ORAL HISTORY OF THOMAS C. GREEN

This interview is being conducted on behalf of the Oral History Project of the Historical Society of the District of Columbia Circuit. The interviewer is Judy Feigin and the interviewee is Thomas C. Green. The interview is taking place at the office of Sidley Austin in Washington, D. C. on April 10, 2025. This is the ninth interview.

MS. FEIGIN: Good morning.

MR. GREEN: Good morning.

MS. FEIGIN: So in the pantheon of your page one political crisis cases, one of the ones that we have yet to cover is Richard Gates. I'm not sure he's a household name, so why don't you explain who he was and then how he fit into the panoply of important political cases.

MR. GREEN: Richard Gates, or Rick Gates, is another example of a client who I came to really like. I've had affection for almost all of my clients. But it's also another example of a client whose political views and political affiliation were contrary to mine.

That circumstance has never really impacted my representation of Rick or anyone else. I was always open to accepting a case on the merits without regard to what I thought were extraneous factors. If the case had merit, I felt it was part of my obligation as a lawyer to take on the case. I'm excluding the case where the issues or conduct were repulsive to me or something like that. But in a normal criminal investigation, although it may be newsworthy, and it may be something that people were generally interested in, it was simply my representation of an individual client. If I felt the client was deserving of representation, I would move forward.

I was sitting in my office one day, this must have been around 2017, when I got a call from Charlie Black, one of the most well-known Republican lobbyists, operatives, whatever you want to say. A really fine individual who had been a partner in the past with Paul Manafort. Charlie explained to me that Gates was someone who was associated and had worked with Paul Manafort. He said Gates had lawyers but both he and Rick felt that Rick was not getting the kind of advice that he needed. Charlie asked me if I would take over Rick's representation.

When someone opens a conversation like that I am a bit tentative because it's not been my practice to replace other lawyers in a case; that can often be problematic. It would take time for me to assess something like that. So I told him that I would certainly talk to Rick Gates and we would go from there; we'd see what eventuated.

So Rick Gates came to see me. I can't pin the date, but it was, I would say, in the late fall of 2017. He was a very engaging individual. He explained to me that he was under investigation in connection with Bob Mueller's investigation into whether or not the election had been influenced by the Russians. Had there been Russian interference in the 2016 election of Trump.

We spent a couple of hours together and he fleshed out for me what the concern was. He explained that Manafort had been a long-time lobbyist for the former president of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovych and that the investigation was into whether or not there had been inappropriate

lobbying on behalf of a political party without disclosure to the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, known as FARA.

There were a host of issues surrounding all of that. So let me back up and put some of this in context. Paul Manafort I did not know. I knew of him. Paul Manafort was, in my estimation, kind of a big-time Republican, a guy who was instrumental in the political operation of the Republican Party. He had represented, I think, a number of Republican candidates in high profile elections and he was appointed by Trump to be manager of the Republican convention. He was appointed in March of 2016 and he was ultimately promoted and became chair of the campaign in May of 2016. That didn't last very long because he was bounced out of the campaign. He resigned from the campaign in August of 2016, when he was replaced by Steve Bannon.

Rick Gates served as Manafort's deputy when he was chair of the campaign. In the summer of 2016, press accounts started to appear and Manafort came under fire over his past lobbying work for pro-Russian Ukrainian oligarchs. There was a big article in August of 2016 in *The New York Times*. It reported that Manafort had received millions of dollars worth of cash payments from Yanukovych's political party. The paper alleged that Manafort had received upwards of $12 million or $13 million in undisclosed cash payments from Yanukovych's political party prior to

2012 and it was all off the books. This was a big, big revelation and this was basically what forced his resignation from the Trump campaign.

Interestingly enough, Gates stayed on for a while and became the campaign's liaison to the RNC. And then Rick became deputy chairman of the inaugural committee. I think he was working here in D.C. But if my memory serves me right, he was ultimately forced out of that position too, as more information about Manafort/Gates activities was publicized.

Bob Mueller was appointed in May of 2017 to look into Russian interference in the presidential election. Bob Mueller at that time was a good friend of mine. I knew him from basically the first day he came to Washington to become director of the FBI.

