

## Interview with John Major Jenkins for *The Examiner*

September 13, 2012

With [Jeffery Pritchett <mabusincarnate@gmail.com>](mailto:mabusincarnate@gmail.com), chopped version here:  
<http://www.examiner.com/article/interview-with-john-major-jenkins-on-maya-cosmogogenesis-2012>

This is the unexpurgated version, see Postscript below for explanation

1. What are your thoughts on David Stuart's teams recent discovery of a new 2012 text as well as his academic interpretation? <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/48000582#.T-zWv3BcTg8> and <http://decipherment.wordpress.com/>

David Stuart is a brilliant epigrapher who has made significant breakthroughs in deciphering the Maya hieroglyphic writing. I've been reading his work for decades. I noticed that he, along with his colleague Stephen Houston, tend to overlook astronomy as an aid to their decipherment. For example, when dates are mentioned one can look up the astronomy occurring on that date, and this should factor into the challenging work of decipherment. Another tendency, or bias, that I've noticed in Stuart and Houston's work, is that when "mythological" place-names are encountered, they are not treated as "real" places. They are assumed to exist only in the imaginations of ancient Maya ceremonialists. This is a very misleading assumption, because we find time and time again that mythological locations, or places, in Maya cosmology refer to astronomical locations. This is perhaps most strikingly true in relation to the "mythological place" that features frequently in Maya creation texts known as the "Black Hole." I suggested in my 1998 book *Maya Cosmogogenesis 2012*, and then showed with examples, that this black Hole is very likely to be the "dark rift in the Milky Way" --- a visible feature in the sky not to be confused with the astrophysical "black hole" that is believe to reside in the center of spiral galaxies. For the Maya, this "dark rift" was interpreted as the *Xibalba be*, the "road to the underworld", and is a feature that plays a very important role in my reconstruction of the astronomy underlying the 2012 date in Maya thought.

With that as a rather lengthy preface to my answer to your question, we aren't surprised to find that David Stuart does not entertain, explore, or offer an astronomical interpretation of the new 2012 text from La Corona. David Stuart is on record adamantly insisting that the Maya didn't think anything at all about 2012. We've seen this in his various interviews (such as on the Earth Sky radio program in April 2012) and in his written statements. In the Maya Decipherment blog that you linked to, you can read another piece he wrote about the 2012 text from Tortuguero (October 2011), and see that he evades and ultimately does not respond to pointed questions by his colleagues Barbara MacLeod and Sven Gronemeyer. By ignoring a critical glyphic component, Stuart claims that "there is no future prophecy" and no event was expected to happen. The event deciphered by Gronemeyer and MacLeod is not a dire doomsday and its not a "descent" of an ancient alien god. It is the preparation for an investiture rite of a deity named Bolon Yokte, who I believe will be sacrificed. And this is the typical deity sacrifice that the Maya believe is necessary to facilitate world-renewal at a great period ending in their calendar (such as 2012). Profound and compelling concepts, to be sure, but not all that surprising. But Stuart seems fixated on denying any meaning to 2012. This is, sadly,

probably by now a deeply ingrained reflex of many professional Maya scholars. I've been saying to scholars for two decades that there is evidence that the ancient Maya thought *something* about 2012, and for two decades I've been resisted and rejected, as well as unethically mitigated by scholars. Stuart would have to eat crow if he admitted that the new evidence showed that the Maya DID think *something* about 2012, and they expected something to "happen" on that date. But it's not an asteroid or Planet X flying in, or anything of that nature dreamt up by modern doomsday people in the marketplace. And it's not an instant shift to 4-D consciousness.

Interestingly, however, we can observe some subtle shifts in how Stuart interprets the La Corona 2012 text. He states that the king of Calakmul, Yuknoom Yich'aak K'ahk, was employing a "literary device" in his use of 2012. Aha! This starts to echo what I've been talking about with Tortuguero Monument 6 (the other 2012 text), which is the one that serves as an illustrative precedent for the La Corona "literary device." Trying to work with Stuart's clinical language, I went along with it and said, "okay, what kind of literary device is it?" Since Lord Jaguar from Tortuguero employed an astronomical parallel between his birthday astronomy and the astronomy of 2012, then Yuknoom may have employed this type of "device." So I looked at Yuknoom's birthday, at the 2012 date, and I also looked at the 9.13.0.0.0 date in the text, which serves as a kind of conceptual fulcrum linking to the 2012 date. The astronomy employed is partially different from the Tortuguero example, but *a birthday astronomy linkage is there*, and that's the key.

