004651 OCT2491

DEAR Bryan or Susan

I am sending this article in the hope that C Span will find that it provides some insight. It may even be worthy of some attention.

I am just the average viewer who followed the hearings. The contradictions did not make sense. During Monday night I sat down by my computer and systematized the facts I recalled. Instead of looking for a motive I looked for patterns in the testimony. The outcome of using this method was a total surprise. It was none the less logical in its own right.

I have so far shown it to six friends of mine, including one psychologist and one professor. One said: "I was hit in the stomach like when I hear a truth, which I refused to see."

All others said something like "that's it." They all suggested that I should try to get it published a.s.a.p.

[redacted]

[redacted]

ORLANDO FL. 32818

[redacted]

HILL versus THOMAS
A TV VIEWERS VIEW

When the reports about Anita Hills allegations surfaced, I thought Thomas´s nomination would be history. Maybe I just rationalized to make it fit into my view, that Thomas should not be confirmed for the Supreme Court. The Wall Street Journal described how a friend of Hill had heard her story years ago. Upon Thomas´s nomination the friend contacted Kennedy´s congressional staffers, and the rest is history. I concluded that she was a reluctant witness, which only made her more believable.

I knew the hearings would be a hit. Ugly but interesting. It would be just like boxing with those two slugging it out. "Sexcrazed black male" vs "Ms Baptist believable Professor".

EVERY PICTURE TELLS A STORY!

Watergate´s TV coverage taught us, what a bad liar looks like. Irangate showed us a couple of bad liars like Secord and Poindexter. It also showed us two extremely believable ones: Reagan and North. North was a telegenic genius. He was very good at avoiding blatant lies, but you could discern a pattern of deception from, what he avoided, and from the way he put a spin on things. "The Teheran tapes" and other witnesses have shown us, what a liar he was. Still, the truth was clearly to be seen on the hearing tapes. Every time you watch them, you discern a little more about Norths pattern of deception. I was confident that the "Hill" hearings would provide a discernible pattern.

HILL´S TESTIMONY

I sat riveted to the screen, when Hill began to testify. Yes, her outline of her lack of action and the ongoing contacts were believable. My wife works as an engineer in a mans world. She regularly experiences harassment, and she would never file a complaint. She knows that she may win the battle of the complaint, but she will loose the war. Filing a complaint and taking legal action is a sure career stopper. That is true in the nineties, and it was even more true in the eigthies. Professor Hill was all mom and applepie. When she finished her prepared statement, I was convinced that Thomas not only engaged in male locker room talk and hit on his secretaries, but also was a very, very sick man.

The answers Professor Hill gave under cross-examination truly amazed me, because she demonstrated a cunning ability to manipulate impressions. She was a professional at putting a spin on things. Not as good as North, but she came close.

Anita Hill clearly gave the impression, that she feared for not only her career, but also her income, when Thomas left for EEOC. When confronted with the fact, that she was a grade "A" employee, who could not be fired, she could have answered that she knew that, but that she was afraid of being sidetracked careerwise. Instead of doing that, she said that she in 1982 did not know her 1982 job security status! Excuse me, every government employee I have ever met, know that by heart. Even government employees, who cannot remember their social security number, can rattle of the facts of their employment status. I now

felt that Professor Hill was capable of lying!

In describing Thomas's alleged quest for dates, she used words as "again and again" and "it went on and on". When asked how many times in total, she replied with a stutter: five, five maybe ten times! Was I the only one to drop my lower jaw? Five maybe ten times over three years. Her earlier use of words created an impression of incessant continuous obsession. Even one request for a date would have been improper, but the point is, that she demonstrated a cunning ability to manipulate the audience. She knew how to put a spin on things and she was good at it.

Why did she never say: "Clarence I respect and admire you, but your talk about pornography and your asking me out for dates are revolting to me. Will you please stop it." She clearly stated that she never said anything to that extent. That to me is incredible considering her education and intellect. All the rest is plausible. It is credible to me that she never took notes, that her ambitions made her follow him, and that she staid in contact with him.

The surprise was her reaction, when she was pressed on the issue, that she of all people would not know what to do. She a lawyer at the EEOC had to be an expert! Once again Ms Hill chose to become evasive and put a spin on. She answered, that she was an expert in commercial law. That was, what she was teaching in Oklahoma, and that was, what she had been working with in private practice. Specter then asked her, what she had been teaching at Oral Roberts. Reluctantly, she answered that she had been teaching civil rights! Her ability to put a spin on facts was rapidly transforming my view of Ms Goody Twoshoes.

What she really was doing deserves a parallel. Let us imagine a tort case where a a wife sues her former husband for emotional pain and suffering. The wife alleges lewd and insensitive behavior during their 1982 to 1984 marriage. Her otherwise impeccable husband had destroyed their sexlife, because he again and again would burp and and scratch himself in peculiar places during foreplay.

