

Revealed: the press regulator's leaked guidelines on Islamophobia

From the [UK's one-man Islamophobia media monitor](#)') who has made it his mission to complain about so-called 'Islamophobia' in the UK's media. He does so to editors directly and via Ipso's official complaint channels.

One national newspaper editor confirmed that he frequently corrects stories online when Versi contacts him – if only to stop the deluge of emails, which can relate to obscure points about the history of Islam.

No one has been told who sits on Ipso's group, deciding how the British press should report about Islam. Which is odd: why the secrecy? When Sir Alan Moses, Ipso's outgoing chairman, was asked twice in private for details of the Ipso group, he said it was confidential, then wasn't sure – and certainly didn't reveal its membership. But I can confirm that one of its members is the very same Miqdaad Versi. Soon, he may well be able to complain to Ipso about stories he dislikes, using guidance that he himself helped to draft. In a commercial sphere, this would be called 'regulatory capture': when a vested interest leans on a regulator to rewrite the rulebook, then uses the new rules to their own advantage.

The Muslim Council of Britain has tried to set up its own press watchdog: the academic-sounding 'Centre for Media Monitoring' . . . also under the control of Miqdaad Versi, who is executive director.

Even without the new Ipso guidance in place, a number of editors and journalists have spoken privately to us about the 'chilling effect' that has already occurred in relation to subjects that touch on Islam. There is a degree of self-

censorship going on and this raises the question: what stories have been set aside on the grounds that pursuing them might bring too much trouble? Note that some of the UK's foremost investigative journalists – such as Andrew Norfolk and Dominic Kennedy of the *Times* – have already been denounced by activists for their alleged 'Islamophobia'. *And don't forget that even*