ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

* * *

In the Matter of:

THE NOMINATION OF JUDGE CLARENCE THOMAS

TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE TO THE U. S.

SUPREME COURT

Interview of GARY LIMAN PHILLIPS

Pages 1 thru 37

Washington, D.C. October 12, 1991

MILLER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 546-6666 GAS

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

In the Matter of the Nomination of Judge Clarence Thomas to be an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court

Saturday, October 12, 1991
Washington, D.C.

The interview of GARY LIMAN PHILLIPS, called for examination by counsel for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in the above-entitled matter, pursuant to notice, in the offices of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Room SD-234, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., convened at 12:15 p.m., when were present on behalf of the parties:

JAMES COOPER, Staff of Senator Biden JEFFERY HARTLEY, Staff of Senator Heflin TRIS COFFIN, Staff of Senator Leahy THAD STROM, Staff of Senator Thurmond BARRY CALDWELL, Staff of Senator Specter

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

PROCEEDINGS

MR. COOPER: My name is James Cooper. I am counsel with Senator Biden's full Committee staff.

MR. COFFIN: I'm Tris Coffin, counsel of Senator Leahy's.

MR. CALDWELL: I'm Barry Caldwell, counsel to Senator Specter.

MR. STROM: Thad Strom, counsel with Senator Thurmond.

MR. HARTLEY: Jeffery Hartley, counsel to Senator Heflin.

MR. PHILLIPS: And I'm Gary Phillips, the witness. Whereupon,

GARY LIMAN PHILLIPS

was called for examination and was examined and testified, as follows:

BY MR. COOPER:

- Q Mr. Phillips, if you could, would you state your address and place of birth?
- A Yes. I live currently at 114 F Street, Southeast, Washington, D.C. I was born in New York.
 - Q And would you describe your educational history?
- A Yes. I graduated from Duke University in 1977. I graduated from the law school in 1980.
 - Q Since 1980, could you describe your employment

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC2 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

history?

Yes. After graduating law school, I worked for the Α Washington office of the law firm Cadwalader, Wickersham & I worked there for about 2-1/2 years. In I believe it was May of '83 I moved to a smaller law firm called Becker & At the time while I was there it became Chameides Chameides. & Partners and I was made a limited partner in the law firm. I left the law firm in the -- in September, approximately September of 1986 and took a job as an attorney-adviser at the Federal Communications Commission, and I am still there today.

- Q In that position, what are your responsibilities?
- I work in the Policy Division of the Common Carrier Α Bureau, and my responsibilities initially were to conduct rulemaking proceedings concerning telecommunications policy. My responsibilities recently have changed somewhat and I am now more in the position of supervising other attorneys in their handling of rulemaking proceedings.
 - 0 Do you know Judge Clarence Thomas?
 - Α No.
 - Have you ever met Judge Clarence Thomas?
 - No.
 - Q Do you know Professor Anita Hill?
 - A Yes.
 - 0 How do you know Professor Anita Hill?

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I met Anita my first year in law school, our first Α year in law school, in 1977, and we have been friends since that time.

How frequently do you have contact with her either 0 by telephone or otherwise?

During law school I would have considered her a close friend, I did consider her a close friend, and we had probably daily contact. When we graduated from law school, until 1980 -- we both moved to Washington. She stayed in Washington until 1983 and during that time we had I would say regular contact. It's hard for me -- I know it varied from time to time and there would be periods when I would see more of her and other periods when I would see less of her. regular contact is specific enough, I would --

0 Once a month?

Α I would say at least once a month, and once or twice a month would be my best quess. Since that time, obviously, our contact has ben less frequent, except during the summer of 1987 when she was in Washington, living in Washington and I saw her again more regularly, fairly regularly over that summer.

And I have maintained phone contact. She comes to Washington fairly often, and I don't know the times that she comes to Washington and doesn't call me, but she has called me when she has come to Washington and we've gotten together

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC 5 507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

for dinner.

We keep up with occasional phone calls, just sort of checking in and seeing how one or the other is doing.

Q When did you first come to know of Professor Hill's allegations of sexual harassment?

A Shortly after Judge Thomas was nominated, Anita called me at work, just to say hello and to catch up, and we were just, you know, talking about things in general, how we were. Then I said, "You're probably sick of this question but what's your impression, what do you think?" and she then told me that the reason she left the EEOC was that she had been sexually harassed by Judge Thomas when she was there.

I asked her whether she planned to go forward with this information and she indicated that she was not inclined to, although -- I mean it appeared to me that she was bothered by the issue and struggling to some extent with the issue.