He had a close friend who was also a close friend of mine and that friend brought us together. The four of us, Bob and his wife Ann, and I and my wife Pam, enjoyed a close social relationship from that point forward. So I knew Bob really well. In all the visits that I made to the Office of the Special Counsel down in southwest Washington, Bob was very careful to kind of stay away from me; he didn't want to appear to his staff as if we were friends or anything. So when we saw each other, it was just kind of a "Hi, Bob." "Hi, Tom." And see you later alligator. [laughter] He left me to handling by Andrew Weissmann and Greg Andres who handled the investigation into Manafort and Gates.

The investigation into both those guys got very hot over the summer of 2017, and then in October of 2017 Manafort and Gates get

indicted, the first indictment. That's filed in front of Judge Amy Berman Jackson in federal district court in D.C. That indictment had conspiracy counts and allegations that they failed to disclose signature authority over foreign bank accounts, failure to file as foreign agents, and lying to the DOJ.

Basically, the allegations were that Manafort was making tons of money working for these interests in Ukraine and he was funneling all that money offshore, mostly into undisclosed accounts that I think were in Cyprus. Enormous sums of money were parked offshore and never declared on his tax returns. And to a much less substantial extent, Gates was alleged to have parked some money there too, and didn't disclose it on his tax returns. But his relative culpability, if you will, was a lot less than Manafort's. Manafort was really the principal target.

So you wonder what possessed Manafort to do this. He's a guy of some stature, very well respected as far as I can tell. But according to the press reports he had an enormous appetite for money. And these funds that were parked offshore were used to fund everything. He had clothing bills that were in the thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars and landscaping and everything. It would all be filtered out of Cyprus back into the United States. None of it was ever declared. So it's against that background that Charlie Black calls me in late fall, while Gates is under indictment with Manafort, and says will you talk to him.

We had a number of meetings. I'm trying to distill this to its simplest. This was an overwhelming case. The government had both these guys in the crosshairs. Much of it was based on documents. Once you get the records out of Cyprus, once you get the payments coming to the United States, once you look at the tax returns, and no foreign accounts are disclosed, and the income isn't on the tax returns, it was hard to figure out a rejoinder to all this.

It wasn't long before I began to talk to Rick about whether the best outcome for him was to consider a negotiation with the government for a plea deal, along with cooperation, which would best minimize his exposure. My recollection is he was initially resistant to that.

MS. FEIGIN: That's probably typical, I imagine.

MR. GREEN: Yes, in varying degrees. Often everyone starts out being resistant to that. He had a number of reasons why he was resistant -- reputational harm, family harm, and everything else. There's a process that that entails. I wrote an article about this, or I was asked to write something which got published, in which I described the process that I and the client go through in trying to assess whether or not to enter into an arrangement like this and what those considerations are.

I started out in this article by saying that because I'm the defense lawyer and I have access to my client, if I can encourage my client to tell me the truth, or if I can induce him to tell the truth by showing him the government's discovery and so forth, I should have a pretty good idea of

what happened because my client is the one who engaged in the conduct and he should be able to tell me.

So through that process of encouraging my client to confide in me, I slowly become equipped to make an assessment of where we are and what is the likelihood of having a viable defense in a courtroom. And I'm in a position, based on all the years I've been doing this, I think to really tell a client whether we have the ability to survive the charges and what the risks are for him. But that isn't the end of the line because I can do that forcefully, eloquently and still have a client who is resistant to sitting down with the government. There's a threshold there that they have to cross where they become comfortable with the notion that they're going to admit to wrongdoing. That's a big part of this. It's psychological and it's emotional, and it's everything else. So here's a little bit of what I wrote about this in this article:

Still, the overriding consideration in my calculus is whether I have reached the conclusion that we are so unlikely to prevail at trial that the only way for the client to improve his position is to consider pleading guilty under a heavily negotiated agreement. Nevertheless, my assessment never controls; the decision belongs to the client or to the client and his family. As difficult as the process may have been to secure the truth from the client, it often pales by comparison to the process of bringing the client to stand before the court and admit his guilt. There are times at this moment when everything breaks down, and whether Humpty Dumpty can

be put together again is often in doubt. Extraordinary hand holding by the lawyer may be required, and long discussion about the client's need to focus on his own destiny (and that of his family) rather than misguided notions of loyalty are part of the process to try to revive the plea process. Throughout all of this, I am acutely aware that all I can do is to give advice. More often than not, my advice is ultimately embraced by my client.[2]

MS. FEIGIN: Do you get the family to help you with this?

