

can side of the panel might have overlooked its easiest defense, that of dealing with the judge's intelligence.

If these allegations, which I believe to be completely unfounded and vigorously believe unfounded, were true, we would be dealing not only with venality, but with abject stupidity with a person shooting himself in the foot, having given someone else the gun to use at any time.

There is no way Clarence Thomas—CT—would callously venally hurt someone. A smart man, concerned about making a contribution to this country as a public official, recognizing the gravity and weightiness of his responsibilities and public trust, a role model and mentor who would, by his life and work, show the possibilities in America for all citizens given opportunity, well, would a person such as this, Judge Clarence Thomas would never ever make a parallel career in harassment, ask that it not be revealed and expect to have and keep his real career. And I know he did no such thing.

He is a dignified, reserved, deliberative, conscientious man of great conscience, and I am proud to be at his defense.

As I told the FBI agent who interviewed me on Tuesday, October 1, I trust Judge Thomas completely, he has all of my support and caring earned by 9 years of the most positive and affirmative interacting, not only with me, but with other staff and former staff, men and women, and I know he will get back his good name.

Thank you.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much.

Ms. Holt.

TESTIMONY OF DIANE HOLT

Ms. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, Senator Thurmond, and members of this committee: My name is Diane Holt. I am a management analyst in the Office of the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

I have known Clarence Thomas for over 10 years. For 6 of those years, I worked very closely with him, cheek to cheek, shoulder to shoulder, as his personal secretary. My acquaintance with Judge Thomas began in May 1981, after he had been appointed as Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights at the Department of Education.

I had been the personal secretary to the outgoing Assistant Secretary for several years. Upon Judge Thomas' arrival at the Department, he held a meeting with me, in which he indicated that he was not committed to bringing a secretary with him, and had no wish to displace me. Because he was not familiar with my qualifications, he made no guarantees, but gave me an opportunity to prove myself.

That is the kind of man he is.

In May 1982, Judge Thomas asked me to go to the EEOC with him, where I worked as his secretary until September 1987.

I met Professor Hill in the summer of 1981, when she came to work at the Department of Education as attorney adviser to Judge Thomas.

After about a year, Judge Thomas was nominated to be Chairman of the EEOC. He asked both Professor Hill and myself to transfer with him.

Both Ms. Hill and I were excited about the prospect of transferring to the EEOC. We even discussed the greater potential for individual growth at this larger agency. We discussed and expressed excitement that we would be at the right hand of the individual who would run this agency.

When we arrived at the EEOC, because we knew no one else there, Professor Hill and I quickly developed a professional relationship, a professional friendship, often having lunch together.

At no time did Professor Hill intimate, not even in the most subtle of ways, that Judge Thomas was asking her out or subjecting her to the crude, abusive conversations that have been described. Nor did I ever discern any discomfort, when Professor Hill was in Judge Thomas' presence.

Additionally, I never heard anyone at any time make any reference to any inappropriate conduct in relation to Clarence Thomas.

The Clarence Thomas that I know has always been a motivator of staff, always encouraging others to grow professionally. I personally have benefited from that encouragement and that motivation.

In sum, the Chairman Thomas that I have known for 10 years is absolutely incapable of the abuses described by Professor Hill.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much.

Ms. Berry-Myers?

TESTIMONY OF PHYLLIS BERRY-MYERS

Ms. BERRY. You can call me Phyllis Berry, since that was my name that I used throughout my professional life, and that's probably what most people are going to refer to me as.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Thurmond and members of the committee, I am Phyllis Berry.

I know and have worked with both Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill. I have known Judge Thomas since 1979, and Anita Hill since 1982. Once Clarence Thomas was confirmed as the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and had assumed his duties there, he asked me to come and work with him at the Commission.

I joined his staff as a special assistant in June of 1982. At the Commission, Chairman Thomas asked that I assume responsibility for three areas: I was to, one, assist in assessing and reorganizing his personal staff, scheduling, speech writing, and those kinds of things; two, to assist in professionalizing the Office of Congressional Affairs, as that office was called then; and, three, assist in reorganizing the Office of Public Affairs, as that office was called then.

Anita Hill was already a member of Clarence Thomas' staff when I joined the Commission.

There are several points to be made:

One, many of the areas of responsibilities that I had been asked to oversee were areas that Anita Hill handled, particularly congressional affairs and public relations. We, therefore, had to work together. Chris Roggerson was the director of congressional affairs at that time, and Anita Hill worked more under his supervision than Clarence Thomas'.

Two, Clarence Thomas' behavior toward Anita Hill was no more, no less than his behavior toward the rest of his staff. He was re-