

her by listening and providing comfort, and apparently there was no comfort to be found.

Senator SIMPSON. Would you have done it differently now, knowing what you know, than what you did then?

Judge HOERCHNER. If I were dealing with Anita at her present age, confidence, professional status, I would consider advising her to do something or say something. To be frank, I don't remember ever giving Anita advice about anything in my life.

Senator SIMPSON. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

I have a few questions, and there are still some more, if you are prepared. Let me ask each of you to answer each of these questions, if you would.

Did Professor Hill ever complain to you that any other employer she had or anyone else other than the nominee had harassed her or had made unwanted sexual advances toward her, had asked her for a date, anything? Can anyone? Let's just go down the list. Judge?

Judge HOERCHNER. I will just repeat essentially the same thing that I said the last time I was asked that question. No, she has never complained of that. She was very poised and very capable of brushing off or laughing off unwanted sexual advances. In this situation, in part I am sure because of the great disparity in power, she was not able to successfully do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Wells.

Ms. WELLS. She has never described to me a situation similar to this or any way remotely similar to this, in terms of a work situation where a supervisor or a superior was making unwelcome advances.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carr.

Mr. CARR. No, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Paul.

Mr. PAUL. No, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Now have any of you ever known, under any circumstances—and you are under oath—has there been any circumstance in your relationship at any time with Professor Hill where you have known her to lie? Judge?

Judge HOERCHNER. Absolutely not.

Ms. WELLS. Never.

Mr. CARR. Never.

Mr. PAUL. Absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is an obvious question, but do any of you have any reason to believe, because there have been a lot of notions proffered here as to whether Professor Hill, who has obviously made an impression of sincerity on the committee as well as many other people, is doing anything other than simply telling the truth? Judge Thomas has come across as very forceful and sincere in his denials. Do you have any reason to believe that any of the reasons that have been offered here, raised here, suggested here over the last several days as you have watched this, amount to anything other than she is simply telling the truth and the facts as they occurred? Anyone?

Mr. PAUL. Senator, if there were any desire on the part of Professor Hill for some sort of advancement in the profession of legal

education, this whole proceeding was not the way to advance her career. She had tremendous opportunities. I feel confident that there were many law schools in this country that would have been happy to have offered Professor Hill a position, prior to this proceeding. She chose to stay where she was because she wanted to be close to her family.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of you, anyone else, have any reason? For example, does anybody have any reason to believe—and again, you are under oath—that, as has been suggested by some here, there is a possibility that Professor Hill is fantasizing? Is there anything in her background or character, in any aspect of your relationship with her, that would lead you to believe—and remember, you are under oath—that she is possibly fantasizing about what happened?

Ms. WELLS. She is one of the most truthful people that I know. She is not one subject to bouts of fantasy. At best, she might be a little sentimental, but to make up a story, for what purpose? To bring this kind of public exposure to herself, it would not be in character.

Mr. CARR. Senator, I certainly would echo that there is absolutely nothing in her character, as I recall, and that the things in her character that I do recall would not support the notion that she would fantasize.

The CHAIRMAN. What in her character do you recall that would not support the notion that she would fantasize?

Mr. CARR. My recollection is that she is a very level-headed and factual person.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been suggested here the possibility that—and I know this has been raised, but I want it on the record—that she might be so ambitious that although, Professor Paul, she would not be looking to advance her career this way, she might be looking to advance her financial situation by being able to turn this into a book or a movie. That has been suggested by some here. Is there anything in her character that would lead you to believe that is a possibility?

Mr. PAUL. Senator, as I said earlier, I believe that the only book Professor Hill has any interest in writing would be a book on the Uniform Commercial Code. She is a private person, as has been testified already. I can't imagine her wanting to reopen this episode. She was so reluctant in her discussions with me. And, moreover, once again going back 4 years ago in our discussion, there is no conceivable, possible gain or advantage she could have imagined 4 years ago, in a discussion in a university cafeteria about her coming to work at my university, in telling me then that she left the EEOC because she was sexually harassed by her supervisor.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like each of you to answer the question.

Mr. CARR. I can only imagine that the rationale for wanting to write a book would be fame or money, and I do not think those are significant motivations for Anita Hill. I don't believe she would have made the career choices she has made with the hope of somehow cashing in at some late date in her life. I think if she was motivated by money, she would have made different career choices.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a partner in your law firm?

Mr. CARR. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Without naming your law firm, how large is your law firm?

Mr. CARR. About 430 lawyers; about 100 partners.

The CHAIRMAN. Would Anita Hill have any difficulty getting a job with your law firm?

