
Can We Agree on the Force, and Call It God?: Multi-disciplined Evidence and Organizational Implications

by

ERIC B. DENT, Ph. D.
University of North Carolina, Pembroke
P. O. Box 1510
Pembroke, NC 28372
910-522-5789 (w), 910-521-6750 (x), Eric.Dent@uncp.edu

Abstract

For a variety of reasons, most people do not know that the preponderance of scientific and humanistic evidence demonstrates the existence of God. Since it does, organizations should proceed, in their policies and practices, under this assumption, just as they would any other scientific finding. This paper briefly summarizes the evidence for God from the fields of philosophy, physics, neuroscience, biology, psychology, and management. Next, materialism is critiqued, establishing that people who choose not to believe in God are doing so because their worldview does not allow for non-materialist explanations, even when the preponderance of evidence points in that direction. The paper concludes with an exploration of how organizations might function differently if the existence of God is acknowledged.

Keywords: God, organizations, management, evidence, proof, materialism

God's Presence in Organizations

There is a very simple solution to a number of issues involving organizational life and certain forms of religious expression such as whether employees of some organizations can gather for prayer time at work, whether school children should repeat the pledge of allegiance with the words "under God," whether public organizations can invoke God or display items that represent a belief in God. The answer is to acknowledge in conventional wisdom, public policy, and practice, that God exists.

God is invoked in many organizations every day. The United States Senate begins each session with a prayer that typically mentions God. The pledge of allegiance to the flag is repeated each morning in many schools throughout the country. Countless retail transactions occur using coins that state "In God we trust." Some people pray privately to God at different times during the day. Some people pray to God at very specific hours of the day so that the fact that they are praying is well known.

Because of the breakdown of other strong sources of community - extended family, neighborhood, church, etc. - many employees now look to their places of employment for their friends, dates, sense of community, and spiritual strivings (Fry, 2003). Not only do nearly all people in the American workforce believe in God, but they want to express that belief in their workplaces. Meta-analyses of hundreds of research studies have found this conclusion to be universally true (Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005). People want to live lives that integrate who they are as employees, parents, lovers, members of religious organizations, hobbyists, and so forth (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000).

Some people favor all of these invocations of God, but others are opposed to each of them. Several of these disagreements result in lawsuits on disputes ranging from a school child hearing the pledge of allegiance to symbols of God being worn on clothing or being posted in workplace offices. A large part of the contention is that some people do not believe that God exists. If God does not exist, then it makes no sense to perpetuate this “superstition” and require people to be subject to it. The purpose of this paper is to show that belief in God is not a superstition, but, in fact, there is enough scientific evidence, using purely secular and humanist sources, to prove the existence of God. Such a proof does not require that people hold a belief in God. The Flat Earth Society has its followers and there are those who do not believe that cigarette smoking increases the likelihood of cancer. So, people are free to believe whatever they would like. However, as a society, in order for us to advance, we should establish policies based on the best available evidence at any point in time. Of course, it is possible that new information will change a given policy. However, using the process of inference to the best explanation (IBE), or abduction, a society should “infer what would, if true, provide the best of the competing explanations of the data we can generate” (Peacocke, 2002, 27). As this paper will show, the weight of evidence supports the existence of the God.

Imbuing the existence of God into corporate and legislative policies will eliminate many contentions including the few listed above. There are many problems it will not solve, though. Firstly, this paper will prove that there is a force or higher power operating in dimensions not accessible to most people. This paper, though, may only

be the first stage of more effort, as science proceeds, of demonstrating additional aspects of God. This first stage will only provide evidence of a higher power. It will not provide evidence of features of God that deists typically ascribe - a loving force concerned with each individual, with a plan for the universe, who desires to be worshiped. Consequently, to raise the rankles of non-theists as little as possible, the term *the Force* will be used throughout the paper for what has traditionally been named *God*.

Secondly, acknowledging the Force will not make clearer how several religious observances should be accommodated, or not, in the workplace. Such an acknowledgment will not clarify whether religious headwear can be worn in positions where the organization may have safety, image, or productivity objectives.

Recognizing the Force, though, will accomplish many goals desired by workers today. Many studies have shown that American workers want an integration of their lives, including an integration of their faith and their work. (Neal, Bergmann Lichtenstein, & Banner, 1999). Moreover, this integration becomes increasingly important as people age, and most developing countries have aging workforces. Recognizing the Force will be helpful in solving more problems related to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (as interpreted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) depending on how organizations navigate among belief in God, spirituality, and religion. Most of the academic literature argues for a distinction between spirituality and religion (Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005) but differentiating the two requires a fallacy in logic (Hicks, 2002; Bailey, 2001; Cash & Gray, 2000).

