

Senator METZENBAUM. I am not saying what somebody said he said. I am asking him what he said. He said that he did not remember Ms. Amy Graham, that he did not know Amy Graham.

You also indicated that she was white and 19. How did you know that?

Mr. DOGGETT. Senator, when your staff or the staff of the committee—

Senator METZENBAUM. My staff has not been in touch—

Mr. DOGGETT. Excuse me. When the staff of the committee—I corrected myself—made these allegations to me, one of the things I said, and if you read my complete statement, you will realize it is there, is that although I do not remember this person, that does not mean this person was not there; that it is possible that she did work at McKenzie and Company. I just do not remember her. I said that. OK?

The second thing I did after the staffers of committee hung up was to call an associate of mine who started at McKenzie in the company with me, at the same time, a man named Carroll Warfield, and I asked him if he remembered this woman because I did not remember her name at all. I did not remember her face. Nothing about her came into my mind, but I knew it was possible she could have been there. Senator, it has been eight or nine years and I, even I can forget people.

He said, "Oh, yes, I remember her," and he was the one who indicated to me that she was white. That, as far as the age 19, I believe you read that when you read statements that I responded to from the Senate Judiciary Committee staff, and that is how we got the age 19, sir.

Senator METZENBAUM. No, I think it was your statement, but we will just drop it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Thank you. Now let me make one other thing clear. The exception to unsworn statements being placed in the record is when the witnesses stipulate that they are admissible, when the parties mentioned in the statements stipulate they are admissible, and when the committee stipulates they are admissible, which is the case of the Angela Wright stipulation. That is different, so no one is confused later, that there is a fundamental distinction.

Now, Senator, who had the—

Senator THURMOND. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Senator SPECTER. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was in the midst of questioning Mr. Doggett and Professor Kothe when we had to take a brief recess for Professor Kothe, so I shall resume at this point.

I think it is worth noting, Mr. Chairman, to amplify what Mr. Doggett has said—if I could have the attention of the chairman for just a moment—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I'm sorry.

Senator SPECTER. Late yesterday evening when we caucused and the chairman stated his intention to try to finish the hearings today—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator SPECTER [continuing]. I then reviewed what had to be done, and at about 6:45 this morning called Duke Short and said we ought to have Mr. Doggett here, and that is why he was called this morning at about 7 o'clock, he said—

Mr. DOGGETT. 6:30, sir.

Senator SPECTER [continuing]. 6:30 central time, so he has been on that track to accommodate our schedule so we could finish today.

Mr. DOGGETT. I don't mind staying here as long as you need, sir.

Senator SPECTER. Well, that is probably going to happen. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOGGETT. I sense that.

Senator SPECTER. I want to explore with you what conceivably—I don't want to overstate it—could be the key to the extremely difficult matter we are looking into. And I had said, shortly before my line of questioning was interrupted, that we have been working on the proposition that either Anita Hill is lying or Judge Thomas is lying.

And we have explored earlier today, with a panel of four women who favor Judge Thomas but who knew Professor Hill very well, the possibility that there could be in her mind that these things happened when they really didn't. And I developed that question after talking to a number of my colleagues, because we have been discussing this matter all day, and it originated with the two affidavits or statements, your affidavit, Mr. Doggett, and Professor Kothe's statement that was not sworn to, where the word "fantasy" was used.

And it may be that we are not limited to the two alternatives, one, that he is lying; two, that she is lying. Perhaps they both think they are telling the truth, but in Professor Hill's case she thinks it is true but in fact it is not. And you testified to a very interesting approach when you referred to the testimony of Mr. John Carr, whom you said you went to graduate school at Harvard with, where you made a key distinction between the way Professor Hill viewed the relationship and the way John Carr viewed the relationship. And I think it would be worthwhile if you would amplify that, as you had started to articulate it earlier.