I also noted that there was a full eclipse over La Corona in February of 696 AD, ten days after the dedication date of the La Corona text. Within a week of the announcement of the 2012 text from La Corona, I'd written three essays and posted them to *The Center for 2012 Studies*. I also contributed comments to Stuart's blog (June 2012), where he posted his own analysis. Curiously, however, he censored posting my comment in which I explained the astronomical approach, so I added that rejected post to one of my essays. It's all publicly available, online, for free: <http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>. CNN will not be running a press release report on it.

So, in brief, Stuart offers good epigraphic decipherments, but they are incomplete because they do not incorporate astronomical considerations. I gladly acknowledge the decipherments offered by the epigraphers but augment them with the astronomy, so my interpretations provide more of what is actually going on in the text. Unfortunately, Stuart's anti-astronomy bias prevents a fuller reading; this is a problem we see with other Maya scholars such as Stanley Guenter. Rather absurd, really, when you remember how important astronomy was to the ancient Maya.

But we should celebrate this new finding from La Corona, because now we have TWO texts from the Classic Period that reference the 2012 period-ending date. My reconstruction work proceeded in the early 1990s without the benefit of these two texts. Instead, I examined the pre-Classic site called Izapa, which many scholars believe was involved in the formulation of the Long Count calendar --- the calendar that generates the 2012 period-ending date. The archaeoastronomy, the ballgame symbolism, the Creation Myth themes, and the iconographic carvings I studied at Izapa allowed me to reconstruct what the creators of the Long Count cosmology intended 2012 to mean. That interpretation is now supported by the two Classic Period "2012 texts" that emerged years after my breakthrough findings were published in my 1998 book *Maya*

*Cosmogenesis 2012*. But Stuart and many other scholars are slow to acknowledge this fact, even while some of them, such as John B. Carlson and Carl Callaway, start to echo, in their own findings, my pioneering ideas.

2. To those that believe the Mayan made any predictions pertaining to 2012, in or on which temples or structures, on which calendar stones or in which of the codices, did the Mayan make any such prophecy's relating to 2012?

The text of Tortuguero Monument 6 isn't exactly a "prophecy", although some scholars use that term. It's more of an appointment. In my reading of the text, it is the date that Lord Jaguar expected to be invoked by his descendants, so that he could be supernaturally present for the ceremonial rite with the deity named Bolon Yokte. This rite, I believe, was a sacrifice ritual. In Maya thought, deity sacrifice is necessary for world-renewal. This idea-complex echoes the spiritual teachings in the Maya Creation Myth, first portrayed on the carved monuments of Izapa. It is there that we might read a "prophecy" for 2012. But, again, prophecy can be a misleading term. It's not the crystal gazing of a Maya Nostradamus, predicting specific things on specific dates. It's certainly not at all a 2012 doomsday prophecy, as our media doomsday pimps would have it. And it's not the descent of an ancient alien god, as the current ancient alien fetish would claim. Instead, the Creation Myth conveys spiritual teachings, applicable to period endings such as 2012. It is an understanding of the cycle dynamics that all processes undergo, and therefore it has some insight into general dynamics expected to be at play as 2012 approaches. The "prophecy" thus paints a picture, that Seven Macaw will be ruling and ruining the planet. Seven Macaw is the archetype of greed and megalomaniacal egoism. Generally, then, we see this to be true to an alarming extent on planet earth, right now. So, yes, the Maya "prophecy" has come to pass.

But the second part of the teaching myth must also be considered. That is the choice, yes or no, about Seven Macaw being "sacrificed." But as a teaching myth, there is free will choice in this and it is best understood as a metaphor, not a literal decree. The Hero Twins demonstrate how to sacrifice vain egoism, thus opening the way for the rebirth of their father, One Hunahpu. This indicates the transformation and rebirth, the world-renewal, that is ultimately the goal of the Maya "prophecy" for 2012. But it requires, for its fulfillment, human activation of *and participation in* the process.

