

Draft Letter (Catholic/Christian perspective)

Dear [MP],

I am writing to you as your constituent, asking you to oppose the adoption of a state-backed definition of “Islamophobia.”

This matter is urgent. A government Working Group, chaired by former Conservative MP Dominic Grieve, is currently preparing a definition of “anti-Muslim hatred/Islamophobia.” The Group was created in February 2025 and is expected to deliver its advice within six months, without parliamentary debate or scrutiny. The consultation has already closed, and the Group could make its recommendation—behind closed doors—within weeks.

As a Christian, I believe all people are created in the image of God and deserve equal dignity and protection before the law. Britain already embodies this principle: we have long traditions of religious tolerance, and the law rightly protects people of all faiths—including Muslims, Christians, Jews, Sikhs, and Hindus—from hatred and discrimination. Indeed, surveys show that nine in ten Britons are comfortable living alongside those of different beliefs, more than anywhere else in Europe. This is something to be celebrated.

Given these protections, it is unclear why a further, separate category is needed. To single out one religious community for special safeguards would contradict the Christian principle of justice—that all should be treated without partiality (James 2:1). Such a step would risk deepening division, rather than fostering harmony. Even Fiyaz Mughal, the Muslim founder of Tell MAMA, has warned that privileging one group in law would “cause major social divisions.”

Moreover, Britain deliberately removed blasphemy laws in 2008, recognising that in a plural society no religion should be shielded from criticism or scrutiny by the state. To introduce an official definition of “Islamophobia” would risk re-establishing blasphemy laws by the back door, but this time favouring a single faith. This would be a step backward, undermining hard-won freedoms of speech and conscience.

There is also a grave risk that such a definition would suppress free speech and hinder truth-telling. Christians are called to speak the truth in charity (Ephesians 4:15), even when it is uncomfortable. Yet some have already branded legitimate concerns—for example, about the role of some Muslim men in grooming gang scandals—as “Islamophobic.” Baroness Casey’s report on those scandals noted that fear of the label “Islamophobic” was one reason officials failed to act. Sarah Champion MP, who courageously raised this issue, was even nominated as “Islamophobe of the Year” by the Islamic Human Rights Commission.

To enshrine such a definition would therefore silence not only criticism of Islamist extremism but also honest public discussion of social harms. That is not justice, but a form of partiality that undermines the common good.

In conclusion, a state-backed definition of "Islamophobia" is unnecessary, divisive, and unjust. The law should protect people equally, without privileging one group above others. Please stand for fairness and for our nation's Christian heritage of equal treatment, and oppose this change. At the very least, the Working Group's proposed definition should be published and subjected to open debate in Parliament before any decision is taken.

I would be grateful to know your position on this matter and how you intend to represent the views of constituents who share these concerns.

Yours sincerely,
[Name]