Introducing Ellul“s Ethics

Ten years after his death, it is clear that Jacques Ellul“s contributions to the field of ethics and moral theology are of significant and enduring value. Nothing will ever rival Ellul“s sociological contributions to our understanding of technique and technology, but, like his work on politics, social change, propaganda, communications, history, religion, and biblical interpretation, his work on ethics stands the tests of time and criticism. In this essay we will explore eight important contributions made by Ellul“s ethics and then consider two especially promising directions for further developing an Ellulian approach to ethics.

Of course, before Ellul“s ethics can be fully assessed, and before any significant further development of his approach can be carried out, a great deal of preliminary work remains to be done. The first challenge is simply to make Ellul“s full body of ethical writing available to readers. Specifically,

(a) his introduction to ethics, Le Vouloir et le faire (ET: To Will and To Do), is no longer in print in French or English; (1)
(b) it is uncertain whether any manuscript exists of the second half of this introductory work, promised by Ellul long ago, but the question of its status must be definitively resolved; even his rough notes on the subject would be a great help;
(c) while Ellul“s Ethique de la liberté eventually appeared in three volumes in France, its English translation, The Ethics of Freedom, only represented volume one and an abbreviated, early draft of volume three of this important work. About 500 pages of the original 800 made it to the English translation. The entire work needs to be available in both French and English; (2)
(d) Ellul“s thousand page manuscript on the ethics of holiness continues to be unavailable in both French and English; apparently Ellul“s handwritten manuscript has now been painstakingly converted into a typescript and could now be edited and published, but various problems could still derail the project; the completion of this big project is absolutely essential;
(e) Ellul“s specific studies of the ethical virtues of hope and faith need to be republished; (3)
(f) while he did not prepare complete studies of love and the ethics of relationship (as he did with faith and hope and the ethics of freedom and holiness), he did write a few essays on love which could be brought together to help complete the overall architecture of his ethical thought; (4)
(g) Ellul“s various articles (and extended sections in various books) on various aspects of ethics also deserve to be collected and made available to students of ethics. There are enough such articles and reviews to make up a substantial volume on its own. (5)

As this large body of writing becomes more fully accessible, the critical and constructive exploration of the implications and applications of Ellul“s ethics can take place. (6) The general structure and logic of Ellul“s ethics, including the points raised below in this essay, certainly deserve further attention. Additionally, Ellul“s ethics invite specific application to challenges in such arenas as new technologies, the worlds of business, politics, and economics, and the life of citizens, disciples, nations, and churches.

The fact is that Jacques Ellul“s ethical thinking is badly needed in the 21st century. With an astonishing foresight Ellul anticipated the global dominance of technique, on the one hand, and the critical importance of religions old (Islam, Judaism, Christianity) and new (the “new demons/possessors”) on the other. Long before postmodernism was fashionable, Ellul fought against, and called us beyond, the dehumanizing “raving rationalism” of the modern. While Ellul“s popularity may have been greatest during the 1960s and 1970s, his greatest importance may be yet to come, as our tottering global civilization begins to come to the end of itself.

Jacques Ellul made at least eight major contributions to the field of ethics. These are not just accomplishments of the past but promises for the future of the field.
1. “Lived morality” vs. theoretical morality. Ellul’s first contribution lies in his exposition of “lived moralities” vis-à-vis the various “theoretical moralities” of philosophy and religion. (7) The actual values by which people live deserve our attention much more than the theories advocated and debated by ivory tower intellectuals. It has been typical for students of ethics to spend much, if not most, of their time studying the ethical theories of Immanuel Kant, Thomas Hobbes, John Stuart Mill, David Hume, and others. But these are theoretical moralities. Ellul asks, “Who, apart from the specialists, is interested in Kant’s ethics? It is a matter for the philosophers, and the philosophers have no influence over morals. . . . No one thinks to govern his life according to the outcome of the quarrels among the specialists in philosophical ethics.” (8) These ethical theories tell us something not just about their philosophical authors but about the society, epoch, and intellectual environment in which they emerged. However, they also distract us from the reality of people’s actual ethical experience, character, decision-making, and behavior. A history and sociology of values, ethics, and morality will tell us a lot more about the essential character of ethics than a survey of the writings of the great philosophers. (9)

