

"Hell hath no fury like . . .," and that is what is being implied here.

Now, Ms. Fitch, you said you have no doubt, as I understand it, that the Professor wanted very much to see the Judge move on and do great things for America.

Ms. FITCH. Be successful in his career, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Be successful. But I want the record to note—and correct me if I am wrong—that in those conversations with the professor where you drew that conclusion, that she wished to see him succeed.

Ms. FITCH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You also went on to say, unless I misunderstood you, that you did not believe there was any romantic element to that.

Ms. FITCH. Oh, no, Senator, and we both said the same things about him, and for neither one of us was there any romantic talk about him at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Now, Ms. Alvarez, in a statement that you issued after Professor Hill's allegations became public, you observed, and I quote.

Ms. Hill was not a team player and appeared to have her own agenda. She always attempted to be aloof from the staff, constantly giving the impression she was superior to others on the staff.

Then your statement goes on to conclude that Professor Hill had a "punchant for being self-serving and condescending toward others," and that the allegations she made "are absurd and are clearly an attempt on her part to gain notoriety." You also said the charges are "outrageous, ridiculous and totally without merit."

Now, Ms. Alvarez, my question to you is this: Could there be a different conclusion drawn from your observation that during her tenure at EEOC, Professor Hill appeared "aloof from the staff"? You draw the conclusion from that that she was self-serving and condescending. Could Professor Hill's aloofness have resulted from feeling uncomfortable around the Chairman of the Commission?

Ms. ALVAREZ. No, it was not her aloofness that made me feel like she was condescending. She was aloof, and she has been described that way by a number of people. The way she made me feel, she acted condescending towards others, was that she would say she had this inside track, she knew the Chairman better than anyone else, and therefore she had some sort of rights, because she had worked with him before, because she was close to him, because she knew how he thought and that sort of thing. So she condescended to others in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how about the aloofness part. Could the aloofness be—

Ms. ALVAREZ. Well, she was not aloof from him. She was aloof from the rest of the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Now how do you know she wasn't aloof from him?

Ms. ALVAREZ. Just in the dealings that I saw. She never seemed to avoid him. She never seemed to try and stay away—

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Ms. ALVAREZ [continuing]. Or she didn't respond to him in a staff meeting or anything like that. I am saying that with the other staff she was very stand-offish.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Ms. Holt, did you find her condescending and aloof? You dealt with her probably more than anybody.

Ms. HOLT. She wasn't condescending to me, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. She was not?

Ms. HOLT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I can understand why. She wanted to get in that door, right?

Ms. HOLT. That could have been it.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Myers—and my apologies, do you wish me to refer to you as Ms. Berry-Myers or would you prefer—

Ms. BERRY. It doesn't matter, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Ms. BERRY. I know who you are talking to, either way.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Ms. Myers, did you find her to be aloof and condescending?

Ms. BERRY. I found her to be aloof, and a woman scorned can mean not just in the romantic context, but if your ideas are not longer, the ones that are considered the ones that the Chairman adopts, if your point of view is not given more weight than someone else's, if your—there are many ways, and not just in the romantic sense, but in the ways that—

The CHAIRMAN. I'm sorry. How did you mean them, then?

Ms. BERRY. Pardon me?

The CHAIRMAN. How did you mean?

Ms. BERRY. I meant it with both of those contexts.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean both romantic and in terms of being rejected professionally, in a sense?

Ms. BERRY. Yes. Those were my observations of Anita and the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Can you give me an example?

Ms. BERRY. Of what?

The CHAIRMAN. Of where she was either rejected and you observed the reaction to her rejection, either in terms of romantic entre or an intellectual entre?

Ms. BERRY. Or an intellectual entre? That was my job, as I said, to be the political eyes and ears, and that sometimes meant that I had to advise the Chairman to take a position that was in his best interest and that of the Commission, and not oftentimes a position that was in the best interests of the bureaucracy or of one side or the other. We had to do what was best in terms of enforcing the law, administering and managing the agency, et cetera, et cetera, and sometimes there were ideological conflicts in that way.

And I have heard Anita characterized in the press as a conservative, and I guess I have a different opinion of what that means. At the Commission I would not have characterized Anita as a conservative. I would have characterized her more as a moderate person or a liberal, and there were times when it was necessary that the conservative view prevail, in my opinion, on some positions that the Chairman took that she adamantly disagreed with.