



Home Office

Country Policy and Information Note

Iraq: Perceived collaborators

Version 2.0

February 2019

Preface

Purpose

This note provides country of origin information (COI) and analysis of COI for use by Home Office decision makers handling particular types of protection and human rights claims (as set out in [the basis of claim](#) section). It is not intended to be an exhaustive survey of a particular subject or theme.

It is split into two main sections: (1) analysis and assessment of COI and other evidence; and (2) COI. These are explained in more detail below.

Assessment

This section analyses the evidence relevant to this note – i.e. the COI section; refugee/human rights laws and policies; and applicable caselaw – by describing this and its inter-relationships, and provides an assessment on whether, **in general**:

- A person is reasonably likely to face a real risk of persecution or serious harm
- A person is able to obtain protection from the state (or quasi state bodies)
- A person is reasonably able to relocate within a country or territory
- Claims are likely to justify granting asylum, humanitarian protection or other form of leave, and
- If a claim is refused, it is likely or unlikely to be certifiable as ‘clearly unfounded’ under section 94 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002.

Decision makers **must**, however, still consider all claims on an individual basis, taking into account each case’s specific facts.

Country of origin information

The country information in this note has been carefully selected in accordance with the general principles of COI research as set out in the [Common EU \[European Union\] Guidelines for Processing Country of Origin Information \(COI\)](#), dated April 2008, and the Austrian Centre for Country of Origin and Asylum Research and Documentation’s (ACCORD), [Researching Country Origin Information – Training Manual, 2013](#). Namely, taking into account the COI’s relevance, reliability, accuracy, balance, currency, transparency and traceability.

The structure and content of the country information section follows a [terms of reference](#) which sets out the general and specific topics relevant to this note.

All information included in the note was published or made publicly available on or before the ‘cut-off’ date(s) in the country information section. Any event taking place or report/article published after these date(s) is not included.

All information is publicly accessible or can be made publicly available, and is from generally reliable sources. Sources and the information they provide are carefully considered before inclusion.

Factors relevant to the assessment of the reliability of sources and information include:

- the motivation, purpose, knowledge and experience of the source
- how the information was obtained, including specific methodologies used
- the currency and detail of information, and
- whether the COI is consistent with and/or corroborated by other sources.

Multiple sourcing is used to ensure that the information is accurate, balanced and corroborated, so that a comprehensive and up-to-date picture at the time of publication is provided of the issues relevant to this note.

Information is compared and contrasted, whenever possible, to provide a range of views and opinions. The inclusion of a source, however, is not an endorsement of it or any view(s) expressed.

Each piece of information is referenced in a brief footnote; full details of all sources cited and consulted in compiling the note are listed alphabetically in the [bibliography](#).

Feedback

Our goal is to continuously improve our material. Therefore, if you would like to comment on this note, please email [the Country Policy and Information Team](#).

Independent Advisory Group on Country Information

The [Independent Advisory Group on Country Information](#) (IAGCI) was set up in March 2009 by the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration to support him in reviewing the efficiency, effectiveness and consistency of approach of COI produced by the Home Office.

The IAGCI welcomes feedback on the Home Office's COI material. It is not the function of the IAGCI to endorse any Home Office material, procedures or policy. The IAGCI may be contacted at:

Independent Advisory Group on Country Information

Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration

5th Floor

Globe House

89 Eccleston Square

London, SW1V 1PN

Email: chiefinspector@icibi.gov.uk

Information about the IAGCI's work and a list of the documents which have been reviewed by the IAGCI can be found on the Independent Chief Inspector's pages of the [gov.uk website](#).

Contents

Assessment	5
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Basis of claim	5
1.2 Points to note	5
2. Consideration of issues	5
2.1 Credibility.....	5
2.2 Convention reason	6
2.3 Exclusion	6
2.4 Assessment of risk	6
2.5 Protection	8
2.6 Internal relocation.....	8
2.7 Certification	8
Country information	9
3. Evidence used in BA (Returns to Baghdad)	9
4. Actors of violence	9
4.1 Sunni militants (including Daesh)	9
4.2 Shia militia	10
5. Perceived collaborators	12
5.1 Types.....	12
5.2 Incidents of targeting	13
Terms of Reference	16
Bibliography	17
Sources cited.....	17
Sources consulted but not cited.....	18
Version control	19

Assessment

Updated: 21 January 2019

1. Introduction

1.1 Basis of claim

- 1.1.1 Fear of persecution or serious harm from non-state actors because the person has, or is perceived to have, collaborated with Western or international companies, and/or the Government of Iraq (GoI).