MR. GREEN: I encourage the client to talk to his family. I have met with family. I've met with the client and his family and laid out the facts. And yes, clients, family, I would say almost every single time. The family is concerned about the health and welfare of the family member and is supportive of the outcome that will have the least serious or unfortunate consequences on that family member.

So back to Rick. We had these conversations. I alerted his lawyers that he had come to me. I called them and I alerted them. My recollection is that they may have already been in some preliminary discussions with Mueller's office, and I told them to cease and desist.

There was a little tension between me and them, but eventually I think Rick made it clear to them that he wanted to proceed with me rather than them and they ultimately filed a motion to withdraw. There was some

[2] https://www.justsecurity.org/88087/the-best-defense-how-attorneys-advise-clients-through-the-mental-process-of-a-plea-bargain/

friction surrounding that; it's hard for me to pull all that together right now. But they ultimately did withdraw and then I took over Rick's representation.

Word leaked out, I think in early 2018, that he had retained me. I don't know how the press picks this up. I think actually what it is is that there was a ton of press posted outside Mueller's office just waiting to see who was going in and out. And I think they saw me going in and out a couple of times and I don't know how they figured out, but they published a couple of articles that said I had been added to his team.

Basically, I went in to feel the government out on the outlines of an arrangement that we could have. They said if he was willing to plead guilty – I think the initial conversations were about one count of perhaps conspiracy. Those documents are probably somewhere; they would be in files that might still be at Sidley, but I don't know.

MS. FEIGIN: They should be in Mueller's files also.

MR. GREEN: They'd be in Mueller's files, certainly. But of course the reciprocal obligation was that Rick had to come in and subject himself to some fulsome interviews. There were a lot of sessions with Andrew Weissman, Greg Andres and FBI agents. They were long days and tedious interviews. I think they were initially impressed with Rick's cooperation. Rick was forthright, but as is the case with a lot of men in his situation, even though they're sitting in a room under the circumstances that we've just

described, what happens to them is really dependent on their performance, if you will, their truth-telling in these interviews.

There's often, I think it's just human nature, there's often a bit of resistance that's still internalized about telling 110% and what is going on inside an individual's mind as to how he states something. Whether consciously or subconsciously, he's shaving just two degrees off; it is hard to know and often hard to discern.

There came a point where Rick was asked a question about what happened at a particular meeting, when Andrew Weissmann accused him basically of lying or withholding some of the details. And this became a stumbling block. Some of this is a bit hazy for me but I think that these discussions were suspended for a bit. Whether the government was willing to continue depended on their belief that Rick was willing to tell the whole truth, in particular about this meeting. And I went through this process again with him. Finally there was a concession that he had not quite remembered correctly and he went back in and told them a slightly different version of this particular meeting.

This happened around the 1st of February, and the government said, well you kind of screwed yourself here because we're going to add another count to this information that you're going to plead to if we go forward with all this. So subsequent to this incident they filed a two-count superseding information in front of Judge Amy Berman Jackson which charged, I think, conspiracy and lying to the government. That was on

February 2nd, and it was right after that actually that Gates's counsel filed their motion to withdraw, which was granted.

And then on February 22nd of 2018, Manafort and Gates were indicted again in Virginia in 32 counts. This was basically to put more pressure on Gates.

MS. FEIGIN: Was this a state indictment?

MR. GREEN: No, this is a federal indictment, essentially embellishing the charges and adding to the charges that were contained in the October 17 indictment of 2017 in D.C. before Judge Jackson. So it was part of the pressure because basically what they were saying to Rick is that if you reject a deal, we're going to make your life more difficult because we are going to indict you in Virginia with Manafort. But if you do the deal, we'll dismiss the Virginia indictment against you and Manafort will be left alone to stand trial.

So that's what happened. Basically like the next day, I think it was February 23rd, Gates went before Judge Amy Berman Jackson and pled guilty to one count of false statement and one count of conspiracy.