She also told me that when she left -- at the time she left the EEOC Judge Thomas told her that if you say anything about this it could ruin my career.

Q Did she ever mention anything like this during the period when she was still in Washington working for Judge Thomas?

A She did not -- she did not mention this. I will say that during the period in Washington, that she was in

- 24

MHLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5
507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

Washington she wasn't particularly happy it seemed to me and she had stomach problems. She was hospitalized once, but even beside that hospitalization she seemed to have frequent stomach problems.

Q Were you aware at the time of these problems that she had been hospitalized or did you learn that recently?

I mean I knew that when she was in the hospital. And, I just remember, it was odd because -- it was odd to me because she had a lot of friends, there were a lot of us from law school that moved to Washington and she also had a whole circle of friends that were not from the law school in Washington. I just knew that -- I mean I didn't know them directly but I had heard of them. And she had what I thought was a terrific job and she was dating somebody and it was -- sometimes I would ask her, you know, what's going on or she would just sort of not seem happy, and she was very ambiguous about why.

You know, sometimes she said something to the -she said she missed her -- one of the reasons was she said
she missed her family, and I don't want to characterize this
as I said why and she said I miss my family. I mean it
wasn't that clearcut, and, to be perfectly honest, I mean I - that was just the reason that -- it sticks in my mind now
that was one of the reasons I heard her give. And generally,
it was never clear to me why.

Q I'm confused. Is this a reason for the unhappiness

A Right.

Q -- or a reason for, or did she attribute this as a reason for her stomach problems?

A Well, I think the two were, were interrelated. It seemed to me, I mean not knowing about what was going on in the office I thought that all the ingredients were there for her to be very, very happy. Everything seemed to be going very well. Nevertheless, she had this nervous stomach that she had never had before. And you know, I, when I tried to figure out why and what it was that was going wrong I really -- I couldn't.

And Anita would say she missed her family but it didn't make sense to me because she was away from her family for three years in law school, and although I know she was very close to her family, she was always yanking out pictures of her nieces and nephews, it just, ah, it didn't really make sense to me.

Q Is this something that you were, that you thought about at that time, the reason for her stomach problems and her unhappiness?

A I just remember -- I'm one of those people where if a friend of mine is unhappy and I'm around I almost like feel guilty, and I felt a little bit helpless. I couldn't like --

- ₂₄

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I didn't know why Anita was unhappy.

And Anita is a very private person and if you asked Anita something and she deflected the question, you know, you wouldn't necessarily keep probing. I mean you would, you would stop at a certain point.

BY MR. STROM:

Q Is this the time when she was at the Education $^{\prime}_{--}$ mean $^{\prime}_{\cdot}$ Education with Judge Thomas?

- A This was towards the end of her stay in Washington.
- Q So that was after --

A I can't tell you, I can't tell you precisely whether this started at EEOC or Education.

Q Let me ask you, did she call you on a regular basis when she was working at the Education Department and discuss her work with you?

A I don't think that we discussed -- and when you say discussed?

Q Did she call you on a regular basis and discuss of the work with you when she was! Education?

- A Discuss work?
- Q Yes.

A I mean we would discuss work in the sense of how is work going, and it's just in the way that two friends discuss work.

Q Oh, I know. But my question is did she do that on

— 24

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

a regular basis or was that just when you happened to run into each other?

A We had regular contacts during that time. I don't know whether every time we had contact we discussed work.

Q Did she call you on a regular basis when she was at EEOC and discuss work with you? On a regular basis?

A Again, the same answer. We had regular contact during that time. Sometimes we would discuss work. We wouldn't, I mean I don't -- once in a while, if there was an interesting case or something, we might have a discussion. We didn't discuss in her office, no.

Q My point is so you all talked, obviously, a good bit. You said you were a very close friend to her in law school and you both came to Washington and you were close.

Did she ever mention to you while she was at Education or while she was at EEOC, in her many discussions with you did she ever mention to you any untoward conduct by Judge Thomas to her, ever?

A The only thing that happened was that I remember when Anita first got the job with Judge Thomas all of her friends were excited for her, including myself, because we had heard of him and he seemed to be a rising star. He was what we thought was a moderate black Republican. And -- the specific answer to your question is no, Anita never mentioned the sexual harassment.

- 24

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

You said that --

MR. COOPER: Could I move it forward to get this

The only thing I would say is Anita -- Anita's enthusiasm for the job and for Judge Thomas seemed to diminish, and she was never specific about it.

You watched her testimony yesterday, and I quess you knew she went from Education, followed Judge Thomas to EEOC and worked with him there.

