

### Task 3 - Depth Analysis of One Column and Two Extras

For many years, there has been a lot of debate over the separation of church and state. While many Americans are strongly for the separation, many are in favor of the separation. Three articles on this subject are very different in points of view and tone, while they are similar in other ways.

The son  
of the founders  
of America

Columnist Mona Charen implies that it is unfortunate that leaders try to incorporate faith into the wrong aspects of politics, including health care reform. Charen pokes fun at Democrats in a sarcastic tone by saying, "Religion in a Democrat is evidence of deep moral commitment, even greatness." This reveals that Charen thinks that some Democrats use religion as a way to achieve "greatness" in order to get votes. In Mona Charen's eyes, Democrats are using religion as a last resort to get health care reform passed, because of the resistance the bill faced. This comes as a surprise, because recently, Democrats have not really been outspoken about religion.

hum... do you think the kind of segregation

this is what is disagree - Certainly not true historically for BIR Democrats

A second article, called "Democrats for Jesus", emphasizes the benefits and affects of being a Christian Democrat. Common Good Strategies is a firm that helps Democratic candidates talk about their faith. CGS sets guidelines for candidates, and as a result, the candidates have been very successful in winning races. CGS suggests that candidates not talk about the separation of church and state, mention how their faith has an effect on policy issues. A third article, titled, "Religion should take back seat in politics", emphasizes that the separation of church and state is needed. Their reason for this is that decisions are not clearly made when religion is an influence.

Mona Charen's column is written from a conservative point of view, whereas the other two articles are written from a Democratic point of view. This factor alone makes the three articles very different. For example, Charen's column implies, in a very sarcastic tone, that it is ironic that suddenly, President Obama is called upon rabbis for help to get health care reform passed, but previously said that religious questions were "above his pay grade". The second article is pleasant in tone, and proves that there are successful Christian Democrats. The third article is strongly opposed to religion in politics, and emphasizes that religion should not have any influence in political decisions.

The original article and the second article, "Democrats for Jesus" are convincing because they both provide many pieces of evidence. However, the third article is not convincing because it does not provide much evidence and it is mostly opinion.

For example?

Cash - I actually wanted to hear more