

Tom makes up a false statement and then create a false debunking around it... I NEVER SAID that I dealt with philology... in fact, though, I worked with one... and I published Ruck's own philology on the matter in the 40th Anniversary edition of SMC. He entirely omits this. I said specifically that I went to Cal State Northridge specifically to get the primary quotes on astrotheology and a few specific citations on Allegro. That's not the only time I spent in the university libraries. He's conflating topics and issues to fit his agenda. Saying that people can see the images for themselves... they can! And not just the one that he focuses on. This guy confuses and conflates many dozens of topics and citations.. he doesn't even understand the argument that was made in the book. Notice that he claims to have read the entire book, then skips right to page 115...Vinny says "it looks like a mushroom" – then Tom sets up a bogus argument from what I wrote.. and omits the history of writings on the Salamander that Ruck and others have done on the subject. Now he takes this one image, pg. 115, and expands it out that somehow all my work is all wrong... this is known as poisoning the well and sweeping generalization fallacies. Then he goes on to argue that the man in the image is dying from eating poison fruit! And he's eating it in front of a tree that looks like a mushroom. But he doesn't explain where the poison fruit came from, only that the salamander poisoned the tree. He apparently takes this literally. Tom claims: "everything he writes about this is incorrect" but doesn't show how... No onus of proof. Just a sweeping generalization fallacy – more attacks on me. Using straw mans and misrepresenting my work is not evidence of error. Then he goes on to talk about Latin and Alchemy and no alchemy treatises are in English! Notice how he sets up that I couldn't have read ANY of them and then switches to "well not this one. I translated it"? Incredible trickery here. I had already told him in an email that it came from Chris Bennett, and it was Chris's original error. But he doesn't attack Chris at all. He just makes huge, sweeping generalizations.. but it's clear that Vinny did this whole interview just to allow someone to attack me... "You're sitting here ripping on Jan Irvin, and apparently you're not done yet..."Then he does an appeal to popularity... how many academics agree or disagree, regardless if they've studied the details of the info. Are they qualified to agree or disagree? Who are they? What did they write? He provides nothing but their appeal. He also omits that a professor wrote a very positive academic review of my book which is published in the academic journals. Notice how his WHOLE ENTIRE argument is based on this ONE image? Anything else he just claims is wrong because

with no supporting evidence, which he ignored! And Hoffman was CIA... as was Wasson. He omits this as well when he says how wonderful they are. And I debunked Tom's article line by line and he ignored it. Why claim that I wouldn't respond? That's just dishonest. I replied to his whole article, breaking down its flaws on February 16, 2013. Notice how he attacks me... Ruck didn't get it from me... we both got it from Chris Bennett... ridiculous. Chris had it cited to the Bodlean. Back then it was very difficult to track down such images. We didn't have online image searches back then. Tom instead makes a huge conspiracy theory. Highly academic piece that he wrote... even though it distorts everything I wrote for his own false presentation of my work. Yes, he did in fact focus on one issue... the single image on page 115.. then he uses fallacies. "a real scholar, the other came from Jan Irvin – laugh" an appeal to ridicule. But then he goes on to lie about Dr. Robert Price and how he and Acharya even worked together for a while... the quote from Price came from his own website! notice he omitted it. Price pulled his own comments on her work:

http://www.robertmprice.mindvendor.com/rev_murdock.htm He also omits this very positive review by Price of Acharya's *Christ In Egypt*:

http://www.robertmprice.mindvendor.com/reviews/murdock_christ_egypt.htm "I find myself in full agreement with Acharya S/D.M. Murdock: "we assert that Christianity constitutes Gnosticism historicized and Judaized, likewise representing a synthesis of Egyptian, Jewish and Greek religion and mythology, among others [including Buddhism, via King Asoka's missionaries] from around the 'known world'" (p. 278).