Right.

O Did you know that after she worked with him at Education and EEOC that she stayed in touch with him over the years, she called him when she was in town, that she invited him out to speak? Were you aware of all these things going on even after she left EEOC working for him?

Α She never called him in my presence. I may have on one occasion -- well, this is, this would be speculative so I wouldn't want to -- I don't think I would want to get into it.

I mean, my comment about that is, my only comment about that, and this is me speaking, is that I think Anita did not want to burn her bridges and I know -- I will say something else too. I know Anita was very concerned about making tenure at Oklahoma. And my assumption is that Anita had occasional contact with Judge Thomas to keep up the networking, to make sure she wasn't burning her bridges, to make sure she didn't make an enemy.

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

story on the record, and the go back to this?

MR. STROM: Absolutely.

MR. COOPER: Okay.

BY MR. COOPER:

Q At the time when -- well, you said this was July of this year?

A Yes. And let me -- I think I said this before. I cannot tell you the specific date of the conversation. I know it was shortly after the nomination. It was before any of this broke. And I remember specifically opening up the conversation by saying, "You're probably sick of this subject," which leaves me to believe that it was probably more than a day or two after the nomination was announced.

And I was quoted in the Washington Post as having said it was a day or two, and I think that when I spoke to that reporter I started off by saying a day or two and then realized that that was too specific and that I couldn't verify that, and then said shortly afterwards. And what I got quoted as saying is a day or two.

Q Did she tell you the specific nature of her allegations or did she -- well, go ahead.

A No. And I didn't ask because, as I said, Anita was a very private person and she was respectful of other people's privacy and I felt like this was probably awkward and an invasion of her privacy to press for lurid details.

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

BY MR. STROM:

Q Can I ask one other question, please, if I might?

Here is what I am having a hard time understanding.

You all just talked regularly while she was in Education and at EEOC and then you kind of lost contact when she moved away from Washington. You remained here and, in your words, I believe you said you only, you got occasional calls from Anita Hill.

And then -- if I could just finish the question.

And then --

- A Well, let me clarify that occasional.
- O Yes.

A When I say occasional calls -- I also use the term occasional contact with Judge Thomas. I was I think -- and that was, according to the record, something like 10 phone calls over a period of whatever number of years, eight years.

I had more frequent contact than that with Anita Hill but it wasn't as regular as when she was here. It wasn't once a month.

Q Well, even -- that's fine, too. Let me -- here is my problem with this. She testified yesterday, and you said you heard it, that this was one of the most agonizing, anguishing, painful decisions that she had to make, that she hardly discussed it with anyone. And yet you said after the nomination she called you to say hello and to catch up, I

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC 5
507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

believe that is what you said, and then the conversation turned to Judge Thomas' nomination.

A I turned the conversation to Judge Thomas' nomination.

Q You turned it. And, of course, you inquired about what she thought, and then this most agonizing, painful, anguishing moment in her life came right to the surface and she told you about it, although you all only talked on occasion and she never mentioned it to you before ever while working with Judge Thomas.

Is that the way it happened?

- A Would you just mind repeating the last part of it?
- O Sure.
- A I'm sorry --

Q No. No. That's fine. You said after she left
Washington and you said, and you clarified occasional, but
you said you only had occasional conversations with Ms. Hill.
Sometimes when she would come back to Washington, you would
get together for dinner. And I am just assuming here, but I
assume she never discussed Judge Thomas at dinner when she
came back into Washington, about things that may have
happened or may not have happened while she worked for him.

But then sometime after the announcement of the nomination she called you to say hello and to catch up, is what you said.

A Right.

Q So, after you all visited and you caught up, the conversation turned to Judge Thomas. She testified yesterday how painful this was. She had not told anyone or just a few people.

And I guess you all maintained that relationship.

I am just wondering were you that close? Does it surprise
you that she would tell you something that she said that she
has kept all these years and hardly told anyone, and now that
you have become something less than a close friend, just a
friend, because you hadn't been around her in a while, does
it surprise you that she would reveal that to you after
hearing her testimony yesterday, and having not heard from
her while working at Education and EEOC when you were close
friends.

A I understand your question now. Your question is was I surprised that she chose me to tell this information too.

I can't say I was Anita's best friend at the time, but we had been very close and I think the only thing that kept us apart during recent years was the distance of -- between us. And no, we -- I mean, no, we were close friends and I really can't answer the question other than that.

