

Just Business Book Review and Reflection

LANELLE M. CHASE
Azusa Pacific University

ABSTRACT: In the field of marketing and business in general, many ideas of what it means to exemplify acceptable ethical behavior inform practice. In his book *Just Business*, Alexander Hill (2008) describes the three elements of the Christian faith (holiness, justice, and love) and relates them to business ethics in the secular world. Is it plausible and acceptable to combine Christian morality and business ethics, or should the two entities exist and function separately? Should there be a “dual morality” or should one’s Christian faith override or replace business ethics? Is the answer situationally driven? How are ethical decisions made when the law and one’s personal faith are in conflict? Should the positivism approach be selected, which says that the law is always right, regardless of whether or not personal conviction opposes it? Narrowing these ethical issues down to the field of marketing, how might the practice of deceptive advertising be viewed in light of these considerations?

INTRODUCTION

In his book *Just Business*, Alexander Hill (2008) details his views on biblical concepts and applies them to business ethics. From a great plethora of topics he could have chosen to highlight from the Bible, he chose holiness, justice, and love. This paper will be a review and reflection on those biblical concepts and the way they relate to several ethical outlooks within the framework of business and particularly the field of marketing. Specifically, the three secular perspectives of dual morality, law, and agency will be examined and a Christian response provided. Within the field of marketing, the ethical issue of deceptive advertising will be discussed in light of the earlier biblical concepts and their relationship to business ethics. The author will relay concepts from Hill’s book as well as describe ideas from the Bible and other academic authors surrounding the relationship between Christian faith and business ethics.

HOLINESS, JUSTICE, AND LOVE IN CHRISTIAN BUSINESS ETHICS

Hill (2008) describes the three biblical concepts of holiness, justice, and love as foundational for a “Christian ethic for business” (Chapter 1, Section 1, para. 1). Many, he says, cannot or do not recognize that faith and business can work together to do well in the world. In fact, many

view business and Christianity as mutually exclusive with business being “dirty” and full of greed with its own set of ethics and Christianity something to personally embrace at home (Chapter 2, Section 1, para. 2). Before diving into the three primary secular outlooks that purport these ideas (dual morality, positivism concerning the law, and agency), Hill’s selected biblical concepts will be explained, and the author will respond to what appears to be Hill’s theological premise undergirding his views on holiness, justice, and love.

First, Hill comes across as writing from the perspective of one who adheres to the Christian faith and may assume his readers do as well. In fact, his book seems to be a bit of an instructional tool, intended on facilitating understanding and practical application of the integration of biblical ideas into the secular business world — how one might live out their faith in the business realm as well as contemplate and discuss business ethics as Christians.

One thing that was not clear in this book was a strong rationale for why living out one’s faith is important beyond “reflecting the character of God” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 3, Section 8, para. 6). What Hill does not provide is a reason why reflecting God’s character is necessary or what the reason for living out one’s faith is.

Holiness

As Hill notes, there are several overlapping ideas between the Christian faith and human-centered ethical

outlooks. The key difference between human-centered and God-centered ethical perspectives is the central guiding priority. In Christianity, several tenants serve to guide ethical behavior, both personally and professionally. Hill draws on three of these: holiness, justice, and love, stating that they are so intertwined; one cannot exist without the other two. The interlinking of these three concepts, in Hill's portrayal, nearly complete the picture we have of God in the Bible.

Starting with the concept of holiness, *Christian Crier* contributor Jack Wellman (2014) provides the Hebrew definition for the word "holy," saying that in the Hebrew Old Testament, the word "holy" is called *qodesh* and means "apartness, set-apartness, separateness, sacredness." In the New Testament, the word holy means *hagios* in Greek and means to be "set apart, reverent, sacred, and worthy of veneration" (Wellman, 2014). In both cases, holiness means to be set apart, to be separate, and to be sacred. It is a designated state of being, not a way of doing.

While Hill (2008) never provides a working definition of what it is to be holy from a biblical perspective, he does give several descriptors of what he apparently considers holy elements of being and doing, including "zeal for God, purity, accountability, and humility" as well as "the concept of single-minded devotion to God and absolute ethical purity" Chapter 2, Section 1, para. 1). The problem with these elements from a biblical perspective is that while each has a solid biblical root on their own, they do not fit the Hebraic or Greek definitions of what it means to be holy.