3. From a peoples who made human sacrifices to the sun, comes this incredibly accurate calendar. Do you feel it is possible they were holding on to a "Lost" technology that was left over from an advanced civilization? Also I wonder what exactly causes people to believe that this calendar is not cyclical?

No, I don't. This idea exploits and reinforces the racist stereotype that the ancient Maya were stupid savages, and needed Atlanteans, Egyptians, Saint Patrick, or extraterrestrial aliens to give them their knowledge. The Maya were and are a brilliant people. They developed novel ways of tracking astronomy and calendar systems not seen anywhere else in the world. Mesoamerican farmers were domesticating corn 8,700 years ago.

There may have been contact with other parts of the world in Mesoamerica, at various times, but this doesn't mean the Mesoamerican people were copycats of visiting foreigners.

People believe the Maya calendar is not cyclical because they are defaulting to the linear time assumption of their own Judeo-Christian conditioning. But even in the Western Gregorian calendar, there are cycles. The decade cycle, the century cycle, the year cycle. Any calendar system could be stretched out indefinitely, giving the appearance of linearity. The Maya Long Count can also be theoretically stretched out forever, but the emphasis is on the cyclic repetition of its core periods: the Baktun, and Katun, and the 13-Baktun World Age cycle. The issue is more in how the processes in the world are perceived. The Maya draw their metaphors from nature, where everything moves in cycles, from birth through growth and decline and back into death and rebirth. Western thought denies the link between death and life, time is linear and death is final. This is a laughably unsophisticated way of understanding reality.

4. Is the solar system really passing through the galactic center on the calendar end date of December 21st, 2012?

No, the solar system does not pass through the galactic center, ever. What you are getting at here is the "galactic alignment" that is the center-piece of my reconstruction work. However, the definition being used here needs to be clarified, otherwise the proposal sounds absurd. The galactic alignment in era-2012 is *the alignment of the December solstice sun with the galactic equator, the lateral mid-line of the Milky Way*. This alignment is real astronomy, was calculated by Jean Meeus and Patrick Wallace, and I summarized and clarified the definitions of the galactic alignment in many books, websites, interviews, and articles beginning in 1994, especially in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment* and in my 2009 book *The 2012 Story*.

5. I'd like to know to what extent the Mayan material was influenced by the earlier, and what is now termed, the "Olmec" civilization ... and by extension, other world cultures. (for e.g., there is some talk of the Olmec being at least "influenced" by colonial remnants of the Shang Dynasy [China] and this would somewhat weirdly tie in with McKenna's jump of logic in trying to harmonize the I-Ching and the Mayan calendar with his "time-wave-zero" project ... does he have any comment on this?

All cultures are influenced by earlier discoveries, events, and cultures. The Olmec are mysterious, and there is evidence trans-oceanic movements. Not all that surprising. But, again, I think it is important to emphasize the unique achievements of the Mesoamerican people, and not try to outsource their achievements to visiting foreigners. If the I Ching has similarities to other oracles or calendars, it is because they draw from the same universal principles, not necessarily because those universally accessible ideas went around the world in boats of space ships.

6. Is there anyway of knowing if the ancient Mayans foresaw the ending of their civilization? Is what happened to the Mayan Civilization a possible future for Western Civilization as well?

The Maya understand that all things come to end in the great cycling processes, and lead into renewal. They would anticipate a future period ending, such as Baktun 10 in 830 AD, and expect that changes would be afoot, endings and new beginnings. But we have to steer clear of projecting our own culture's concepts of "endings" onto the Maya. They understood the relationship between life and death and the ongoing cyclic renewal of processes in time, including the rise and fall of cultures and civilizations.