We were close -- we were very close friends. I think we would -- and we still are close friends. We just

- 24

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 5

Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666 don't talk to each other as much as we did.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

BY MR. COOPER:

- 0 You stated earlier that she expressed her reticence about bringing this information forward, whether publicly or otherwise. Did you encourage her --
 - Α No.
 - 0 --to come forward?
 - A Absolutely not. No.

BY MR. STROM:

When did you talk to her last before she called you 0 concerning Judge Thomas' nomination -- or just to catch up? I'm sorry.

I honestly can't remember. It had been longer than usual and it had been probably a few months. Now let me clarify one other thing or mention one other thing. It's we, a good friend of mine is Keith Henderson. In fact, I -- he is -- I introduced Anita and Keith and they subsequently became friends, and they spoke as well. And sometimes I would hear from Keith that he spoke to Anita and she said "Hi" and so on. So, I mean I sometimes would get sort of a hello from Anita through another person as well.

- So you hadn't talked to her probably in two or 0 three months, your estimate, or four --
 - Or possibly -- or possibly three Α
 - Q It had been longer than usual.

Α Um-hum.

3

And, in this conversation when you all were Q catching up she revealed this incident to you before it became public --

Α That's right.

7

0 -- and before she decided to go forward and share this painful experience that she alleges occurred?

8

Α Yes.

9

0 Okay. That's fine. That's what I wanted. you.

10

BY COOPER:

11

Q Okay. You did not encourage her to come forward with the information?

13

12

Absolutely not.

14

Q When did you know that she had told someone other

15

than you about her allegations?

17

16

told me that he had spoken to Anita and that Anita had told

I had a conversation with Keith Henderson and he

19

18

him that she had been contacted by Senate staff and that she

20

had agreed to provide them with the information that she had

21

told me about, and that she had done so with the idea that the matter would be handled discreetly by the Senate Judiciary

23

22

Committee.

24

Before we get into that, could you explain who Keith Henderson is?

MILLER REPORTING CO., INO 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002-

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Keith Henderson is a friend of mine. He's just a Α friend that I made in Washington. He did not go to Yale Law He's a close friend of mine. And he's a friend that School. goes back to, maybe, 1981. BY MR. STROM: 0 How did he know Anita Hill? He met Anita through me. Q Oh, I see. BY CALDWELL:

So when you spoke with Anita on the phone, you didn't ask her or she didn't state whether or not she had told anyone else this information about the events?

Α I don't recall that conversation. I recall some of the conversation, the parts that I have mentioned, and I recall them very vividly. I can't tell you for sure that that part of the conversation never took place, but I can tell you for sure that I don't recall it.

I want to explore that conversation just a little bit.

What was your general reaction to her comments? I think my first reaction was "poor Anita," what a horrible thing for somebody to have to go through. At some point shortly after that I linked in my own mind her unhappiness with these allegations and it was all of a sudden the puzzle seemed to me to make more sense. I, it seemed to me,

507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 (202) 546-6666

no wonder. This is why Anita was unhappy. This is why Anita moved back to Oklahoma.

Q Did you express that to her on the phone?

A No. I mean, I, I -- I hung up the phone and I thought about it for a while. It was disturbing to me. And I think it was after that.

Q Before the phone call, is there a circle of friends that you may have just discussed generally, "Gee, Anita seems unhappy in light of having this experience"?

A I think a lot of her friends were aware of that and a lot of her -- I mean, any of her friends that you asked I think would say that.

Q After the phone call, did you discuss this with those friends?

A I remember mentioning this to three people. So I mentioned it to three friends of Anita's and mine. One of the people wasn't really a friend of Anita's, someone who had met Anita, was my roommate. Two of the people were mutual friends of Anita, one of whom was Keith Henderson.

I didn't mention this right away. I mentioned this to Keith sometime in September.

BY MR. STROM:

Q Mr. Phillips, you said you were aware that she was having stomach problems while she was at EEOC, I guess it was, because you all were close at that time and you talked

MILLER REPORTING CO., IN 2 5
507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

on a regular basis. And I guess you knew then or you learned after her testimony yesterday that she was hospitalized for a period of time because of that.

- A Um-hum.
- Q Were you aware of that at the time that she was hospitalized.
 - A Yes.
- Q Did you attribute that to -- those stomach problems to her diet or to some stress-related problems? And, considering your closeness to her, did you go visit her in the hospital during that time?
- A I think I found out about it right at the end of her hospital stay and I didn't visit her in the hospital.
- Q What did you attribute her stomach problems to, just based on your conversations with her? Or did you have conversations --
 - A I thought it was stress.
 - Q You thought it was stress?
 - A Right.
- Q Is that based on your discussions with her? Did she tell you?
- A I don't, I mean I have it in my mind right now that it was stress and I don't know. I would imagine that Anita, that maybe Anita told me it was stress. I mean I don't know why I would have come to that conclusion myself.