The outline for this proof of the existence of the Force is as follows: evidence provided will be empirical, philosophical, and historical/traditional. Fairly recent breakthroughs will be discussed from the fields of philosophy, physics/cosmology, neuroscience, biology, psychology, and management. Because the evidence is pervasive in so many areas, the number of fields presented here is limited only by space constraints and expresses the primary explorations of the author. Many other arguments could be elaborated, such as Godel's Incompleteness Theorem, which proves that rational thought can never reach the ultimate truth or Heisenberg's (1962) proof arguments of the philosophy of science which demonstrate that no one can observe nature directly but only nature exposed to a method of questioning, and that each method of questioning is limited. Next, this paper will conclude with a critique of the philosophy of materialism, one to which many popularizers of science subscribe.

Bear in mind that what is proven here could be construed as fairly modest - that there is someone or something that transcends the material life traditionally studied in science. No evidence is offered that this power, force, or transcendence is personal, wants to be worshiped, loves people, or has other attributes. During the final month of preparation of this paper, something fortuitous happened. One of the leading champions of atheism, Antony Flew recently reversed his 66-year position that God does not exist (Carrier, 2004). The definition of God he finds evidence for is consistent with the thesis of this paper, that there is a Force. Flew accepts only a "minimal" God who does not intervene regularly in life and does not provide for an after-life. Although there is scientific evidence of some attributes of the Force, such as its personal or

supra-personal nature, (Peacocke, 2002), that case will not be made here. No attempt is at this stage to provide evidence of other characteristics of the Force.

The Argument from Philosophy

Perhaps the oldest arguments for the existence of the Force can be found in philosophy, dating at least to Aristotle. These arguments have been offered in Greek, Middle Eastern, Asian, and European philosophical schools of thought¹. They have been labeled arguments from the nature of morality, from the meaning of life, from cosmology, from ontology, and so forth. In this paper, we will focus only on the teleological argument. Various challenges have been proposed to these philosophical arguments for the Force. Challenges and counter challenges have kept philosophers occupied over the centuries.

The teleological argument is that there was a particular purpose in establishing the universe and that someone or something was responsible for it. In this paper, it is labeled the Force. Please recall that the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the existence of the Force, a power that has capabilities beyond what human beings have. The principle challenges to the teleological argument have essentially boiled down to arguing that evolutionary processes explain phenomena in the universe that have the appearance of having been designed (“ongoing creation”). These arguments, however, do not address the instant of the creation of the universe (“initial creation”). This paper

¹ Note that at this time, there was no separation of philosophy, science, and theology. These were fused disciplines (Berman, 1981).

will not address any philosophical arguments other than those pertaining to the actual moment of the establishment of the universe.

People and nature can establish machines or phenomena that are self-organizing. They can establish scaffolding and other requirements to create the initial conditions that will then launch a self-generating process. However, there is no challenge in philosophy to the simple conclusion that someone/thing intended the universe to be created. Nobel prize winner Leon Lederman points out that there are no data about the beginning of the universe. Scientific data and equations have been developed for the universe only once it reaches the “mature” age of a billionth of a trillionth of a second. Any information about the creation of the universe before this time is inaccessible to the tools of science (Hawking, 1988; Nicholi, 2002).

I, personally, find the logical proof of creation to be the most compelling. Others, however, may be more inclined to theoretical and experimental physics in the area of cosmology, to which we now turn our attention.

The Argument from Physics/Cosmology

The only real challenge to the teleological argument has been against “ongoing creation,” that the process of self-organization greatly reduces some of the time needed for the evolution of, for example, human beings (Stewart & Cohen, 1997). Recent discoveries of the intricacy of DNA alone, discussed below, however, have provided substantial evidence in opposition to self-organizing processes resulting in DNA.