The government wanted his sentence deferred. They didn't want any date because they said he's now cooperating, he's going to be a witness in ongoing trials, and we want to defer the sentencing. And Amy Berman Jackson said fine, I'll defer the sentencing. And that sentencing got deferred for some period of time. I'll get to that in a minute.

So they dismissed the Virginia case against Gates as part of the plea deal. Manafort is now facing two indictments. The case that went to trial first is the second indictment filed in Virginia, rather than the earlier indictment filed in the fall of '17, which was the initial charge. Manafort goes to trial in July of 2018. I think his trial starts on July 31. Gates is going to be the star witness. Everybody knows that and everybody's waiting for him to testify. He didn't testify immediately, but not that long after. Gates came, I think, to the trial on August 6th. So maybe at the end of the first week of the trial we show up. He was prepared. I think Andres interrogated him.

I went over to watch him testify. He told the jury that he himself had siphoned off some of the money that was in these Cyprus accounts without Manafort's knowledge, by filing false expense reports with Manafort's entity. He also admitted to concealing millions of dollars in foreign bank accounts on Manafort's behalf and to falsifying loan applications and other documents to help Manafort get even more bank loans which Manafort used I think basically to buy real estate in Manhattan and Virginia. Gates had to admit that the two of them did not report income or the foreign bank accounts and that he knew they were engaging in misconduct.

Just to give you more of a feel for it, he read off the names of more than a dozen shell companies that they had set up in Cyprus and in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, et cetera, to stash the proceeds of Manafort's

consulting work and so forth. He said that he was very sorry for what he had done. That was a tough experience for him, it really was. It was an ordeal but it would be an ordeal for anyone in that situation, having to get up on the witness stand in a public forum and admit to that amount of misconduct. The jury found Manafort guilty of 8 of the 18 charges in the case later in August of 2018.

MS. FEIGIN: Actually some of the money Gates siphoned off was from Manafort's money, right?

MR. GREEN: It was Manafort's money.

MS. FEIGIN: Not just the money he put aside for himself.

MR. GREEN: Not just the money he put aside for himself, correct. So Rick is, in a sense, done for a while, having been the principal witness in that trial. But Manafort is facing another trial. He's facing trial on the earlier 2017 indictment in front of Amy Berman Jackson. And although I don't want to dwell on Manafort, in order to escape a second trial, he pleads guilty in front of Amy Berman Jackson.

In September of 2018, he pleads guilty to two felony counts along with a promise to fully cooperate. Then in the course of his cooperation, a couple of months later, the government contends that he's lied in his interviews.

The following year, we're now in 2019, in March, Manafort gets sentenced by Judge Ellis in Virginia to 47 months, which everyone thought was a break for him. The government had asked for a pretty

severe sentence so they thought Ellis really gave him a pass on some of this misconduct.

Now we come a week later, in March of 2019. Manafort, having pled guilty in front of Amy Berman Jackson, is going to get sentenced and she adds another 3 1/2 years to his sentence on his plea. So that's Manafort. I think his lying to the government during his cooperation played some part in the sentence that she imposed but I can't remember just how it did. I think it may have been factored into the government's recommended sentence.

But Gates is called upon to testify again. In November of 2019, he testifies in Roger Stone's trial.

MS. FEIGIN: We should say what Roger Stone was charged with.

MR. GREEN: Stone was charged with obstructing Congressional investigations by testifying falsely and failing to turn over records. He was also charged in five counts of making false statements and one count of witness tampering.

Rick described Stone's interest in the release of the so-called stolen emails from Hillary Clinton prior to the 2016 election. There were a bunch of brainstorming sessions on what to do with that information. He was not the principal witness in Stone's trial but they used him in that trial.

Then on December 17th, Gates comes up for sentencing on his own plea. This is December 17th of 2019. By that time the government, notwithstanding his little hiccup when he was being interrogated, was

appreciative of his cooperation. They felt that he walked the walk and was deserving of a great deal of consideration. They wrote a sentencing recommendation where they asked the court to sentence Gates to probation.

MS. FEIGIN: Wow!

