

this very carefully, I considered it carefully, and I made a determination to come forward. I think it is unfortunate that that comment was made by a man who purports to be someone who says he knows me, and I think it is just inaccurate.

Senator SPECTER. Well, you have added, during the course of your testimony today, two new witnesses whom you made this complaint to. When you talked to the FBI, there was one witness, and you are testifying today that you are now "recalling more," that you had "repressed a lot." And the question which I have for you is, how reliable is your testimony in October 1991 on events that occurred 8, 10 years ago, when you are adding new factors, explaining them by saying you have repressed a lot? And in the context of a sexual harassment charge where the Federal law is very firm on a 6-month period of limitation, how sure can you expect this committee to be on the accuracy of your statements?

Ms. HILL. Well, I think if you start to look at each individual problem with this statement, then you're not going to be satisfied that it's true, but I think the statement has to be taken as a whole. There's nothing in the statement, nothing in my background, nothing in my statement, there is no motivation that would show that I would make up something like this. I guess one does have to really understand something about the nature of sexual harassment. It is very difficult for people to come forward with these things, these kinds of things. It wasn't as though I rushed forward with this information.

I can only tell you what happened, to the best of my recollection what occurred and ask you to take that into account. Now, you have to make your own judgments about it from there on, but I do want you to take into account the whole thing.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I will proceed with the question of motivation on my next round, because the red light is now on.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

There is one-half hour still to use. I am going to yield the bulk of it to Senator Heflin, but I am going to ask for just a few minutes.

Would you prefer a break?

Ms. HILL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Because you have been sitting there a long time.

Ms. HILL. I will take a break. I need to read the statement from Mr. Doggett.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are not going to go to Mr. Doggett now. Before we get back to Senator Specter, we will break and give you an opportunity to read that statement, which, I might add, we are reading for the first time ourselves.

Ms. HILL. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. But we are not going to break now, so there will be order. Order in here. We will break after Senator Heflin and I ask our questions, and then we will give you time to read the statement, and, as I said, give all us time to read the statement, because the statement is news to me as well as the rest of the committee, other than Senator Specter.

Senator Specter and all of us acknowledge that there is a need to understand the nature of sexual harassment and the way in which people respond to that harassment.

One of the things that you have repeatedly said here, and you have said publicly prior to coming here, is that this was not your idea, you did not want to come here. You have stated, and it appears to be so, that you are a reluctant witness, not one who is out charging down the road. As Senator Specter acknowledged, and as every expert in the field acknowledges, that is not conduct inconsistent with someone who has been harassed.

Now, let me ask you this, though, because I am sure a lot of people, including me, are wondering about it. You indicated, and it is totally understandable, that you repressed a lot. Again, every expert over the years with whom I have spoken about this subject—not about you, not about this incident, but about the nature and the conduct of harassment and the response of the person harassed acknowledges that repression is not unusual.

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But I would like to ask you if, notwithstanding that fact, you can lay out for the committee what, in fact, was the sequence of events that did bring you forward?

You and I had a long discussion—relatively long discussion—the night that the Senate agreed—we meaning the members of the committee—the Senate agreed to put off the vote on Judge Thomas until 6 o'clock this coming Tuesday. I called to tell you that you would be receiving a subpoena so that you would not be alarmed when someone knocked at your door, and then you and I had a discussion about the sequence of events that brought you here. You have made reference to that sequence, directly and indirectly, on this record and off this record, but publicly.

Now, this is not something that you initiated, is that correct?

Ms. HILL. No; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were contacted by a staff person from the U.S. Senate, is that correct?

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you indicated to me you thought that staff person—and it is perfectly understandable, you would, in my view—you thought that staff person was a staff person from the Judiciary Committee, is that correct?

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And then you were contacted subsequently by two other staff persons?

Ms. HILL. Yes. Let me clarify something. I thought that staff person was acting on behalf of a member of the committee—

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Ms. HILL [continuing]. With regard to their duties on the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Which is I understand to be the case, and legitimately so.

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But as we talked, I had indicated to you that I, in my responsibilities as chairman, did not make known the allegations to the committee as a whole until after the committee had begun its meeting. That is not your responsibility, that is mine, but I want to get at this issue, because it seems to me it does go to explain your assertions here this morning as to how you got here.