[Back to Contents](#)

1.2 Points to note

- 1.2.1 The Upper Tribunal, in the case of [BA \(Returns to Baghdad\) Iraq CG \[2017\] UKUT 18 \(IAC\)](#), heard on 24-25 August 2016 and promulgated on 23 January 2017, which considered the treatment of perceived collaborators in Iraq, recognised the difficulty in defining the term 'perceived collaborator' and thus concluded that '[the] assessment of whether a person is likely to be perceived as a collaborator will depend on the facts of each case' (paragraph 49).
- 1.2.2 For the purposes of this note, the term 'perceived collaborator' means:
- those who have worked for coalition forces (several countries' armed forces led by the United States and the United Kingdom) and/or international (particularly Western) organisations; and/or
 - anyone, including those who work(ed) for or assist(ed) the GoI, perceived to be acting contrary to the agenda of various armed groups, principally Daesh (ISIS) and the Shia militia; and
 - returnees from the West.
- 1.2.3 This notes does **not** include information about and an assessment of those who have been perceived as collaborators of Daesh (ISIS). For information about and assessment of such claims, see the [country policy and information note, Iraq: Sunni \(Arabs\)](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2. Consideration of issues

2.1 Credibility

- 2.1.1 For information on assessing credibility, see the [Asylum Instruction on Assessing Credibility and Refugee Status](#).
- 2.1.2 Decision makers must also check if there has been a previous application for a UK visa or another form of leave. Asylum applications matched to visas should be investigated prior to the asylum interview (see the [Asylum Instruction on Visa Matches, Asylum Claims from UK Visa Applicants](#)).
- 2.1.3 Decision makers should also consider the need to conduct language analysis testing (see the [Asylum Instruction on Language Analysis](#)).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.2 Convention reason

- 2.2.1 A perceived collaborator falls within the Convention reason of actual or imputed political opinion.
- 2.2.2 Establishing a convention reason alone is not sufficient to be recognised as a refugee. The question to be addressed in each case is whether the particular person will face a real risk of persecution on account of their actual or imputed convention reason.
- 2.2.3 For further guidance on Convention reasons and particular social groups, see the [Asylum Instruction on Assessing Credibility and Refugee Status](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.3 Exclusion

- 2.3.1 If it is accepted that the person has been involved in serious human rights abuses, decision makers must consider whether one (or more) of the exclusion clauses is applicable. Each case must nevertheless be considered on its individual facts and merits.
- 2.3.2 For further guidance on the exclusion clauses and restricted leave, see the [Asylum Instruction on Exclusion: Article 1F of the Refugee Convention](#) and the [Asylum Instruction on Restricted Leave](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.4 Assessment of risk

a. Non-military/security related 'perceived collaborator'

- 2.4.1 The Upper Tribunal in [BA](#) found:

'The evidence shows that those who worked for non-security related Western or international companies, or any other categories of people who would be perceived as having collaborated with foreign coalition forces, are still likely to be at risk in areas which are under ISIL [Daesh] control or have high levels of insurgent activity. At the current time [2017] the risk is likely to emanate from Sunni insurgent groups who continue to target Western or international companies as well as those who are perceived to collaborate with the Government of Iraq' (paragraph 107 (ii)).
- 2.4.2 For information on the security situation in Iraq, including about Daesh's current control of territory (which has diminished significantly since mid-2014), see the [country policy and information note on Iraq: security and humanitarian situation](#).
- 2.4.3 The Upper Tribunal also found 'The current evidence indicates that the risk in Baghdad to those who worked for non-security related Western or international companies is low although there is evidence to show that insurgent groups such as ISIL [Daesh] are active and capable of carrying out attacks in the city. In so far as there may be a low level of risk from such groups in Baghdad it is not sufficient to show a real risk solely as a perceived collaborator' (paragraph 107 (iii)).

- 2.4.4 Outside of the evidence considered by the Upper Tribunal in [BA](#), there is very limited information about the treatment of those who worked in non-military and security roles who may be perceived as a collaborator.

[Back to Contents](#)

b. Military/security related 'perceived collaborator'

- 2.4.5 The Upper Tribunal in [BA](#) commented:

'We make clear that we have not considered any detailed evidence on the potential risk to perceived collaborators in other categories such as those who worked in a military or security setting, including interpreters... However, the evidence outlined above shows that such people are likely to be at risk in areas under ISIL [Daesh] control outside Baghdad. We bear in mind that the case was not prepared with those potential risk categories in mind. Although there is likely to be the same low level of risk from ISIL [Daesh] in Baghdad, Dr [Alan] George's initial opinion was that there may be a slightly enhanced risk to those who worked in a military or security setting. Nothing in the evidence that we have considered suggests that there are regular reported incidents of collaborators from a security setting being targeted in Baghdad city. However, given the focus of this case we are unable to give any clear guidance relating to the possibility of an enhanced risk to perceived collaborators from a military or security setting without further evidence' (paragraph 67).