MR. GREEN: Yeah. Which was quite a concession on their part. I thought Judge Berman Jackson would do that because she was aware of his cooperation. We made her aware and I think she believed it to have been significant and to credit the government's description of what Rick accomplished for them and so forth. So I anticipated that she would sentence him to probation. And of course I endorsed that in my statement to the court.

To my surprise, she said right off the bat I don't think I'm going to be inclined to sentence Mr. Gates in the way you anticipate, which sent a little tremor through me. I didn't know what she was going to do. In the end, she sentenced him to 45 days of incarceration along with 300 hours of community service and a modest fine. She allowed the 45 days to be spent on intermittent weekends, and there was a three-year period of probation.

I then embarked on an effort to find a reasonably hospitable place for Rick to serve his weekend time. The probation officer was willing to work with us and there was some facility in Virginia not too far from his home. It could even have been a state facility.

But we were now in COVID time. As a result, I went back to Judge Jackson and asked for relief to suspend Rick's sentence. I think he

had served about 15 days of the 45 days but because COVID was rampant everywhere, to suspend the sentence on account of the danger to him in the jail.

She suspended the sentence and that ended it. He never went back. He never served another day. It was kind of unclear whether it was a temporary suspension or a final suspension, but it was treated by the probation officer as a final suspension.

MS. FEIGIN: I think I recall that his wife was undergoing medical treatment and that was part of the reason they were concerned about his possible exposure there. She was immunosuppressed and therefore more vulnerable to complications.

MR. GREEN: That could well be the case. She did have medical issues. I don't have access to what I wrote at the time but that was the story. He and I have stayed friends. I see him from time to time and I have great affection for him. I'm sure he's probably very active in this administration somewhere doing something.

MS. FEIGIN: You began this session by saying – and this is another example of it -- that you generally find yourself having a lot of affection for your clients even if you're politically in disagreement. But what happens when you don't like your client? Is it a problem?

MR. GREEN: No. I'm going to tell you something pretty remarkable. It would be hard for me to remember a situation where I didn't like my client because in the initial interviews, a certain degree of chemistry has to emerge, and if I'm

looking at someone and I just think, golly, this is not someone I want to spend time with, I will make up some reason and I won't take them on. I wouldn't need five fingers to count the times that happened.

MS. FEIGIN: So it's like a first date? [laughter]

MR. GREEN: Like a first date. Yeah, it's like one of those things where you do it now online [laughter]. You've got to like each other. I don't know, maybe it's part of my personality. It takes a lot for me not to like someone, or to put it the other way, it takes a lot for me to dislike someone.

What is interesting is that in many of these major cases that I handled, my clients were Republicans. I've always been a Democrat, but I'm a moderate. I'm a centrist. I'm not a way-out Democrat. And most of the guys I represented who were Republicans were not way-out Republicans either. They were all just individuals who had a serious problem to me.

MS. FEIGIN: This case put you in contact with a lot of people whose names were then, and actually to this day are still, in the news. Do you have any sense of Manafort as a person? And of course, we should say he was ultimately pardoned.

MR. GREEN: Yes, ultimately pardoned by the president of the United States of America. Manafort was pardoned on December 23, 2020. So lucky Manafort, yeah. Trump's got his finger on the pardon button. He's pardoned a lot of people.

The only observations I can make about Manafort stem from the objective facts. I never sat down to have a conversation with him, but what he did, the enormity and the circumference of his financial crimes, was huge. And that says something about your personality. It says something about your outlook on life to do that, while at the same time, you then take those enormous funds that you've secreted so to speak, and then spend them lavishly on entertainment and clothes and home. In my value system, that doesn't speak well of someone.

I don't know what his family thought. When this investigation arose, there were press reports that he had obtained one of these loans for a piece of real estate in New York, in I think lower Manhattan, that was basically an investment property. In order to get the loan, I think he had to tell the bank that his children lived in the facility. In other words, it was a residence. And he told them that if anyone ever inquired, they had to say that. I don't know what his family thought of what was going on. But he had his issues.

MS. FEIGIN: You mentioned that when Manafort left the campaign, Rick Gates worked under Steve Bannon. Do you have a sense of Bannon?

