The Junk Science Of Jim Hopper

(my narration only)

Jim Hopper believes in recovered memories. That makes him an idiot. He is also a scientist with credentials; that makes him a dangerous idiot.

If you haven't heard of Jim Hopper, outside of his scientific work he shills for the sexual grievance industry, and by all accounts makes a good living from it. According to the homepage of his website:

"I consult to clients and teach a variety of professionals on trauma, healing and seeking justice, including the neurobiology of trauma and its implications for the law enforcement and criminal justice systems, the unique impacts of sexual trauma on boys and men, and contemplative methods in the healing of trauma."

That sounds impressive, but what does consulting on the neurobiology of trauma really entail? For the most part it means explaining or explaining away purported delays in reporting rape and other sexual crimes. This is something he does with vigour.

How do women react to rape? How would you react if you were surrounded in a dark alley by a dozen dudes who demanded you give them your wallet or else? You'd probably hand it over, and almost certainly report it later. Likewise, some women submit out of fear. There are two other reactions though - flight and fight. A woman who runs from an attacker might well outrun him, adrenalin tends to have that effect on people. If she fights him she may end up being seriously injured or worse; on the other hand, she may hold him off until the cavalry arrives, she may discourage him, or she may even get the better of him. Either way, victims usually report promptly, and because fighting back generates physical evidence, most genuine rape victims are believed.

In 1981, there were 34 genuine reports of rapes in South Wales, and every single one resulted in a conviction.

For decades, the sexual grievance industry including rape crisis centres have whined about the purportedly low conviction rate in rape cases. Their principal solution to this has been to mount an attack on due process, one that has been extremely successful, especially in Canada. Another line of attack has been to claim that in addition to surrendering to a sexual predator, running from him, or attempting to fight him off, women freeze. We are now told there are three reactions to such an attack: fight, flight, or freeze.

In 2017, Rape Crisis Scotland produced a series of videos to that effect with the clear purpose of brainwashing juries into believing any woman who claimed to have been raped regardless of any exculpatory evidence. You can find my rebuttal at the Internet Archive, but this is where Jim Hopper comes in, helping to explain away this freezing mechanism, and especially in historical cases, to explain away purported delays in

reporting, including by enlisting repressed memories. The Blasey Ford case contains elements of both.

You may recall that in their desperation to prevent the elevation of Brett Kavanaugh to the United States Supreme Court, the Democrats went to extraordinary lengths, including enlisting Christine Blasey Ford, who claimed she had been the victim of an attempted rape by Kavanaugh and one of his classmates at a house party some thirty-five years previously. Dr Ford was unable to give any details about this party, and in an October 2018 blog for *Scientific American*, Jim Hopper asked why can't Christine Blasey Ford remember how she got home?

The obvious answer for Jim is that she was traumatised, and had also repressed the memory of this shocking assault. Incredibly, Kavanaugh was able to produce exculpatory evidence, which led some people to suggest Ford had made an honest mistake. Ann Coulter made an excellent point that people will sometimes import public figures into their memories; Coulter illustrated this with prosaic examples from her own, personal experience. Another person who was prepared to give Ford the benefit of the doubt was the vlogger Ali Alexander, until he did some further research then realised Ford was simply lying.

In 1997, Kavanaugh's schoolfriend Mark Judge published a book in which he mentioned house parties of the sort described by Ford. But he gave no details of the venue. Alexander reasoned that Ford had read this book and built on it.

Instead of blasting Ford, the Republicans brought in the experienced sex crimes prosecutor Rachel Mitchell to question her very passively. Mitchell was able to show Ford had lied on two material points - her second front door and her purported fear of flying - both of which were somehow said to be connected with her phantom Kavanaugh experience.

Finally, any hope any jurist of reason might have had of believing Ford was exploded when her attorney made a stunning admission about her client's motivation. Sadly, none of this will impress a true believer like Jim Hopper.

On his website, Hopper pours scorn on the work of Elizabeth Loftus, the world's leading expert on false memories. He trashes her famous Bugs Bunny experiment, suggesting this unique, wise-cracking rabbit could somehow be confused with furry Disneyland creatures.

In his short two part video *How Memory Works*, he points out correctly that memories are stored in different parts of the brain, and that they can be dredged up from the subconscious by smells and other stimuli, but herein lies the danger. How do we know these memories are real? Here are two shocking examples.

Late one night in 1979, Kevin Green left his heavily pregnant wife Dianna in bed and went out to buy a takeaway meal. When he returned to their Tustin, California home, he found Dianna barely alive; she had been beaten savagely and raped within a small window of opportunity. Although the doctors were unable to save her baby, they did manage to save Dianna, barely, but she had no memory of that terrible night, and had also regressed to a child-like state.

The police had no doubt who was responsible, an as yet unidentified serial killer known as the Bedroom Basher, but when Dianna's memory returned, she identified Kevin as her attacker. Kevin was charged, tried and convicted. How could he not be, all things considered? It was not until 1996 that the truth came out when Gerald Parker confessed. DNA was the final nail in the coffin, but Dianna was never able to come to terms with the truth.

The case of Nicole Althaus was a lot less tragic, but worrying nevertheless. In 1990, the teen made a single allegation against her father Richard. After that, her allegations mushroomed, resulting in the arrest of her father for rape and other crimes, and of her mother for sexual assault. Thankfully, the courts realised what had happened, and in April 1992, so did Nicole. One of the horrors to which she was allegedly subjected was walking barefoot over hot coals. So why weren't her feet scarred? She and her parents went on to sue the therapists who had implanted these false memories in her fragile young mind.

Many, probably the vast majority of recovered memories of child sexual abuse, are confabulations of innocent incidents. Think about it, a young girl in her cot does what young girls do. There is a nasty smell and a nasty feeling. Her mother picks her up, washes her, changes her, perhaps rubs cream into her private parts. Later, her father bounces her up and down on his knee; perhaps she sees a drunk or homeless person in the street behaving bizarrely while out shopping with her mother. Childhood amnesia and confabulation lead in later life to her believing she was sexually abused.

Every time there is a drama series featuring a violent rape or child sexual abuse, rape crisis centres the world over receive floods of calls from mentally disturbed women and at times men who have been "triggered" by a scene and are experiencing what they believe to be flashbacks.

By feeding these delusions, Jim Hopper and the fanatics behind legal dominance feminism are causing rather than solving problems, destroying innocent lives, and tearing families apart.