

## **The Enduring Importance of Jacques Ellul for Business Ethics**

*Ellul Forum July 2013* [www.ellul.org](http://www.ellul.org)

**By David W. Gill** [www.davidwgill.org](http://www.davidwgill.org)

**Abstract:** From at least three perspectives, Jacques Ellul's thought addresses today's business world and its ethics in a profound and essential way. First, he challenges the sacralization and worship of money which have come to dominate the thought and practice of today's business leaders. Second, he challenges us to critical thought and a rediscovery of the individual and the human in a domain enthusiastically and willingly enslaved to technique at every level. Third, he challenges in the name of freedom and vocation the necessity and meaninglessness which dominate today's workplace.

**Bio:** David Gill earned his PhD at the University of Southern California with a dissertation on "The Word of God in the Ethics of Jacques Ellul," subsequently published as the first of his seven books on theological or business ethics. He spent a full sabbatical year (1984-85) and several summers in Bordeaux, meeting with Ellul and many Ellul scholars, family, and friends. He is currently Mockler-Phillips Professor of Workplace Theology & Business Ethics and Director of the Mockler Center at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston. He is the founding president of the International Jacques Ellul Society.

\*

\*

\*

\*

The first image of Jacques Ellul that comes to mind is not that of someone sitting in the board room of some skyscraper advising the corporate chieftains of our day. No, our Ellul is the little man in his beret emerging from behind his desk in his home study to greet a friend --- or the professor entering the lecture hall to read his latest notes on the successors of Marx.

But it is my contention that our teacher Jacques Ellul is very precisely a voice to which those corporate chieftains would do well to pay attention these days. While he thought and wrote in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, his message is only *more* appropriate and necessary in the first half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As a long-time teacher of ethics to business students and ethics consultant to actual business organizations, it is my conviction that there are three particular aspects to the enduring importance of Jacques Ellul for business ethics.

For the most part, business ethics, at least in the USA, is a toothless, dull, and irrelevant enterprise. If I may use one of Professor Ellul's images it is little more than "the colorful feather in the cap" of a tyrant who marches onward unimpeded. As currently practiced, business ethics is either wedded to the hopeless detached, rationalism of Modernity and the moral philosophy of Kant, Mill, and their kind --- or it is drifting at sea in the Post-modern Nietzschean subjectivism of "everyone does what is right in his own eyes." Often giving up on both Modernity and Postmodernity today's business ethics attaches itself to the bureaucratic state and is reduced to little more than legal compliance. Contemporary business ethics communication and training methods typically place employees in front of personal computer screens and

thus habituate their viewers to artificially simple scenarios with clear solutions, to be discovered by individuals interacting alone with their screens. To the extent that real problems are engaged from time to time, this approach amounts to little more than “damage control” of legal, financial, and reputational matters. The causes and conditions that initially give rise to such damage are never addressed. The process of mutual discernment and response goes unattempted.

Today’s business ethics is, for the most part, a mess, a waste of time, and an illusion. As I see it, Jacques Ellul’s work provides a critical warning and challenge to business ethics at three points: (1) the reduction of business purpose and mission to nothing but a worshipful, addictive quest for *money*; (2) the total subordination of business organization and practice to the ironclad rule of *technique* and (3) the resignation of business personnel to the *necessity* of work and the consequent absence of freedom and vocation. If business ethics would seriously consider these three points, it could re-acquire a critical and then constructive role in our era.

### **The Worship of Money**

There is a strain of thought that argues that all business is ultimately and primarily motivated by a quest for profit in the form of money. Business is not charity; business is a *for-profit* commercial and economic activity. If you don’t make a profit, or at least break even financially, you will go out of business. Actually this is true of non-profit charitable institutions as well --- though they can be salvaged by donors rather than customers or investors. In any case, there is an essential and important financial, monetary aspect to running a business. It cannot be ignored. And no doubt the fear of financial failure as well as the dream of great success and wealth are highly motivating factors in business.

