## Exhibit 54

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

Abdiqafar Wagafe, et al.,
On behalf of himself and
others similarly situated,
Plaintiffs

VS.

CASE NUMBER:

DONALD TRUMP, President of the 2:17-CV-00094-RAJ United States, et al.,

Defendants

\_\_\_\_\_\_/

The virtual deposition, via Webex, of MARC SAMUEL SAGEMAN, Ph.D., M.D. was held on Tuesday, August 18th, 2020, commencing at 10:17 a.m. before R. Dwayne Harrison, a Notary Public.

\*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL DUE TO PROTECTIVE ORDER\*\*\*

REPORTED BY: R. Dwayne Harrison



```
Page 22
                 MR. HANDYSIDE: Object to the form.
 1
 2
                 No, absolutely not. I hope not. I don't
     think that anybody within the IC would make that
 3
 4
     mistake. This was just an example to illustrate what
 5
     I'm talking about, to illustrate the meaning of
 6
     sensitivity and specificity. I really hope with all my
 7
     heart that this is not the case.
 8
                 Okay. So you are not saying that the
 9
     federal nominators, those individuals within the
10
     federal government involved with nominating individuals
11
     to the watchlist, operate on the premise that, if
     somebody speaks Arabic, therefore they're a terrorist?
12
13
                 No.
                      This was just an illustration of what
14
     sensitivity and specificity meant. I really hope that
15
     nobody does that.
16
                 And I wanted to ask you something else.
                                                           Ι
17
     believe you also said that there's a thousand
18
     terrorists in the world.
19
                 Did I hear you say that correctly?
20
          Α
                 Just off the top of my head, yeah,
21
     probably.
22
                 Can you tell me where you get that number
23
     from?
24
          Α
                 Nowhere.
25
          Q
                 Okay. It's just a guess?
```



- 1 A Well, it depends on what you mean by
- 2 terrorist and I think we probably are going to get into
- 3 the global terrorist database where they take any act
- 4 of war as terrorism and that's totally meaningless.
- 5 They just oversampled those acts.
- 6 Terrorism is in relative domestic
- 7 peacetime. I define terrorism as the categorization of
- 8 deliberate outgroup violence, political violence during
- 9 domestic peacetime. And so you see that a country has
- 10 to be basically at peace, not suffering from an
- insurgency or wide civil unrest and it turns out that
- 12 the terrorism of any kind is actually fairly rare.
- 13 Q So under your definition there that you
- 14 just gave -- I'm just trying to clarify.
- 15 You believe that under that definition
- 16 approximately a thousand terrorists exist worldwide; is
- 17 that fair?
- 18 MR. HANDYSIDE: Object to the form.
- 19 Misstates prior testimony.
- 20 A No, I don't believe that. I think that,
- 21 just of the order of magnitude, it's probably closer to
- 22 reality given seven or eight billion people. We're not
- 23 talking about a hundred thousand people.
- In terms of the global neo-jihadi
- 25 terrorists, I think that -- if I looked at that and we



- 1 have close to one per hundred million per year, there
- 2 are many other types of terrorism, you know, namely the
- 3 Irish.
- 4 I'm not really talking about insurgency.
- 5 You really don't have much more than that. So if you
- 6 can multiply -- you know, one per hundred million per
- 7 year and the number of terrorists, nobody is really
- 8 held -- I mean, terrorism is not a career. People do
- 9 terrorist acts. That's what a terrorist is. It's a
- 10 person that's does terrorist acts.
- 11 So if you can multiply that by 80, you can
- 12 see that -- and 80 is because we have eight billion
- people and I just the number death rate per hundred
- 14 thousand -- per hundred million people, you can see
- 15 that by saying about a thousand -- I'm really
- 16 overestimating by at least one or two orders of
- 17 magnitude. By orders of magnitude, that means zeros
- 18 after the one. So ten is an order of magnitude of one;
- 19 a hundred is an order of magnitude of two; a thousand
- 20 is an order of magnitude of three. You can see that's
- 21 what an order of magnitude is. It's a term-of-art in
- 22 probability.
- 23 O Okay. Another clarification. The
- 24 definition you gave of terrorism, it requires domestic
- 25 peacetime.