"Christianity is largely the product of Egyptian religion being Judaized and historicized' (p. 482).~ Robert Price" Uh oh! Now who's the one caught: "Uh ohLooks like someone got caught red-handed making an argument from ignorance: There's no place to hide anymore. ~ Tom Hatsis" The irony is too rich. Tom claims there is no evidence for any of this, but he ignores the very evidence... he omits the citation from the philologists, Ruck – 15 full pages, and also this one – which was published in BOTH books he cited: "Since the time Allegro published *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*, much new research in the area of fertility cults and their relationship to entheogens, and especially mushrooms, has surfaced. Finding a Sumerian philologist who possesses a knowledge of entheogens and fertility cults is next to impossible. However, during our research we learned of one highly accredited Sumerian philologist, Anna Partington. Partington is a former associate of Allegro, who also possesses a

deep understanding of entheogens and fertility cults. Though not in complete support of his views, this is what she had to say regarding Allegro: Most people come to the field of Sumerian studies with a background in several early Mideastern languages. Although John was of a previous generation, he was, in common with most Orientalists, perfectly well equipped to deal with cuneiform languages. He found comparative linguistic study especially interesting; but early in his career the finding of the scrolls by the Dead Sea led him to specialise in translation of these Hebrew and Aramaic documents. Unfortunately, the comparative philological work presented in SMC [The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross] uses a number of hypothetical Sumerian words not attested in texts. These are marked with an asterisk following philological convention. This is akin to proposing there is a word in the English language 'bellbat' because the individual words 'bell' and 'bat' are known to exist separately. Then again words of different languages are gathered together without the type of argument which would be expected in order to demonstrate possible relationship.~ Anna Partington

?Uh oh! This is very obviously a hit piece. It's incredible how Vinny and these hosts just let people lie and attack researchers and scholars without reading or verifying anything they say... and Vinny even admits during the interview that he's not read my work! WTF? Notice how Vinny, or Thomas, didn't ask me to debate? Neither contacted me for a debate... and Thomas just lies over the matter. He contacted me name calling.. . like he just called me a coward.. Tom's emails to me are below. Then he mentions his pal Jonny Enoch.. . "citations are from Mars" - that Jonny Enoch - who refused to discuss a single point I'd actually written. Jonny's entire argument was attacking me for revealing the truth behind Terence McKenna, his sacred cow. Jonny set up a straw man and refused to discuss the actual points of my research, so yes, I entirely blew him off ...Jonny made a laughable video attacking my work where he ignored everything I'd written, but this also reveals a possible agenda here with Thomas.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jSz-iHprQgY> I'd love to debate this guy...if he could actually focus on the work and not just name call like we're on a play ground. He's totally into attacking me and not the work... though I did make a mistake that it was family member of his who contacted me. This is from February 14, 2013: "Just wanted jan to know an ex tutor of my brothers is mentally unstable and bashing Jan on facebook complete with posting names and people he claims have emailed him calling him names and insulting him. be careful because tom who is agrippa weyer on fab is disturbed and should not be

worked with on any projects.” But it's amazing how Vinny just goes on and allows this guy to continue to lie about me...I am responding to him and he is on a rant and tirade and he is lying, and I've responded to him in the past, so his calling names, such as coward, is again, nothing but more name calling and lies and the omission of the fact that I already debunked his paper in an email! Most of this interview is just him attacking me and then distorting my words and research which he seems incapable of comprehending. I'm sitting here going line by line through your entire interview. How is that cowardice? He doesn't say. Then he has to attack me if I know Latin or not... this is a circumstantial ad hominem. Actually, I do know that V is not in Latin... but it's regardless if I know Latin when we're discussing it in English as well as Allegro's work was all published in English, etc..is irrelevant – it's a circumstantial ad hominem and bears nothing on the information itself. Then he says I should study the trivium before I promote it... and here he's using all of this fallacious logic. Then he brings up an example from A&S about illogic and then attacks me for the world being flat, when we say that... “Ancient pagan religions in the Mediterranean area and throughout the Middle East taught that the universe was quite tiny. These included the religions of ancient Egypt, Babylonia, Canaan, etc. The earth was often thought of as flat, like a dinner plate. Mountains around the edges held up a rigid metallic dome, which formed the sky. The gods and angels pushed the sun, moon, planets and stars across the dome of the sky on a daily basis. God sits on his throne in Heaven, which lies above the great dome or canopy. Doors or windows in the dome could be opened through which water, fire (in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah), and brimstone could be poured. This is the view of the universe that the writers of the Bible appear to have adopted from these pagan religions, if one interprets their writing literally. The problem came after Aristotle suggested that the earth is a sphere. Many members of the clergy could not accept that as truth. There are a number of implications in the Bible that it is the sun that moves, not the earth.” And also: Our ancestors lacked the technology that we pride ourselves on today. For them, it made sense that the earth was the center of the universe. From as high up on any mountain as one could climb, the earth appeared to be as flat as a chessboard. Additionally, the sun and moon do appear to move across the sky. These theories have been proven wrong over time, but this is what the masses were once taught, in part because this is what they could see with their own eyes. Still, to this day, we use words like sunrise and sunset. While these words obviously imply movement