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

(202) 546-6666

23

Q From her workload? Or what did you attribute the stress to, I mean, being as close as you were to her? Did she mention something at work caused the stress, or something in her family life, or something here in Washington?

A It was not attributed to her family life and there was nothing wrong with her social life in Washington. You know, as I said, she had a lot of friends -- and let me make this clear. Anita was very, very well liked in law school. Everybody liked Anita. She was one of these people that had friends sort of in every corner of the law school. She really was someone who could bridge gaps.

And a lot of people from Yale came to Washington, and there were a lot of us here. And I know she had other friends. And I attributed it, I think, to work pressures.

Again, I had no -- you know, I didn't even imagine that sexual harassment was going on.

- Q Because she didn't discuss that with you then.
- A She did not discuss it with me.
- Q But yet she called you after she had moved away from Washington, after -- you said that then you didn't see her on a regular basis, you all didn't talk on a regular basis, just occasionally, but she would come back -- my problem is that you all were very close at that time, yet she chose to come and tell you this after a long period of time when you all had not been that close.

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5

507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666 Q From her workload? Or what did you attribute the stress to, I mean, being as close as you were to her? Did she mention something at work caused the stress, or something in her family life, or something here in Washington?

A It was not attributed to her family life and there was nothing wrong with her social life in Washington. You know, as I said, she had a lot of friends -- and let me make this clear. Anita was very, very well liked in law school. Everybody liked Anita. She was one of these people that had friends sort of in every corner of the law school. She really was someone who could bridge gaps.

And a lot of people from Yale came to Washington, and there were a lot of us here. And I know she had other friends. And I attributed it, I think, to work pressures.

Again, I had no -- you know, I didn't even imagine that sexual harassment was going on.

- Q Because she didn't discuss that with you then.
- A She did not discuss it with me.
- Q But yet she called you after she had moved away from Washington, after -- you said that then you didn't see her on a regular basis, you all didn't talk on a regular basis, just occasionally, but she would come back -- my problem is that you all were very close at that time, yet she chose to come and tell you this after a long period of time when you all had not been that close.

A Well.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Do you find that unusual?

A I mean not necessarily. I mean I -- there are lots of possible explanations. An obvious one is that at the time the sexual harassment was going on Anita didn't feel comfortable talking to it about -- didn't feel comfortable talking about it to very many people at all. I think to a certain degree Anita still feels uncomfortable talking about it, but she is more secure professionally, she is, has been -- she has distanced herself from it in time, so she may just feel more comfortable talking about it generally and that's why she was able to talk about it with me now, rather than at the time it was happening.

Q Well, when you say now, you mean before, before that information was leaked and before she was confronted with her statement but after Judge Thomas' nomination? It was before she had--

- A Right.
- Q -- had had to discuss it in the press.
- A Right. Right.
- Q So it is not now contemporaneously with her testimony?
 - A No. No. No. Right.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q Mr. Phillips, would you consider her relaying to

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

you the events a very private thing with her? Could you be more specific? Α 0 Well --I mean private in what way? The fact that she had Α 5 been sexually harassed? Something very personal to her. Something very 7 Deep, dark secret. Something that a person may, you know, write into a diary. Something personal of that 9 nature. Would you consider that? Well, yes and no. Obviously, it's a personal 10 Α But she hadn't told me about it and I would not ask 11 matter. her the details. I consider that to be personal. 12 13 The fact that she had been sexually harassed, I wouldn't go telling that, broadcasting it to the world. 14 did share that information to, with two of her close friends. 15 Q Throughout your relationship, say from law school 16 up to the present, can you recall whether there is anything 17 else -- I use this word a little loosely -- similarly 18 personal or private which she may have conveyed to you? 19 I don't think there ever was anything similarly 20 Α 21 personal or private. That is why I use it loosely. Were there other 22 Q private personal events in her life that she may have related 23

A There were none of anything approaching this level

24

to you?

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

of significance. We talked about our social lives in general terms. As I said, Anita was, was a private person. I would know that she was dating somebody. I would know whether she liked the person or not and generally, and how things were going. I wouldn't know any of the more intimate aspects of their relationship.

