

Senator SIMON. And let me just add that one or more of those calls were made with great reluctance. We have evidence on that also.

Now, getting to the panel, and we will get to you here. Judge Hoerchner, you said in your deposition you were asked:

*Question.* "Did you see her press conference on television?"

*Answer.* Yes, I did.

*Question.* Did you find her to be credible?

*Answer.* I saw most of it. Absolutely. If you knew Anita you couldn't doubt her word on anything. I've never known her even to exaggerate. As you can tell from what you've seen of her on television and in person, her style is understatement in everything she does.

Now, yesterday it was suggested by one of the Members of the Senate that the fact that she did not document what was happening to her questions her credibility. I would be interested in any reflections you might have, all four witnesses, on whether or not—on the matter of documentation in that kind of a situation, and does the fact that she did not document this in any way diminish her credibility in your mind?

Judge if we can call on you first.

Judge HOERCHNER. Absence of documentation could never diminish Anita's credibility to those of us who have known her since 1977 and 1978. Documentation is usually in my experience something that someone would do who is contemplating a lawsuit. It was always my impression that Anita had no intention to sue then Mr. Thomas and that she has had no agenda vis-a-vis Judge Thomas.

Senator SIMON. Ms. Wells?

Ms. WELLS. The lack of documentation does not trouble me, Senator, because I think, as I tried to indicate to Senator Specter earlier, I don't see what a record would have accomplished. She knew what was done to her.

And furthermore, to put it down on paper, to say he said X to me on Thursday, would have been no more evidence for us today than anything else.

Senator SIMON. And, of course, she didn't anticipate anything like this.

Ms. WELLS. No. So there was no reason. As the Judge said. she wasn't thinking of bringing a suit.

Senator SIMON. And, if I could relate it, it says to me that she didn't intend to prosecute or carry on in that way.

You have mentioned your own experience. Did you document that in any way, writing it down in a diary or anything?

Ms. WELLS. No, I did not. It is just something that will always be with me and so I have no need to write it down. I would like to forget it and I cannot. So I would not want it to be anywhere where it could be picked up and read by anyone.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Carr?

Mr. CARR. I would echo that, I guess. But in addition, my recollection of discussing these things with Anita Hill is that they were very painful for her, and I think she did not want to, certainly, talking about them with me, and she may well have wanted to forget them, and that writing them down may, in fact, in and of itself have been additionally painful for her.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Paul?

Mr. PAUL. Senator, I would have to say as a lawyer that the absence of documentation is completely consistent with my recollection of her reluctance in wanting to discuss it and her statement that she felt she had no recourse.

Senator SIMON. If I may ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Briefly.

Senator SIMON. Each of you has explained why you are here. Why do you think Anita Hill came forward and testified?

Judge HOERCHNER. She has said that she came forward out of a sense of her obligation as a citizen. I think the incidents that occurred those many years ago have raised a serious question of character in someone who has been nominated for one of the most important positions in the country.

I know that she was very reluctant to come forward. I think she felt she had a duty to her country.

Senator SIMON. Ms. Wells?

Ms. WELLS. Well, I can only echo what the judge has said. Anita, Professor Hill, is a very loyal person and therefore she is loyal to what she believes she ought to do, and so therefore she has come forward only because she felt that that was the right thing to do.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Carr?

Mr. CARR. Senator, I can really only, I guess, speculate on it, on why she has come forward. I would think my recollections of her personality are that while she would like to come forward in this manner she would be terrified of the invasion of privacy and she would have been extremely hesitant.

At the same time, I have the recollection that she is a forthright person and when asked a question she feels compelled to give an honest answer. And I would think here that she has somehow found herself on the sort of proverbial slippery slope. That she has felt obligated to make some statement when asked and that that has snowballed totally out of control to the point where she had no alternative but to come forward in a total and fulsome way.

Senator SIMON. And, if I could ask you, and then I want to hear from Mr. Paul, she is both a lawyer and a law professor. I assume she has a very elevated feeling, as we all do, for the Supreme Court.

Do you think this was a factor in coming forward also?

Mr. CARR. It may well have been that when she looked at the price she would have to pay to do this that because it was the Supreme Court she viewed it as of such great importance that she was willing to pay that price.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Paul.

Mr. PAUL. Of course, I haven't discussed with Professor Hill, Senator, her reasons for coming forward, but I would imagine that if I were in her situation, when asked the question by an agent of the FBI, I would feel compelled to answer the question honestly as a servant to the court.

I cannot imagine anything that Professor Hill could think to gain as a legal academician by coming forward. I think her career has, frankly, probably suffered as a result of her coming forward. I think that she had a very bright career. I think that if someone had asked me a few weeks ago I would say that I could imagine