Q "Did you ever ask him to stop his revolting behavior?"
A "No, he was an overtowering figure in my life, I was confused and dependent."
Q "You never let him know?"
A "Well, sometimes I sort of did through my body language and attitude, but he was so dominant. I never knew what to do."
Q "Mrs. X what was your occupation from seven to ten years ago, when this supposedly occurred?
A "I have a degree in psychology and I work as a management consultant."
Q "In what field of expertise did you work during this abusive period?"
A "I am an expert in management consulting, my first job was also in that field."
Q " I repeat, what was your first job after the divorce seven years ago? Did you for the next two years teach as a professor in sextherapy at the University of Illinois?"
A "Yes."

Q "During your marriage, did you work in the field of sextherapy as a sextherapist?"

A "Yes."

The hypothetical sextherapist and the real lawyer both knew that they might seem believable if they were perceived as Ms. Goody Twoshoes. They would have a harder case, if held to the standards of what a reasonable decent person would do. Anita Hill knew, that it would be damaging to her if held to the higher standard of an assertive lawyer and expert in civil rights. Her evasiveness was a blatant example of playing fast and loose with facts. Her attempt to do it, and belief that she could get away with it, raised concerns about her perception of reality.

The next thing that stunned me was her statement about her "last night at the job dinner" with Thomas. During this meal he supposedly said to her, that she could destroy him, if she ever told. Up until then I had believed that Thomas might be an insensitive "lockerroom womanizing chauvinist" without understanding for women. One of those persons who are offensive without knowing it. Up until this point I had the feeling that the stories could be somewhat reconciled. He would not interpret his lockerroom and prowling as harassment. Moreover, she was on the other hand reading a bit more into it, than what most other women would do!

Now, one of them had to be lying!

This was a pivotal point in her statement, and I was sure that later questions would shed light on this watershed event. Amazingly, there was no questions about the context. Did he just sit there and say: "Anita, this is an excellent lobster, the steak is delicious. By the way you will destroy my career, if you ever tell about the pubic hair on my Coke can. Uhmmm dessert looks great."

It amazed me even more, that she did not recall, where they had dinner. She did not remember the dinner. She did not remember how she got there. She was not sure, but she thought that she took the sub home. Sorry, but every "last night dinner" with my bosses, on the last day prior to me leaving a town where I have spent years are etched into my brainstem. Many people do not have that kind of memory. Still, most battered or harassed women remember the last night with the violator. The moment where they broke out of his dominance stands clear in their memory. Admittedly not always. Still, it seemed odd, very odd indeed.

Specter´s questioning regarding Hills conversations with Senate staffers about an anonymity deal clearly indicated, that he was onto a discrepancy. He was painting her into a corner, and he did repeatedly offer her to jump out. Hill, an experienced lawyer sounded eerily like Mary Beth Whitehead. Whitehead like Hill repeatedly got herself trapped in impossible contradictions. Increased pressure on a provable discrepancy should cause an experienced person to back down and "remember." The more this individual was pressed up against the wall, the faster she would lie.

What kind of ride was she taking us on? The calls from the staffer, and the calls from a certain journalist, were the two

events, which pulled her into this maelstrom. It is not by any stretch of imagination plausible, that she cannot remember the order or content of those calls. Everyone remembers the sequence of life changing events, which rips them out of anonymity.

The order of events and content of calls would probably have thrown a less positive light on her allegation. To avoid that she chose to lie. She did only recant, when the handlers told her that she would otherwise be caught in a blatant lie. Once again it raised serious questions in my mind about her perception of reality. She must have known, that records regarding staffers calls exists, and she still thought that she could get away with lying! This was a Yale lawyer, not Mary Beth Whitehead!

The rest of her testimony seemed plausible. At the end of her testimony I felt sure that Thomas was a goner. Anita Hill would not concoct a lie of this enormity. Yes, she was lying at the periphery of her story, and she had shown a propensity for playing fast and loose with the facts. That did not mean that the center of her story was untrue. Still, an insensitive chauvinist, who tries to date his subordinates and engages in degrading lockerroom talk will not be confirmed to the Supreme Court. If he got away with this kind of behavior seven years ago, he would have done it again. Women would come out and prove the track of "Bigfoot" beyond even a reasonable doubt.

THE THOMAS TESTIMONY

As I expected, he categorically denied her allegations of sexual harassment. The only surprise was him telling about visits to her apartment!

I had hoped that we could have moved on to third party witnesses. They would be the key. Instead we were presented with political grandstanding. The Republicans building up Thomas´s outstanding record and character, and the Democrats engaged in characterassasination.