- 2.4.6 Evidence about the treatment of those who worked in a military or security setting (such as interpreters) overall relates to events between 2003 and 2011 (see [Perceived collaborators](#)). The available evidence does not establish that there is a current general real risk outside Daesh-controlled areas to those in this category.

[Back to Contents](#)

c. Returnees from the West

- 2.4.7 The Upper Tribunal in [BA](#) also found:

'Whether a returnee from the West is likely to be perceived as a potential target for kidnapping in Baghdad may depend on how long he or she has been away from Iraq. Each case will be fact sensitive, but in principle, the longer a person has spent abroad the greater the risk. However, the evidence does not show a real risk to a returnee in Baghdad on this ground alone' (paragraph 107 (iii)).

- 2.4.8 There is no available evidence outside of that considered by the Upper Tribunal in [BA](#) about the treatment of someone being perceived as a collaborator because of their spending time in the West. There is therefore no reason to justify departing from the guidance in [BA](#) on this point.
- 2.4.9 While in general there is no real risk based on being perceived as a collaborator, decision makers must decide each case on its facts, with the onus on the person to demonstrate that they would be at risk on return.
- 2.4.10 For further guidance on assessing risk, see the [Asylum Instruction on Assessing Credibility and Refugee Status](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.5 Protection

- 2.5.1 Where the person's fear is of persecution and/or serious harm from non-state actors, decision makers must assess whether the state can provide effective protection.
- 2.5.2 The Upper Tribunal in [BA](#) found: 'In general, the authorities in Baghdad are unable, and in the case of Sunni complainants, are likely to be unwilling to provide sufficient protection' (paragraph 107 (vii)).
- 2.5.3 The Upper Tribunal did not consider protection in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI). The evidence is limited, but it does not suggest that the authorities in the KRG are unable or unwilling to provide effective protection to those at risk from non-state actors. The onus will be on the person to show why they cannot obtain protection from the Kurdistan authorities.
- 2.5.4 For more about entry requirements to the KRI, see the country policy and information note on [Iraq: internal relocation, civil documentation and returns](#).
- 2.5.5 For further guidance on assessing the availability of state protection, see the [Asylum Instruction on Assessing Credibility and Refugee Status](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.6 Internal relocation

- 2.6.1 In general, internal relocation is possible to the areas of Iraq where the risk does not extend and which do not breach Article 15(c) of the Qualification Directive. Decision makers must decide each case on its facts. For information on the security and humanitarian situation, see the country policy and information note on [Iraq: security and humanitarian situation](#).
- 2.6.2 For further information about and an assessment of internal relocation in Iraq, see the country policy and information note on [Iraq: internal relocation, civil documentation and returns](#).
- 2.6.3 For further guidance on internal relocation and the factors to be considered, see the [Asylum Instruction on Assessing Credibility and Refugee Status](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

2.7 Certification

- 2.7.1 Where a claim is refused, it is unlikely to be certifiable as 'clearly unfounded' under section 94 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002.
- 2.7.2 For further guidance on certification, see [Certification of Protection and Human Rights claims under section 94 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 \(clearly unfounded claims\)](#).

[Back to Contents](#)

Country information

Updated: 7 January 2019

3. Evidence used in BA (Returns to Baghdad)

- 3.1.1 The Country Guidance (CG) case of [BA \(Returns to Baghdad\) Iraq CG \[2017\] UKUT 18 \(IAC\)](#), heard on 24-25 August 2016 and promulgated on 23 January 2017, considered the issue of 'perceived collaborators' in Iraq. The Upper Tribunal consulted a range of sources and covered issues including:
- limitations in the evidence (paragraphs 45-47);
 - the Western presence in Iraq (paragraph 57);
 - categories of 'perceived collaborators' (paragraphs 57-59);
 - treatment of 'perceived collaborators' by Sunni militants (including Daesh) (paragraph 63);
 - treatment of 'perceived collaborators' by Shia militia (paragraphs 62, 66);
 - reported incidents of the targeting of 'perceived collaborators' (paragraphs 60-63);
 - reported incidents of kidnapping (paragraphs 68-83); and
 - state protection (paragraphs 102-106)

[Back to Contents](#)

