continually pressure me to go out with him, continually, and he would not accept my explanation as being valid.

Senator Specter. So that when you said you took it to mean, "We ought to have sex," that that was an inference that you drew?

Ms. Hill. Yes, yes.

8

9

10 11

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

Senator Specter. Professor Hill, the USA Today reported on October 9th, "Anita Hill was told by Senate staffers her signed affidavit alleging sexual harassment by Clarence Thomas would be the instrument that 'quietly and behind the scenes' would force him to withdraw his name." Was USA Today 12 correct on that, attributing it to a man named Mr. Keith Henderson, a 10-year friend of Hill and former Senate Judiciary Committee staffer?

Ms. Hill. I do not recall. I guess--did I say that? I don't understand who said what in that quotation.

Senator Specter. Well, let me go on. He said, "Keith Henderson, a 10-year friend of Hill and former Senate Judiciary Committee staffer, says Hill was advised by Senate staffers that her charge would be kept secret and her name kept from public scrutiny."

"They would," apparently referring again to Mr. Henderson's statement, "they would approach Judge Thomas with the information and he would withdraw and not turn this into a big story, Henderson says."

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

Did anybody ever tell you that, by providing the statement, that there would be a move to request Judge Thomas to withdraw his nomination?

Ms. Hill. I don't recall any story about pressing, using this to press anyone.

Senator Specter. Well, do you recall anything at all about anything related to that?

Ms. Hill. I think that I was told that my statement would be shown to Judge Thomas, and I agreed to that.

Senator Specter. But was there any suggestion, however slight, that the statement with these serious charges would result in a withdrawal so that it wouldn't have to be necessary for your identity to be known or for you to come forward under circumstances like these?

Ms. Hill. There was--no, not that I recall. I don't recall anything being said about him being pressed to resign.

Senator Specter. Well, this would only have happened in the course of the past month or so, because all this started just in early September.

Ms. Hill. I understand.

Senator Specter. So that when you say you don't recall,

I would ask you to search your memory on this point, and

perhaps we might begin—and this is an important subject—

about the initiation of this entire matter with respect to

the Senate staffers who talked to you. But that is going to

(2)

18

19 20

22

21

24

 be too long for the few minutes that I have left, so I would just ask you once again, and you say you don't recollect, whether there was anything at all said to you by anyone that, as <u>USA Today</u> reports, that just by having the allegations of sexual harassment by Clarence Thomas, that it would be the instrument that "quietly and behind the scenes" would force him to withdraw his name. Anything related to that in any way whatsoever?

Ms. Hill. The only thing that I can think of, and if you will check, there were a lot of phone conversations. We were discussing this matter very carefully, and at some point there might have been a conversation about what might happen.

Senator Specter. Might have been?

Ms. Hill. There might have been, but that wasn't--I don't remember this specific kind of comment about "quietly and behind the scenes" pressing him to withdraw.

Senator Specter. Well, aside from "quietly and behind the scenes" pressing him to withdraw, any suggestion that just the charges themselves, in writing, would result in Judge Thomas withdrawing, going away?

Ms. Hill. No, no. I don't recall that at all, no.

Senator Specter. Well, you started to say that there
might have been some conversation, and it seemed to me--

Ms. Hill. There might have been some conversation about what could possibly occur.

1.1 12

14

15

16 17 18

19 20

25

21 22 23

Senator Specter. Well, tell me about that conversation. Ms. Hill. Well, I can't really tell you any more than what I have said. I discussed what the alternatives were, what might happen with this affidavit that I submitted. We talked about the possibility of the Senate committee coming back for more information. We talked about the possibility of the FBI, asking, going to the FBI and getting more information; some questions from individual Senators. just, the statement that you are referring to, I really can't verify.

Senator Specter. Well, when you talk about the Senate coming back for more information or the FBI coming back for 13 more information or Senators coming back for more information, that has nothing to do at all with Judge Thomas withdrawing, so that when you testified a few moments ago that there might possibly have been a conversation, in response to my question about a possible withdrawal, I would press you on that, Professor Hill, in this context: You have testified with some specificity about what happened 10 years ago. I would ask you to press your recollection as to what happened within the last month.

Ms. Hill. And I have done that, Senator, and I don't recall that comment. I do recall that there might have been some suggestion that if the FBI did the investigation, that the Senate might get involved, that there may be -- that a



-25

number of things might occur, but I really, I have to be honest with you, I cannot verify the statement that you are asking me to verify. There is not really more that I can tell you on that.

Senator Specter. Well, when you say a number of things might occur, what sort of things?

Ms. Hill. May I just add this one thing? Senator Specter. Sure.

Ms. Hill. The nature of that kind of conversation that you are talking about is very different from the nature of the conversation that I recall. The conversations that I recall were much more vivid. They were more explicit. The conversations that I have had with the staff over the last few days in particular have become much more blurry, but these are vivid events that I recall from even eight years ago when they happened, and they are going to stand out much more in my mind than a telephone conversation. They were one-on-one, personal conversations, as a matter of fact, and that adds to why they are much more easily recalled. I am sure that there are some comments that I do not recall the exact nature of from that period, as well, but these that are here are the ones that I do recall.