MR. GREEN: He may have worked for Bannon for a bit, but then I think he moved because the election came soon thereafter. Manafort left in August of 2016 and the election was in November so I think he worked there for just a bit. I probably knew something about his relationship with Bannon at the time.

But then I think he went to Washington to work, and he may even have gone right before the election to Washington to work on the inaugural.

MS. FEIGIN: Did he also work with Kellyanne Conway?

MR. GREEN: I'm sure he knew her. I'm sure he knew all these people. But I've never had occasion to really drill down on any of that.

MS. FEIGIN: As this is a history for the D.C. Court Society, can you tell us a little bit about Judge Amy Berman Jackson?

MR. GREEN: I admire Amy Jackson. I think she's a tough, courageous, fair-minded judge. And I have admiration for her. I think she got reversed here recently on something to do with the Office of Special Counsel, who had been fired. She brought him back on, I think under a temporary injunction, pending the outcome of the case. She wrote I thought a really compelling opinion as to why it makes no sense to fire a special counsel who's there to assess the merits of certain controversies. But I think she was reversed which I thought was kind of silly. I haven't had a lot of cases in front of her. She's had some interesting cases which I've read about. I think she's a really good judge.

MS. FEIGIN: We could probably go on for weeks and weeks about all your cases, but those being the highlights, before we conclude this oral history, maybe we can just wrap up a couple of things that we touched on earlier.

We talked about your work as treasurer for the National Symphony [Session 6]. Since that discussion things at the Kennedy Center have changed. President Trump has taken over leadership of the Kennedy

Center. I wonder if there's been any impact on the National Symphony or you have any comments about that.

MR. GREEN: The Kennedy Center is a national memorial, like the Lincoln Monument or the Washington Monument. It is a memorial to President John Kennedy. The federal government, as it is obligated with every other monument or memorial, particularly to a president, pays for the upkeep and maintenance of the building. That's the limit of the government's contribution to the Kennedy Center.

The Kennedy Center is a national forum for the arts or the performing arts. It survives on two sources of income. One, income from the productions that appear on stage there, and two, charitable contributions. That's it. The Kennedy Center has always been operating with a difficult budget. It's always in search of funds to cover the costs of putting on these productions, so to speak.

The symphony and the opera each have their own boards and their own sources of income which again are revenue from the performances and charitable contributions. Both the opera and the symphony have historically operated with a deficit and that deficit has been covered by the Kennedy Center budget.

Deborah Rutter, the long-time president of the Kennedy Center, announced that she was going to leave in the fall of this year. I admire Deborah Rutter very much. I think she's been great for the Kennedy Center. Not to say that we didn't have some discussions about the

operations of the symphony and the amount of any subsidy from the Kennedy Center itself. But I have great respect for her and was sorry to hear that she was going to retire after I think about 10 or 11 years at the Kennedy Center, and then even more sorry to hear that Trump had terminated her.

What inspired Mr. Trump to focus on the Kennedy Center I will not know. I do not know. But with one sweep of his arm, he cleaned out the entire Kennedy Center board except for a few people that were already on that board that were related or within his camp, so to speak. Threw David Rubenstein off the board and terminated his tenure as chairman, one of the most remarkable guys living today. And filled it up with some of his favorites.

It's interesting because obviously Trump may know a lot of people. I'm guessing now, he may know a lot of people. But I don't know that he has real friends or connections or whatever. He watches a lot of TV. He watches Fox, so Fox becomes the source of everything, Cabinet officers, Kennedy Center board members and so forth. It's really kind of unbelievable.

He has placed in charge at the Kennedy Center Ambassador Richard Grenell. I think he was the former ambassador to Germany. I've never met him, but I would anticipate that in time he may be terminating the employment of a lot of individuals who have given a great deal of service to the Kennedy Center.

There have been some performances and performers that have canceled at the Kennedy Center. If I were talking to them, I think that's short-sighted. I understand why you're doing it, but you're depriving the Kennedy Center of operating funds, of revenue, and putting jobs in jeopardy, and a lot of people have bought tickets and want to see you and it's just an unnecessary impact and disappointment to them.

Hamilton canceled, which is the biggest. I think it's the biggest revenue producing production at the Kennedy Center in the past and probably in the future. That's not helping the Kennedy Center. A lot of people wanted to go see it and so forth. So I don't know what they're going to do about the programming. The programming may change a little bit because there may be shows that don't want to appear at the Kennedy Center, but so far the operations of the orchestra have not been really impacted.