A business is interested in acquiring your money but (in distinction from theft and begging) it must deliver some service or product in return for which customers are willing to pay it money. A successful business in a competitive economic environment (as opposed to a non-competitive monopoly environment which is an unacknowledged reality in many industries and markets today) must keep its focus on delivering that product or service not only efficiently (minimizing waste of time, resources, etc.) but excellently. If the enterprise turns its primary attention to the monetary return, and loses focus on the excellence of the product or service, the money itself may well disappear. This is the simplified common-sense argument for money being very important -- but not *all-important* -- in business.

But in two decisive steps, money has swamped other considerations and become dominant in business purposes and focus today. First, the neo-capitalist “market fundamentalists” of recent decades have boldly proposed that “greed is good,” in the famous words of the fictional Gordon Gecko in the American film “Wall Street” (1987). This philosophy is no longer the cartoonish extreme of a movie but the

conventional wisdom of the business world: it is good for you, good for the economy, good for the world, for each of us to pursue as aggressively as possible our own self-interest, understood in terms of financial profit and wealth. Well before the movie popularized the notion, Milton Friedman, the Nobel laureate economist of the University of Chicago, famously wrote: “The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits.”<sup>1</sup> Period. Today’s business leadership seems determined to eliminate all regulation and all restraint on the naked, predatory pursuit of money. Of course there are important exceptions but the dominating spirit is the “love of money for me.” The fact that in the 2012 presidential election financial tycoon Mitt Romney could win the support of almost half the American electorate, despite publically dismissing the interests of the poor and the middle class, indicates the extent to which the “winner-take-all” mentality has captured the masses.

Perhaps a business does deliver excellence in its service or product; perhaps they do treat their employees well; but for today’s neo-capitalists such commitments and practices are strictly utilitarian and pragmatic. Excellence, quality, and fairness *only* matter if they can be shown to increase profits. And at the other end of the spectrum, marketing deception, product testing flaws, exploitive wages, dangerous working conditions, harm to the environment, negative social impacts --- these all may be justified as part of the market’s “invisible hand” as it eventually brings its bounty to those who deserve it. For business leaders (or workers), it’s all about money . . . money-for-me. Now.

The second step in this development is the rise of the financial services industry. The titans of business and industry today are no longer those who create and sell products or services of one kind or another. No, today’s richest rewards go to bankers and investment fund managers who speculate on interest rates, debt, risk, investments, and insurance. In today’s business world, manipulating piles of money is considered so important that it entitles one to reap vast personal profits, skimming off large portions of peoples’ investments and savings. Even when banks and investment firms fail, as they have so miserably in the past four years, their leaders are considered so rare and so important, it seems, that no retention bonus or salary increase is too high to hand over to them. No doubt there is a legitimate role for bankers and investment managers. But many of today’s most famous leaders in these fields seem very little more than thieves in well-tailored suits. Money has become everything.

Jacques Ellul’s *L’Homme et l’Argent* was first published in 1954. Even then Ellul was predicting the triumph of money, east and west:

Beginning in the Middle Ages . . . capitalism has progressively subordinated all of life --- individual and collective --- to money . . . . One of the results of capitalism that we see developing throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century is the subservience of being to having. . . . It is the inevitable consequence of capitalism, for there is no other possibility when making money becomes the purpose of life.<sup>2</sup>

Ellul goes on to argue that the differences between capitalism and socialism are shrinking and less and less consequential. Certainly it is hard to see any significant differences in attitude and behavior toward money in China by comparison to the USA or France.

Ellul points out that Jesus warned that money could function as the god “Mammon” in peoples’ lives, receiving their awe, deference, and worship, occupying the center of their attention and desire, serving as the source of their meaning and value. Money acts as a spiritual “power” (*exousion*). Ellul points out that Mammon can play this central role for the poor, the “have-nots,” as well as for the rich, the “haves.” But beyond the “spiritual” problem and personal bondage, Mammon does certain things to its devotees.