4. Actors of violence

4.1 Sunni militants (including Daesh)

- 4.1.1 An article by McClatchy DC Bureau, a news service in Washington DC, dated March 2013, noted that Iraqis who worked with Americans, who applied for special US visas, and their advocates, said that Sunni militants threatened them¹.
- 4.1.2 Malcolm W Nance, in his book 'The Terrorists of Iraq: Inside the Strategy and Tactics of the Iraq Insurgency 2003-2014', published in December 2014, wrote: 'The tactics selected by the terrorist insurgents on any given day have a single terminal objective: to kill a government soldier, a perceived collaborator (government workers), or any foreigner to maintain the destabilization of the Shiite majority-based regime.'²
- 4.1.3 A post by The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, which describes itself as a 'non-profit operating in the U.S., founded with the belief that the United States Government has a clear and urgent moral obligation to resettle to safety Iraqis who are imperilled [sic] due to their affiliation with the United States of America', undated but copyrighted 2017, read:

¹ McClatchy DC Bureau, 'U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...', 14 March 2013, [url](#).

² Malcolm W Nance, 'The Terrorists of Iraq: ...', December 2014, p. xxiv. Hard copy only.

‘Compounding the urgency, the terrorist group which is responsible for the slaying of many U.S.-affiliated Iraqis over the years, the Islamic State of Iraq, has just issued its strategic plan, which the List Project has examined.

‘There are clear references to steadily and patiently targeting U.S.-affiliated Iraqis in the wake of our [the US-led Coalition] departure. The perception, however desirable, that the “surge” eliminated the possibility of terrorist groups to carry out complex and high-impact attacks ignores the numerous attacks during the past year of withdrawal. The Islamic State of Iraq, an umbrella organization which includes Al-Qaeda in Iraq, has claimed responsibility the majority of these attacks, several of which targeted foreign embassies.’³

4.1.4 It is not exactly clear what period this source is referring to; however, the source refers to the ‘past year of [US] withdrawal’, which suggests that it is 2009-2011. The source also refers to the ‘Islamic State of Iraq’, a forerunner to Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) (‘Daesh’). The group changed its name to ISIS in 2013.

4.1.5 The UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), in their November 2016 Position on Returns to Iraq, citing various sources, commented:

‘ISIS [Daesh] is reported to systematically target those considered to be affiliated or collaborating with the Iraqi Government, the ISF [Iraqi Security Forces] or associated forces. Persons opposing, or perceived to be opposing ISIS, or infringing on ISIS rules, are reported to be at risk of severe punishment meted out by self-appointed Shari’a courts without due process. As ISIS has come under increased military pressure, it has reportedly also abducted and executed former members of the ISF and men and boys unwilling to fight on behalf of the group. There are also reports that ISIS has been threatening relatives of those they suspect to be supporting the ISF. The enforcement of summary justice reportedly includes, inter alia, executions by shooting, beheading, stoning, burning, drowning, electrocution and throwing off tall buildings, as well as flogging, crucifixion and amputation of limbs. According to reports, ISIS is holding large numbers of people captive while torture and ill-treatment are said to be widely used in ISIS facilities.’⁴

[Back to Contents](#)

4.2 Shia militia

4.2.1 An article by McClatchy DC Bureau, dated March 2013, noted that Iraqis who worked with Americans, who applied for special US visas, and their advocates, said that the Shia militia threatened them⁵.

4.2.2 A Landinfo response (translated into English), dated 2016, which cited various sources, noted:

‘One can not in general terms today say that the Shiite militias promotes threats or violent [sic] to people who work for, or are / have been involved, foreign companies in Iraq. This was a relevant issue in the period before the

³ The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, ‘A History of ... Withdrawals’, undated © 2017, [url](#).

⁴ UNHCR, UNHCR Position on Returns to Iraq, 14 Nov 2016, para 10, [url](#).

⁵ McClatchy DC Bureau, ‘U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...’, 14 March 2013, [url](#)

Americans pulled their troops out of Iraq in December 2011, and especially in the most violent period between 2005 and 2008. According to the UNHCR occurred albeit [sic] still some attacks against people who had worked for foreign forces or organizations in 2012.

‘Before the Americans pulled out of Iraq, were people who worked for the US-led coalition subjected to abuse by militias, including the Shiite, who wanted to liberate Iraq from occupation forces. This affected not only Iraqis who assisted the forces directly, but also others who worked in the civil, such as in the oil sector.

‘Today however, the situation is different. The Shiite militias are now, in spite of internal feuds and power struggles, mainly focused on combating the threat from the Islamic State (IS).