Mr. DOGGETT. Senators, at every step—in fact I remember when I was at Yale Law School seeing Senator Kennedy give a speech to people at Yale, back in the early seventies—at every step of my education, at Claremont Men's College, at Yale Law School, at Harvard Business School, one of the things I tried to do was to provide assistance to make sure that black law students and Hispanic law students would have the best possible opportunity to do as well as possible, because I had something to prove, Senators. I had had people tell me that I could not be good because I was black, and I was out to prove them wrong.

Because of that, I was asked by my colleagues at Harvard Business School, in part because I was an older student and in part because of my commitment to excellence, to be the Education Committee chairperson for the African-American Student Union, and to organize tutorial study groups and other support activities to make sure that every one of our people had the best possible

chance to do as well as possible, to excel. That is how I met John Carr.

I know John Carr, and I think I know him well. I definitely know him better than I know the judge and I know the professor. I saw John Carr this May at Harvard Business School for our 10th Harvard Business School Alumni reception, reunion, and we talked.

In those 10, 12 years, John Carr has never mentioned Anita Hill to me. We have talked about women John Carr has had relationships with. I have called him up at times and said, "Hey, man, haven't you gotten married yet?" because we were that close, and he would say, "Well, you know, there really hasn't been anybody special." We have talked about the issue of John Carr's personal life, and her name never came up in the way that she described herself.

I, as the Senator asked me, am not a psychiatrist, I am not a psychologist, and so maybe I am not qualified to use the term "fantasy" from a professional standpoint, but as a lay person and an individual, that is what I felt. And given what John Carr has said and has not said, given what the Professor has said, given that she has described a series of activities where Clarence Thomas was obsessed with her—every time she said no, he would try to get her to relent and go out with him, over a period of years, obsessed with her—I have to deal with the realities that if he was so obsessed with her, why did he never talk to me about her or anybody else about her?

One of the things, Senator, that stunned—I won't use that word again—that amazed me about the testimony of the women who worked with Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas, is that they came up with conclusions very similar to what I put in my affidavit, and these are women I have never met. These are women who knew both of the people involved in this hearing at this stage far better than I did.

I was going to a gut sense, on male intuition. They were saying the same thing, without any communication between the four of them and myself, based on years of observation. I find that amazing.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Doggett, you heard the testimony of the panel with Ms. Berry on it? You were in the hearing room at that time today?

Mr. DOGGETT. Hearing room at the end, and I was at the hotel looking at it on TV, sir.

Senator SPECTER. So you saw the panel with Ms. Alvarez, Ms. Fitch, Ms. Holt—

Mr. DOGGETT. I saw most of what they said, although I missed part of it as I was coming here to appear before you gentlemen.

Senator SPECTER. Did you hear the part where Ms. Berry testified to amplify an interview which she had given to the New York Times, that Professor Hill was rebuffed by Judge Thomas?

Mr. DOGGETT. I do not remember the exact facts, but I heard most of her response to the New York Times—

Senator SPECTER. Well, I think it would be worthwhile for you to refer to whatever you heard of their testimony, in terms of their statements as to the relationship between Judge Thomas and Pro-

fessor Hill, because their testimony was extensive as it relates to the approach you are articulating.

Mr. DOGGETT. Right. My experience with Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill was inconsistent, as I said, with what she was alleging, and based on my experiences over a period of a year and a half with Anita Hill and over a period of 7 or 8 years with Clarence Thomas, I came to some conclusions as a lay person, as an individual, as an untrained non-professional, where I used the words "fantasies" and I talked about her possibly reacting to being rejected. I did that sitting in Austin, Texas, Thursday afternoon, on my computer with my word processing software.

