

She told me that she was being subjected to sexual harassment from her boss, to whom she referred by name. That boss was Clarence Thomas. Anita's use of the words "sexual harassment" made an impression on me, because it was the first time I had heard that term used by a friend in personal conversation.

Anita said that Clarence Thomas had repeatedly asked her out. She told me she had, of course, refused, but that he wouldn't seem to take "no" for an answer. He kept pressing her and repeating things like "I'm your time" and "You know I'm your kind of man, but you refuse to admit it."

One thing Anita told me that struck me particularly and that I remember almost verbatim was that Mr. Thomas had said to her, "You know, if you had witnesses, you'd have a perfect case against me."

She told me that she was very humiliated and demoralized by Mr. Thomas' behavior and that it had shaken her faith in her professional ability.

At the end of the conversation, Anita seemed more depressed than when it began. Contrary to my hope, talking things out did not seem to have given her any relief or comfort.

After our conversation, I was both saddened about my friend. Because it had been so painful for Anita to talk about the matter, I did not try to pull information out of her. In subsequent conversations with Anita, I learned that the problem continued, but I do not recall in detail further conversations about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, as a result of the high esteem in which her law school classmates hold her, 65 members, over 65 members of Anita's law school class have been contacted and have signed the following statement:

It has been our privilege to know Anita Hill, professionally and personally, since the late 1970's, when we were in law school together. The Anita Hill we have known is a person of great integrity and decency. As colleagues, we wish to affirm publicly our admiration and respect for her.

She is embroiled now in a most serious and difficult controversy, which we know is causing her great pain. We make no attempt to analyze the issues involved or to prejudge the outcome. We do, however, wish to state emphatically our complete confidence in her sincerity and good-faith, our absolute belief in her decency and integrity. In our eyes, it is impossible to imagine any circumstances in which her character could be called into question. We are dismayed that it has been. We know that it could not be by anyone who knows her.

Anita has imperiled her career and her peace of mind to do what she felt was right. We know we are powerless to shield her from those who will seek to hurt her, out of ignorance, frustration or expediency in the days ahead, but we will have failed ourselves, if we did not at least raise our voices in her behalf. She has our unhesitating and unwavering support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Paul.

#### TESTIMONY OF JOEL PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, Senator Thurmond and members of the Committee: I am an associate professor of law at the Washington College of Law at American University here in Washington. Before joining the faculty at American University in 1986, I practiced banking and corporate law in California. I presently teach international business and trade and foreign relations law.

I am here to give my account of what I was told in the summer of 1987 by Prof. Anita Hill——

The CHAIRMAN. The summer of when?

Mr. PAUL. The summer of 1987.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. PAUL [continuing]. And to give my impressions of her character and credibility.

As soon as I read Professor Hill's allegations in the Washington Post, on Monday morning, I realized that I had a duty to come forward and to give my account, because I knew that Professor Hill's allegations were not an 11th-hour fabrication, as some have said, but, rather, a more specific description of the events she related to me more than 4 years ago.

I first met Professor Hill at a 10-day conference of the Association of American Law Schools, in June 1987, at the University of New Mexico Law School. I was impressed by her intellect and her professional achievements.

At that time, she was interested in coming to Washington to research an article she was then writing. I suggested to her that she might want to spend some time at the Washington College of Law, since we are always looking for good teachers and scholars to join our faculty.

Subsequently, I arranged for Professor Hill to come to our school during July 1987, where she was given an office, secretarial support, and use of our library facilities for the summer.

At that point, a number of our faculty were very interested in encouraging Professor Hill to apply for a visiting professorship at the American University. During the course of her research at our school, we had a number of occasions to talk about her interest in the American University and our interest in having her join the faculty.

During one such occasion, over lunch in the university cafeteria, I asked Professor Hill why she had left the EEOC. This was a logical question to ask in the course of discussing with her her employment history. Professor Hill responded, reluctantly and with obvious emotion and embarrassment, that she had been sexually harassed by her supervisor at the EEOC.

I was shocked and astonished by her statement, which is why I remember the incident so vividly. I do not recall whether she went on to say the name Clarence Thomas, but if she had said it, the name would not have meant anything to me at that time, because I had no idea who Judge Thomas was. I asked Professor Hill if she had sought any recourse for her situation, and she said no. When I asked her why not, she said that she felt she had no effective recourse in that situation.

I believe that Professor Hill's statement to me was truthful. Professor Hill at that time had no reason to claim sexual harassment as an explanation for leaving the EEOC. Many people leave government jobs for teaching positions. Thus, I concluded then and I still believe that she was telling the truth.

On Monday morning, after I read the news of Professor Hill's allegations, I phoned some of my colleagues from my home to ask their advice about what to do with this information that I had.

When I arrived at school later that morning, another colleague, Ms. Susan Dunham, on her own initiative, came to me, having read the article in the Post—

The CHAIRMAN. What day was this, again?

Mr. PAUL. This was on Monday morning, sir—and she reminded me, that is, Ms. Susan Dunham reminded me of the fact that I had communicated to her the substance of my conversation with Professor Hill shortly after it occurred.

I then recalled that, indeed, right after my lunch conversation with Professor Hill, I went to Ms. Dunham, who had some practical experience in the field of employment discrimination, and told her of Professor Hill's problems at the EEOC. Ms. Dunham said at that time that this was the case of the fox guarding the hen house. That phrase stuck in my mind. I was pleased that Ms. Dunham independently could confirm my memory of these events.

I had at that time, and I have now, no reason to question the facts as Professor Hill related them to me. I always regarded her as having the highest integrity. I know her to be a deeply religious person.

Moreover, I cannot believe that she could be politically motivated. I know from numerous conversations with her that she served faithfully in the Reagan administration, that she was generally in sync with the goals of that administration, and that she did not disagree with the overall policies of the administration.

Indeed, when Judge Robert Bork was nominated to the Supreme Court in the summer of 1987, I remember vividly that Professor Hill supported his nomination and told me that she held him in extremely high esteem, as a former teacher of hers at Yale. Her strong support of Judge Bork led to a number of loud lunch table disagreements between Professor Hill and other colleagues of mine. Thus, I cannot accept the conclusion that her statements have been motivated by political ideology.

In closing, I would reemphasize that I am here simply to aid the Senate Judiciary Committee in its efforts to determine these facts. I have not taken any position with regard to Judge Thomas' nomination prior to these allegations. Indeed, a national petition of law professors opposing his nomination was circulated at my law school several weeks ago. I was asked to sign it and I refused, despite the fact that 18 of my colleagues signed that petition, as well as many others from other law schools.

I came forward on my own initiative to recount what I was told by Professor Hill. I have not spoken to Professor Hill since sometime prior to the nomination of Judge Thomas. I have never discussed my testimony or any aspect of these hearings with Professor Hill or any person representing Professor Hill, or with any organization or anyone representing any organization.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to help you get to the facts. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me begin by asking you again, for the record, just go down the line starting with the judge, if you will, tell me your college education, your post-graduate education and what jobs you have held since your graduation from post-graduate school, please.

Judge HOERCHNER. I have a bachelor of arts degree from the University of the Pacific, and, more specifically, from their honors