of the sun, they are common solecisms that almost everyone gladly overlooks. Notice how he uses an equivocation regarding flat... mountain vs. the flat earth theory? These are two very different things... an equivocation is using the same word for different meanings in the middle of an argument to trick the listener. This is a dishonest trick he used, and you can hear Vinny go silent, recognizing something wasn't right with Tom's argument, but failing to call him out. The church banned writing... the dark ages... education and writing was banned for many in the lower classes – the serfs – for centuries during the Dark Age, as it's called. Citations below. He omits that Ruck's name is on the back cover of my book *The Holy Mushroom*... From the back cover of my book *The Holy Mushroom: John Allegro's Revelation of the sacramental role of the sacred mushroom in the ancient religions spanning the agrarian region from Mesopotamia to the Near East* was immediately and unfairly rejected by a chorus of scholars less competent than him, but continuing research into early Christianity and the mystery religions of the Greco-Roman world and their perpetuation in alchemy and European folkloric traditions has vindicated the correctness of his discovery. ~ Carl A. P. Ruck, Boston University. He also omits that Ruck himself dealt with Allegro's other philology issues in the republication of Allegro's *Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*, a 15 page addendum at the back of the republication of Allegro's book *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* – that I published! He also omits in his rant on me that his email was attacking me and calling me a fraud... and he focuses only on the one issue, which I responded to him in detail all of the issues in his paper, which he also omitted. This is his first email to me after his family member contacted me and warned me about him: "Uh ohLooks like someone got caught red-handed making an argument from ignorance:<http://www.arspsychedelia.com/roasting-the-salamander-mushroom-cult-theorists-vs-critical-historical-inquiry.html> There's no place to hide anymore. You should have learned Latin like I suggested (instead of posing with your overuse of "argumentum ad ignorantium"), cause you are about to look really foolish. Please see Appendix 2 and answer my questions. I will not respond otherwise. checkmate, amateur. ~ Tom Hatsis, February 16, 2013." He never even once considers how he attacked me in his first introduction and how this would play out in my response to him. "Uh oh" is right! Here's another good one: "Hey Jan, So I was talking to the pub. house lawyers about my legal right to call you a "fraud" in my forthcoming book that demolishes your idiotic ideas. The lawyers said that it

depends on if you knew at the time that you were full of shit, or wholly ignorant of how dumb you truly are. My question: are you aware of the fact that you are a fraud or are you just stupid? I ask because, legally, I can't call you a "fraud" or a "charlatan" in my book if you *truly* are ignorant of how stupid you are. If you are aware of how subpar your "research" is, then I can call you a fraud all day and night. If you are not, I have to settle on words like "historically inept," and "stupid." So I leave the decision to you. When my book comes out next year, do you want the chapter devoted to you to be titled "Jan Irvin: Charlatan" or "Jan Irvin: Idiot"? Please let me know asap!!! Oh! And have a great day! Once my book comes out, and everyone sees how dishonest (or stupid – remember, it's your choice!) you are, you won't have too many more good days. Sincerely, Thomas Alexander Hatsis

