

through all of the facts and come up with some decision, if it is humanly possible—and it may not be humanly possible—of who is telling the truth.

The issue of motivation as to someone coming forward and making a statement that was untrue arising—now, we have gone into various elements that people might think of in regard to motivation, and I want to ask you, and all of you and each of you can answer it: Was she, in your observation, a zealous-cause person, whether it be in civil rights, the feminist movement, or whatever? Did she ever indicate to you that she was as zealous-cause person, who was willing to do great things, move forward, and take drastic steps in order to advance whatever her cause would be?

Judge HOERCHNER. Most definitely not, Senator. I know that she worked under the Reagan administration. To this day, I have no idea how she votes. I have very little sense of where she would fit on a political spectrum. Further, due to the quiet and gentle strength of her nature, she is not someone who seeks a public forum.

Senator HEFLIN. Certainly, you wouldn't use the word "militant" in any degree?

Judge HOERCHNER. I think she would be very offended by that word.

Senator HEFLIN. All right. Ms. Wells?

Ms. WELLS. I would agree with the judge. In all the time that I have known Professor Hill, we have not had a conversation that would indicate a militant viewpoint about current affairs or any particular philosophy. She is very even tempered, in my estimation.

Senator HEFLIN. Mr. Carr?

Mr. CARR. Your characterization of her as militant I found—

Senator HEFLIN. Well, I don't mean to necessarily use "militant." It is probably the extreme word to use.

Mr. CARR. Well, just to respond to that, I am a corporate, sort of a Wall Street lawyer, my profession, and I would consider myself militant compared to Anita Hill. [Laughter.]

Senator HEFLIN. Mr. Paul.

Mr. PAUL. I recall on one occasion asking her specifically about whether she agreed with the policies of the Reagan administration specifically on civil rights issues, and I remember her saying that she didn't have any disagreements with them.

The only time I remember her being at all animated in a political discussion was the lunch table discussion that I referred to in my testimony, where she very strenuously defended her former mentor-teacher Judge Robert Bork.

Senator HEFLIN. I am limited to 5 minutes, and I will sort of go over these and ask each of you to make comments on it: Vindictiveness, a martyr-type complex, desire to be a hero, write a book, spurned woman or scorned woman in regard to romantic interests, and then the issue of whether or not she has any fantasy or out of touch with reality.

I suppose most of you have heard what we have attempted to go over to find motivation, and if you would comment on those, each one of you.

Judge HOERCHNER. Is that to start with me, Senator?