BY MR. STROM:

Q Mr. Phillips, when she called you after President
Bush nominated Judge Thomas to sit on the Supreme Court and
you all -- as you say, the call was just to catch up. When
the conversation turned to Judge Thomas and you asked her
opinion of it, did she say, I'm disappointed because he
sexually harassed me, or did she say, Well, Gary, I want to
discuss something with you very personal and very private and
I want you to keep it confidential, or did she say --

A She said -- sorry to interrupt. Do you want to finish?

Q No. Or did she say, Keep this private, Gary, but I want to tell you what happened? Did she give any opinion other than what she alleges occurred while working with Judge Thomas as to his fitness to serve on the bench, or did she just start right in with what she says happened?

A She said that the reason she left the EEOC was that she had been sexually harassed.

Q That was her response to Judge Thomas' --

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

21 22 23

6

8

9

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

~ 4

24

A She may have said, and I think she said -- I can't swear to it -- she may have prefaced that by saying I never told you this before but the reason I left the EEOC was that I was sexually harassed.

Q What was your question to her to prompt that response?

A My question to her was to ask her what she thought of the nomination.

Q She didn't tell you what she thought other than the reason I left. I guess it was implicit in your mind then how she felt about the nomination?

A We discussed -- to my recollection, we discussed that. I mean I had posed the question thinking of it in more, you know, what do you think of his mind, and I think that the -- to my recollection, that was her response.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q No other expansion on that? You didn't talk about his philosophy, you didn't talk about his mind? Did it stop right there, to the best of your recollection?

A I don't remember. And just, it's possible we could have, but it strikes me as -- that we wouldn't have because it would just seem almost ridiculous to, well, what did you -- you know, after she says he sexually harassed me to say, "Well, what did you think of his legal scholarship?"

BY MR. STROM:

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

Q But she responded when you said, "What do you think of Judge Thomas' nomination?" she responded, "I left the EEOC because he harassed me."

I don't remember whether she said something inconsequential before that. Let me clarify that. I mean I don't, I can't sit here and tell you the chit-chat that we had before this conversation. The significant aspects of the conversation stick out vividly in my mind, and it's possible that there was sort of some, you know, kind of stuff that didn't stick out in my mind that was the prelude to that.

But I know that she said, after I asked her what she thought of the nomination -- she did not bring up the subject. I brought up the subject. And, after I brought up the subject, she may have said something sort of innocuous or certainly less dramatic first. But whether it was the first thing she said or the second or the third, she then said, "The reason I left the EEOC was that I had been sexually harassed by him."

Did she tell you she was going to go forward and tell anyone else of this during the nomination process?

She told me she was not. She told me she was not Α inclined to.

And did she tell you that of her own volition or 0 did you further inquire?

I think that was my next question when she said Α

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

3

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that. I asked her if she was going to go forward and she indicated that she wasn't going to.

Q That was between July and when she was contacted by Senate staffers here?

- A That's right.
- Q And she told you she was not inclined to go forward?
- A That was between the announcement of the nomination and before she was contacted.

BY MR. HARTLEY:

Q Why do you think she changed her mind and chose to go forward?

A Well, as I said, when I asked her if she was going to go forward she didn't unequivocally say no way, absolutely not. She indicated that she was not inclined to, and it seemed to me that she was struggling with that issue. It just -- and she was bothered by that.

And I don't remember the specific words she said, but the clear impression to me was that she was -- at that time did not intend to go forward but, you know, hadn't closed the door on it.

Q Have you talked to her subsequent to that phone conversation?

A We've traded phone calls and we played a pretty long game of telephone tag and kept missing each other.

BY MR. STROM:

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

- 24

Q You know she taught some civil rights courses, she worked at EEOC. Did she specifically use the term "sexually harassed" to you in that phone conversation, or did she give you specifics of what she alleged?

- A No, she used the term.
- Q Sexually harassed?
- A Yes.

Q Because I know she did not use it in her statement and that's why I find that significant.

A Well, I mean my understanding of that issue is that her view was that Clarence Thomas had engaged in sexual harassment. She felt that whether legally it was sexual harassment was really irrelevant. What was relevant was that this was -- or was not relevant in the sense that this is not a legal claim of sexual harassment. Obviously, the difference between breaking the law and not breaking the law is relevant. But she felt that what was important was to get the information before the Committee and have them consider it for what it was.

So, I think that was -- I mean that is my understanding of that issue.

Q She knows sexual harassment is a term of art. She worked at EEOC. She has taught civil rights courses, and she knows that that is a legal term that is used to describe certain actions. So she, I guess, felt comfortable telling

you that that is what occurred.

A I think in her mind what occurred is sexual harassment. I think she believes that the conduct that occurred or that she alleges occurred, I will say that, you know, for the record --

Q How do you explain then when she later talked to the press that she said I did not use the term sexual harassment in my statement?