For those most inclined to scientific explanation, the Force is perhaps most visible in the evidence provided by cosmological physicists about creation. Nearly all

scientists working in the field accept the “hot” big-bang theory for the creation of the universe. Data about the creation moment can be extrapolated from the distance of certain bodies and the speed with which they are moving. Equations have been developed to explain these relationships. From these observations and equations, Green and Schwarz (1984) have shown that at 10^{-43} seconds after the creation event began at least 10 dimensions existed, and they split into two pieces - a four dimension piece that became our dimensions of length, width, height, and time and a six or more dimension piece that permanently ceased expanding and never produced matter (Green & Schwarz, 1984). Consequently, *anyone who accepts the evidence for the “hot” big bang theory is also accepting the evidence that someone or something operated in ten or more dimensions at the time of creation.*

Some historical background is instructive on this subject. Human beings take for granted a world of three spatial dimensions and one time dimension (for a total of four). Early in the 20th century, though, Albert Einstein concluded from his scientific work that there must be additional dimensions. Einstein’s conclusion was contrary to the generally held belief of the day that the universe is eternal and that time is reversible. George Ellis, Stephen Hawking, and Roger Penrose offered a proof of Einstein’s theory in 1966. In 1993, the Nobel prize in physics went to Russell Hulse and Joseph Taylor who established beyond a shadow of scientific doubt that Einstein was right and whoever or whatever caused the universe must possess at least one more dimension of time than the one in our universe (Taylor, et al, 1992; Penrose, 1994). Even more recent work has suggested that these six or more additional dimensions remain curled up everywhere within the other four dimensions (Bohm & Peat, 2000). Frederick Burnham,

a science-historian said in 1992, “These findings, now available, make the idea that God created the universe a more respectable hypothesis today than at any time in the last 100 years” (quoted in Schaeffer, 2003, 50).

A second cosmological perspective of analysis for the moment of creation examines the conditions necessary for a universe that can sustain any form of life. Barrow and Tipler (1987) have written a 736-page book codifying all of the constraints necessary for life in the universe. If any of hundreds of values had any, or more than a little, variation, the universe would not be able to sustain life. For example, “if the rate of expansion one second after the big bang had been smaller by even one part in a hundred thousand million million, the universe would have recollapsed before it ever reached its present size” (Hawking, 1988, 121-122). “If the electric charge of the electron had been only slightly different, stars either would have been unable to burn hydrogen and helium, or else they would not have exploded” (Hawking, 1988, 125). A final example is that the values of the four fundamental forces in nature vary by a factor of 10^{41} . Any slight changes in the relative strengths of any of these forces would not allow for life in the universe.

Although it is conceivable that evolutionary processes facing millions and millions of choice points resulted in life as we see it today, scientific evidence extant today suggests that there was only a single event that caused the universe to be created. The instant of creation did not have multiple random choice points. In a moment, all of the physical characteristics of the universe were determined and set in motion. Many people have speculated about the possibility of parallel universes (Hawking, 1988), universes that spawn other universes (Barrett, 1987), or a universe without a beginning

(the “no boundary” proposal) (Hawking, 1988). As of yet, there is no scientific evidence for any of these positions and the theoretical logic of the latter has been shown to be flawed (Schaeffer, 2003, 65). At this time, the best scientific evidence suggests that there is one universe and that it was created according to the “hot” big-bang theory. As Stephen Hawking (1988), no proponent of God, has written, “It would be very difficult to explain why the universe should have begun in just this way, except as the act of a God who intended to create beings like us (127).

The Argument from Neuroscience

Some have believed that when others are attempting to interact with the Force they are simply deluding themselves. After all, if the Force does not exist then the whole notion of praying to and worshiping the Force would be akin to wishing on a star. Recent research into the workings of the brain, though, have demonstrated that humans may be neurologically designed to believe in the existence of the Force. Newberg, D’Aquila, and Rause (2001) injected a radioactive material into people who claimed to have interactions with the Force at just the time when these people were alleging such interactions. These subjects were then quickly examined using a SPECT (single photon emission computed tomography) machine, representing the latest in imaging technology. These three researchers discovered that they had “uncovered solid evidence that the mystical experiences of our subjects - the altered states of mind they described as the absorption of self into something larger - were not the result of emotional mistakes or simple wishful thinking, but were associated instead with a series of observable neurological events, which, while unusual, are not outside the range of

normal brain function. In other words, mystical experience is biologically, observably, and scientifically real” (7). Their results demonstrate that human beings have a neurological process that enables them to transcend material existence and acknowledge and connect with what is perceived to be an “absolute, universal reality that connects us to all that is” (9).

This evidence, of course, is indirect. Just because human beings have this capability does not mean that the Force exists. Yet, all other conscious capabilities normal humans have do correspond to what is real (People have hunger and food exists; people have a sex drive and sex exists). This evidence essentially boils down to the following logic: if a particular need, drive, capability, and so forth exists in the DNA and other genetic material of the normal population, then it has evolved or been created that way to correspond with reality. In everyday vernacular, humans are “hardwired” in certain ways - sight that enables a visual representation of the world, analytical abilities that allow for the recognition of cause and effect relationships in the world, and so forth.

