

The Concept of Separation of Church and State Grossly Misinterpreted by Liberals Today



This article is written primarily with US Americans in mind. I don't know what other countries in the world have a separation of Church and State. I know for sure the Philippines *doesn't* have it. I believe the Philippines is controlled by the Roman Catholic Church.

I'm writing this article because I think the principle of separation of Church and State is a *good* thing, not bad. This article explains why it's good, and how the Devil's people misinterpret it for evil.

So often I hear from Bible rejectors that American government agencies and public schools must not have any type of Christian activity or they are in violation of the Constitution. Does the US Constitution actually forbid Christianity?

Because of their belief in a separation of church and state, the framers of the Constitution favored a neutral posture toward religion. The members of the Constitutional Convention, the group charged with authoring the Constitution, believed that the government should have no power to influence its citizens toward or away from a religion. The principle of separating church from state was integral to the framers' understanding of religious freedom. They believed that **any governmental intervention in the religious affairs of citizens would necessarily infringe on their religious freedom.** (Source: [Cornell Law School](#))

The key words are, "any government intervention". When the Supreme Court in 1963 passed a law which forbids any public school teacher to read the Bible to their class, would not you call that "government intervention" on others religious freedom? I sure would!

You may be surprised as I was to learn exactly who and why the separation of Church and State was implemented in the government of the United States of America. It was promoted by the Baptists! They are the only non-Catholic group that was never a part of the Roman Catholic Church. Baptists were

previously known as Anabaptists. They existed long before the Protestant Reformation. There were many Bible-believing Christ-following groups that existed before the Protestant Reformation.

Not only were the Baptists persecuted by the Church of Rome, they were also persecuted by the Protestants in the early British colonies in America!

The following quotes are from [Religion in Colonial America: Trends, Regulations, and Beliefs](#)

Eight of the thirteen British colonies had official, or "established," churches, and in those colonies **dissenters who sought to practice or proselytize a different version of Christianity or a non-Christian faith were sometimes persecuted.**

In those colonies, the civil government dealt harshly with religious dissenters, exiling the likes of Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams for their outspoken criticism of Puritanism, and whipping Baptists or cropping the ears of Quakers for their determined efforts to proselytize. Official persecution reached its peak between 1659 and 1661, when Massachusetts Bay's **Puritan magistrates hung four Quaker missionaries.**

Virginia imposed laws obliging all to attend Anglican public worship. Indeed, to any eighteenth observer, the "legal and social dominance of the Church of England was unmistakable." After 1750, as Baptist ranks swelled in that colony, the colonial Anglican elite responded to their presence with force. **Baptist preachers were frequently arrested.** Mobs physically attacked members of the sect, breaking up prayer meetings and sometimes beating participants. As a result, the 1760s and 1770s witnessed a rise in discontent and discord within the colony (some argue that Virginian dissenters suffered some of the worst persecutions in antebellum America).

The following are quotes from [Letters between Thomas Jefferson and the Danbury Baptists \(1802\)](#)

The Baptists write to Jefferson:

Our sentiments are uniformly on the side of religious liberty--that religion is at all times and places a matter between God and individuals--that no man ought to suffer in name, person, or effects on account of his religious opinions--that the legitimate power of civil government extends no further than to punish the man who works ill to his neighbors; But, sir, our constitution of

government is not specific. Our ancient charter together with the law made coincident therewith, were adopted as the basis of our government, at the time of our revolution; and such had been our laws and usages, and such still are; that religion is considered as the first object of legislation; and therefore what religious privileges we enjoy (as a minor part of the state) we enjoy as favors granted, and not as inalienable rights; and these favors we receive at the expense of such degrading acknowledgments as are inconsistent with the rights of freemen. It is not to be wondered at therefore; if those who seek after power and gain under the pretense of government and religion should reproach their fellow men--should reproach their order magistrate, as a enemy of religion, law, and good order, because he will not, dare not, assume the prerogatives of Jehovah and make laws to govern the kingdom of Christ.

Jefferson's reply to the Baptists:

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

I hope you clearly see that Thomas Jefferson agreed with the Baptists that the laws of government should be limited only to civil secular matters, and not matters of religion or personal beliefs. The Baptists opposed the concept of union of Church and State which the Roman Empire applied throughout its history. Worship of the emperor was compulsory according to Roman law.