7. Do you think our sun is a binary star and is there any scientific proof of the binary companion to Earth's sun?

No, I don't believe this is an accurate model, and there's no scientific proof for it. I spoke at the first three *Conferences on Precession and Ancient Knowledge* (2004-2006), organized by the originator of the binary star hypothesis, Walter Cruttenden. I endorsed Cruttenden's 2005 book with the statement that it is important to be open to investigating new theories and ideas, but I did not state that I thought that his hypothesis was correct, or that I agreed with it. In fact, an article I wrote at the same time pointed out discrepancies in his work and my disagreements with them. Nevertheless, a vituperative critic and cyber-stalker, Jim Smith, smeared out the clarity of my actual statement and posted, on my Wikipedia name entry page, the false notion that I agreed with Cruttenden's binary star hypothesis. Wiki is basically a vector for axe-grinding and unethical debunker types. I exposed Jim Smith's tactics here: <http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>.

8. What about the origin of the proposed conscious shift, Why people believe their will be a cleansing of the mind and consciousness and spirit? Your personal thoughts on what exactly is going to happen or is happening right now?

I believe that a "consciousness shift" requires that a person engages the process necessary for achieving such a shift. That process involves surrendering, or sacrificing, the illusions that keep the consciousness stuck to more limited planes of perception and understanding. The language used is usually too *definite* --- like "this or that WILL happen." That's ridiculous. What are we, robots in a clockwork universe? Likewise, prophecy is not about "something that will happen." Prophecy is best understood as an *evocation*, and this can be an evocation of a highest potential or a lowest potential. We choose. Opening up to higher potentials requires sacrificing the illusory baggage that keeps us stuck. Manifesting the lowest potential requires giving into fear, reinforcing habitual and life-destroying behavior, and clinging to illusion.

9. What are your thoughts on why so many ancient cultures signify 2012, or the planetary alignments therein, with a time of great change? As it is well documented in Hopi, Hindu, Sumerian, South American and Mayan....

As I explored in my 2002 book *Galactic Alignment*, the galactic alignment itself (which is NOT an “alignment of planets”), does seem embedded in many traditions around the world. That’s not an explicit reference to “2012”, but a general knowledge of the astronomy involved seems indicated. It has to do with the great cycles of time in which the earth is embedded --- namely, the precession of the equinoxes. It is not surprising that many ancient civilizations and also indigenous societies sensitive to the stellar movements, have a knowledge of the great cycles, the World Age doctrine, and the idea that the earth and humanity passes through many changes, many chapters or phases, over vast periods of time. The early Maya, some 2,100 years ago, made a calendar and a profound cosmology around this knowledge, blending good scientific astronomy with cosmological beliefs and Creation Myth teachings.

10. Thoughts on Calleman and Tzolkin vs Long Count?

The Tzolkin is the 260-day calendar, and the Long Count is the 20-base system. They interface consistently, such that the “zero date” on August 11, 3114 BC (Long Count 0.0.0.0.0) and the 13-Baktun period-ending on December 21, 2012 (Long Count 13.0.0.0.0) both fall on the day 4 Ajaw in the Tzolkin calendar.

Calleman invented his own period-ending date (in October of 2011) for the Long Count, which has no basis in Maya thought. Not sure what more can be said; not sure why such totally false assertions gain any amount of currency or longevity in the marketplace. I guess I could speculate a bit on that, however. Calleman and Barbara Clow, who published his book, hooked up and supported each other. Calleman wrote the introduction to Clow’s “2012” book and Clow generously cited and sung the praises of Calleman’s ideas (an adapted “fractal time” model that was, in fact, pioneered by others, namely Terence McKenna). So, Calleman got a push in the marketplace because Clow still makes decisions for Bear & Company, which is now an imprint of Inner Traditions. I’ve seen both Clow’s and Calleman’s books prominently on display in foreign airports, in foreign languages. Those are strategic marketing decisions. So, that explains the continued dispersion of Calleman’s factually incorrect ideas. What it doesn’t explain is why any thinking people should work so hard to ignore basic facts about the Maya calendar and spread information that is not congruent with the authentic Maya calendar tradition. A basic fact of the relationship between the Tzolkin, Long Count, and Gregorian calendar systems is what I call “the equation of Maya time”: **13.0.0.0.0 = 4 Ajaw = December 21, 2012**. That’s not “my 2012 theory”; that’s basic factual information. That basic equation is not attested in Calleman’s work, nor in most areas of the popular 2012 marketplace.