‘What may trigger these militias to again threaten foreign players in Iraq, and possibly their local partners, the return of foreign ground forces. This is a bone of contention in Iraqi politics. As a result of IS's seizure of power in parts of central Iraq, the foreign forces, including American, again returned to the country. These have mainly been doing consulting and training of Iraqi forces. As of August 2014, they also assisted the Iraqi army with air strikes against IS targets. These forces participation in ground operations has so far been minimal and largely confined to the Kurdish forces' operational areas.

‘Influential militia leaders have stated that they will not allow foreign ground forces, and has threatened violent reactions if US troops will participate in ground operations

‘The influential Shiite politician Moqtada al-Sadr, who in recent months has collected thousands of people in Baghdad in demonstrations against the government's lack of reforms, has also come with direct warnings to the American and British Embassy in Baghdad. When al-Sadr in March planned to enter the well-guarded Green Zone, where the main government offices and foreign embassies are located, he warned the US and Britain that they would meet reactions if they intervened.’⁶

4.2.3 The response added:

‘Working for foreigners has not in itself something of apostasy from Islam to do [sic]. The term "apostate" was still used rhetorically whether people who worked for the foreign forces, especially in the most violent period in Iraq between 2005-2008.

‘Today this is no longer a relevant issue in the face of Shiite militias. Shiite militias aimed to get the foreign forces out of Iraq, and that goal was reached in December 2011. What may happen if the US military presence in Iraq increases in the future, as signalled [sic] by the US authorities, is not easy to predict (Browne 2016). However, there is nothing as yet indicate they will get in the same situation as in 2005-2008. Both sjiamilitsene [Shia militia], Iraqi authorities and the US military have a common goal in fighting IS, and the US military contribution is specifically linked to this. Iraqi soldiers who work

⁶ Landinfo, ‘Response Iraq: The situation for the people who worked for foreign companies’, 2016, translated by the Home Office. Available on request.

closely with the foreign forces, is today, though among the most vulnerable in Iraq. However, it is not the Shiite militias as attacks against them, but IS.⁷

- 4.2.4 An article in Al-Monitor, dated October 2016, noted that ‘factions’ of the PMU [Popular Mobilisation Units – the Shia militia] are ‘threatening to attack US troops that participate in the battle to liberate Mosul from the Islamic State (IS), but the Iraqi government hopes to smooth things over...’ The article quoted PMU leader Rayan al-Kaldani, who in September 2016 said: “The PMU will be dealing with any illegitimate and foreign forces in Mosul the way it deals with the gangs of the Islamic State.” A former US military intelligence officer, Michael Pregent, said that most of the PMU factions fighting alongside US forces have fought against US forces in the past and that: ‘Most, if not all, PMU factions perceive the US military presence in Iraq as an occupation.’⁸
- 4.2.5 The article continued: ‘Many of the Shia militias fighting in the PMUs also fought U.S. soldiers during the occupation, and they disdain anyone who collaborated with the U.S.’⁹
- 4.2.6 A post by The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, undated but copyrighted 2017, read: ‘The British conducted little contingency planning throughout their withdrawal from Basrah in Southern Iraq [in 2007]. As they withdrew, militias systematically hunted British-affiliated Iraqis, warning them to “get out or die.”’¹⁰

[Back to Contents](#)

5. Perceived collaborators

5.1 Types

- 5.1.1 An article in the Washington Post, dated September 2015, noted that there were ‘50,000’ men and women who served as interpreters for the US military in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, it is not clear how many of this number worked in Iraq¹¹. An article in The New York Times, dated February 2017, noted: ‘Thousands of interpreters, known to troops as “terps”, worked for the USA in missions in Afghanistan and Iraq.’¹² The Congressional Budget Office reported that as of August 2008, roughly 70,000 Iraqis were working for U.S. government agencies or their contractors in Iraq¹³.
- 5.1.2 An article in Task & Purpose, which describes itself as a ‘news site for veterans, by veterans’, dated July 2016, noted that interpreters who worked with the American armed forces were embedded with units and were used during meetings with Iraqi city leaders, security patrols, combat missions and sometimes emergency medical situations after bombings. Often they translated documents or videos that troops would find in underground

⁷ Landinfo, ‘Response Iraq: The situation for the people who worked for foreign companies’, 2016, translated by the Home Office. Available on request.

⁸ Al-Monitor, ‘Will PMU attack US troops in Iraq?’, 3 October 2016, [url](#)

⁹ The Daily Caller, ‘Left Behind: Iraqi Interpreter Faces Death Threats ...’, 20 April 2016, [url](#)

¹⁰ The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, ‘A History of ... Withdrawals’, undated © 2017, [url](#)

¹¹ Washington Post, ‘Forget the Syrian refugees. ...’, 17 September 2015, [url](#). Subscription required.