2. The integration of morality with the sacred. A second important emphasis in Ellul’s ethics is the inextricable relationship of morality to whatever is regarded as “sacred” in a society. “Every group is organized around what might be called a ‘principal motif’ . . . It is in relation to this principal motif that the group’s hierarchy of values is arranged.” “When a society no longer acknowledges a central motif . . . no morality can remain valid: or the same is true when the morality which is affirmed is out of harmony with the principal motif.” (10) In The New Demons Ellul describes how “it is important to have rules of behavior deriving from the sacred.” (11)

Another way to put it is that “our gods determine our goods.” Ethical reflection and ethical behavior is motivated, leveraged, and determined by what is our core purpose, our principal motif, our sacred. No ethical or moral reform is possible without addressing the question of what is our sacred, our mission, our god. This point is utterly critical in the field of business and organizational ethics today: no improvement is possible without addressing the larger purposes of the organization. It has been common to try to separate ethics from religion and the sacred, on the assumption that the latter is necessarily divisive and is altogether dispensable to ethics and morality. Yet many people attest to the importance of religion as a source and shaper of their values and ethics; and those who do not, typically have some unacknowledged substitute sacred lurking just below the surface of their ethics and values. (12)

3. Technological morality as the dominant “lived morality” of our time. Third, Ellul identified and analyzed the dominant lived morality of our era, “technological morality,” with its core values of efficiency, normality, and success. (13) This technological morality is now deeply embedded in all sectors of our society, from business to education to religion. Ellul, far more than any other thinker, exposed the reality and nature of this enemy of an authentic ethics of life and freedom. Many have thought of technology as a “value-free” phenomenon. A means. Ellul showed that it has become a sacred “end,” the telos of our society, embedded with values. “The fact is that technology is felt by modern man as a sacred phenomenon. It is intangible, the supreme (in the cabalistic sense), unassailable operation. All criticism of it brings down impassioned, outraged, and excessive reactions in addition to the panic it causes.” (14)

In our postmodern context, it is often naively assumed that the only values to which we submit are those of our own personal choosing and that, in turn, we are (or we are the creators of) our own gods. Much of this is illusory and many postmodern individuals are unconsciously living out a worship of technique and a conformity to the values of technical morality. “We are entering into a new form of morality which could be called technological morality, since it tends to bring human behavior into harmony with the technological world, to set up a new scale of values in terms of technology, and to create new virtues.” (15) But this is not true merely with self-conscious postmodernists; technological morality has also invaded and colonized ethical thinking among Christians and other traditional groups, to a much greater extent than is realized.

4. The legitimacy of the morality of the world (the two ethics). Fourth, Jacques Ellul called attention to the value and importance of the morality of the world, alongside the ethics arising out of a relationship with God. These two ethics each have their legitimacy, their distinctives, and their limitations. Despite Ellul’s sometimes harsh critique of both of these ethical enterprises, his challenge to work at improving both of them is unmistakable.
“Life is possible within an ethical system. Apart from that it would be constant warfare, and interpersonal relationships would be unthinkable. Therefore we must respect this morality for its utility, since it is useful to man. . . . The Christian, because he is a man, should lend a hand in making the world livable. Morality is part of that task, the common morality, the morality of the group, interpersonal morality. We must respect it, build it, and strengthen it in company with our fellows.” (16)

How do we do this? My view is that we begin by identifying the sacred, the central motif, the core purpose of any given group, large or small. What is it that is being treated as sacred? What is at the center of our attention, thinking, and purpose? Then, we critically reflect on whether this sacred stands as a worthy enough center of our common project. Finally, we work together to elaborate ethical guidelines that are in alignment with that “central motif.”