Senator Specter. Well, Professor Hill, I can understand why you say that these comments, alleged comments, would stand out in your mind, and we have gone over those. I don't

9|| 10

7

5

11 12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20! 21

22

23

want to go over them again. But when you talk about the withdrawal of a Supreme Court nominee, you are talking about something that is very, very vivid, stark, and you are talking about something that occurred within the past four or five weeks, and my question goes to a very dramatic and important event. If a mere allegation would pressure a nominee to withdraw from the Supreme Court, I would suggest to you that that is not something that wouldn't stick in a mind for four or five weeks, if it happened.

Ms. Hill. Well, Senator, I would suggest to you that for me these are more than mere allegations, so that if that comment were made--these are the truth to me, these comments are the truth to me--and if it were made, then I may not respond to it in the same way that you do.

Senator Specter. Well, I am not questioning your statement when I use the word "allegation" to refer to 10 years ago. I just don't want to talk about it as a fact because so far that is something we have to decide, so I am not stressing that aspect of the question. I do with respect to the time period, but the point that I would come back to for just one more minute would be -- well, let me ask it to you this way.

Ms. Hill. Okay.

Senator Specter. Would you not consider it a matter of real importance if someone said to you, "Professor, you won't

have to go public. Your name won't have to be disclosed. You won't have to do anything. Just sign the affidavit and this," as the <u>USA Today</u> report, would be the instrument that "quietly and behind the scenes" would force him to withdraw his name. Now I am not asking you whether it happened. I am asking you now only, if it did happen, whether that would be the kind of a statement to you which would be important and impressed upon you, that you would remember in the course of four or five weeks.

Ms. Hill. I don't recall a specific statement, and I cannot say whether that comment would have stuck in my mind. I really cannot say that.

Senator Specter. The sequence with the staffers is very involved, so I am going to move to another subject now, but I want to come back to this. Over the luncheon break, I would ask you to think about it further, if there is any way you can shed any further light on that question, because I think it is an important one.

Ms. Hill. Okay. Thank you.

Senator Specter. Professor Hill, the next subject I want to take up with you involves the kind of strong language which you say Judge Thomas used in a very unique setting, where there you have the Chairman of the EEOC, the Nation's chief law enforcement officer on sexual harassment, and here you have a lawyer who is an expert in this field, later goes

on to teach civil rights and has a dedication to making sure that women are not discriminated against. And if you take the single issue of discrimination against women, the Chairman of the EEOC has a more important role on that question even than a Supreme Court justice—a Supreme Court justice is a more important position overall, but if you focus just on sexual harassment.

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

25

The testimony that you described here today depicts a circumstance where the Chairman of the EEOC is blatant, as you describe it, and my question is: Understanding the fact that you are 25 and that you are shortly out of law school and the pressures that exist in this world--and I know about it to a fair extent, I used to be a district attorney and I know about sexual harassment and discrimination against women and I think I have some sensitivity on it--but even considering all of that, given your own expert standing and the fact that here you have the chief law enforcement officer of the country on this subject and the whole purpose of the civil right law is being perverted right in the office of the Chairman with one of his own female subordinates, what went through your mind, if anything, on whether you ought to come forward at that stage, because if you had, you would have stopped this man from being head of the EEOC perhaps for another decade? What went on through your mind? I know you decided not to make a complaint, but did you give that any

1 consideration, and, if so, how could you allow this kind of 2 reprehensible conduct to go on right in the headquarters, 3 without doing something about it?

Ms. Hill. Well, it was a very trying and difficult decision for me not to say anything further. I can only say that when I made the decision to just withdraw from the situation and not press as claim or charge against him, that I may have shirked a duty, a responsibility that I had, and to that extent I confess that I am very sorry that I did not do something or say something, but at the time that was my best judgment. Maybe it was as poor judgment, but it wasn't a dishonest and it wasn't a completely unreasonable choice that I made, given the circumstances.

Senator Specter. My right light is on. Thank you very much, Professor Hill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8

10

11

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, Professor Hill.

We will adjourn until 2:15. We will reconvene at 2:15.

[Whereupon, at 1:10 p.m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2:15 p.m., the same day.]

6 7 8

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Senator Thurmond. Senator Specter, do you want to proceed?

Senator Specter. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When my time expired we were up to the contact you had with Mr. Brudney on September 9th. If you could proceed from there to recount who called you and what those conversations consisted of as it led to your coming forward to the committee?

Ms. Hill. Well, we discussed a number of different issues. We discussed one, what he knew about the law on sexual harassment. We discussed what he knew about the process for bringing information forward to the committee. And in the course of our conversations Mr. Brudney asked me what were specifics about what it was that I had experienced.

In addition, we talked about the process for going forward. What might happen if I did bring information to the committee. That included that an investigation might take place, that I might be questioned by the committee in closed session. It even included something to the effect that the information might be presented to the candidate or to the White House. There was some indication that the candidate or, excuse me, the nominee might not wish to continue the process.