This power of money establishes in the world a certain type of human relationship and a specific human behavior. It creates what could be broadly called a buying-selling relationship. Everything in this world is paid for one way or another. Likewise, everything can, one way or another, be bought. . . . The world sees this behavior as normal. . . . A related example of the way money corrupts the inner person is betrayal for money. It is not insignificant that Judas’s act is represented as a purchased act.<sup>3</sup>

The point is that when “the love of money” (for my bosses and owners or for myself) drives business and careers it is a “root of all sorts of evil,” to cite the famous statement of St. Paul (I Timothy 6:10). Monetizing and commoditizing all things, all relationships, and all transactions necessarily dehumanizes all concerned and blinds us to values and realities that simply cannot be measured by money. “Money reduces man to an abstraction. It reduces man himself to something quantitative.”<sup>4</sup> It is a short and logical step to prostitution and even slavery as economic practices. Moreover, the single-minded quest for money leads to profound betrayal in relationships. Loyalty and betrayal are simply about a cost-benefit calculation, nothing more or less.

The question is about the larger purpose of work and business. Do we yield to the propaganda of the Mammon-worshippers? or do we resist and make our own work decisions and our business management decisions in light of other criteria, other purposes? Of course, we do not always or fully get to choose the *telos* and purpose of our company or even of our career or our daily work. It may be that much of the time, for most of the people, simple survival forces us to play the work and business game within the community and culture of Mammon worship. Our individual decisions and acts may appear utterly useless in the larger perspective.

But to the extent that we can find room to resist and to pursue another way, what might we propose? Remember how Ellul in *The New Demons* warns that casting out one demon may make room for seven demons worse than that first one!<sup>5</sup> My own approach in working with companies is to focus the mission on innovation, i.e., on creating and inventing products and services that are useful and reliable for people,

and even beautiful if that is possible. Or as a second business purpose I suggest the mission to help the hurting, heal the sick, protect the vulnerable, and repair the broken. This sounds terribly obvious: create something good or fix something bad. But I am convinced that it is precisely those two themes that capture the imagination and passion of the worker. Rather than serving Mammon, or still less the Nation, or Race, my recommendation is to serve our neighbors and friends by creating and redeeming the basic, important things in their lives. And by making these the driving purposes of business, money can return to its proper, subordinate place.

So the voice of Jacques Ellul on money is critical for our era. His assessment of its sociological functioning is important. But the fact that his viewpoint is couched in biblical and theological language and in the prophetic warnings against the worship of Mammon means that there may be some leverage to liberate some of today's deluded Religious Right cheerleaders for market fundamentalism to the detriment of all else. Money is an unworthy and savage god. The value system that spins out of a choice to make money our sole mission is not a pretty sight.

### **The Submission to Technique**

There is secondly, an almost complete insensitivity in the business world to the actual role of technique and technology.<sup>6</sup> The standard viewpoint in business is that technology is a set of neutral tools serving our purposes and practices as we determine. Who better than Ellul to remind us of the dominance of technique: "the totality of methods, rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency for a given stage of development ...."<sup>7</sup> Technique and technology are in no way merely a set of tools serving business. The tools have coalesced into an ensemble that actually runs today's business practices. Ellul explains that technology is "not merely an instrument, a means. It is a criterion of good and evil. It gives meaning to life. It brings promise. It is a reason for acting and it demands a commitment."<sup>8</sup>

For best-selling authors such as Nicholas Negroponte (*Being Digital* (Vintage, 1996)), Michael Hammer (*Reengineering the Corporation* (HarperBusiness, 1993)), and Don Tapscott (*Paradigm Shift* (1993), *Digital Capital* (2000), *Wikinomics* (2006)), the embrace of technology by business should be complete and unreserved. They are among the countless cheerleaders for an unqualified subordination of business to the latest technology, to the maximum extent possible. In their world, technology is on the throne, not in the toolbox, of business. The pressure is irresistible: more technology, all the time, everywhere, no matter what the cost. We must keep up with our competitors and with technological change and innovation. Adopt, support, and upgrade, all the time. Jim Collins's best-selling management book *Good to Great* argues for a more qualified stance --- that truly great companies use technology as an accelerator rather than as a primary driver or steering wheel.<sup>9</sup> But even in Collins's approach, the deep subordination of business to technology is not fully recognized.