5. The necessity and urgency of Christian ethics. Fifth, Ellul was a pivotal figure in convincing a whole generation of Christian theologians (perhaps especially in America) that dogmatics were not enough, that the faith must be articulated in an ethics and lived out in faithful discipleship in the world. The conflict between Christian faith and modern culture was not to be played out merely as a contest of ideas and arguments (as Protestant orthodoxy and Fundamentalism were inclined) but rather in a whole style of life that included behavior as well as thought. But is the language of ethics and morality appropriate here? Ellul is at his most extreme dialectical contradiction in his answer. Christianity is not about morality but about faith, about a life in response to God’s presence and word. “The biblical concept of the good as the will of God immediately prohibits us from formulating an ethic. An ethic is always, ultimately, the formation of a good in itself.” (17)

“And yet a Christian ethic is indispensable,” Ellul says. (18) “The construction of a Christian ethic is necessary, first of all, because it is a guide, an indication given to faith, a real assistance to the brethren.” (19) Ellul’s dialectic highlights the radical difference between the ethics of the world and the ethics of the Word. What unites both disparate phenomena under the rubric of ethics is their common quest to know what is right and good. Beyond that, they are radically distinctive. The fact that Ellul himself set out to write a massive three-part introduction to a Christian ethics ought to put to rest any thought that Christian ethics is an unworthy pursuit.

6. A Christian ethics centered on Jesus and guided by Scripture. Sixth, in rebuilding a Christian ethic for our times, Ellul made a huge contribution with his insistent focus on Jesus and Scripture. “The word of God is fully expressed, explained, and revealed in Jesus Christ, and only in Jesus Christ, who is himself, and in himself, the Word.” (20) “We know God fully only in Jesus Christ.” (21) And about Scripture, Ellul says “The criterion of my thought is the biblical revelation, the content of my thought is the biblical revelation, the point of departure is supplied by the biblical revelation, the method is the dialectic in accordance with which the biblical revelation is given to us, and the purpose is a search for the significance of the biblical revelation concerning ethics.” (22) Ellul’s work provided fresh, insightful, and powerful new understandings of the ethical implications of these core authorities in the Christian life. After Ellul, Christian ethicists paid more---and better---attention to Jesus and Scripture, which simultaneously lends their work credibility in the church and revolutionary distinctiveness in the world. Part of what keeps our ethical systems and approaches humble and temporary, as Ellul urges, is that the criteria of the good and right are located in the authority of Jesus and Scripture. All commentaries, systems, traditions, and teachings are a step removed from these authorities.

7. The priority of a Christian ethics of “being” (over “doing”) Seventh, Ellul’s ethics emphasize “being” over “doing.” “Man always looks for a good which will determine a ‘deed’ ---whereas in Jesus Christ it is always a matter of ‘being’.” (23) Ellul reflected at great length on the Pauline virtues of faith, hope, and love as accounts of the appropriate stance before the Wholly Other God. “When asked what to do, Paul answers by saying what we should be.” (24) While ethics will sketch out decision- and action-guidelines---indicatives if not imperatives---the heart of the matter in Christian ethics is to be brought into a stance of hope before God (to which God can give freedom), a stance of faith (to which God can provide holiness and distinctiveness), and a stance of love (to which God can respond with the gift of renewed relationships). In a Christian church deeply tainted by the modern scientific quest for abstract, universal laws followed by rational decision and effective action, Ellul’s call back to an ethics of stance and virtue, is a powerful antidote. (25)
8. The temporary, limited status of all Christian ethics. Eighth, and finally, Ellul’s emphasis on the “temporary” and humble status of any Christian ethic, including his own, is a rare but essential call to freedom and responsibility in the field of ethics. Ellul frequently wrote and said that he was not creating another system but rather trying to provide his readers with the means to think out for themselves the meaning of their life or faith or ethics. It is an ongoing challenge to all who labor in this field, not to fix the work of Ellul or anyone else in stone but to stand on his shoulders, to learn from him and then push forward to an even better understanding of ethics for the time and place in which we must live. Ethics has so often been a means of judging, condemning, and rejecting others (and often enough oneself also) in an arrogant, domineering way. Ellul shows us a different path that is simultaneously bold and humble.