In 2003, the Commission on Children at Risk used this word “hardwired” to express recent biological findings related to child development in its report, “Hardwired to Connect: The New Scientific Case for Authoritative Communities” jointly sponsored by the YMCA of the USA, Dartmouth Medical School, and the non-partisan Institute for American Values. This report was prepared by 33 distinguished children’s doctors, research scientists, and mental health and youth service professionals. Essentially, these researches found that human beings have a biological drive to be connected to the transcendent and to strive for moral and spiritual meaning in the same way that

people have a biological sex drive (Boisture, 2003). This biological drive to connect with the Force was found across culture and time boundaries.

The Commission concluded by noting that there are great similarities in the needs that people have for both the connection to others and the connection to the transcendent. In fact, it appears that in some cases, a well developed connection to the transcendent can offset the deficiencies that arise if a child does not receive appropriate connections with adults.

Biological discoveries about how human beings really function have allowed people to increase their health and lengthen their lives. For example, regular exercise, sufficient sleep, and proper nutrition are all known to enhance health and longevity. Further evidence for the biological need for humans to interact with the Force can be found in similar benefits to health and longevity. This study found a large and growing body of research correlating “overall health, increased longevity, higher levels of personal happiness, and a stronger purpose in life” (14) among adults and “higher self-esteem, more positive attitudes about life, reduced risk of intentional and unintentional injury, reduced substance abuse, and a range of other positive health outcomes” (14) among adolescents. Examples of such studies are Strawbridge, Cohen, Shema, and Kaplan (1997); Koenig (2000); and, Koenig (2001).

The Argument from Biology

At first I intended to keep biology out of this paper, because this area is one where the materialists (discussed below) have been most ardent in their defense. To enter this potential minefield, an important distinction needs to be made.

“Microevolution” describes the changes that take place within a species or close relative. As a school child I was taught that Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution showed that humans have evolved from monkeys. This change from one novel form to another, is “macroevolution.” Yet, we know today that the scientific evidence does not support this position (Kelly, 1999, 369). In 1953, Stanley Miller made front page news by producing a few amino acids from random chemical reactions. It was much less newsworthy that subsequent experiments failed to extend these results. In 1954 Nobel prize winner George Wald published an article in *Scientific American* noting that given enough time (on the order of billions of years), random reactions would eventually produce human beings (Schroeder, 2001). The tide was starting to turn in 1968 when Noam Chomsky, “no friend of religion,” wrote in *Language and Mind*, “It is perfectly safe to attribute this development (human language) to natural selection so long as we realize that there is no substance to this assertion, that it amounts to nothing more than a belief that there is some naturalistic explanation for these phenomena” (Schaeffer, 2003, 96).

The evolutionary theory that random reactions led to the complexity of life was essentially falsified by the development of the electron microscope. In the mid-1970s Elso Barghoorn found fully developed bacteria in rocks 3.6 billion years old. That was about the same time that liquid water first formed on earth. Before Barghoorn’s discovery, Wald and others could plausibly believe that bacteria could evolve a couple of billion years after water existed. After Barghoorn’s work, it was no longer plausible to explain the existence of a life form as complex as bacteria as long as 3.6 billion years ago based on time and random reactions. A few years later, a symposium on Anatomy

and Physiology was held at the Wistar Institute. There “mathematicians forced biologists to confront the reality that all calculations of probability say “no” to the assumption of randomness being the driving force behind life’s development” (Schroeder, 2001, 100). Leslie Orgel, a collaborator of Francis Crick’s² (co-discoverer of DNA), has written, “We conclude that the direct synthesis of the nucleosides or nucleotides from the prebiotic precursors in reasonable yield and unaccompanied by larger amounts of related molecules could not be achieved by presently known chemical reactions. The *de novo* appearance of oligonucleotides on the primitive earth would have been a near miracle” (quoted in Schaeffer, 2003, 92).

The fatal flaw in the hypothesis that random reactions and genetic mutations have resulted in the complexity of life seen today is what has been discovered in microbiology in the past 30 years. Only when there was a lack of knowledge of the intricate workings of the cell could this hypothesis deserve consideration. So, there is overwhelming evidence to falsify this hypothesis. But, where is the evidence *for* the Force in all of this? It is found in wisdom. The actual data from the evolution of life reveal a pattern of wisdom, not one of random reactions. Wisdom, or complexity of information, or an idea “is the fundamental building block of the universe, and it is inherent in all parts” (Schroeder, 2001, 49) especially in life, its most complex revelation. There is no way to predict from the unintelligent laws of nature that the complexity of life would appear. Fortunately, there is now evidence of the imbedded wisdom that, working together with the laws of nature, has established today’s world.