The man who has made a laughing-stock out of you in REAL academic circles." Really? How? Whom? Who are their names? Ruck? Hardly. It's only another appeal to ridicule and an attack on me. As I replied to his above email attack: Resorting to Ad hominem attacks, rather than dealing with each specific point of the research on its own merit by going one by one, is really a sign of one's mental bankruptcy and lack of mental cognizance and inability to deal with facts – this is why they name call like little children on the playground: "fraud" "Charlatan" "idiot" "dishonest" "stupid" "full of shit" "dumb" – terms one uses to "attack the man" when one feels threatened and intellectually incapable of dealing with the facts and citations presented. Another trick of mental deficits is to not examine the entire argument as a whole – to cherry pick a single item out to attack – known as a straw man argument – and take it out of context. How you want to present yourself is really up to you. Make sure that you take nothing out of context, and don't misquote anything, as this is when the person you're attacking and name calling at will get to take every penny from your work. If you want to sound like an intelligent human being, then you'd simply have to deal with each citation point by point in the work as a whole, rather resorting to adolescent idiocy such as name calling. Singling out a single image and ignoring every other bit of the research presented and then name calling is not a sound or intelligent way to approach things – but how one who's agenda driven protects his beliefs. Luckily, only your own reputation is on the line – and your non-existent publisher's. I find it strange that he has to omit the first 115 pages of my book that is entirely based on primary documentation... he did this in his emails too – all the while attacking me as a researcher, which is very unprofessional. He's into attacking researchers and not the

research... he looks for scant evidence to distort to fit his agendas... Vinny didn't even call him out on all of these fallacies he's using... so sad. Then he attacks the idea of illiteracy and reading being banned in the Dark Ages - the very reason why they were called the Dark Ages in the first place. Doh!:

[https://www.google.com/search?q=Catholic+church+banned+writting&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla%3Aen-US%3Aofficial&client=firefox-a#client=firefox-a&hs=fvE&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&q=Catholic+church+banned+writing&spell=1&sa=X&ei=UCG6Ua7AAcaziwLGk4HQBw&ved=0CCoQvwUoAA&bav=on.2,or.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47883778,d.cGE&fp=ee29a23208bd926f&biw=1920&bih=992\[12:49:12 PM\]](https://www.google.com/search?q=Catholic+church+banned+writting&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla%3Aen-US%3Aofficial&client=firefox-a#client=firefox-a&hs=fvE&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&q=Catholic+church+banned+writing&spell=1&sa=X&ei=UCG6Ua7AAcaziwLGk4HQBw&ved=0CCoQvwUoAA&bav=on.2,or.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47883778,d.cGE&fp=ee29a23208bd926f&biw=1920&bih=992[12:49:12 PM]) Jan Irvin: Illiteracy in the Dark

Ages:

https://www.google.com/search?q=Catholic+church+banned+writting&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla%3Aen-US%3Aofficial&client=firefox-a#client=firefox-a&hs=JJu&rls=org.mozilla:en-US%3Aofficial&client=psy-ab&q=illiteracy+in+the+dark+ages&oq=illiteracy+in+the+dark+ages&gs_l=serp.3..0j0i22i30l3.113728.119877.2.120054.37.27.5.5.6.0.134.2651.16j11.27.0...0.0...1c.1.17.psy-ab.t8B-95Yyqto&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47883778,d.cGE&fp=ee29a23208bd926f&biw=1920&bih=965

And all of this just up to the 34 minute mark.. And Vinny, who knows the trivium, allowed this to go on! It's funny though also that when he replies to my debunking of him, he omits ALL of the original key details in his first email to me, cited above. I don't know if I can stomach any more of this vacuous idiocy. But maybe I'll finish rebutting this nonsense later. Reading just streams of lies and idiocy makes my stomach turn.