When Constantine promoted Christianity as the State Religion in 313, it was *not* a good thing! The government stopped persecuting the established large church which became the Catholic Church, but continued to persecute Christian groups that did not agree with the Catholic Church in doctrines and practices.

The following quotes are from [How Constantine Created the Christian Church](#)

Constantine saw Christianity's belief in one god as a way to unify the empire that had been so badly divided for two decades. But he discovered that Christianity itself was not unified. So, he called

the Council of Nicea in 325 to bring together the 1,800 bishops from around the empire to work out official doctrine and provide the basis for a unified Church. Constantine paid for the entire council and even paid for travel, giving bishops the right of free transportation on the imperial postal system.

The council laid the foundation of orthodox theology (Catholic theology) and declared several differing theologies heresies. Constantine's support initially gave Orthodoxy the ability to require Christians to adopt their doctrinal formulation. While during the next few decades, the church's fortunes waxed and waned, within a century, Christianity had been declared the official religion of the Roman Empire and non-Christian religions were in steep decline.

Do you see how the government took a hand in determining what is right and what is wrong in matters of Christian faith? This is exactly what the American Baptists wanted stopped!

The following are quotes from [Baptists: Separation of Church and State](#)

For Baptists, the concept of a free church in a free state rests not on political theory nor on human documents but on the word of God. The Baptist belief in religious freedom and its corollary, the separation of the institutions of church and state, comes from the Baptist commitment to the authority of the Bible.

What is meant by the terms "church" and "state"? The term "state" refers to governments. The Bible indicates that governments are ordained by God to provide law and order (Romans 13:1-5).

The term "church" refers to religious organizations. For Baptists, this includes both local congregations and various entities established for religious purposes, such as associations, conventions, schools and institutions for ministry.

Ideally, the relation of church and state is mutually beneficial. For example, the state is to provide order and safety; these are useful to the church in carrying out its mission (Acts 13-16). And the church contributes to a positive social order by helping to develop law-abiding, hard-working, honest citizens (Ephesians 4:24-32; 1 Peter 2:11-17).

Baptists contend that this mutual benefit works best when the institutions of church and state are separate and when neither seeks to control the other. The state is not to dictate doctrine, worship style, organization, membership or personnel for leadership of the church. The church is not to seek the power or the financial support of the state for spiritual ends. Such is the model set forth in the New Testament.

The Roman Catholic Church is in opposition to the concept of Church and State. The Pope claims temporal authority even today over the governments of the world whether they acknowledge him or not.

Likewise, after the Protestant Reformation got rolling, the Protestants continued the practice of controlling the government just like the Catholics did. It did not bare good fruit at all. In Geneva, the Presbyterians burned at the stake anyone who they considered a heretic. And they used the city government to do it. This is no different than what the Roman Catholic Church did throughout the centuries.

Islamic governments are in opposition to the separation of Church and State. It's illegal for Christians to preach the Gospel in Saudi Arabia.

The government of Israel has no separation of Church and State. It's now illegal to preach the Gospel in Israel.

The government of India seems to condone the persecution of Christians by Hindus.

All of the above is to show the reader the benefits of the separation of Church and State, and the evils of union of Church and State. Now let's talk about how the liberals are abusing the concept of separation of Church and State.

Quotes from

<https://www.flfamily.org/issues-research/legal-judicial/church-state/>

The so-called "wall of separation between church and state" has done more damage to America's religious and moral tradition than any other utterance of the Supreme Court. While the First Amendment was originally intended to prevent the establishment of a national religion and thus ensure religious liberty, **the Supreme Court's misuse of the "separation of church and state" phrase has fostered hostility toward, rather than protection of, religious freedom.**

Leftist liberal Democrats and some Catholic Republicans have grossly misinterpreted separation of Church and State by demanding any and all Christian-related activities to be banned from the public school system. The result has been the degradation of American society! School shootings! Drag queen story hour for little children! Biological males now compete with females in physical sports!

When I was a kid in the 1950s, it would have been unthinkable for the POTUS to promote the transgender movement and have an audience with an adult man who thinks he's a 12-year-old girl! And a beer company gives free beer to the adult man who pretends to be a female who is underage to drink to celebrate his 365 days of "girlhood". What kind of logic is that?! It's utter madness!

I'm sure the reader can come up with many examples of misinterpretation of the separation of Church and State. Your comments are welcome in the comments section.