Ellul has shown at great length how technique/technology is not a simple “add-on” to business and other human domains. Rather, it constitutes an environment and a milieu; it is self-augmenting and universalizing in its constant growth, extending everywhere and into everything. One technological problem leads to a problem which requires further technological interventions and solutions. The scale and scope of technology in business is remarkable in its own right. There seems to be nothing in the name of which the encroachment of technique should be resisted or refused. Everything, every operation, every person, every moment should be subjugated to technique (much as in the previous section it is monetized).

But beyond this challenge of scope and scale, Ellul calls our attention to the values that are embedded in technology.<sup>10</sup> Where technology dominates, its values dominate. Many companies articulate a list of “core values” to which they aspire. All too rarely do these organizations evaluate these lists or the degree to which their company cultures actually reflect these aspirations. The *actual* working values of any organization dominated by technique/technology were discussed in Ellul’s chapter on “Technological Morality” in his introduction to ethics, *To Will and To Do*. What are the basic characteristics of this technological value system? Since technology is precise, exacting, and efficient---it demands of people that they be *efficient, precise* and *prepared*. It is a morality of *behavior, not of intentions*---it is solely interested in *external conduct* (older moralities often addressed intentions and attitudes as well). It is a morality that excludes questioning and rigorously commands the *one best way of acting* (older moralities countenanced the agony of moral quandaries and questioning).

What are the ethical values embedded in technology?

- *Normality*. We are not called upon to act *well* (as in other moralities) but to act *normally*, to be adjusted. To be maladjusted is a vice today. "The chief purpose of instruction and education today is to bring along a younger generation that is *adjusted* to this society" (192).
- *Success*. "In the last analysis," Ellul says, "good and evil are synonyms for success and failure" (193). Morality is based on success; the successful champion is the moral exemplar of the good; if crime is bad it is so because "it doesn't pay," i.e., it is unsuccessful.
- *Work*. With the overvaluation of work come self-control, loyalty and sacrifice to one's occupation, and trustworthiness in one's work. The older virtues having to do with family, good fellowship, humor, and play are gradually suppressed unless they can be reinterpreted to serve the good of technique (e.g., rest and play are good if, and because, they prepare you for more effective, successful work).
- *Boundless growth* ---in the sense of continuous, unlimited, quantifiable expansion. "More" is thus a term of positive value and moral approval, as are the "gigantic," the "biggest." "In the conviction

that technology leads to the good" there is no time or purpose for saying "No" or for recognizing any limits or for impeding the forward advance of technology (197-98).

- *Artificiality* is valued over the natural; nature has only instrumental value. We do not hesitate to invade and manipulate nature---whether that is the space program, deforestation and industrial development, animal farming, water resource "management," genetic experimentation, or whatever. We have little respect for the givenness of nature in comparison to our valuing of the artificial.
- *Quantification and measurement.* Despite Einstein's nice comment that "everything that can be counted doesn't count and everything that counts cannot be counted" our technological society insists on quantifying and measuring intelligence (IQ), success (church attendance, salary levels), personality traits (Meyers-Briggs, etc.).
- *Effectiveness and efficiency.* The measurably ineffective or inefficient are replaced or despised. Frederick Taylor and scientific management.
- *Power and speed.* Weakness and slowness are only valued by eccentrics. In today's absolutely frantic society, it is hard to dispute that this has become a virtue and value.
- *Standardization and replicability* Technology demands that people adapt to machines. The universal impulse of technology privileges platforms that link the parts together. The eccentric is only of interest in a museum.

Technological moral values, in general, are instrumental rather than intrinsic. These values become our criteria for decision and action (replacing such maxims as "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," "Love your neighbor as yourself," and "Treat others always as ends, never as means"). They become our virtues of character so that the good person is one who is a normal, adjusted, hard-working, successful creator and manager of the artificial (replacing the "just, wise, courageous, and temperate" classical ideal and the "faithful, hopeful, loving" Christian ideal).

