

Religious liberty

Law



Justice Antonin Scalia dissented in the given case stating that the Act's stated purpose that is "protecting academic freedom" stood to be a legitimate secular purpose. In other sense, Justice Scalia believed that the considered academic freedom also included within its ambit the students' right to be exposed to religious views and indoctrination.

The majority opinion seems more to be in consonance with the Supreme Court interpretation of the Establishment Clause in a historical context. In the light of *Engel v. Vitale* (1962) decision, it could be said that the inclusion of such texts, dogmas, practices and theories in the school curricula that adhered to a specific religion amounted to a violation of the Establishment Clause. However, if one takes into consideration the ruling in *Zorach v. Clauson* (1952), it could be said that the Supreme Court could have modified its ruling by leaving the study of creationism in Public Schools as an optional choice, subject to the opinions and considerations of the specific students. The ruling in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971) also supports the Edwards ruling, as the inculcation of religious courses at state expenses amounted to an entanglement between the state and the religion. Besides, in a historical context, the United States Constitution has always been averse to Fundamentalist views supportive of religious literalism and contrary to a liberal scientific temperament.