MS. FEIGIN: Good.

MR. GREEN: We'll see. Time will tell; the jury is still out. Ambassador Grenell and those who work with him have been very open with us and have assured us of their interest in promoting and maintaining the orchestra as one of the jewels of the Kennedy Center. So I'm hopeful and optimistic that we will be able to continue and produce wonderful music for the Washington, D.C. community.

MS. FEIGIN: I hope so. These are tumultuous times and people reading this later on may not be able to appreciate quite how tumultuous, but if there's

anything you want to comment about the current situation, I'd welcome your views.

MR. GREEN: We could sit here for a long time and talk about what is going on here. Trump and those around him like to talk in terms of having received a mandate from the American people in the last election. It is true that he won the popular vote by I think less than a percentage point; he did not obtain 50% of the total vote. His vote total was below 50%. I think the two candidates were maybe 1% apart. Hardly a mandate.

He's surrounded himself, particularly with members of his Cabinet, not every single one, but most of them are, I think, marginally qualified, if at all. And the Supreme Court did him an enormous favor and in my opinion created an enormous injury to our democracy and to the way our country runs when they held that the president has a certain degree of immunity even for criminal conduct while in office.

A number of people have expressed the view that Trump ran for president in order to escape his indictments and to work retribution on all of his enemies, perceived enemies. His list of perceived enemies is enormous and I think he adds to it every day. So it's a deplorable situation. Without burdening these pages with too much elaboration, I think eventually his administration is going to implode. I think it's going to implode even prior to the midterms.

In recent days, with these tariffs, he became subject to enormous pressure from a variety of sources. Most of the time he's impervious to it;

he believes that he alone knows what's best. But as in other cases, prior instances, he succumbed to that pressure and announced a 90-day pause in the tariffs. It would be great if the Congress were to take the tariff prerogative back from the president and return it to the Congress, where it belongs under the Constitution.

I think he saw some of that handwriting on the wall. I don't know what's going to happen because if he was indeed that sensible for 30 seconds, he may change his mind 22 times between now and the expiration of this 90-day period. We shall see.

Layer that on top of what he's trying to do to certain law firms. The reaction of certain law firms to succumb to that pressure is sad on both accounts, sad that he's trying to seek retribution against law firms. The fact that he's ordered the attorney general to pursue any law firm that files any action which he deems to be without merit and vexatious and so forth is absurd. But some law firms then come and kowtow to him and enter into these arrangements; it's awful.

Do I understand it? On one level, sure. The only motivating force that drives these law firms to make these deals has to do with money. It's only money. But then you say, what's the average partner make at some of these firms that we've heard about? Maybe I don't know anymore because I've been away from it, but it could be $5 million. It could be more, really it could be more. So if they stood up to Trump and they lost a few clients, maybe the average partner would have to only make $4 million or $3

million. It's not as if they're not going to be able to buy eggs, which are expensive, I admit. But there's a resistance. The resistance is forming. And Trump will hear from the resistance sooner or later.

MS. FEIGIN: Before we wrap it up entirely, are there any loose ends that you would like to reference?

MR. GREEN: I note with some sadness that my friend General Secord passed away not too long ago. It was very sad. He's going to be buried at Arlington National Cemetery at some point in the future and I plan to attend that ceremony. I have great admiration for him. He was a gutsy guy in so many respects. As you know, I've written a little thing I'd like to append to the end of my interviews.

MS. FEIGIN: Good. We'll do it.

MR. GREEN: And then the powers that be can decide whether it's inappropriate or not, but I also want to thank you, as I will in that little appendix, if I may, for all the time that you've devoted to this. I've gotten to know you, and that's been a great pleasure and joy.

MS. FEIGIN: It's been my privilege to do this.

MR. GREEN: So there's where we are. I apologize to anyone who reads this for the fact that time has dimmed my memory about some of the details on some of these cases. But it's been a hell of a journey for me and quite rewarding.

MS. FEIGIN: Thank you so much. It's going to be a wonderful addition to the Historical Society's inventory of interviews.