² Crick regularly told fellow Cambridge students in the 1940s that he wanted to study biochemistry in order to disprove the existence of God (Schaeffer, 2003, 90).

Complexity theory has demonstrated that a far-from-equilibrium condition can transform a system. However, if something does not lock that system into place, it will revert to its less ordered state. Life, though, has “outwitted” (Schroeder, 2001, 59) the second law of thermodynamics by concentrating energy and building complex biological cells only because of wisdom inherent in the process. Another place where this wisdom is evident is the various portals of a cell. Who or what is the gatekeeper determining what substances can come in and what must go out? A reductionist analysis of this process does not reveal the inherent wisdom built in. In other words, if you break a cell into its parts, you do not find a part that keeps track of what is allowed in. A staggering example of wisdom is that when a human egg is fertilized, the combination of these two cells contains the blueprint for 10^{27} atoms. The DNA contains the design for what should become a finger, what an eyelash, what a heel.

Another fascinating example has to do with human brain size. Humans seem disadvantaged relative to four-legged creatures because the latter have larger birthing channels relative to their size, because their pelvis supports less body weight. Women’s pelvis’s require much more bone mass to support the weight of the upper body. Consequently, humans brain size must be relatively much smaller than four-legged creatures. However, imbedded wisdom has resulted in a wrinkling of the brain so that a much larger surface area can occur in an equivalent space. Consequently, “though the difference between the human genome and that of a chimp is estimated to be less than 1 percent, our cerebral cortex has ten times more neurons” (Schroeder, 2001, 112).

Perhaps, the easiest way to relate to the wisdom built in is the notion of consciousness. Although, many mechanical functions of the brain can be explained without wisdom, consciousness requires it. There is even scientific support for wisdom present in a universal consciousness. The double slit demonstration in physics shows that information is apparently shared by entangled particles that become separated by distance, when we know of no communication mechanism that allows for information to be transferred between them as rapidly as would be necessary” (Shelton, 1999).

The Argument from Psychology

Psychologists study human mental processes and behavior. Although the organized field of psychology is relatively new, data revealing human mental processes and behavior are available across several millennia. While the physical sciences focus on laws of nature, psychology focuses on laws of conduct. Scientists know, for example, that if people do not sleep for a long period of time, eventually they will get sick. Likewise, scientists know that people, who have developed a normal attachment to humanity, who repeatedly cheat another person will eventually experience guilt.

In this area, evidence for the existence of the Force can be found in the archetypal and wisdom traditions that transcend all known cultures and tribes. A variety of these wisdom truths has been recorded (Moses, 1989) including be good to your neighbor and it is more of a blessing to give than receive. Living these practices has resulted in more joyful fruitful lives across millennia and across geographical boundaries. It is also the case that all cultures and wisdom traditions have a recognition

of the Force. There are differences in how this Force manifests itself and what characteristics it has. Nonetheless, there is universal agreement of its existence.

Although Freud was an atheist, the implications of his own work provide archetypal evidence of the existence of the Force (Sandelands, 2003). Freud contended that the psyche of humans is such that they need a father figure to bring them to truth and to rescue them from human anxiety. Freud also showed that there must be a father figure beyond logical reason and human existence who can perform these functions for people. Freud never drew these two to their logical conclusion, that there exists such a figure, the Force.

The Argument from Management

The modern workplace organization is another realm in which there is evidence that people have been imprinted with a belief in the Force. Sandelands (2003) offers a proof of the Force with three primary arguments: the argument from management, the argument from organization, and the argument from social life. Here, only the former will be summarized. Sandelands (2003) writes provocatively, “where many may see meanness and corruption - think of the scandalized Enron, Arthur Andersen, Tyco, Adelphia, ImClone, Vivendi, Xerox, and their ilk - I see evidence of one true God” (169).

