

Integration of Creation Science and Intelligent Design in Public Schools

Among the most controversial and longest-standing scientific fields of interest in the interaction between religion, education, and politics is the question of whether Creation Science and Intelligent Design should be taught as part of science in public schools. Creation science relies on the literalistic interpretation of the Book of Genesis in the Bible, and it states that the universe, the Earth, and life are the result of the work of God, who created it in its present form within several thousand years in the world (Yeban). Even though Intelligent Design (ID) is more modern and less religious in its terms, there are elements of the natural world that are too intricate to be created in response to the work of natural selection alone, thus the emergence of an intelligent design. These perceptions are endorsed by those proponents, generally conservative Christian groups, and insist that such perceptions ought to have equal time in the science classes to alternatives to Darwinian evolution, and these are manifested as one of academic freedom and equity (Yeban). However, the overall problem is that neither Creation Science nor Intelligent Design meets the simple definition of the theory of nature: they are not supported above and below by values, which cannot be justified or rather disproved, that is why all of them take different attempts to explain with the help of supernatural laws, which are not the issue of the scientific investigation.

These teachings are highly serious when they are presented in the science syllabus in the publicly funded schools with regard to the legal, educational, and philosophical concerns. The U.S Supreme Court has, through law on several occasions, ruled out that Creationism or Intelligent Design should not be taught in a public school since such a move would contravene the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment that mandates the separation of religion and state. *Edwards v. Edwards v. [1996] (Classical) 424-425 U.S. 203*. In a case where Aguillard

(1987) struck down statutes that required schools to put Creation Science in their school curriculum next to evolution, the judge decided that the statutes were religion-based and not a secular learning process (Yeban). Similarly, the example of *Kitzmiller v 2005*. What did the rule Dover Area School District do in concluding that Intelligent Design is not a viable scientific theory but is rather a form of Creationism and could not be taught as a part of a regular science classroom? Along with the problem of legality, the incorporation of those beliefs has a detrimental impact on the teaching of the science field, as it shifts the mindset of religion-determined beliefs and scientific research, which is premised on empirically supported evidence (Berkman et al.). Science, by definition, tries to establish some natural explanation of the natural phenomena, and the addition of supernatural causation will alter the methodology of science and will also confuse students about what science is and how it functions.

Also, the campaign of incorporation of Creation Science and Intelligent Design into the school curricula is a component of a greater cultural and ideological struggle within American society. To the majority of conservative Christians, evolution can be seen as a threat to the central religious doctrines of creation of man and the purposes of God, thus the need to defend the beliefs within the education framework (Yeban). Nevertheless, such opinions popularized inside the learning institution must remain impartial and not advance a specific theological position since the presence of the introduction of pluralism and neutrality of the state institution (public school) suggests a certain theological perspective to students of other faiths (or even no religion whatsoever). It also plays against American students in the sciences and their competitiveness, which would compete globally since scientific literacy has evolved that became the foundation of modern biology, medicine, genetics, and environmental science. Scientific approaches, including those provided by the physical sciences, have never been the correct place

to disagree over the types of religious or philosophical perspectives of origins, and consequently, the role of science in those matters (Berkman et al.). Through this, the concern over whether religious sentiments were suppressed or not cannot be an issue, but the necessity to maintain academic rigor of the academic community and follow the constitutional precepts (Yeban). The integrity of the science education would ensure that the students would not only be capable of critical thinking skills, but that they would have the right perception of the natural world without sectarian orientation.

Works Cited

Berkman, Michael B et al. "Evolution and creationism in America's classrooms: a national portrait." *PLoS biology* vol. 6,5 (2008): e124. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0060124

Yeban, Jade. "Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design in Public Schools." *Findlaw*, 2025, www.findlaw.com/education/curriculum-standards-school-funding/creation-evolution-and-intelligent-design-in-public-schools.html. Accessed 22 Oct. 2025.