¹² New York Times, ‘Visa Ban Amended to Allow Iraqi Interpreters Into U.S.’, 2 Feb 2017, [url](#)

¹³ The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, ‘A History of ... Withdrawals’, undated © 2017, [url](#)

terrorist caches¹⁴. An article in The New York Times, dated February 2017, noted: 'In addition to interpreting, they also advised US soldiers through Iraqi politics, tribal disputes and social customs.'¹⁵ An article in Al Jazeera, dated February 2017, noted that 'tens of thousands' of Iraqis worked with the Americans as engineers, drivers or cultural consultants (as well as interpreters), for which they face 'grave dangers'.¹⁶

- 5.1.3 An article in the Daily Caller, dated April 2016, noted that 'thousands of interpreters risked their lives working on behalf of the United States during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan'.¹⁷
- 5.1.4 An article in The New York Times, dated February 2017, noted that interpreters who worked for the United States between 2003 and 2011 worked 'often at great...risk' to themselves and their families...They were given American nicknames like "Tony" and "Bobby" and "Max". The article said that they 'often wore scarves across their faces to mask their identities'.¹⁸
- 5.1.5 An article in Fortune, dated January 2017, quoted Allen Vaught, a former US Army captain who worked in Fallujah: "A lot of translators were trying to get the hell out of there because they had a mark on their head for working with U.S forces...They're viewed as collaborators".¹⁹
- 5.1.6 An article by McClatchy DC Bureau, dated March 2013, noted that people who worked with Americans were viewed as 'enemy collaborators'.²⁰
- 5.1.7 The same source noted that, in 2008, 'militants' targeted those who served in 'supporting roles'.²¹
- 5.1.8 An article in Al Jazeera, dated February 2017, noted that, in December 2006, an armed group targeted a family because one member worked at a US military base in Baghdad²².

[Back to Contents](#)

5.2 Incidents of targeting

- 5.2.1 An article in the Daily Caller, which describes itself as a 'for-profit, independent news outlet' and 'one of America's largest and fastest-growing publications', dated April 2016, noted: 'While most of the U.S. military personnel who fought in those conflicts [in Afghanistan and Iraq] have now returned home, a majority of their interpreters remain in-country and their lives are in as much danger now as they were before'. It described the experience of 'Mahbeer', from a Shia-controlled part of eastern Baghdad, who worked as an interpreter for the US Army for five years. The article said that Mahbeer's wife and children are also in danger. Mahbeer said: "We

¹⁴ Task & Purpose, 'This Iraqi Interpreter ... Finds Peace in Texas', 14 July 2016, [url](#)

¹⁵ New York Times, 'Visa Ban Amended to Allow Iraqi Interpreters Into U.S.', 2 Feb 2017, [url](#)

¹⁶ Al Jazeera, 'What happens to Iraqis who worked with the US military', 1 Feb 2017, [url](#)

¹⁷ The Daily Caller, 'Left Behind: Iraqi Interpreter Faces Death Threats ...', 20 April 2016, [url](#)

¹⁸ New York Times, 'Visa Ban Amended to Allow Iraqi Interpreters Into U.S.', 2 Feb 2017, [url](#)

¹⁹ Fortune, 'Trump Refugee Order Dashes Hopes of Iraqis ...', 28 Jan 2017, [url](#)

²⁰ McClatchy DC Bureau, 'U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...', 14 March 2013, [url](#)

²¹ McClatchy DC Bureau, 'U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...', 14 March 2013, [url](#)

²² Al Jazeera, 'What happens to Iraqis who worked with the US military', 1 Feb 2017, [url](#)

[those who worked with the US] are afraid of everything: armed militias backed by Iran on our streets, without fear of the government, on the pretext that they are protecting Iraq and at the same time they are a serial killer[s]”’. Mahbeer said his life was first threatened through an anonymous death threat letter²³.

