



1 Testimony in Opposition to SB2355 – Intelligent Design

2 Chairman Beard members of the committee, I'm here to speak in strong opposition to this  
3 bill that would require intelligent design to be included in HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE If  
4 **Intelligent Design (ID)** were to be taught in an academic setting, it would be most appropriately  
5 placed in courses focused on **philosophy, religious studies, or history of science** rather than in  
6 science classes.

7 With all due respect to the bill sponsors. This subject matter does not belong in high school  
8 science courses

9 Intelligent design is considered inappropriate for high school science curricula for several  
10 reasons, primarily because it does not meet the criteria of scientific theory and conflicts with the  
11 principles of science education. Here's why: # 1. The courts have ruled it is a theory or religion  
12 not of science. But more:

- 13 1. **Lack of Empirical Evidence and Testability** – Science is based on observable, testable,  
14 and falsifiable explanations for natural phenomena. Intelligent design does not offer  
15 testable hypotheses or empirical evidence that can be independently verified through  
16 experimentation.
- 17 2. **Violation of the Separation of Church and State** – Courts, including the U.S. Supreme  
18 Court, have ruled that teaching intelligent design in public school science classrooms  
19 violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. In *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area*  
20 *School District (2005)*, a federal court determined that intelligent design is a form of  
21 religious belief rather than a scientific theory, making it unconstitutional to include in  
22 public school science curricula.
- 23 3. **Misrepresentation of the Scientific Method** – Science relies on methodological  
24 naturalism, meaning it explains the natural world through natural causes. Intelligent  
25 design posits a supernatural cause, which falls outside the scope of scientific inquiry.  
26 Teaching it as science misrepresents the nature of scientific investigation.
- 27 4. **Consensus Among Scientists** – The overwhelming consensus among biologists,  
28 chemists, and physicists is that evolution, supported by genetics, fossil records, and other  
29 evidence, is the most robust scientific explanation for biodiversity. Intelligent design does  
30 not hold credibility in the scientific community as an alternative theory.
- 31 5. **Potential for Confusion Among Students** – Teaching intelligent design in science  
32 classes alongside evolution can create confusion about the nature of science and critical  
33 thinking. It blurs the line between faith-based beliefs and evidence-based scientific  
34 reasoning.
- 35 6. **Appropriate Venue for Discussion** – While intelligent design may be an appropriate  
36 topic for discussions in philosophy or religious studies courses, it does not belong in the  
37 science curriculum. Science education should focus on teaching theories that are  
38 supported by scientific evidence and peer-reviewed research.



1        **Court Rulings Define It as Religion, Not Science** – The *Kitzmiller v. Dover* (2005) trial  
2        concluded that ID is a religious belief and not a scientific theory, ruling that it should not be  
3        taught in public school science classes.

4        If **Intelligent Design (ID)** were to be taught in an academic setting, it would be most  
5        appropriately placed in courses focused on **philosophy, religious studies, or history of science**  
6        rather than in science classes. Here’s where it might fit:

### 7        **1. Philosophy Courses**

- 8        • **Philosophy of Science** – Discussing the nature of science, the demarcation problem  
9        (what separates science from non-science), and how ID compares to scientific theories  
10       like evolution.
- 11       • **Philosophy of Religion** – Exploring the argument from design, teleological arguments,  
12       and how ID relates to broader philosophical debates about the existence of a designer.

### 13       **2. Religious Studies Courses**

- 14       • **Comparative Religion** – Analyzing ID alongside traditional creationism, evolution, and  
15       other religious perspectives on the origin of life.
- 16       • **Theology Courses** – Examining ID’s roots in religious thought and its relationship to  
17       various theological interpretations of creation.

### 18       **3. History of Science Courses**

- 19       • **Evolution vs. Design in Scientific Thought** – Studying how ideas about design and  
20       evolution have developed over time, including figures like William Paley (who proposed  
21       the watchmaker analogy), Charles Darwin, and modern ID proponents.
- 22       • **Science and Society** – Exploring the cultural and legal battles over teaching evolution  
23       and ID in schools, including landmark court cases like *Kitzmiller v. Dover* (2005).

### 24       **4. Political Science or Law Courses**

- 25       • **Church and State in Education** – Analyzing legal cases surrounding ID, the  
26       Establishment Clause, and how courts have ruled on teaching religious concepts in public  
27       education.

### 28       **Where It Should NOT Be Taught:**

- 29       • **High School Science Classes** – Because ID lacks empirical support, falsifiability, and  
30       peer-reviewed research, it does not meet the criteria of scientific theory and is not  
31       appropriate for biology or other science curricula