What ultimately made you decide that you must go public, knowing that all this would occur?

Ms. HILL. Well, I was presented with the information by a newspaper reporter.

The CHAIRMAN. The information that you had submitted to me and I distributed to the committee?

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You were presented with that information and—

Ms. HILL. Over the telephone, it was read to me verbatim by a member of the press.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the thing that was read to you verbatim was the statement that you had submitted and asked me to distribute to the committee, is that correct?

Ms. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So, in your view, you are here as a result of some unexpected events—

Ms. HILL. Definitely.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. And events that turned out not to be within your control?

Ms. HILL. Definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider yourself part of some organized effort to determine whether or not Clarence Thomas should or should not sit on the bench?

Ms. HILL. No, I had no intention of being here today, none at all. I did not think that this would ever—I had not even imagined that this would occur.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as I listened to you today answer very direct questions by Senator Specter, fair and direct questions, you stated here—correct me if I am wrong—that you did not view what was happening to you as a situation in which you would need to have a record to be able to retaliate or sue. Your main objective was to try to stop what you alleged to be happening, from happening, is that correct?

Ms. HILL. That is correct, that was my motive at the time, just to stop the activity.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this what you anticipated?

Ms. HILL. This? No, not at all. I would have never even dreamed, I just can't imagine.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it reasonable to say that it was your hope and expectation that it would not come to this?

Ms. HILL. It was exactly what I was trying to really very—I made greater effort to make sure that it did not come to this, and I was meticulous, I was making every effort to make sure that this public thing did not happen. I did not talk to the press. I was called by the press on July 1. I did not talk to the press. This is exactly what I did not want.

The CHAIRMAN. And is it fair to say that attitude prevailed up until the moment the press person called you and read you your statement?

Ms. HILL. Well, the attitude of not wanting this to happen?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Ms. HILL. It prevails even today.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are beyond that point, as you know.

Ms. HILL. Yes, we are beyond that point, but it certainly prevailed up until that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I ask that is that it is important, it seems to me, for the committee to know why someone would move from one point to the next and still hope that she didn't have to reach an end point, with the end point being a situation like this one here. Am I misstating in any way your desires as you moved along in this process or were moved along in this process?

Ms. HILL. The desire was never to get to this point. The desire—and I thought that I could do things and if I were cautious enough and I could control it so that it would not get to this point, but I was mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you very much.

I yield to my friend from Alabama, Senator Heflin.

Senator HEFLIN. Professor Hill, we heard Judge Thomas deny that he had ever asked you to go out with him socially, dating, and deny all allegations relative to statements that allegedly he had made to you that involved sex, sex organs, pornographic films and materials and this type of thing.

You have testified that this occurred, and that he asked you to date and go out socially. You have testified here today concerning statements that he had made to you about pornographic films and materials and other things.

I, and I suppose every member of this committee, have to come down to the ultimate question of who is telling the truth. My experience as a lawyer and a judge is that you listen to all the testimony and then you try to determine the motivation for the one that is not telling the truth.

Now, in trying to determine whether you are telling falsehoods or not, I have got to determine what your motivation might be. Are you a scorned woman?

Ms. HILL. No.

Senator HEFLIN. Are you a zealoting civil rights believer that progress will be turned back, if Clarence Thomas goes on the Court?

Ms. HILL. No, I don't—I think that—I have my opinion, but I don't think that progress will be turned back. I think that civil rights will prevail, no matter what happens with the Court.

Senator HEFLIN. Do you have a militant attitude relative to the area of civil rights?

Ms. HILL. No, I don't have a militant attitude.

Senator HEFLIN. Do you have a martyr complex?

Ms. HILL. No, I don't. [Laughter.]

Senator HEFLIN. Well, do you see that, coming out of this, you can be a hero in the civil rights movement?

Ms. HILL. I do not have that kind of complex. I don't like all of the attention that I am getting, I don't—even if I liked the attention, I would not lie to get attention.

Senator HEFLIN. Well, the issue of fantasy has arisen. You have a degree in psychology from the University of Oklahoma State University.

Ms. HILL. Yes.

Senator HEFLIN. Have you studied in your psychology studies, when you were in school and what you may have followed up with,