- 5.2.2 The article continued: ‘Mahbeer said he knows many interpreters who have been harassed and killed for their work with the U.S. One example he provided was that of a young man who was killed four months ago [December 2015]. He left his house one day day [sic] never to return – his body was later discovered.’ The article noted: ‘Cases like those of Mahbeer [who received death threats] are all too common.’²⁴ However, the article did not provide further specific examples.
- 5.2.3 An article in Task & Purpose, dated July 2016, described the experiences of an interpreter who worked for the US military between 2008 and 2011, who received ‘numerous’ death threats, felt unable to leave his house in Baghdad and feared terrorists and militias. The interpreter said: “Honestly, they hate us more than the United States Army...Multiple times they called me a traitor”. He was sent a death threat in the post in 2010 which made him change address; although he was followed home from work in 2011, which prompted him to quit his job²⁵.
- 5.2.4 An article in Fortune, dated January 2017, cited Allen Vaught, a former US Army captain who worked in Fallujah, who said that two interpreters he worked with were executed by militia groups. It is not clear when this allegedly happened, although the article noted that Vaught went to Iraq in 2003²⁶.
- 5.2.5 An article by McClatchy DC Bureau, dated March 2013, noted that people who worked with Americans are viewed as ‘enemy collaborators’ and receive ‘death threats’, even 15 months after the US withdrawal from the country. It cited Khaldoun Kubba, who worked with the US government after the invasion on projects in south Iraq: “People don’t forget what you did. Ever.”²⁷
- 5.2.6 An article in Foreign Policy, dated February 2017, documented the experience of the interpreter Munther Alaskry, who claimed he moved house four times in Baghdad for safety reasons since he stopped working for the US military²⁸.
- 5.2.7 A post by The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, undated but copyrighted 2017, read: ‘Many more [than ‘hundreds and likely thousands’] have been abducted, tortured, raped, and forced to flee as a result of their collaboration...’²⁹

²³ The Daily Caller, ‘Left Behind: Iraqi Interpreter Faces Death Threats ...’, 20 April 2016, [url](#)

²⁴ The Daily Caller, ‘Left Behind: Iraqi Interpreter Faces Death Threats ...’, 20 April 2016, [url](#)

²⁵ Task & Purpose, ‘This Iraqi Interpreter ... Finds Peace in Texas’, 14 July 2016, [url](#)

²⁶ Fortune, ‘Trump Refugee Order Dashes Hopes of Iraqis ...’, 28 Jan 2017, [url](#)

²⁷ McClatchy DC Bureau, ‘U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...’, 14 March 2013, [url](#)

²⁸ Foreign Policy, ‘For Iraqi Military Interpreters ...’, 6 February 2017, [url](#)

²⁹ The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, ‘A History of ... Withdrawals’, undated © 2017, [url](#)

- 5.2.8 The source also stated: 'While the full scale of violence will likely never be known with certainty, hundreds and likely thousands have already been slain...In a single mass killing, 17 interpreters were assassinated; their bodies were strewn throughout the streets of Basrah [in 2006].'³⁰
- 5.2.9 An article in McClatchy DC Bureau, dated March 2013, noted that, in 2008, 'militants were regularly tracking and executing Iraqis who served in supporting roles'.³¹
- 5.2.10 An article in the Daily Mail, dated May 2015, reported that Daesh publicly hanged a 'suspected spy', accused of collaborating with the Iraqi army, in a location 30 miles from Ramadi³².
- 5.2.11 An article in Al Jazeera, dated February 2017, reported that, in December 2006 in Baghdad, 'armed men dressed in Iraqi military uniforms' raided the home of Farah Marcolla, killed her husband and kidnapped her father (who was later ransomed)³³.
- 5.2.12 Iraq specialists attending a European Asylum Support Office (EASO) meeting on Iraq in April 2017 were asked: 'Are interpreters/drivers etc that works [sic] for the coalition still at risk of being persecuted?' Mark Lattimer, Director of the London-based Ceasefire Centre for Civilian Rights, responded: 'To my knowledge, there have not been many cases recently. There are many US personnel still in Iraq; with most of the government; this is a less sensitive job than previously'.³⁴
- 5.2.13 Gareth Stansfield, Professor of Middle East Politics and the Al-Qasimi Chair of Arab Gulf Studies at the University of Exeter, responded to the above-mentioned question: 'Iraqis can forget quickly, but they can also remember quickly. If, for instance, the Asaib Ahl al-Haq [militia] made good on their threats to target Americans then you could see guilt by association coming back in and the re-targeted [sic] of former American associates coming back. It has changed over time, but it could change again and quickly'.³⁵
- 5.2.14 The Iraq Body Count (IBC) organisation maintains a list of documented civilian deaths in Iraq. In the period 20 March 2003 - 31 December 2011, when the US military left Iraq, 103 translators are listed as having been killed and a further 22 were wounded. In the more than five years since then until 28 February 2017 - the most recent date for which data has been entered in the database - only three translators are listed as having died in Iraq, one of whom was working for the Venezuelan embassy³⁶.