It is precisely because we know that what happened at Vivendi and Enron was wrong that we find evidence of the Force. From Machiavelli’s *The Prince* to the occasional modern book, such as, *Swim with the Sharks Without Being Eaten Alive* by Harvey Mackay, we do find proponents of manipulation, coercion, and greed. In the centuries since Machiavelli, though, these writings are swamped by those that promote

fairness, principled negotiation, and humane work conditions. We know that actions taken in the business world everyday fall short of these goals. Yet, we persist in advocating this “loftier” conduct. Why? Sandelands (2003) points out the most logical answer:

we teach management the way we do because above and beyond imperfect human motivations and systems, there *is* a higher law: the law of God. Under God, it is good and reasonable to love others as one’s self. Under God, it is good and reasonable to negotiate in mutual concern, to pay people fairly and nurture performance through interesting work and team play, to design work so workers may grow together, to lead with an open mind that serves the needs of the community, and to meet superiors, peers, and subordinates in networks of love and respect (170).

It is the existence of the Force that provides the higher standard of conduct we affirm, even as we daily fall short of it.

Critiquing Materialism

Many people believe that science has disproved the existence of the Force. C. S. Lewis (1956), for example, describes how that was a tenet he was taught in school and a belief he adhered to until he examined the evidence for himself. In fact, there have been many professed atheists who have decided to write *the* landmark book demonstrating that the Force does not exist. When these researchers have taken the time to thoroughly analyze all of the evidence, and are committed to a scientific approach that demands an open inquiry without *a priori* beliefs, these researchers have

found that a rational weighing of the evidence required them to abandon their belief in atheism. Such a search and “conversion” has been told in many books such as *God: The Evidence* (1997) by Patrick Glynn and *The Case for Christ: A Journalist's Personal Investigation of the Evidence for Jesus* by Lee Strobel (1998).

If the balance of evidence in all of the disciplinary subjects listed above results in the conclusion that the Force exists, why is this not widely known among the general public? The answer is that many popularizers of science have succeeded in imbuing the culture with the philosophical belief in materialism, or what George Gilder refers to as “the materialist superstition,” a worldview in which emotions, mind, and all feelings of spirituality are the products of the physical body (Schroeder, 2001).

Although the percentage of physicists who believe in God mirrors the general population (survey in the November 7, 1988 issue of *Chemical and Engineering News*, cited in Schaeffer, 2003, 12), the “household names” of science - Sagan, Dawkins, Freud, Gould, Lewontin, Crick - have been disproportionately non-believers (Peacocke, 2002, xvi). Their statement of faith is perhaps best captured in the *New York Review of Books* essay by Harvard’s Richard Lewontin that appeared on January 9, 1997: “We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that

produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door” (quoted in Schaeffer, 2003, 100).

Faith in materialism results in these scientists conducting and reporting their findings in many anti-scientific ways. For example, although evidence supporting the hot big bang theory of creation kept increasing, John Maddox, as editor of *Nature*, a highly respected peer-reviewed scientific journal wrote in August 1989, “the big bang is philosophically unacceptable... It is a theory that will be gone in ten years” (quoted in Schroeder, 2001, 45). How can a respectable scientist publish a statement that a scientific finding is unacceptable? Only if he is unwilling to consider all of the evidence at hand. Likewise, in his psychiatric writings, Freud is dispassionate and objective. His philosophical works, though, are “intense, emotional, argumentative, and, at times, desperate and pleading” (Nicholi, 2002, p. 53) rather than logical and scientific.

The *a priori* commitment to materialism is further compounded by the projection into scientific work of unintended biases such as ideology (Dent, 2005). One of my favorite examples of this bias is Mitroff’s (1974) study of 42 leading scientists of the Apollo space program. Prior to the initial moon landing, scientists had spent decades developing a comprehensive body of theoretical work. Mitroff interviewed these leading scientists at four intervals before and during the collection of moon samples. These samples would provide strong evidence in favor of and in opposition to a number of the theories at the time concerning topics such as age of the moon, general geochemical and petrological results, and seismic and magnetic results. In general, in spite of the evidence accumulating to strengthen the evidence for the work of certain scientists,

those who became out of favor continued to hold their prior beliefs. "In the words of a number of the respondents: 'They [referring to the other scientists] just don't change, do they? But then, perhaps if I were honest with myself I'd say I haven't changed much either'" (Mitroff, 1974, 167). To Antony Flew's credit, his willingness to consider new data at age 81 and change his mind reflects the intellect and spirit of inquiry to which scientists should aspire.

Read the words of the materialists as they come up against the self-imposed boundary of materialism. It seems as if they would easily accept a non-materialist explanation if only they would allow it.

Richard Dawkins has written on the back cover of his book *Climbing Mount Improbable*: "The metaphor of 'Mount Improbable' represents the combination of perfection and improbability that we find in the seemingly 'designed' complexity of living things" and in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*, "Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose" (quoted in Schaeffer, 2003, 81)³.