The one interesting point was, that Thomas had the guts to point to the underlying racism! Most black people I talk to believe that racism played a big role. Most white people I talk to denies, that there was any racism involved. Well, if you could not see the racebaiting in the Stuart wife murder in Boston, and the covert racism in the Willie Horton ads, then you are excused from seeing it here.

Metzenbaum let racism out of the closet, by using some incredible allegations to characterassassinate John Doggen as another "Vile sexcrazed male." It was there for all the world to see when John Dogget responded: "Anyone who believes, that a 33 year old black man, on the first day on a new job goes up to a 19 year old white girl and kisses her on the mouth in the midst of the lobby, should have their head examined by a psychiatrist!"

Is Metzenbaum not a racist?

If a white American UN observer tomorrow stood accused in Baghdad of going into the presidential palace´s lobby and kiss the first the best Arab woman on the mouth, would Metzenbaum believe the allegations? Would you?

Would Metzenbaum believe any white male, who testified that Anita Hill, during her first day of work at Oral Roberts University right in front of the church, came up and kissed him

on the mouth saying: "Are we going to have fun!"

White America have this distorted picture of "The vile, prowling, sexcrazed black male." Every time we are fed the image we swallow it bait, hook, sink, and line. Charlie Stewart knew that. The makers of the Willie Horton campaign knew that. The one who planned the timing of the leak knew that. The Anita Hill story was tailor-made for our latent racist biased stereotype of the threatening black male. Just see how the country flips out, when a film is made about a black man and a white woman! Try and count a thousand kisses on daytime soap, and check if there was one interracial kiss!

The "leaker" knew that feeding this to the public was easier than shooting fish in a barrel. He did not only have Anita Hill´s allegations about a "vile, prowling, sexcrazed, black male," he did also have a black male, who had dared to break the taboo of taboos by marrying a white woman!

Yes, this racebaiting was swallowed hook and sink. Hopefully, it will remain stuck in our throats and make us sick to our stomachs until we become honest about how biased we are.

THE WITNESSES!

I was sure that Thomas would get nailed!

All the witnesses were good and upstanding citizens. Some of them demonstrated a Hill like cunning in their ability to put a spin on testimony. Phyllis Berry, Susan Hoerchner, and John Doggen all showed that they had an ax to grind. Not that they were not telling the truth, but their propensity for playing up minor events detracts from their credibility.

Phyllis Berry, was Thomas´s political eyes and ears, and she would be the one to spinn things his way. She had prior to the hearings told the press, that she had a hunch, that Hill had a crush on Thomas. She failed in substantiating her rumormongering. Phyllis Berry´s spin control even made her name another male superior of Anita Hill, who had less of an impeccable reputation!

Susan Hoerchner´s speech about Thomas only having to blame himself for his troubles was out of bounds. It was only one of many examples of her willingness to draw conclusions unfitting for a true witness. She, the closest friend, was probably the one, who originally contacted Kennedy´s staff about the Hill story. If she was the one who pushed her friend into the maelstrom, then she had an obligation to help her out using all means.

John Doggen´s story about Hill´s "naive romanticism" may hold a key to this drama, but it was in and by itself not that decisive. He talked about other "facts". The way she reacted at Yale Alumni network parties, her behavior at the EEOC office, but he did not substantiate his conclusions. Doggen was even better at putting spin on his allegations than Anita Hill was. If he had had more substance, he if anyone would have gotten it out.

THOMAS´S SIDE!

Thomas´s witnesses impressed me as assertive, compassionate, and intelligent women. Anita had worked among those women, who did not only chew nails, but who also would spit them out again. Hill could hardly have made it in that team, if she was

the meek character we saw testify. Many of those women had experienced harassment themselves. They had worked intimately with both Hill and Thomas, and none of them had noticed any indication of harassment. They could not explain it. The fact that they to some extent were pushed into trying to speculate for motives troubles me. Still, those were the only persons, who observed Hill and Thomas interface for years. Not even they could come up with a plausible answer.

The one thing they were able to convince me about was that Thomas never ever engaged in locker room talk. That he never asked employees for dates. Moreover, he actually listened to and advised female employees, who had experienced sexual harassment. He understood what sexual harassment is, and could not unwittingly have engaged in it. That in and by itself did not prove him innocent.

Now there was only one option. Either Thomas or Hill had a quirk in their personality the size of Grand Canyon!

HILL´S SIDE!

Hills corroborating witnesses stunned me. They confirmed that she had told them of harassment without really going into detail! Incredible, that is like someone telling you that they are " "somewhat pregnant." Ten months later when they repeat "the somewhat pregnant story," you fail to ask the "who is the father question." What about the delivery on the first one.

Everyone who has had a friend tell about battery, rape, harassment or other traumas knows "the pattern". You sometimes have to prey your friends open about what bothers them, but as soon as they begin to talk, the floodgates swing open. You say "oh no what happened" and you share in their tears, when they unload the specifics of their painful experiences. Professor Hill is the first person I have heard of, who only tells a half told story to her closest friends! The reaction of those four seem so atypical to me.