[Back to Contents](#)

³⁰ The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, 'A History of ... Withdrawals', undated © 2017, [url](#)

³¹ McClatchy DC Bureau, 'U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided ...', 14 March 2013, [url](#)

³² Daily Mail, 'ISIS hangs 'Iraqi army collaborator' from bridge ...', 20 May 2015, [url](#)

³³ Al Jazeera, 'What happens to Iraqis ...', 1 February 2017, [url](#)

³⁴ EASO, COI Meeting Report, Iraq, 25-26 April 2017, Brussels, July 2017 (p.26), [url](#)

³⁵ EASO, COI Meeting Report, Iraq, 25-26 April 2017, Brussels, July 2017 (p.26), [url](#)

³⁶ Iraq Body Count, Database – Documented civilian deaths from violence, [url](#)

Terms of Reference

A 'Terms of Reference' (ToR) is a broad outline of what the CPIN seeks to cover. They form the basis for the [country information section](#). The Home Office's Country Policy and Information Team uses some standardised ToRs, depending on the subject, and these are then adapted depending on the country concerned.

For this particular CPIN, the following topics were identified prior to drafting as relevant and on which research was undertaken:

- Actors of violence
 - Sunni militants (including Daesh)
 - Shia militia
- Perceived collaborators
 - Types
 - Incidents of targeting

[Back to Contents](#)

Bibliography

Sources cited

Al Jazeera, 'What happens to Iraqis who worked with the US military', 1 February 2017, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/02/muslim-ban-closing-door-170201050223763.html>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Al-Monitor, 'Will PMU attack US troops in Iraq?', 3 October 2016, <https://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2016/10/pmu-iraqi-us-mosul-battle.html>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

The Daily Caller, 'Left Behind: Iraqi Interpreter Faces Death Threats For Helping US Troops', 20 April 2016, <http://dailycaller.com/2016/04/20/left-behind-iraqi-interpreter-faces-death-threats-for-helping-us-troops/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Daily Mail, 'ISIS hangs 'Iraqi army collaborator' from bridge just an hour's drive from Baghdad as terror hordes attack another town on their march towards capital', 20 May 2015, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3089235/ISIS-hangs-Iraqi-army-collaborator-bridge-just-hour-s-drive-Baghdad-terror-hordes-attack-town-march-capital.html>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

European Asylum Support Office (EASO), EASO COI Meeting Report, Iraq, Practical Cooperation Meeting, 25-26 April 2017, Brussels, July 2017, <https://www.easo.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/coi-iraq-meeting-report.pdf>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Foreign Policy, 'For Iraqi Military Interpreters, Trump Travel Ban Chaos is 'Life and Death'', 6 February 2017, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/06/for-iraqi-military-interpreters-trump-travel-ban-chaos-is-life-and-death/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Fortune, 'Trump Refugee Order Dashes Hopes of Iraqis Who Helped the U.S.', 28 January 2017, <http://fortune.com/2017/01/28/trump-refugees-iraqi-translators/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Iraq Body Count (IBC), Database – Documented civilian deaths from violence, <https://www.iraqbodycount.org/database/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Landinfo, 'Response Iraq: The situation for the people who worked for foreign companies', 2016, translated by the Home Office. Available on request.

The List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, 'A History of Just and Unjust Withdrawals', undated by copyrighted 2017, <http://thelistproject.org/history/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Malcolm W Nance, 'The Terrorists of Iraq: Inside the Strategy and Tactics of the Iraq Insurgency 2003-2014', December 2014, p. xxiv. Hard copy only.

McClatchy DC Bureau, 'U.S. pledge to help Iraqis who aided occupation largely unfulfilled', 14 March 2013, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/nation-world/world/article24746656.html>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

The New York Times, 'Visa Ban Amended to Allow Iraqi Interpreters Into U.S.', 2 February 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/02/world/middleeast/trump-visa-ban-iraqi-interpreters.html?mcubz=0>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

Task & Purpose, 'This Iraqi Interpreter, Called A Traitor At Home, Finds Peace in Texas', 14 July 2016, <http://taskandpurpose.com/iraqi-interpreter-called-traitor-home-finds-peace-texas/>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNHCR Position on Returns to Iraq, 14 November 2016, paragraph 10, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/58299e694.html>. Accessed: 7 January 2019

The Washington Post, 'Forget the Syrian refugees. America needs to bring its Afghan and Iraqi interpreters here first', 17 September 2015, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/09/17/forget-the-syrian-refugees-america-needs-to-bring-its-afghani-and-iraqi-interpreters-here-first/>. Subscription required.

[Back to Contents](#)

Sources consulted but not cited

n/a

[Back to Contents](#)

Version control

Clearance

Below is information on when this note was cleared:

- version **2.0**
- valid from **11 February 2019**

Changes from last version of this note

Inclusion of accepted recommendations by the Independent Advisory Group on Country Information (IAGCI)

[Back to Contents](#)