Preserving and Extending Ellul’s ethical legacy

These eight contributions Ellul has made to the field of ethics are of no small importance to a world and a church that struggle to know what is the right thing to do in so many circumstances and domains. We should remember that Ellul would not be the first intellectual whose work grew in importance after the author passed from the scene. Søren Kierkegaard’s biggest, if not also his greatest, work, the Concluding Unscientific Postscript sold only a dozen or so copies in his lifetime. But after SK’s death, various scholars and friends saw with growing clarity the value of his legacy and refused to let it disappear. Today there are hundreds of thousands of copies of Postscript being studied in dozens of languages. Jacques Ellul had greater impact on his contemporaries than did Kierkegaard but we face a similar challenge to promote the publication, translation, distribution, and study of his works. We should aim to do as well with Jacques Ellul’s legacy as the intellectual heirs of Kierkegaard did with his.

A Deeper Understanding of Character and Virtue in Ethics

As Ellul’s ethical works become more fully available to serious students, one of the most important avenues of further study will be to consider in depth Ellul’s work on the ethics that flows from the classic theological virtues of faith, hope, and love. The postmodern attack on modern moral theories (Kant, Mill, et al) has roots not just in the existentialist approach to ethics articulated in different ways by Kierkegaard and Nietzsche but in the virtue ethics traditions of pre-modern societies. How is Ellul’s understanding of a theological virtue ethics similar and different to the approaches of moral philosophers and theologians, such as Alasdair MacIntyre and Stanley Hauerwas?

In his Ethics of Freedom Ellul provides us with some general comments on ethics and virtue as well as some specific insights into the virtue of hope and the ethics of freedom. Ethics “flows out of the relationship with Christ,” Ellul writes. (26) Paul’s theological virtues of faith, hope, and love provide a “mediation” of that relationship. Each of these virtues “expresses a specific type of behavior.” Thus, hope is expressed in freedom, faith in holiness, and love in relationship. Ellul published individual books on hope and faith, and extended articles and chapters on love. His three-volume ethics of freedom was published; his thousand-page manuscript on the ethics of holiness may yet be published. He did not write the ethics of relationship. Ellul believed that the hope/freedom studies were the most important studies for our era, a time of loss of authentic hope and freedom. Ellul presented faith/holiness and love/relationship as a dialectical relationship in which the first draws us away (producing a distinctiveness of identity) and the second sends us back (into relationships and presence in the world).

The language Ellul uses to describe hope and freedom helps illuminate what he understands virtue to be. Hope is a “response of man to God’s work for him,” a “response to God’s love and grace.” (27) Hope rests on the resurrection and victory of Jesus Christ. Hope is not just an emotion or feeling but an “actualization here and now” of an anticipated life and glory; it is a “way of living.” Freedom, in turn, is God’s gift and response to man’s hope. Freedom is a “situation made for us”--not an expression of our will or our being, a “fruit” rather than a “work,” in the traditional Pauline terminology. Freedom is not a virtue or a fragment of the Christian life but the “climate of all virtues.” “Freedom is first a power or possibility—a power to act and obey.” (28) Ellul says that there is “no incontestable outward sign” of freedom in a life but that there is nevertheless a qualitative difference perceived on a personal and relational level. The freedom that comes from hope characteristically strains toward the future, and leaves the old behind. Freedom is not sitting back and letting God work—it is knowing God’s will and doing it.” (29) By hoping in God, one is attached and linked to God’s future and thereby freed from and in the present.