Without doubt, in many business operations and practices these technological values can have an important place. But when they are allowed in without a self-conscious and critical awareness, without any limits, their reign can become one of terror. What happens to the value of the eccentric, the mystery, the paradox, the immeasurable? How do we deal with the long-term and the subtle, the inefficient but beloved? What happens to wild creativity that thrives on openness, risk, conflict, and the lessons only failure can teach? Wisdom loses to knowledge, knowledge to information, information to data. People lose to systems and numbers.

So Ellul's powerful voice is needed more than ever to awaken business folk from their uncritical slumber in the face of technological imperialism. A legitimate human ethics must be asserted over technique, not coopted and tamed by it. The first duty is that of "awareness" Ellul argues.<sup>11</sup> If we proceed blindly in

denial of the impact of technique/technology on our corporate culture and values we can and will do nothing to resist it. This awareness of the technological values embedded in all business practices today is a gift to business ethics that Ellul can make, better than almost anyone else.

### **Dominated by Necessity**

The third area in which Ellul has a critical and enduring importance for business ethics is in consideration of the meaninglessness and necessity of work. Historically and sociologically, Ellul argues, work is a matter of toil and necessity for survival. For the vast majority of people through history and even today, it is survival and necessity that dictate whether one finds adequate work, what kind of work one finds, and the generally negative character it then has. It is historically false to view work as a means to freedom or self-expression and fulfillment. It is simply necessary. Ellul rejects the ideological glorification of work by both Marxists and capitalists as simply a tool to reinforce our conformity, subservience, and integration into an economic or political movement. Of course, just because work is necessary does not mean it should be despised or made worse than it is. We should accept our necessity to work and then do it well.<sup>12</sup>

Sociologically, Ellul has often argued that work is a matter of necessity rather than freedom. For the vast majority of the world's people work is about survival, not high meaning and freedom. But even for those privileged to choose their work, the phenomenon remains locked into necessity. "Work is an everyday affair. It is banal. It is done without hope. It is neither a value nor is it creative."<sup>13</sup>

Theologically, Ellul has an explanation for this based on his reading of the biblical creation story. He argues at some length that human work is rooted not in creation but in the fall.<sup>14</sup> Ellul will have no truck with theologians who want to ground the meaning of work in our being created in the image of God or commissioned to serve as co-creators with God. The commission to Adam and Eve to name the animals, till the garden, and be fruitful and multiply was nothing like what we call work, Ellul maintains, because it was an exercise of freedom before God in an unbroken, unified, perfected world. Human work is what is required in a broken world of alienation from God, from the earth, and from other people. Work is fundamentally toil. It is of "the order of necessity." So "calling" and "vocation" in biblical theology are not to be confused with work but are something very separate.

Here is how he explains it:

It is a very classical idea that work existed in the creation, but it was work in a very different sense there. That is, the work in Genesis 1 and 2 was non-utilitarian. All the trees gave their fruit spontaneously, and although Adam was commissioned to watch over the garden there were not



any enemies there. Thus it was good work, a job, but one that was not in the domain of necessity. That is the great difference for me . . .

I don't think you can say that for God the creation was a job or work. The Greeks and Babylonians always considered creation an effort. But the Bible says that it was the *word* of creation rather than a *work*. It was something more simple. I agree with you that God's act was creative and that what responds in us is word and work. There is a work command but Adam and Eve were then in the presence of God rather than having merely a work or vocation. The idea of work and vocation is always confusing, but I believe that vocation or calling is always, and only, service of God.<sup>15</sup>

For Ellul the challenge is to find a *vocation* that is a kind of dialectical counterpart to our *work*. "We obviously have to discover a form of activity which will express our Christian vocation and thus will be an incarnation of our faith." This vocation is "free and an expression of grace" and yet it "is an equivalent of work." Ellul suggests that his own career as author and university professor was a species of work in the order of necessity. His *vocation*, on the other hand, was his volunteer activity working with the "Prevention Club" for street kids and juvenile delinquents. Ellul acknowledges that "To direct an enterprise of this kind . . . is real work. Yet it forms no part of the necessary work provided by society. It presupposes autonomy, inventiveness, and free choice."<sup>16</sup>

It is at this point that I have to take issue with Ellul's biblical interpretation and application – and his analysis of our actual work experience. In terms of our experience, in *both* the domain of ordinary work *and* that of volunteer vocational service, the experience of necessity, technique, toil, and trouble regularly appear. This is just as true in a church or environmental movement or volunteer youth athletic team as it is in a conventional business. And on the other hand, the opportunity for human kindness and care, for creativity, for meaning and even redemptive impact on others can present itself in business organizations, not just in the volunteer sector. Not all businesses, all the time, crush out human freedom, relationship, and creativity. In fact the best businesses promote such things. It is just not an either/or situation where work is all crushing necessity and external vocation is all freedom and meaning.