Page 25 Did I hear that correctly? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 So the country in which the terrorist act 4 occurs has to be at peace or the country that produces 5 the national or the individual has to be at peace? 6 MR. HANDYSIDE: I object to the form. 7 Compound. 8 It's -- yeah, peacetime is kind of Α 9 geographic as well. So, yes, it's really meaningful in peacetime as opposed to war because war has so many 10 11 acts like World War II. I mean, you can call that, 12 therefore, terrorism. 13 Terrorism is really a specific type of political violence which is really not an insurgency, a 14 15 civil war or just a war between two states. That's 16 just war. People who study terrorists do not really 17 study war because they just -- you know, it would water 18 down the meaning of terrorism to a level that's 19 completely meaningless. 20 So, yes, it does require domestic 21 peacetime, but let me offer to modify that a little bit 22 on account of -- because reality is a little bit more 23 complex than those nice black and white distinctions. 24 So in one of my books, Turning to Political Violence, I have several instances of terrorism in 1905 25



- 1 in Moscow and, at that time, Russia was at war with
- 2 Japan. But the act of terrorism had nothing to do with
- 3 Japan. No, it was not the Japanese, you know,
- 4 attacking Russia. It was really a subgroup of Russians
- 5 were upset at their government and carrying out
- 6 terrorism acts, namely the killing of the uncle of the
- 7 czar.
- 8 Similar in the late 1960s and early 1970s
- 9 in this country when you have acts of terrorism
- 10 conducted by the Weather Underground. But the United
- 11 States was at war at the time. Even though it had not
- 12 declared war, it was definitely at war with Vietnam.
- 13 But you can see that the act conducted in the United
- 14 States was not really directed by the Vietnamese to the
- 15 United States. So we cannot call those in these
- 16 relatively domestic peacetime events terrorism events
- even though the country is not, technically, in peace.
- 18 Q I want to move on to what you said next,
- 19 would -- I documented that you said next which was
- 20 additional factors you believe contribute to the
- 21 unreliability of the federal watchlisting system, lack
- 22 of quality control and others.
- So I'd like you to talk specifically to the
- 24 lack of quality control and tell me your factual basis
- 25 for that opinion.



Page 225 Yes, we are okay now. 1 2 With respect to state sponsors of 3 terrorism, what countries do you regard as state 4 sponsors of terrorism? 5 The United States, by far, number one. 6 in terms of the department of states they sponsor, it 7 basically depends on your point of view. So each 8 country has their own view of who is a state sponsor of 9 terrorism and we have boiled it down to just three countries. 10 11 If I recall -- I think in my report I 12 recall putting North Korea, but it was just taken 13 off -- recently off the list. So we just have Iran, 14 Syria and the Sudan according to the State Department. 15 Who I consider state sponsor of terrorism, 16 it really depends. I mean, most -- a lot of states do 17 fund groups that seem to do violence to countries that 18 they are against and if you just look at it neutrally 19 you have to count -- include everybody. I'm just 20 saying that the United States is probably the largest 21 state sponsor of terrorism throughout the last fifty 22 years does not mean that I disagree with it. 23 As a matter of fact, I was one of the 24 agents doing exactly that, namely training, funding, 25 making sure Afghan rebels had weapons in the 1980s and



- 1 I think that I completely agree with it. I was doing
- 2 what my government was telling me to do with my full
- 3 consent and full approval.
- 4 So, basically, when you say state sponsor
- 5 of terrorism, you have to have a definition that's at
- 6 least neutral so you can actually talk the same term
- 7 with colleagues who may not be Americans. And so the
- 8 scientific definition is different from a political
- 9 definition.
- 10 Q Okay, and what I'm interested here is your
- 11 definition, actually, or what you consider -- which
- 12 countries you consider to be state sponsors of
- 13 terrorism.
- So is it accurate to say you consider the
- 15 United States, Iran, Syria and Sudan to be state
- 16 sponsors of terrorism?
- 17 A Oh, no. I consider many more. Just look
- 18 at Syria --
- 19 Q Again, that's a different answer.
- 20 My question was: Do you consider those
- 21 four countries to be state sponsors of terrorism?
- 22 A No. The United States is actually actively
- 23 sponsoring terrorism right now in Syria simply because
- 24 of our strong support of the Kurdish forces. I suspect
- 25 we also have very active role in Somalia. We still