Mr. CARR. Today she might, but I think that is a reference to the economic times, but I have no doubt she would have—I don't think she would have any difficulty getting a job at a major law firm, either in New York or in some other city.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Wells, with regard to the question of writing a book, is there anything in her background? Did she ever indicate to you that, "Boy, I saw such-and-such a story, they could turn that into a mini-series," or anything?

Ms. WELLS. There is nothing. I wouldn't even be tempted to say that she was particularly romantic in outlook. By that I mean, she is not even the type, as I know her, to want to sit down and talk about the latest best-seller, and get into the characterizations there and talk about how this character appeals to you, as though that individual were real. I don't even think she likes soap operas.

The CHAIRMAN. Does she enjoy, like some men and women do, gossip?

Ms. WELLS. We never gossip. She and I never gossip, so I can't speak to that. I mean, we knew many of the same people, and we never sat around talking about them and gloating over juicy tidbits. That wasn't in her nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, it has been suggested by some, as well, that she may just be a very malleable person. It was clearly suggested yesterday, at least as one possibility, that she had an ideological bent that was inconsistent with the nominee, she felt strongly about that, and that she found herself placed in the hands of interest groups who used her like putty to accomplish this ideological end that she felt was important to accomplish and they felt was important to accomplish.

Is she that malleable a person, or is there anything in her character—and again you are under oath—in your knowledge of her, to indicate to you that she is someone that is that malleable or so inclined?

Judge HOERCHNER. Well, as I testified just a moment ago, I have never given her advice, and the reason is that she is so independent and that I respect her judgment so much that I would not presume to advise her. I cannot imagine a force that could take her and use her as a malleable object.

The CHAIRMAN. I say to my colleagues, I know my time is up, I only have two more questions. It may be useful for me to finish them, if that is all right, and then move on to anyone else who may have questions.

I would like to ask a question of Mr. Carr and Mr. Paul. Mr. Paul, Professor Paul, at the university did you find her one that was malleable, that shrank from intellectual combat, that was easily able to have her opinions formed? I mean, is there any evidence of that?

Mr. PAUL. I would not describe her as shrinking from an argument, no, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you describe her?

Mr. PAUL. My impression is that she is a very strong person. I think my impression of her is that she feels very deeply about her own being. She has a strong sense of roots, a strong sense of who she is and what she is, perhaps based on her religious upbringing, and she doesn't shrink from anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that maybe a more senior professor who is sitting having a discussion on a legal point, she is not the kind who would yield her opinion to an ad hominem argument?

Mr. PAUL. That is correct, Senator. The summer that she was visiting at our school was the summer of Judge Bork's nomination to the Supreme Court. If you recall, that was a very controversial nomination.

The CHAIRMAN. I had forgotten that. [Laughter.]

I would like to forget that.

Mr. PAUL. Members of my faculty were, I would say, mostly opposed to the nomination, and in defending Judge Bork as she did at that time, she could not have thought she was advancing her opportunities to return to our school. She did so. She did so eloquently. She did so with tremendous force and conviction.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carr, on the same point, is she strong-willed? Is she malleable? Was she someone who yielded to intellectual or any other kind of pressure?

Mr. CARR. I would not call her malleable. I don't recall strenuous intellectual debate with her.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess that wasn't what you had in mind. [Laughter.]

I don't mean that in a bad way. I wasn't trying to be facetious. I mean, there was a different relationship you had. I should drop this. [Laughter.]

Senator HATCH. Yes, you should drop that.

The CHAIRMAN. I should drop that part. You understand what I mean. I am being very serious. I mean, was there anything in her character that would lead you to believe that groups or individuals could use her for their advantage, to promote another cause? That is what I am trying to get at because that is what has been raised here. It has been flatly suggested that is what happened.

Mr. CARR. I don't believe that that would be possible. My recollections of Anita are that she had some fundamental, basic beliefs about what was right and what was wrong, and I would venture to guess that these kinds of sexual accusations were clearly wrong, and that she was not expedient or willing to subvert or change her views inconsistent with the way they in fact were.

The CHAIRMAN. I have one last area to cover. Did any of you attend her going-away party that was, we have heard testified to here, at the EEOC when she decided she was going to leave?

Ms. WELLS. I attended a going-away party at the Sheraton-Carleton.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the going-away party, do you recall? What was the purpose of the going-away party?

Ms. WELLS. Well, she was saying good-bye to her friends here.

The CHAIRMAN. To go to where?

Ms. WELLS. To Oral Roberts.