11. What will John Major Jenkins be up to after 2012 has passed and any events or future books or project you would like to mention and links?

Well, I'm looking forward to the "Great Return" conference in Copan, December 16-22. This will be an important capstone for my 26 years of engagement with the Maya world. And participants are still welcome (see <http://Alignment2012.com>). After 2012, my work with Maya cosmology will continue. I'm sure more 2012 inscriptions will be found. In fact, we are still working out the astronomy in the new 2012 inscription from La Corona. I've posted three essays about it already on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website (<http://thecenterfor2012studies.com>). My long article on "The Field of 2012 Studies in Year 2012" will be published in November. I also plan to release my final pre-2012 book in November, called *Time Conscious Kingdoms: How Maya Kings Used 2012 in Their Rhetoric of Power*. I continue to contribute to the events and projects launched by the non-profit *Maya Conservancy* (<http://mayaconservancy.org>), and a visitor center and museum is being built near Izapa. Next year, my essay on the astronomy of Tortuguero Monument 6 will be published with the University Press of Florida. Generally, however, I look forward to a little sabbatical from writing and research. It's been quite draining, with little compensation. This may come as a surprise but publishing has changed so much; everything is free online. But I am very grateful that I've been able to pursue this work, that I've been able to share it around the world in many different languages, and I have boundless gratitude for the many friends and allies I have made over the years.

I look forward to pursuing more artistic endeavors. I still do, and always have, loved books. I have set up a Traditional Book Arts studio, with antique letterpress printing equipment I have rescued and restored. I do prints and limited editions, hand-set books on nice hand-made paper, hand bound. I'm quite excited about the projects I've already outlined, which includes manifestos, posters, and poetry. My Oak Root Press website is: <http://alignment2012.com/home-shop.html>. I will also be leading tours to Maya sites, beginning late next year. In 2013 I will be releasing my post-2012 book, a novel I wrote in 2005, called *Remembering 2012*. Many of the events I creatively wrote about, seven years ago, have now come to pass. The transformation is just beginning, and more surprises await.

## **Postscript: The Response to Clearly Presented Information**

There was immediate contentious reaction to the content of this interview, on two fronts. In the comments section, Jorge Perez de Lara wrote on September 20:

David Stuart did not disregard Barb MacLeod's and Sven Gronemeyer's argument, but rather pointed out his disagreement with a specific grammatical form which happens to make a critical difference in whether the phrase is talking about the future or referencing the present. John Major Jenkins' approach in incorporating astronomy in understanding Maya worldview is very likely a positive contribution, but he has himself subtracted from it by making it an almost obsessive argument. Not every Maya date has to have astronomical implications. Especially, since it is reasonable to assume that Maya texts (like most human texts elsewhere) are primordially of a historical nature.

I responded:

Jorge, Stuart did evade responding directly to the argument they were making. In his blog he said he would return to it later, but he never did. In that same blog piece, he provides a line drawing that ignores the glyph fragment below the P4 position, and this is one of the things that MacLeod and Sven were trying to draw his attention to. This is clear in the close-up photographs that I took of Tortuguero monument 6 in March 2011. I posted my report on *The Center for 2012 Studies* website, offering the photos freely to the community of scholars. They are the best close-up photos available, and resulted in a more direct analysis of Lord Jaguar's birthday. They have been ignored by scholars, including Stuart, and all of the scholars who contributed to the recent *Archaeoastronomy* vol. 24 journal.

A comment from another reader, Veli Albert Kallio at Andrews University, went as follows:

As helping faith-keepers in their various motions, I agree with Jorge's comment that there is obsession in Jenkins to cite astronomy. But every path maker makes his pet excesses and I refuse chastise for twists he makes, in particular as our organisations agree certain aspects, or sees their potential, i.e. the 7 Macaw. I really congratulate Jenkins on spotting the 7 Macaw almost right. However, Jenkins is deficient with his skyward projection, the axis mundi may have been from zenith of the universe to nadir of Xi'balb'a, but this dismisses the four lateral directions which are equally important to Maya in the earth tree symbolism and the three dimensions.