A I haven't seen her statement, so I don't know whether she did or not.

Q She said yesterday that she did not, and she said to the press that she did not.

A I think she testified yesterday on that point, and she testified as I said just now, which is that it was her intention to bring this information to the Committee so that the Committee could consider it. This is not a court of law and she was not bringing a legal claim. And she said, yes, in my mind this is sexual harassment but I think whether or not as a legal matter this is sexual harassment may be to disguise the real issue, because this may be considered inappropriate and disqualifying conduct even if as a legal matter this is not sexual harassment. So, to get into an argument as to whether this is sexual harassment is really to create a red herring.

MR. COOPER: Is there any other knowledge, personal

20l

knowledge that you have that you can bring to bear on this matter? Is there anything else that you want to discuss?

Because if not, I have concluded my questions.

BY MR. COFFIN:

Q When you were in law school with Anita Hill, who were her three or four closest friends?

A I will just qualify this by -- I will qualify my answer by saying this is my perception of who were.

Q Of course.

A Okay. I will name a few of her closest friends.

Sonia Jarvis would have to be one. Kim Taylor would have to be another. I know that she was very close to Sue Hershner, but I was closer to Sonia and Kim than I was to Sue Hershner.

So I was more aware of her relationship with Sonia and Kim, so it's hard for me to say.

Q Okay. And, when you were in Washington with her, who were three or four of her closest friends here in Washington, during the time -- you know, that time frame?

A She was dating somebody when she was in Washington. He was a resident, medical resident, and so I would assume that he would be. But I -- that's not a friend, so let me, let me back-track a little bit.

Sonia was in Washington and Anita lived with Sonia, so obviously Sonia would have to be one. I don't know, see - I mean, again, as I said, Anita had a whole circle of

- 24

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5
507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

1	friends outside of her law school friends and I wasn't part
2	of that other circle in Washington. So I sort of saw her in
3	the context of
4	Q Okay. Well, among the law school friends, though,
5	you said Sonia
6	A Among the law school friends, I would say Sonia and
7	Kim. Kim was in Washington.
8	Q Kim?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. Now, the next question for you is do you
11	know John Carr?
12	A No.
13	Q You don't.
14	BY MR. HARTLEY:
15	Q Do you know who John Carr is?
16	A I've heard the name.
17	Q Do you know if he if John Carr and Anita Hill
18	are friends? And where did you hear the name?
19	A I just heard the name in the context of this
20	hearing, and I may have heard the name before but I don't
21	remember.
22	BY CALDWELL:
23	Q Just a couple of things with regard to her
24	indication that she was not inclined to go forward in the

conversation you had with her. Did she ask you or did you

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

sense she was asking you your advice on whether or not she should go forward?

A I don't think so, and I would not have felt like it was my position to advise her on something like that. I thin that is an intensely personal matter and it is something that only she can decide for herself.

Q And the only other question I have is --

A I just want to say one other thing which is relevant, and this is again my understanding. Anita, I mean the suggestion has been raised that Anita might have been a political pawn or something like that. Anita is not at all a political person. Anita, in fact, was -- I mean to the extent that Anita had political views, they tended to be moderate to conservative, and in my opinion any suggestion that she might captive to a liberal special interest group is completely out of character with Anita. In my own view that is just completely ludicrous.

Q That seems to suggest political in the movement sense. What about political or opportunistic in the career advancement sense?

A Well, I don't see how anyone would think that this would advance her career.

Q But there are questions about why she--and she admits that, that it was an advancement, her accession, if you will, in the civil rights field, to move from OCR over to

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002

EEOC.

A Oh, okay. I think going to the EEOC clearly was, and I think that the questions on that issue tended to focus on why Anita thought she might lose her job if she stayed at Education, and that was, she said, one of the factors she considered. I mean, everybody in this room I am sure knows that one of the things you don't do, if you are an attorney in Washington, is take a step down, especially if you are young in your career.

And wholly apart from the issue of whether she could have worked for Thomas' successor at Education, to go from being the special assistant to an Assistant Secretary to being a staffer would be a terrible career move, and at the same time she was being offered a very, very good career position. You know, if you are a young attorney interested in civil rights law and you are two years out of law school, being a special assistant to the head of the EEOC is about as good a job as you can get.

So I think that combining all those factors, and most especially the fact that the harassment had ceased at that point and she had no reason to believe that it would start up again, I think that decision was retrospectively maybe the wrong one, but at the time, for her, a reasonable one.

