

DUPLICITY MARKS WASHINGTON POST

On December 3, the Washington Post issued an editorial condemning the Catholic League for “censoring” the Smithsonian video. Below is Bill Donohue’s response, released to the press:

On November 30, I issued a news release objecting to a vile video that showed large ants crawling all over Jesus on the Cross. What mattered more than the video was its venue: it was part of a Smithsonian exhibition, an institution that would collapse absent federal funding. My central objection is this: if it is wrong for the government to use public monies to promote religion, it should be equally wrong for the government to bash religion. Accordingly, I asked that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees “reconsider future funding.”

I did not ask for the cops to storm the Smithsonian and confiscate the video. I did not ask to ban the exhibition. I did not even ask for the video to be pulled. I simply raised a question regarding the propriety of using public monies to fund an institution that assaults the sensibilities of Christians. And for this, I am labeled a “censor” by the *Washington Post*.

On December 1, the newspaper’s art critic said I missed the point of the video: it was really a statement about the suffering of a guy dying of AIDS. He’s right—I missed that point completely. Now in today’s editorial, the Post backs their critic’s interpretation, saying that the ants on the crucifix “could be understood as an expression of the ‘hideous, heart-rending loss of a loved one...’” I have news for them: it could also be seen as hate speech.

What is really astonishing is that on October 10, the *Washington Post* censored a cartoon because it “might offend and provoke some *Post* readers, especially Muslims.” And what was it? Some ants eating Muhammad? No. In fact, Muhammad was never even shown. The cartoon merely showed kids and animals frolicking about, asking, “Where’s Muhammad?” Their hypocrisy is sickening.