

ward, you have to think again, well, how am I going to pay the phone bill, if I do that. Yes, perhaps this job is secure, but maybe they will post me in an office in a corner with a telephone and the Washington Post to read from 9 to 5, and that won't get me anywhere. So, you are quiet and you are ashamed and you sit there and you take it.

Judge HOERCHNER. Senator, I agree that there is a tremendous tendency toward self-blame in women who are subjected to this sort of experience. It goes so far back into our history, even in the Garden of Eden, who was the bad person there who offered the apple to Adam and had to suffer for that for the rest of eternity or for the rest of human history.

I believe that most women who are in a situation of sexual harassment really only desire cessation of the problem. They have, very often, I believe, little desire for revenge. If the behavior stops, then they are much more comfortable, I believe, but I think the pain remains. I think it is indelible.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me reiterate here that there are two distinct issues here. One is the response of those victimized and the other is whether or not someone was victimized here. This is relevant testimony, what we just heard.

I always find it difficult as to why men can't understand it. I wonder how many tens of thousands of millions of men in this country work for a boss who treats them like a lackey, tells them to do certain things and they stay on the job. We never ask why does that man stay on the job.

I wonder how many men there are, if in fact they are approached by a man on the job who had a different preference than they do, I wonder how ready they would be to go open and say, "By the way, my boss, that fellow up there, approached me." A lot would, just like a lot of women do go forward, and a lot wouldn't.

I don't know why we have so much trouble understanding the pattern of the victimized person, but that is not the issue here today. The issue here today is whether or not there was victimization, whether or not there was harassment. Although this is relevant, I want to keep bringing it back.

The only reason it is brought up now is because those who are making, as they should, Judge Thomas' case keep coming forward and saying, "why would you stay?" I have not brought forward, as was suggested, "expert testimony" on the pattern of victimization, the pattern of behavior that people would engage in.

I have held numerous hours of hearings on that subject, but we are here again, please, as a fellow I used to talk for, a great trial lawyer in Delaware, used to say, please keep our eye on the ball, and the ball is not the overall pattern of harassment in America, but whether or not Anita Hill was harassed. This will only continue to be brought up as long as we continue to ask the question "why would she stay?" There are both legitimate questions but let's keep our eye on the ball as best we can.

Now I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Senator THURMOND. Senator Grassley.

Senator GRASSLEY. None of you have claimed close friendship with Anita Hill. What bothers me in this whole hearing is the fact that these allegations, as serious as they are and as serious as she