Ellul’s expositions of hope and freedom are exhilarating, not just theologicially but politically and culturally. What we can already see in his hints about faith and holiness, and about love and relationship,
is equally promising. But how does Ellul's work on virtue ethics relate to that of other ethical writers? From Aristotle onwards, virtues have been thought of as traits and habits of character. Long debate has taken place about the sources of virtue---to what extent is it the training of a natural endowment? To what extent are the virtues gifts of God (the "infused" virtues of Thomas Aquinas)? Whether gifts of nature or God, what are the roles of socialization and personal choice in the nurture and expression of a virtue like hope or love? What does it mean to value and pursue hope or another virtue in my own life? How do I proceed? Is it possible to make a habit of the stance of hope or faith? Or must it be an existential choice in every given moment and circumstance? Much of the virtue ethics tradition has argued that we must simultaneously seek to appropriate the virtue as an ingrained habit, capacity, and disposition and as a vital, existential stance in the moment. It is not either/or but both/and. And God is fully capable of doing a work of molding character as habit and embedded disposition as well as initiating a stance of hope or faith, in the existential moment. Ellul's language is distinctly tilted toward the Kierkegaardian individual in the moment. But there are also hints of possible connections to a more Thomistic approach.

The challenge is to go (with Ellul) beyond both schools of thought and articulate a virtue ethics appropriate to our time and place.

A Better Understanding of Individual and Community in Ethics

Ellul argues that social transformation results from the accumulation of a vast number of individual decisions from below. It is only the individual act of freedom that can break the technological system of ideology and belief (though the technological system of material correlation and integration is almost impossible for that individual to break)(195). Individual Christians have sometimes been free, he says, but not the church (289). His ethics is an individualistic ethics, not part of a commitment to a collective movement, but it is not private (210). This is hard for people to grasp or accept because the modern mind is used to collectivist thought. Sociology tends to give primacy to the group with no real safeguards for the force and validity of individuals, but the individual is key (296). Christian freedom is individual and personal in origin and execution but also necessarily collective in its reference and consequences because of the centrality of love (270). So it is the lay individual who is on the frontier of church and world where the decisive action and conflict takes place. "But it is only on the basis of a church which is a strong body and community that this is possible for the layman" (298).

Whatever the sociologists may say about the life of groups, communities, and institutions, Jesus and the Bible (Ellul's avowed authorities for his ethical thought) certainly provide strong and unrelenting calls to moral community. In a general sense, "it is not good for one to dwell alone" (Genesis 2:18). In a very specific way, the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount (the most famous ethical teaching of the Bible) were given to a community, not to an individual. Jesus sent his disciples out two-by-two, not one-by-one. Jesus promised "wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst" and that whatever two or three "bound on earth" (a metaphor for moral decision-making) would be bound in heaven. Members of the "body of Christ" should value the other parts of the "body" and realize that it takes all parts of a body to make it function properly. (31)

It is certainly important to hear Ellul's warnings about how groups can be the instruments of social conformity and are subject to laws of bureaucracy. It was sad to hear him confess (as he often did) that he never personally experienced community in any significant way that he could write about. Community seemed an impossible ideal to Ellul. He had a good eye for the hypocrisy and conformity of the church. Nevertheless, the actual communities of Israel and the early church are never presented in the Bible as anything other than flawed, imperfect phenomena; they are not dispensable just because they are so far from ideal. Indeed the community is essential for the individual's discernment of the ethical right and good, and the community is essential for the carrying out of the right and good. The community is where character is formed and where individuals are taught the counter-narrative to the story of technological growth and goodness that otherwise becomes our central motif.
Ellul certainly hints at the importance of moral community, but it is largely undeveloped (much as it was in the writings of Kierkegaard). Perhaps Ellul’s work on the ethics of love/relationship would have developed this part of the picture. It is for us now, to pursue the project.

Looking back at Jacques Ellul’s writings on ethics ten years after his death is as challenging and provocative an experience as it was to first encounter them in past decades. It is impossible to measure his influence on the field of ethics; while many scholars and writers owe him a great debt, he has never been a central figure in the “ethics establishment.” His role has been that of a prophet to the intellectuals--rather than a guru or creator of a school of disciples. But his legacy continues to challenge and inspire. It will be to our great loss if we do not explore and elaborate Ellul’s ethical thought during the coming years.
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