And theologically, I would argue that despite his brilliant insights, Ellul's interpretation of the biblical story is unconvincing. His rejection of any notion of work being rooted in creation, and of any survival of creational goodness and freedom after the fall, is unpersuasive. To stipulate that God's own creational activity was not work is unnecessary. To stipulate that the commission to Adam to name the animals and till and keep the garden were not work in any sense is also unnecessary. One reason not to follow Ellul here is The Decalogue --- which is given in two forms. In the Deuteronomy (chapter 5) version both work and Sabbath are grounded, Ellul-style, in liberation from work as slavery in Egypt. But in the Exodus

(chapter 20) version, Sabbath and work are grounded in God's example of both in creation. So taken as a whole, work and rest are *both* viewed within a dialectic of good creative work and fallen necessary work. Think also: the Hebrew word *avodah* is used for *both* work and worship, suggesting an affinity Ellul overlooks. Paul challenges Christians not just to carry out their worship and vocations to the glory of God but "whatever you do in word or deed" do it all in the name and to the glory of God. Of course, Jesus Christ called his disciples away from their work --- just as he called them away from their family ties. But then he sent them back, though with a new set of priorities.

So the way Ellul draws the theological and sociological lines on this topic of necessity and freedom in work is unconvincing. But where Ellul is convincing beyond doubt is in his challenge that humans need freedom, meaning and significance and the workplace rarely provides these things. My conclusion is that we should not just acquiesce in this workplace necessity but carry the fight for freedom and dignity directly into the workplace. For me the challenge from Ellul for business ethics is to go beyond where he ends up and fight for reforms in the workplace so that work is meaningful and not alienated, so that there are opportunities for growth and creativity, so that non-technical values are affirmed, so that human relationships can occur in healthy ways. The reality is that some businesses do succeed more than others in pursuing and achieving these values (e.g., Southwest Airlines, Costco).

We must not let businesses and managers off the hook by saying that mindless and meaningless work is a simple necessity. No, managers must be challenged to provide space for meaning, for good communication, for creativity at work. Nothing will ever be perfect, but that must not prevent us from trying. All of Ellul's challenges to risk and contradiction, to freedom and vocation, should be initiated within the workplace as much as alongside of it.

The enduring importance of Ellul on the question of work, in my opinion, is first of all, to remain ruthlessly realistic and critical regarding the actual experience of work. He does describe the lot of most of the world's workers, most of the time, and we must have no illusions. But secondly, his challenge implies a confrontation of freedom and necessity, an introduction of the Wholly Other into the mundane world of work. Despite his own pessimism about the possibilities within the workplace, Ellul suggests that we should make efforts toward de-institutionalization, de-structuralization and "so acting in the sphere of work that this becomes a setting for human encounter."<sup>17</sup> Moreover, Ellul grants that "When human work produces joy or what seems to be outside the everyday, we have to realize that this is an exceptional event, a grace, a gift of God for which we must give thanks."<sup>18</sup>

So it is, after all, possible for grace to break into our work. And despite his apparent theory of an unbridgeable divide, Ellul himself actually promoted this integrative quest. In the 1982 interview I conducted with Ellul, he described his efforts to help Christians integrate their faith and work:

My friend Jean Bosc and I started the Associations of Protestant Professionals. We discussed professional problems, concretely, just as they are in life. The theologians would simply describe what the Bible says, without spelling out what the professional should do. That way they were challenged to figure out what to do, what sort of solution to bring to those problems. We had some very different experiences. It was easier for doctors and nurses than for business people. The groups that never went along very well were those composed of bankers and insurance agents. . . . Most of the associations lasted six years, from 1947 to 1953. Problems were submitted by the participants. We tried to get them to reflect on practical problems. There were congresses, study courses, and consultations. A businessman, for example, might submit a business venture for study and discussion by the group. Two groups, doctors and teachers, continue on to the present day, but the others ended.”<sup>19</sup>

## **Forward in Hope**

In the end, it is a matter of hope and freedom. In *Hope in Time of Abandonment* Ellul wrote that authentic hope only begins when all seems lost, the walls are sealed off and there is no way out. So it is that in work and business, necessity seems to rule, technique determines our action, and money is the object of worship. But precisely at each of those points we must resist. In the end this resistance may be against “business as usual” --- but it is for “business as it could be,” an enterprise in which human freedom can be expressed, human values respected, and all pretender gods and idols dethroned.

---

<sup>1</sup> *New York Time Magazine*, September 13, 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Jacques Ellul, *Money & Power* (ET InterVarsity Press 1984), p. 20. *Reason for Being* (ET: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 86-93, has a further discussion by Ellul of the significance and vanity of money.

<sup>3</sup> *Money & Power*, pp. 78-79. See also Robert Kuttner, *Everything for Sale: The Virtues and Limits of Markets* (Alfred Knopf, 1997) which demonstrates this impact in great detail.

<sup>4</sup> Jacques Ellul, *Ethics of Freedom* (ET Eerdmans, 1976), p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Jesus' parable in Matthew 12:43-45; Luke 11:24-26.

<sup>6</sup> I will use “technique” and “technology” almost interchangeably here. But I mean submission to a way of thinking and acting --- as well as to the machines and structures created and sustained by that spirit.

<sup>7</sup> *Technological Society*, (ET Alfred Knopf, 1964).

<sup>8</sup> *To Will & To Do: An Ethical Research for Christians* (ET Pilgrim, 1969), pp. 190-91.

<sup>9</sup> Jim Collins, *Good to Great* (HarperBusiness, 2001), Ch. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Ellul's chapter on “Technological Morality” in his *To Will and To Do*, pp. 185-198, is a brilliant account of technological values. My discussion here follows closely my recent article “Jacques Ellul and Technology's Trade-Off” in *Comment Magazine* (Toronto, Spring 2012), pp. 102-109.

<sup>11</sup> *Presence of the Kingdom* (ET Seabury, 1967), pp. 118 ff..

<sup>12</sup> Ellul discusses the concept of “necessity” in *Ethics of Freedom*, pp. 37-50, and *To Will and To Do*, pp. 59-72. In *Presence of the Kingdom* he urges that ordinary work and life must be done well pp. 16-19.

<sup>13</sup> *Ethics of Freedom*, p. 506.

<sup>14</sup> Ellul, “Work and Calling,” *Katallagete IV* (Fall/Winter 1972): 8 – 16; reprinted in James Holloway & Will Campbell, eds., *Callings* (Paulist, 1974), pp. 18-44. See also “Freedom and Vocation” in Ellul, *The Ethics of Freedom*, pp. 495-510, Ellul, “Technique and the Opening Chapters of Genesis,” in Carl Mitcham and

---

Jim Grote, eds., *Theology and Technology* (University Press of America, 1984), and the section on work in Ellul's commentary on Ecclesiastes *Reason for Being* (ET: Eerdmans, 1990), pp.93-106.

<sup>15</sup> Interview of Jacques Ellul conducted by David Gill in July 1982 at Ellul's home in Pessac with the assistance of Joyce Hanks; subsequently translated by Lucia Gill and published as "Jacques Ellul on Vocation & the Ethics of the Workplace" in *Radix Magazine* 22.4 (Summer 1994), pp. 12-13.

<sup>16</sup> *Ethics of Freedom*, pp. 507-508.

<sup>17</sup> *Ethics of Freedom*, p. 481.

<sup>18</sup> *Ethics of Freedom*, p. 506.

<sup>19</sup> Gill Interview of Jacques Ellul (July 1982), pp. 11, 28.