The axis mundi from heavens to the bosoms of Xi'balb'a links the skyward 9 steps or strides of the Bol'on Yokte on pyramids (to the 9 primordial Lords of the past worlds) that are now represented by the flooded cenotaph in a proper Mayan cultic complexes. Jenkin's obsession to the planets, stars, and galaxy beyond is too Quetzalcoatl-centric for the faith-keepers preference. Whilst the Hero Twins (sun and moon) are vitally important celestial players for life against the canvass of the Milky Way, represented by Quetzalcoatl dragon which forever seems to be eating its tail between sunrise and sunset as the seasons pass during the years. Jenkin's omission of the four lateral directions of the earth tree are, therefore, a lamentable omission.

I would like to rather make corrections to Jenkin's statements as faith-keepers are strictly not on business of commercialising and benefitting financially from their traditions. This may limit our circulation and do some damage as well to our cause of getting various native American Indian mythologies recognised at par with many historic texts and myths of the Old World. But Jenkin's is clearly on the right track barring obsession to the sky at the expense of world we live in.

Veli Albert Kallio, FRGS.

To this, I responded:

Veli, your comments reveal you are unfamiliar with my work. My reconstruction at Izapa acknowledges three cosmic centers (each having a corresponding axis mundi). One is the zenith, but that center is demonstrably NOT the one associated with Seven Macaw / the Big Dipper, at Izapa. As for me having an "obsession" with astronomy ("obsession" being used here clearly in a dismissive pejorative sense), you might consider simply that my work has specialized in reconstructing lost aspects of ancient Maya astronomy. That's a focus. However, I have had to be adamant about the astronomy within Maya traditions, because the current climate in Maya Studies is basically anti-astronomy. This is shown by Jorge's comment above, regarding the primarily "historical nature" of Maya inscriptions. This "either-



or" mentality is why the pendulum keeps swinging in Maya studies. In fact, I do acknowledge multiple levels of reference in the inscriptions and other Maya traditions. The historical events are easy to identify; for astronomy and other aspects we have to work a little harder. But they are there, as can be seen in my SAA paper on Tortuguero astronomy and in my chapter in the Gelfer anthology. I've been working harder than most to reconstruct those more difficult aspects, because scholars are safe and complacent and oriented to old-boy-network career advancement.

On the second front there arose a threat because Jim Smith noticed this interview and emailed Jeffery Pritchett at the Examiner and blackmailed him into removing the reference and link to the clarifying dossier I had written about Smith's attempts to sabotage my work under different aliases on the internet. Smith sent a group email to Pritchett, myself, Johan Normark and Bill Hudson:

Subject: The interview with John Major Jenkins endangers my family and libels me

Dear Mr. Pritchett,

I was informed yesterday of the Examiner interview with John Major Jenkins, in which you give his link to his "dossier" on me. I am writing to inform you that that dossier is an invasion of my wife's privacy that potentially puts her and her family in danger. Archaeologist Johan Normark removed the link from his own blog for that reason, when Jenkins posted it there. (see <http://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/the-819-day-count-at-xultun/>, then search "Oh dear, JMJ").

I have sent Jenkins several emails demanding that he take down the dossier, such as this email of 17 June:

Dear Mr. Jenkins,

A quick search of your "dossier" on me reveals that you not only mention that I have a wife, but identify her by her married and maiden names. As you must be well aware, Mexico has a high rate of kidnappings, and a high rate of murders of people who in any way rock the boat. Although my wife is in no way involved in this affair, you have recklessly or maliciously exposed her to danger. I demand that you remove her name from the "dossier" immediately.

Jim Smith

Jenkins not only ignored all of my emails, but has now attempted, through the Examiner, to communicate my wife's personal information to a wider audience.

The "dossier" is also libelous, in that Jenkins makes statements that are either knowingly or recklessly false. As evidence of this, please note that he was offered numerous opportunities by 2012Hoax.org to point out any errors of fact in the articles I'd posted there, but he could not come up with a single one.

