

Obama's Choice, Not Ours

What do you think of Obama's choice of Rick Warren to deliver the inaugural invocation? Who would have been your choice?

1.....My choice to give the inaugural prayer for our first *Jewish* president will be the American rabbi who best represents the President-elect's vision of life and understanding of America's needs and potential for being good news to humanity and to the good earth.

2.....Since Obama is *an evangelical-liberal Christian*, I assume he sees Rick Warren as the Christian leader who best represents Obama's vision of life and understanding of America's needs and potential for being good news to humanity and to the good earth.

3.....As world figures of *open minds and generous hearts*, Obama and Warren give hope wherever they go. Obama will try to live out his book-title, "The Audacity of Hope"; and Warren's life radiates both spiritual and material hope. (Warren gives 90% of his income to charity and causes he believe in; takes no money for pastoring the Saddleback Church; and has paid back to that church all the money they ever paid him. He agrees with Jesus: "It's more fun to give than to get.")

4.....In his first press conference after announcing the selection of Warren, Obama passed off the why question by referring to the fact that despite his disagreements with Obama, Warren invited him to address Warren's church two years ago: *payback time*. Said Obama, he no more agrees with Warren on everything than Warren, when he invited Obama, agreed with him on everything.

5.....America today has so many single-issue lobbyists that any appointee for the inaugural prayer would outrage some lobbyists. I'm no lobbyist, but I'm pro-choice and disagree with Warren on abortion: too bad he doesn't agree with me. Too bad, say the gay-marriage lobbyists, he doesn't agree with them; but too bad they are screaming as if Obama had attacked their constitutional rights in appointing Warren for the inaugural prayer.

6.....My choice for the inaugural prayer would be, and is, Obama's.

BY WILLIS E. ELLIOTT | DECEMBER 27, 2008; 12:56 PM ETSAVE & SHARE:        

PREVIOUS: [CHOOSING WARREN: OBAMA AT HIS BEST](#) | NEXT: [WARREN A GOOD CHOICE; HERE'S A BETTER ONE](#)

Comments

Please report offensive comments below.

Obama is NOT an evangelical Christian. He is a mainline Protestant and he is left leaning. He does not believe in a 100% literal interpretation of the Bible.

POSTED BY: JIMWALSH1 | JANUARY 2, 2009 12:52 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

If I were to cast Warren back to 1963 he would be one of the Evangelical pastors who supported the "sanctity of traditional marriage": between a white man and a white woman. He would have compared Obama's parents, a Black man married to a white woman at the time, to Bestiality.

If I were to cast Willis E. Elliott, and his ilk, on that same stage he would be applauding Warren for handing out turkeys on Thanksgiving in the poor black neighborhoods (as if generosity was a christian miracle rather than the

fall back position for any church)

and Elliott would be excusing the president if he 'owed' the racist Warren a chit.

and Elliott would be excusing the president if he seemed to agree with anything else that Warren might say. As if telling someone they are an animal because of the color of their skin is excused as long as you can give an inspiring sermon on some other topic, as if telling a minority in this country that they are pedophiles who engage in incest is excusable as long as Willis E. Elliott isn't personally offended by the comments.

and Elliott would be telling civil rights leaders to stop whining and embrace Warren even while Warren dished his hate.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the civil rights movement which proved that we can have hope and made us realize that equality for all is a principle worth fighting for. Along the way we are still shocked, but should not be, that the very people who say they stand for hope are often the cause of duress and shame. Rick Warren, make no mistake, works hard to abolish hope for a minority of Americans. Asking him to lead a prayer with all Americans present means that Hope is an empty word to Obama, or perhaps it is a word they only wish remains empty for the gay community.

POSTED BY: SOLANUM | DECEMBER 29, 2008 11:45 AM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

What a curious argument. Let's see now. Inviting the Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan to Lyndon Johnson's inauguration in 1964 would have helped unite Americans, overcome the divisions created by the civil rights struggle, encouraged white racist bigots to moderate their bigotry, and pointed the way to a better America. The type of people who murdered peaceful civil rights workers, beat the Selma demonstrators to a bloody pulp, set loose the police dogs on black protesters, and bombed black churches would have seen the light and changed for the better if only mainstream America had simply showed them more tolerance.

You truly have to be deaf, blind, and dumb to believe that giving an evangelical preacher like Warren a seat at the table serves the cause of inclusiveness and dialogue. You undermine, not reinforce, the cause of inclusiveness by conveying legitimacy to the voices of exclusiveness. The civil rights battle was not won by inviting racist bigots into the tent. On the contrary. The civil rights battle was won by kicking the racists out of the tent and telling them never to return.

The mentalities of the Rick Warrens of the world are even more set in concrete than the mentalities of the worst of the white racist bigots. God, remember, instructs Rev. Warren what to do and what to say. God cannot be right today and wrong tomorrow. Human dialogue does not change God's policies. Therefore, Rick Warren cannot be wrong yesterday and right tomorrow. Human dialogue will not change his policies.

That's the only way to deal with the current crop of religious-inspired bigots who preach discrimination against some classes of our fellow Americans. Relegate them to the margins of this society—just like we did with the once powerful KKK and its ilk.

I ask Barack Obama and all those who support his choice of Warren two questions:

1. What is the difference between Warren's insulting and inflammatory depiction of gays and a white racist bigot's depiction of blacks who led the civil rights movement as "just a bunch of trouble-making N-words?" I don't see it.
2. Using the "big tent" reasoning, tell me why that rationale could not be used to invite Louis Farrakhan to say a prayer at the inauguration?

POSTED BY: TBARKSDL | DECEMBER 29, 2008 7:52 AM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

It would be childish for me to be mad because Warren doesn't agree with me, but thanks for pointing that out, anyway.

Warren may believe that being gay is a sin, heck, perhaps like the Amish he believes that driving a car is a sin -but even that wouldn't make folks angry. What's truly sad is Warren's hatred. Comparing drivers to sexual predators and incestual polygamists: that is hate speech whether you're talking about automobiles or human beings.

He has a right to speak his mind, but since when do we look for bigotry to be the voice of our nation?

P.S. if you believe that driving a car is a sin, don't drive one.

~

POSTED BY: SOLANUM | DECEMBER 29, 2008 1:37 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Thanks, Soja!
And the best to you,
in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

POSTED BY: ELLIOTTWL | DECEMBER 28, 2008 10:51 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Dear Rev Elliot

A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year 2009!

Soja John Thaikattil
Sydney, Australia

POSTED BY: S_J_THAIKATTIL | DECEMBER 24, 2008 6:45 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The comments to this entry are closed.