Two of them never even heard her name the perpetrator. I believe that she told them of painful experiences, but everything else does not fit "the pattern" of a truly traumatized person confiding in her friends. Traumatized persons get overcome with emotional pain, when they revisit the experience. Where were Anita Hill´s emotions, when she revisited during testimony?

The most amazing corroboration from this panel was the fact that John Carr contradicted Professor Hills testimony, and supported John Doggen´s. Hill had stated that she had been dating Carr. He stated they they had gone out to dinner more times, but he would not characterize the relationship as dating!

HILL´S DISCERNIBLE PATTERN

SPINCONTROL!

She put an exaggerated spin on the number of dates requested!

She put a minimizing spin on her civil rights expertise!

She put an exaggerated spin on Dean Kovter´s influence over her.

Her "poor little me" spin on the events surrounding the trip

to the airport was diametrically opposed to Kovter's and Thomas's testimony.

FROM GRAVE INCONSISTENCIES TO UNTRUTHFUL STATEMENTS!

The telephone calls. At first they were garbage. Next, she said, that it was calls to the secretary. She changed it a third time, when it became undeniable that what walks like a lie, and quacks like a lie, is a lie.

She denied knowing Phyllis Berry. The reality of having worked under Berry for years forced her to change her statement.

At first she stated, that she had had no social contact with Thomas beyond the "you can destroy me dinner." Thomas's testimony dramatically improved her memory. Just another flip flop.

After the lunch break she came back and recanted about her contact to Senate staffers. This lawyer was at least smarter than Mary Beth Whitehead.

Apart from the big question. Thomas's and Hill's testimony differed on two points. The drive to the airport, and Thomas visiting her apartment. Both instances came down on Thomas's side!

OUTRIGHT LIES!

Anita Hill lied under oath, when she was questioned about the "anonymity deal." No reasonable and decent person could forget the order and content within a few weeks!

She lied, when she stated that she did not know her 1982 job status in 1982!

Two sworn witnesses testified that her statements during testimony were diametrically opposed to their experience of events at the convention in Atlanta. Another lie within a few weeks!

PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE!

Not even Ollie North's two day testimony left that many gaping holes. The pattern is clear! The preponderance of evidence shows Anita Hill to play fast and loose with facts, and that she repeatedly lied. The web Hill entangled herself in in seven hours would have untangled her story during a second cross-examination. She was smart enough to avoid that. Still, the extent of her contradictions points to a rift in her character the size of Grand Canyon.

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that neither Hill nor Thomas have a rift in their character the size of the Grand Canyon. Still, there is a truth the size of the Grand Canyon hidden between those two individuals. Both of them are telling the truth, but not the whole truth.

We have all been through the experience of accuser and defender. "Mommy, mommy Brian pushed me and I fell down the stairs!" "No, I did not push Jeff down the stairs!" Jeff and Brian are both telling the truth, but not the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Close questioning of Jeff will show that he was pushed and fell, then he got up ran to the stairs, stumbled and rolled down.

Brian is speaking the truth when he says "No, I did not push Jeff DOWN THE STAIRS!" The reason Brian does not volunteer the truth is that they were both playing with fire, and they do not want mommy to know about the forbidden game.

Thomas stonewalls the skeleton by avoidance!

What is Anita Hill avoiding. How could Anita Hill lie so much, and still pass a lie detector? The simple truth must be that she did not lie, when she told about his quirky remarks. Neither did she lie, when she told of him asking for dates. What she avoided to tell was, that they were lovers, and that the quirky remarks related to a mutual and consenting relationship between lovers.

Now we know, why she never requested him to stop. Now her "somewhat pregnant" stories to her friends fits in. Yes, she had trouble with Clarence her boyfriend not with a harasser. Her missing emotional pain is explained. It explains the web of lies created to shield a skeleton.

All the time she knew, that Thomas could end her high wire act in a second by telling about their love affair! How could she be so dead sure that he would not tell? Because he was shielding a true skeleton! A scorned woman would not bring down his nomination, so what did he have to hide?

The only thing that could have brought down Thomas´s was the "A" word!

The answer may lie with her five day hospital stay in 1984. She left Washington and her lover shortly thereafter. She may have ended up in the hospital as a result of intense discussions between her and Thomas regarding Roe vs. Wade. Those discussions were not merely philosophical discussions. The one and only thing, which Thomas could not let out of the closet was the big "A" word! The republicans would then have aborted his nomination. It is the only explanation, which makes all the pieces fit into the puzzle.

Right now I feel sad for Thomas and all black males, who once again were victims of such vicious racebaiting.

Shortly, I will feel very sorry for an Anita Hill, who will be attacked savagely by both blacks and women´s lib groups.