Francis Crick in his book *Life Itself*: "An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going" (quoted in Schaeffer, 2003, 91).

³ In spite of these statements, Dawson was quoted in an April 9, 1989 *New York Times* article: "It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)"

Stephen Jay Gould: "We are not likely to detect the event of speciation itself. It happens too fast in too small a group, isolated too far from the ancestral range."

Dawkins, Crick, Gould, and others, have done their best to contort their work to fit in a materialist paradigm. They cling to this philosophical worldview in spite of the abundance of evidence demonstrating its limitations for the research they are trying to conduct.

Organizational Implications of God's Existence

Schroeder (2001) writes, "I am not anti-evolution. And I am not pro-creation. What I am is pro-look-at-the-data-and-see-what-they-teach" (p. 91). There has been overwhelming evidence since the mid 1970s that the Force exists. Many who are not aware of these recent scientific findings need to reeducate themselves. They would do well to read the findings directly, not summaries filtered through the lens of the materialist worldview. For anyone with a truly scientific mind, a spirit of inquiry of look-at-the-data-and-see-what-they-teach, the conclusion in the early 21st century is clear. This is not to say that additional data could not be forthcoming that would change this conclusion in the future. For now, though, "the proposed inferences about God, *if taken together*, are cumulative in their effect and make a more convincing case than any of the rival explanations" (Peacocke, 2002, 130). We should work with this 30+-year conclusion and begin to align organizational policies and practices based on the knowledge that the Force exists.

As noted above, the aim of this paper is modest. Simply acknowledging the Force does not, for example, solve any questions of religious expression in the workplace. However, if the Force were taken as fact, the workplace would likely change in a number of ways. If we take one further small step and attribute wisdom to the Force, then changes could be even more pronounced. If we could generally agree that the Force exists, and is imbued with wisdom, wouldn't we want to spend part of our workday (as well as outside of work) thinking about that wisdom and what insights it may have for our challenges?

In *Leadership and the New Sciences*, Wheatley (1992) popularized the idea that nature can serve as an example of effective organizational functioning. Much of complexity theory has developed identifying characteristics found in nature such as redundancy, interdependence, and self-organization (Dent & Holt, 2001). Since the Force would be seen as natural, the wisdom embedded in its transcendence could be seen as an important source of leadership. Theories of spiritual leadership have emerged (Fairholm, 1996; Fry, 2003) although nearly all leadership theories have focused on the physical, mental, or emotional domains. Work in this area would have greater validation. Apparently, communing with the Force is a common activity among organizational leaders (Harvey, 2001; Wharff, 2004), but this aspect of decision making seems never to have been systematically studied.

Recognizing the Force could also have implications for environmental and other ethics in the workplace. To date, much of the work in the Organizations and Natural Environment interest group has been driven by a moral argument about the importance of the environment. The existence of the Force, though, suddenly changes the value of

“externalities.” The transcendent is no longer ephemeral and easily dismissed. Its status is elevated in organizational decision making.

A final organizational implication discussed here has to do with the best-practice model for fostering spirituality put forward by Mitroff and Denton (1999). In determining the “best” model to suggest, the primary criterion they use is “least likely to incur an intense counterreaction by stakeholders” (177). Part of that counterreaction, presumably, is that many people have only heard scientific evidence for or against the Force from popularizers rather than examining the evidence themselves. An even better model could surface as more and more people accepted the existence of the Force and began exploring the implications for their lives inside and outside of work. Mitroff and Denton (1999) see a model as strong if it integrates Wilber’s (1995) two-by-two matrix of interior-exterior and individual-collective. What would it mean for organizations if they took seriously the implications of the existence of the force in each of these four dimensions?

As scholars, our ultimate goal is not any particular ideology, but truth. The state of scientific and humanist evidence of truth today points to the Force. God exists. Believe it (until new evidence suggests otherwise).

References

- Ashmos, D., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: a conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. June 2000.
- Bailey, J. R. (2001). Book review of J.A. Conger & associates, *Spirit at work: Discovering the spirituality in leadership*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 367-368.