Senator Specter. Mr. Brudney said to you that the nominee, Judge Thomas, might not wish to continue the process if you came forward with a statement on the factors which you have testified about?

Ms. Hill. Well, I am not sure that that is exactly what he said. I think what he said was, depending on an investigation, a Senate, whether the Senate went into closed session and so forth, it might be that he might not wish to continue the process.

Senator Specter. So Mr. Brudney did tell you that Judge Thomas might not wish to continue to go forward with his nomination, if you came forward?

Ms. Hill. Yes.

Senator Specter. Isn't that somewhat different from your testimony this morning?

Ms. Hill. My testimony this morning involved my response to this USA newspaper report and the newspaper report suggested that by making the allegations that that would be enough that the candidate would quietly and somehow withdraw from the process. So, no, I do not believe that it is at variance. We talked about a number of different options. But it was never suggested that just by alleging incidents that that might, that that would cause the nominee to withdraw.

Senator Specter. Well, what more could you do than make

allegations as to what you said occurred?

Ms. Hill. I could not do any more but this body could.

Senator Specter. Well, but I am now looking at your distinguishing what you have just testified to from what you testified to this morning. And this morning I had asked you about just one sentence from the USA Today news, "Anita Hill was told by Senate Staffers that her signed affidavit alleging sexual harassment by Clarence Thomas would be the instrument that quietly and behind the scenes would force him to withdraw his name."

And now you are testifying that Mr. Brudney said that if you came forward and made representations as to what you said happened between you and Judge Thomas, that Judge Thomas might withdraw his nomination?

Ms. Hill. I guess, Senator, the difference in what you are saying and what I am saying is that that quote seems to indicate that there would be no intermediate steps in the process. What we were talking about was process. What could happen along the way. What were the possibilities? Would there be a full hearing? Would there be questioning from the FBI? Would there be questioning by some individual members of the Senate?

We were not talking about or even speculating that simply alleging this would cause someone to withdraw.

Senator Specter. Well, if your answer now turns on

 process, all I can say is that it would have been much shorter had you said, at the outset, that Mr. Brudney told you that if you came forward Judge Thomas might withdraw. That is the essence as to what occurred.

Ms. Hill. No, it is not. I think we differ on our interpretation of what I said.

Senator Specter. Well, what am I missing here?

Senator Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, can we let the witness speak in her own words, rather than having words put in her mouth?

Senator Specter. Mr. Chairman, I object to that. I object to that vociferously. I am asking questions here. If Senator Kennedy has anything to say let him participate in this hearing.

The Chairman. Now, let everybody calm down. Professor Hill, give your interpretation to what was asked by Senator Specter. And then he can ask you further questions.

Ms. Hill. My interpretation--

Senator Thurmond. Speak into the microphone, so we can hear you.

Ms. Hill. I understood Mr. Specter's question to be what kinds of conversation did I have regarding this information. I was attempting, in talking to the staff, to understand how the information would be used, what I would have to do, what might be the outcome of such a use. We

.

talked about a number of possibilities, but there was never any indication that, by simply making these allegations, the nominee would withdraw from the process. No one ever said that and I did not say that anyone ever said that.

We talked about the form that the statement would come in, we talked about the process that might be undertaken post-statement, and we talked about the possibilities of outcomes, and included in that possibility of outcome was that the committee could decide to review the point and that the nomination, the vote could continue, as it did.

Senator Specter. So that, at some point in the process, Judge Thomas might withdraw?

Ms. Hill. Again, I would have to respectfully say that is not what I said. That was one of the possibilities, but it would not come from a simple, my simply making an allegation.

Senator Specter. Professor Hill, is that what you meant when you said earlier, as best I could write it down, that you would control it, so it would not get to this point?

Ms. Hill. Pardon me?

Senator Specter. Is that what you meant, when you responded earlier to Senator Biden, that the situation would be controlled "so that it would not get to this point in the hearings"?

Ms. Hill. Of the public hearing. In entering into

these conversations with the staff members, what I was trying to do was control this information, yes, so that it would not get to this point.

Senator Specter. Thank you very much.

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator.

Now, Professor Hill, with your continued indulgence, what we will do is, I will yield to my colleagues, alternating, and limit their questions to 5 minutes, if I may, and I would begin with my friend from Massachusetts, Senator Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will just take a moment.

I know this has been an extraordinary long day for you, Professor Hill, and it obviously has been for Judge Thomas, as well, and I know for your family. I just want to pay tribute to both your courage in this whole procedure and for your eloquence and for the dignity with which you have conducted yourself, and, as is quite clear, from observing your comments, for the anguish and pain which you have had to experience today in sharing with millions of Americans. This has been a service and we clearly have to make a judgment. It certainly I think has been a very important service.

Let me just say, as far as I am concerned, I think it has been enormously important to millions of Americans. I do not think that this country is ever going to look at sexual