For the above reasons, I respectfully request that you remove the link and all references to me from the interview at your earliest convenience. If you would like more information on Jenkins's stooping to extortion and blackmail to silence his critics, please see <https://haecceities.wordpress.com/2012/08/11/2012-information-needed-about-the-real-galactic-alignment/>. [Note: This page was set up in relation to Bill Hudson's page that he set up in early 2012 after I contacted him and asked him to remove the statement on his front

page that I was a 2012 doomsday proponent. Instead, he set up this page in order to create a space for ambush by the anonymous member-contributors to his website (Mark Van Stone, Kevin Whitesides, Kristine Larsen, Jim Smith). I told him I did not need nor want a public attack sponsored by him, that I had already responded in detail to my critics, and the point was for him, as chief moderator of his website, to removed false defamatory information. - JMJ]

Thank you for your time and attention.

Jim Smith

Fearing the threat of legal action, Pritchett immediately removed the link without consulting me. (Though not responsible for the content of the link, Pritchett bowed to fear and decided to not support the content of our interview; “all it takes for evil to flourish is for good men to sit idly by” (or, worse, to obey the evil).

The actions of Jim Smith are well documented in my dossier (<http://www.update2012.com/Jim-Smith-Tom-Brown.pdf>), and he clearly has an interest in keeping this out of public view. The accusations of threat to his wife are totally unfounded, and there are no threats in my dossier. His perceived threat is imagined, and subsequent emails suggest that he’s not all that concerned about dangers to others, but only about his own reputation, and for being exposed as an unethical and irrational person. My response to the group email was as follows:

The interview under question links to the dossier that I posted online in June of 2012, which is an expose on the deceptive character assassination tactics of Jim Smith, masquerading since early 2010 on some occasions under the alias of Tom Brown. This is a document that defends my character and work from Jim Smith, who has engaged in damaging libelous behavior online, by exploiting multiple online venues including Amazon, Wikipedia, Youtube, Normark's Archaeo Haaceities site and William Hudson's 2012hoax site. He has also threatened "to destroy me".

The important things that needs to be understood are that 1) I have made no threats in my dossier; 2) all of the information referenced in the piece was publicly available online. Although one can understand a person being upset for his unethical and deceptive behavior being exposed, when he probably believed he was being sufficiently stealthy, there is actually no endangerment and no threat. Jim Smith, I'd appreciate it if you could simply accept that I have a right to defend and expose your false representations of me and my work. Unlike your own repeated and intentional attacks, intended to damage or "destroy" me, I exposed your actions with fairness, facts, and equanimity.

Again, there are no threats made in my dossier, and all information referenced was publicly available, found online.

To Jim Smith (aka Tom Brown, aka pdecordoba, aka jschiapas),  
However, I am willing to work with you. If you would like me to remove this piece, which is a fair and important antidote to your still existing slanders online, then please remove, or arrange to have removed, all of your disinformation and slanders that still linger on in sites such as Amazon (book review section), your Youtube posts, my Wikipedia name entry (the comment that I agree with Cruttenden's binary star theory, which I do not, as I've explained to you), on numerous pages of Normark's Archae Haacc. site, and on

numerous pages on Bill Hudson's 2012hoax site. Also, please send a signed affidavit stating that you will cease being a cyber-stalker, under your name and any aliases, and that you will cease spreading slanders and misinformation about me, my background, my supposed belief, and my work with the Maya. Let me know when you've done this.  
Thank you,

John Major Jenkins

p.s. Jeffery, thank you for posting our interview. Please contact me privately.

To this Jim Smith seized upon my invitation for a fair reconciliation (the last paragraph). Instead of commencing with negotiations or seeking any kind of mutually satisfactory agreement, he instead imagined that my trade-off constituted extortion. This dementia resulted in his further threats for legal action as well as what I have good reason to believe were emails, sent under false gmail accounts designated with my friend's names but directed explicitly to my name, containing viruses designed to destroy my computer if I was to click on the enclosed link, which was identifiable as a hidden .exe file. In June I also received an email, immediately after the debacle with the Normark website and right after I posted my dossier, from who I believe to be another Jim Smith alias, which read "I will destroy you!" My only recourse at this stage seems to be to continue documenting the irrational and insane behavior of this cyber-stalker. - JMJ