

as a friend, or J.C. Alvarez, she was someone you knew and I assume, you know—in all the ways I leave it to you. You have described your relationship. I won't embellish that.

But, in any event, there were no more calls to you after the last one about the marriage. Isn't that the last one we have recorded for our records?

Ms. HOLT. That is right, Senator.

Senator SIMPSON. In other words, the calls came from 1984 to 1988, 1987—August of 1987, by a woman who had heaped a garbage of verbiage upon her in her life. And the calls continued to come, 15 or 16 of them, and then they ended on that August 4 day in the afternoon when she found—and did you tell her that Clarence had married?

Ms. HOLT. I don't recall that, Senator.

Senator SIMPSON. You remember that conversation?

Ms. HOLT. Not really. I don't.

Senator SIMPSON. In any event, she left the message, which is of the record, congratulations, and that was that.

Senator THURMOND. On the marriage.

Senator SIMPSON. On the marriage. And so that is the last call that Ms. Hill ever made to your knowledge to the agency?

Ms. HOLT. That is the last one to my knowledge, yes.

Senator SIMPSON. Let me ask—you made a statement, Ms. Alvarez, on page 4. A rather powerful comment about Ms. Hill and your alarm as to what she had done and said. It was something to the effect—you have your statement there?

Ms. ALVAREZ. Um-hum.

Senator SIMPSON. It was page 4. I quote from page 4, at the top: "I don't know how else to say it, but it blew my mind to see Anita Hill testifying Friday. Honest to goodness, it was like schizophrenia. That was not the Anita Hill I knew and worked with at the EEOC. On Friday, she played the role of a meek, innocent, shy Baptist girl from the South who was a victim of this big bad man." That is quite a powerful statement.

Why did you say this reference to schizophrenia?

Ms. ALVAREZ. Because there were two different personalities.

Senator THURMOND. Speak out so we can hear you, please.

Ms. ALVAREZ. There were two different personalities. When I worked with Anita Hill and I knew her, as I said, she was not a victim. She was a very tough woman. She stood her ground. She didn't take a lot of anything from anyone, and she made sure you knew it.

And the person who was here Friday was somebody who played a totally different role. Who was I am meek, I am shy, I am overwhelmed, I am victimized. And that was not the Anita Hill I knew. It was two different personalities.

Senator SIMPSON. Well, based upon the years that you have known her, all of you, and worked with Anita Hill, have any of you ever known her to exaggerate small slights that you might have seen, make a big deal out of something that didn't warrant it?

Ms. ALVAREZ. Well, the exaggeration that I saw in her probably most often was about her relationship with the Chairman. You know, that she knew how he thought, she had some sort of special

insight into him, that sort of thing. That was the exaggeration that I saw.

Senator SIMPSON. And so, and I am going to conclude. So have you ever known her to focus on an injustice of some sort that she felt should be remedied? Have any of you seen that? You do. I just asked you because you used that phrase. And I wonder if any of you have ever witnessed in her some exaggeration of a slight or focusing on an injustice of some sort. Do you recall that?

Ms. HOLT. I don't recall, Senator.

Ms. FITCH. There was once an overreaction that stuck out in my mind. It wasn't important, but I thought it was clearly an overreaction. But it was not about anything terribly important.

Senator SIMPSON. Did you notice anything like that, Ms. Myers.

Senator METZENBAUM [presiding]. Senator, your time is up, and I have tried to be patient. It has gone over for several minutes.

Senator SIMPSON. I know but I haven't—just the final witness, if I might. Did you notice anything like that in what I asked?

Ms. BERRY. Not that I remember. Not that I can remember.

Senator SIMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METZENBAUM. Thank you.

Ms. Berry or Berry-Myers, you made one statement that I found quite interesting. You said that, "In that capacity I have been privy to the most intimate detail of his life," meaning, of course, Judge Thomas.

Were you familiar with the details of his family life?

Ms. BERRY. Somewhat. What I meant by that was having to go through the confirmation process I am witness to like—FBI documents, letters for or against, background checks, you know, those sorts of things. That is what I meant by that.

Senator METZENBAUM. Those are the professional parts. You were saying the most intimate details of his life. Did you know, for example, of his relationship with his son?

Ms. BERRY. Yes. His son and my son were friends, and are friends.

Senator METZENBAUM. And did you know the ladies he dated, if any? I am not even sure if he was married at the time you made that statement.

Ms. BERRY. Yes, I know.

Senator METZENBAUM. You knew the ladies he went out with socially?

Ms. BERRY. Some, yes. Yes. I know of them. Some I know. And I knew his wife, yes. His first wife, Kathy.

Senator METZENBAUM. Do you know about personal problems that he had, if any?

Ms. BERRY. I know how, I know the struggle that it was when he was separating from his wife, what impact that had on his life and his son's life.

Senator METZENBAUM. The reason I asked the question is because Judge Thomas said in his statement, "I do not and will not commingle my personal life with my work life, nor did I commingle their personal life with the work life. I can think of nothing that would lead her to this," was the last sentence. It is not relevant to this point.