- Barrett, W. (1987). *Death of the soul: From Descartes to the computer*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Barrow, J. D. & Tipler, F. J. (1987). *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berman, M. (1981). *The reenchancement of the world*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bohm, D. & Peat, F. D. (2000). *Science, order, and creativity*. London: Routledge.
- Boisture, R. A. (2003). Summary of the Commission on Children at Risk's Report, "Hardwired to connect: The new scientific case for authoritative communities" (YMCA of the USA, Dartmouth Medical School, Institute for American Values). Washington, DC: YMCA of the USA.
- http://www.ymca.net/hardwired_report/HW_companion.summ.pdf
- Carrier, R. (2004). Antony Flew considers God... sort of. Retrieved December 15, 2004, from <http://www.secweb.org/asset.asp?AssetID=369>
- Cash, K. C. & Gray, G. R. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace, *Academy of Management Executive*. 14(9), 124-134.
- Dent, E. B. (1999). Complexity science: A worldview shift, *Emergence: A Journal of Complexity Issues in Organizations and Management*. 1 (4), 5-19.
- Dent, E. B. (2005) The observation, inquiry, and measurement challenges surfaced by complexity theory. In K. Richardson (Ed.), *Managing the Complex: Philosophy, Theory and Practice*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers. (in process).

- Dent, E. B., Higgins, M. E., & Wharff, D. M. (2005). Spirituality and leadership: An empirical review of definitions, distinctions and embedded assumptions, *Leadership Quarterly*. 16 (in process).
- Dent, E. B. & Holt, C. G. (2001) "CAS in war, bureaucratic machine in peace: The U. S. Air Force example," *Emergence: A Journal of Complexity Issues in Organizations and Management*, 3(3), 90-107.
- Fairholm, G. (1996). Spiritual leadership: Fulfilling whole-self needs at work. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17(5), 11-17.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-.
- Green, M. B. & Schwarz, J. H. (1984). *Physics Letters*, 149B (117).
- Harvey, J. B. (2001). Reflections on books by authors who apparently are terrified about really exploring spirituality and leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 377-378.
- Hawking, S. (1988). *A brief history of time: From the big bang to black holes*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Heisenberg, W. (1962). *Physics and philosophy: The revolution in modern science*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hicks, D. A. (2002). Spiritual and religious diversity in the workplace: Implications for leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*. 13, 379-396.
- Kelly, Kevin (1994). *Out of control: The rise of neo-biological civilization*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Koenig, H. G. (2000). Religion, spirituality, and medicine: Application to clinical practice, *JAMA* 284. 13 (October 4), 1708.
- Koenig, H. G. (2001). Religion and medicine II: Religion, mental health, and related behaviors, *Int J Psych Med* 31(1), 97-109.
- Lewis, C. S. (1956). *Surprised by joy: The shape of my early life*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mackay, H. (1988). *Swim with the sharks without being eaten alive: Outsell, outmanage, outmotivate, and outnegotiate your competition*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Mitroff, I. I. (1974). *The subjective side of science: A philosophical inquiry into the psychology of the Apollo moon scientists*. Amsterdam : Elsevier.
- Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). *A spiritual audit of corporate America A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Moses, J. (1989). *Oneness: Great principles shared by all religions*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Neal, J., Bergmann Lichtenstein, B., & Banner, D. (1999). Spiritual perspectives on individual, organization and societal transformation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(3), 175-185.
- Newberg, A., D'Aquili, E., & Rause, V. (2001). *Why God won't go away: Brain science and the biology of belief*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Nicholi, A. M. (2002). *The question of God: C.S. Lewis and Sigmund Freud debate God, love, sex, and the meaning of life*. New York: Free Press.

- Peacocke, A. (2002). *Paths from science towards God: The end of all our exploring*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Penrose, R. (1994). *Shadows of the mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sandelands, L. E. (2003). The argument for God from organization studies, *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 12 (2), 168-177.
- Schaeffer, H. F. (2003). *Science and Christianity: Conflict or coherence?* Watkinsville, GA: The Apollos Trust.
- Shelton, C. (1999). *Quantum leaps: 7 skills for workplace reCreation*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Stewart, I., & Cohen, J. (1997). *Figments of reality: The evolution of the curious mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strawbridge, W. J., Cohen, R. D., Shema, S. J. & Kaplan, G. A. (1997). Frequent attendance at religious services and mortality over 28 Years. *American Journal of Public Health*. 87(6), 957-961.
- Strobel, L. (1998). *The case for Christ: A journalist's personal investigation of the evidence for Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Taylor, J. H., et al. (1992) Experimental constraints on strong-field relativistic gravity, *Nature*. 355, 132-136.
- Wharff, D.M. (2004). Expressions of spiritually inspired leadership in the public sector: Calling for a new paradigm in developing leaders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland University College.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science: learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Wilber, K. (1995). *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*. Boston: Shambhala.