Today, gentlemen, as you know, four women I have never met and have never talked with came to the same conclusion based on extensive experience and observations with Anita, with Professor Hill and Judge Thomas. Mine was just intuition, gentlemen. Theirs was based on experience, and we both came, all five of us came to essentially the same conclusion. That surprised me, but now I am not surprised.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Doggett, what similarities, if any, do you see between the description you have made of your own relationship with Professor Hill, where you categorized in your affidavit her response to being rejected, and the relationship which Professor Hill had with John Carr, where she had exaggerated the relationship as you have testified from your personal knowledge of the two of them, and the relationship with Judge Thomas, where she has represented the kind of a relationship which Judge Thomas has flatly denied and others who know the two of them think totally implausible?

Mr. DOGGETT. In my case, Senator, which I obviously can talk about the clearest, she came up to me before we left—before she left for Oral Roberts University, and basically chastised me for leading her on, and gave me in effect advice that I should not in the future lead women on. I felt at the time, and the good chairman of this committee notwithstanding, I still feel at this point and I will always feel that that was totally inappropriate, given everything I tried to do to be a supportive, older upper-classman, part of the Yale Law School group.

Regarding Mr. Carr, John Carr, Attorney Carr, my friend, I have had a series of conversations with this man over the past decade. He has never, ever said that he was dating Anita Hill. When he was here under oath he said, to paraphrase him, "I would not define our relationship as a dating relationship."

Regarding Judge Clarence Thomas I have the least information, because he never, ever at any time mentioned this woman to me. And at the time, the one time that I have concrete observation about her perception of how she thought she should be treated by me vis-a-vis Judge Thomas, she wanted to go into Judge Thomas' inner office at EEOC because she felt that was appropriate, and for me it didn't make any sense at all.

So in those three instances—my own personal experience, a statement by a business school colleague and friend of mine, and my one observation about Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas back, I believe, in 1982, there is a consistency in a perception of something that did not exist.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Doggett, do you think it a possibility that Professor Hill imagined or fantasized Judge Thomas saying the things she has charged him with?

Mr. DOGGETT. You know, part of what makes this so unpleasant for all of us is that her charges are so clear, explicit, and extreme. I know how difficult it has been for me to even remember what happened back in 1982, so one of the things I did was take some time off from work to look at Anita Hill when she was testifying before this committee, and I will tell you gentlemen, she looked believable to me, even though the words she was saying made absolutely no sense.

I believe that Anita Hill believes what she has said. I believe, and I am saying this under oath, that there is absolutely no truth to what she has said. But I believe that she believes it.

I was impressed with her confidence, her calm, even though the things she was saying in my mind were absolutely, totally beyond the pale of reality.

Clarence Thomas told me in his office that "These people are going to shoot at me. I have a target on my back. It is one of my jobs to make sure that I am not going to be the black in the Reagan Administration that gets tarred and feathers."

Doing what she alleges that he did with her was a prescription for instant death. Clarence is not a fool. And quite frankly, Anita Hill is not worth that type of risk.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Doggett. Very powerful.

Professor Kothe, just a question or two, and this is following up on what Senator Biden had asked you, and it relates to the testimony which you had given that Professor Hill was very complimentary about Judge Thomas. There has been considerable testimony given by people who have tried to explain Professor Hill's activities in the sense that she was controlled by Judge Thomas when she worked for him, and that even after she left him she needed him for a variety of assistance.

But my question to you is did there come a point where she had sufficient independence from Judge Thomas so that a continuation of laudatory, complimentary comments which you have testified about would tend to undercut her credibility that he had said these dastardly things to her early on?

Mr. KOTHE. I am not so sure that I grasped the essence of your question. I don't know that she was ever dependent upon him for adulation. She had a continuing relationship, I think of a professional nature, with the EEOC. She was doing some studies and getting materials from them, and the things that we were working on together, we both derived information from the EEO office.

Just how extensive was her continued interaction with Chairman Thomas, I really don't know.

Senator SPECTER. Well, let me break it down for you, Professor Kothe, to this extent. You have testified that you thought her charges were inconceivable, as I think you have earlier said. Is that correct?

Mr. KOTHE. Yes. Absolutely.