctly cites to Argüelles 1987: 194.

Now, returning to the incorrect placement of that phrase on the top of page 196, and the extra “the.” If those are simply removed then the corrected passage will read:

All our senses will attain new revelations, for then, Argüelles tells us in typical science jargon, we will reconnect the “heliotropic octaves” in the “solar activated magnetic field.”¹¹

But now it is slightly nonsensical as to Arguelles's full passage, but you can add "with" to accurately reflect his meaning:

All our senses will attain new revelations, for then, Argüelles tells us in typical science jargon, we will reconnect with the "heliotropic octaves" in the "solar activated magnetic field."¹¹

Now, A Very Important Correction:

I noticed that one of Aveni's final corrections, which he sent to both you and I on August 13, was not added to the "corrected" PDF. From Aveni's correction-list of August 13:

p. 202, l. 27:

Delete: "As anthropologist --- pointed out, many of the ideas about postmillennial prophecy draw on the work of --- (old note 35)"

Delete old note 35, p. 235.

This is also stated in the list of corrections you recently sent me, on 9-14. The *entire passage* from beginning to end, *and its end note*, were to be deleted. The sequence of end notes within the text were to be preserved, because Aveni also requested that a new note 35 be added, just prior to this now deleted passage & its end note. Also, with the old note 35 (the John Hoopes source) deleted from the End Notes section, and the new end note 35 added there (a citation to my book *Galactic Alignment*), the sequence of the notes in the End Notes would have been likewise preserved. However (a BIG however here), while your editor DID add the new note 35, your editor neglected to delete old note 35, renamed it note 36, and adjusted the remaining sequence of end note numbers (in the End Notes section on pp. 235-236). The editor also adjusted, by 1, the sequence of superscripted end notes in the text, following end note 35. These resequencings were unnecessary, as Aveni had cleverly accounted for this.

So, what needs to happen here is that, on page 235 of the "corrected" PDF you sent me, note 36 "Hoopes, Mayanism Comes of (New) Age" needs to be deleted. Then the following sequence of end notes needs to be restored to its original sequence, such that the final end note is #51 Godwin, Atlantis and the Cycles of Time on page 236. In addition, the sequencing within the text needs to be restored, as your editor increased all the superscripted end note values by 1, beginning with the Schele & Freidel citation (line 19 of page 203). In the PDF this needs to be changed from 37 to 36, and all subsequent superscripted end notes in the text need to be restored to their original sequence, ending in 51 (p. 206, line 5).

If Aveni's clever addition of new note 35 and his deletion of old note 35 (on page 202) would have been correctly adopted, these complicated end note numbering changes and re-corrections would have been unnecessary. This one is rather critical because Aveni had correctly requested the deletion of the erroneous Hoopes source, but that didn't get performed in the "corrected" PDF that you sent me.

Finally, there's some messy formatting with the new passage that Aveni requested be added after end note 34 on page 202 (lines 26-27). You need a space after the superscripted end note 34, and the second "i" in the book title *Galactic Alignment* needs to be italicized. Also, there is no need for the superscripted end note 35 to be italicized.

In the mid-1980s I wrote and edited step-by-step instruction manuals for kits. Since the late 1980s I have edited hundreds of books for twelve different publishers and I worked at ILE and netLibrary in Boulder the 1990s-2001, not to mention my own books and essays, so I know how to spot and explicate these kinds of mix-ups, which often happen in publishing. I hope you understand that my comments are geared toward helping you correctly apply *what Aveni himself requested and approved*. In two instances (the first two I described above) there's a typo and a mistaken phrase placement that Aveni certainly did not intend, and which I've noted in the interest of the book being more accurate. I think I've been surgically clear in my comments, but please contact me if you have any questions. Best wishes,

John Major Jenkins

Darrin responded the next afternoon, thanking me for double-checking and he explained that his production department may have gotten Aveni's agreed-to revisions out of context while compare the different lists and comments. Nevertheless, he assured me they would get fixed, and said there was a process for indicating a second printing (though he didn't say a *revised* or significantly *corrected* second printing). He said he would look into it. I responded with a brief "Okay, great. Thank you and best wishes, John."

So, apparently we are one step further, six weeks later, to the corrections actually being enacted. The process began with my initial query on June 15, three-and-a-half months ago. I just re-checked the Worldcat.org database to see how many more of Aveni's books were now on the shelves of libraries (mostly academic) around the world. The number is now up to 149, which is about 25 more than when I first checked in July. A few of the listings include the sub-title "From Millerism to Mayanism" and this indicates what was probably an early working sub-title supplied by the publisher in pre-press announcements to purchasers at libraries.

Final Update: Error-containing first printing is pulped. October 5, 2016. Darrin sent me the final revised and corrected PDF yesterday. I looked through it and confirmed that my latest notes and corrections (detailed above) were incorporated into it. In addition — and this is an important point — a "Corrected second printing" note was added to the front matter. In addition, Darrin said the remaining copies of the error-riddled first printing were being pulped. The new PDF is the colorized eBook file, which I assume will also be used as the printer's file, for the second printing, which should be happening soon. As of today, there are 149 copies listed on Worldcat.org, all from the first printing, and ten of them are at college and university libraries in my state, Colorado (including the universities in Fort Collins, Greeley, and Boulder), and one in nearby Wyoming. Some of these first edition copies are at libraries in Europe and around the world. So, mission largely accomplished.

9,730 words