Q And my last question is, how did we find out about

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you and about the conversation? How did we find out about that?

A You tell me that.

MR. COOPER: I am not sure how we found out about him, and I can't say how the committee found out about him.

I have certainly read about you, but I am not the person that brought you to the committee.

BY MR. HARTLEY:

Q Who have you talked to? Who have you spoken to?

A I spoke to Morgan Frankel, and I believe that, and this is the extent of my knowledge on this--I was a fellow classmate. Morgan Frankel was a classmate of mine. And a classmate named Jeff Cunard must have read the account in the paper, and I don't know whether Morgan did independently, but I was talking to them at about the same time, and then just a few minutes later you called me.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q I'm sorry. Who is Morgan Frankel?

A I thought he was--is he not a Judiciary Committee staffer?

BY MR. HARTLEY:

- Q I have never heard the name before in my life.
- A I do not know.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q Did he tell you that he was a Judiciary Committee

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 5
507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666 staffer?

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Α Obviously not, if he wasn't.

No. I mean, that could happen. There are a lot of people up here.

BY MR. HARTLEY:

Did he say, "I am Morgan Frankel, and I work for..."

I thought he did. Α This all happened just on Thursday. Was it Thursday? I was planning on going away this weekend. In fact, I did.

0 Where to?

Α I had a non-refundable ticket to Miami, and I was going to visit my brother down there. I had tickets to the Miami Hurricanes-Penn State game today, and I had a 6 o'clock flight. I was in my office, and at about--it was late afternoon, I mean it was probably 4 o'clock in the afternoon, I got a call from Jeff Cunard, and Jeff Cunard asked me if I was going to be testifying.

- 0 Excuse me. Who is he?
- He is a law school classmate. Α
- 0 Oh, okay.

Α He asked me if I was going to be testifying. said I hadn't heard anything about that. I had left a message with Sonya Jarvis, who is close friends with Anita and is sort of, I think, working closely on this, that I was

507 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-6666

23 MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 planning on going away for the weekend, and if I was going to be needed, to let me know, and I hadn't heard anything so I assumed I wasn't going to be called.

And then Jeff, a party line, hooked up on a conference call with Morgan, and I thought that Morgan then called you.

BY MR. COOPER:

That is a possibility. Morgan did Q I don't know. not, this person did not call me personally. Whether this person called any person connected with any Senator on this committee--

And then you called me back and I spoke to you, and Α at that point it wasn't clear whether I was going to testify or not, so I decided to go.

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q So Cunard is a friend of yours. Is he associated with the staff or the committee?

Α No, not that I know of.

BY MR. HARTLEY:

Q What does he do for a living? Do you know?

Α He graduated in our law school class. I believe he works for a law firm but I don't know for sure. I know he I hadn't spoken to him in many months, and did at one time. I don't know for sure, I am I am sure that he contacted me. speculating, but given that I hadn't spoken to him, I assume

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5 507 C Street, N.E.

5

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Washington, D.C. 20002

that he was contacting me because he had read what I told the Washington Post

BY MR. CALDWELL:

Q And the <u>Post</u> did not indicate how they found out about you?

A In the article?

Q No, you personally, when you were approached by the Post reporter.

A I approached the <u>Post</u> reporter, but the <u>Post</u> reporter approached one of my housemates from law school.

There were a few of us that lived in a house off-campus.

Bill Hassler. And this is what I was told. I don't know this first-hand.

The article appeared on a Monday—I am getting a little confused as to time—the article appeared Monday morning. On Sunday evening I was at home, and one of my other housemates, Larry Starfield, called me at home and said that a Washington Post reporter had contacted Bill and she was doing a story on Anita. He didn't give her my name because he respected my right to not say anything if I didn't want to. He had her name and number, and I took it and I called her because I had read, frankly, I had read the story, the account—no, it was the next day—I guess I had read sort of some of the smears that were beginning and, you know, I mean, this was—I think it was clear to me that people were

MILLER REPORTING CO., INQ 5

507 C Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-6666

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

going to be engaging in character assassination. And I can tell you I feel very, very strongly that as far as I know, Anita is a person of absolute integrity. And I don't like being here; I would have much rather been in Miami, frankly. I am nervous about the prospect of testifying, and I would not have made myself as available as I did if I didn't feel from the bottom of my heart that Anita is a person of absolute integrity.

I have no questions. Did you want to MR. COOPER: say anything else for the record? If you feel like putting anything in, you know--

> MR. PHILLIPS: No.

MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 1:10 p.m., the interview concluded.]

(202) \$46-6666