What it means to be holy in the Bible is to be God's, to be set apart for Him. Anyone can appear zealous for God (look at Muslims, or Hari Krishna's, or Tibetan monks), but to be holy according to the Bible, is to belong to Jesus, set apart for Him alone. Anyone can be pure in whatever belief they may have, but does that make them holy? Not according to the Bible. As Paul said, "There is no one righteous, no not one" (Rom. 3:10). Even atheists can be accountable to each other and Buddhists can come across as very humble. Does this mean that they are holy? Orthodox Jews can have single-minded devotion to God, but not know Jesus and, in fact, deny Him. The apostle John said, "Whoever denies the Son does not have the Father either; he who acknowledges the Son has the Father also" (ref. 1 Jn. 2:23). Again, by definition, to be holy is to be God's. Can someone who denies the Son and does not have the Father, still be His? Not according to the Bible (Hill, 2008, Chapter 2, Section 1, para. 1).

Therefore, although related to the *biblical* definition in a surface way and understandable from the perspective of humanism, it is the perspective of the author of this review that what Hill referred to in terms of holiness is not the

biblical definition of the term.

To drive this point home further, the word "holy" is used by Isaiah the prophet regarding how the four living creatures before God's throne describe Him night and day saying, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory" (Isa. 6:3). John reiterates this scene through expression of the vision of Jesus he had while receiving the book of Revelation on the island of Patmos (Rev. 4:8). When Moses approached the burning bush in the book of Exodus, God told him to remove his shoes because the ground on which he was standing was "holy" (Ex. 3:5). The question the author has for Alexander Hill is: Did the ground Moses stand on "do" anything to be considered holy by God? Did it have a certain state of mind or was it zealous for God? Or was it sanctified, set apart and *made* holy because of and by the One whose presence was in the burning bush? How then are people made holy? By the presence of the Holy One Jesus, through his Holy Spirit within those who believe.

In the New Testament, almost every reference of the word "holy" pertains to the Holy Spirit, holy angels, or to Jesus. Of the 174 references, there are only a handful of places where the word is used for other purposes, but even in those cases, it refers to holy things, places, or people that are *set apart for God* (for example Mt. 4:5, 27:53 – holy city, Lk. 1:70 & Acts 3:21 – holy prophets, Lk. 1:72 – holy covenant, etc.). What does it mean then to be holy? To be set apart? In the biblical sense of the word, it means to be God's.

Another example of holiness in the Bible is found at the implementation of the Jewish feast of the Passover, instituted by God when the Jews were getting ready to flee from Egypt, where they had been enslaved for roughly 400 years. The Jews were saved from the final plague, not because they did anything right or wrong but because they put the blood of the Passover lamb on the lintels of their doors, signifying the blood of Jesus, who was the fulfillment of that feast, showing they trusted in God's salvation. They were set apart and saved from the wrath of God that came upon the Egyptians because they believed in God and entered into his salvation. That is the biblical definition of what it means to be holy. It means to be set apart for God. Instead of highlighting this concept, however, Hill (2008) attaches the word "holy" to his idea of what it is to be "zealous" for God and to be ethically "good," which any non-Christian can be (Chapter 2, Section 2, para. 3).

Hill also does not highlight why it is important for Christians to be ethically good or zealous for God in the first place. Jesus and other New Testament authors clearly explained that the reason for this is for the sake of the world, who "seeing your good words (will) glorify your Father who

is in heaven” (Mt. 5:16); God who is “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance” (2 Pet. 3:9). One might reflect God’s character (Hill, 2008, Chapter 3, Section 8, para. 6), but to what end? Hill never draws on the verses mentioned or eludes to an evangelistic end, although the Bible clearly states it as the primary reason for shining as “lights in the world” as we hold out the word of life (Phil. 2:15). If we are not promoting the Gospel and do not see that as purpose behind our actions, out of love for Jesus, we are not acting holy; we are just acting good.

Hill’s argument taken to the furthest extent flies in the face of Paul’s words in Ephesians 2:8-9 which says, “For it is by grace you have been saved (set apart – made holy), through faith and that not of yourselves; it the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast” (NKJV). His idea of what it means to be holy, in light of the biblical definition, also go against Paul’s words to the Romans, “Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the deeds of the law” (Rom. 3:27-28). While the author is sure that Hill was well meaning in his idea of what holiness is, critical analysis shows that his outlook does not line up with the biblical definition of the word (based on examination of the Hebrew and Greek definitions).

Hill’s underlying beliefs about reality that his definition of holiness seems to draw from could redraw the maps of the business landscape when it comes to behavioral reform of Christians who choose to interact in a way that lines up with their faith in God. Again, what Hill calls “holy” is one of three intertwined aspects of who he perceives God to be, and by acting according to his definition of holiness, he seems to believe Christians could represent God’s character in the world. What Hill does not expound on, is what *the Bible* says true holiness is and why it is important to reflect God’s character in the first place (specifically, the evangelistic purpose of expressing through words and actions the nature of God, that people might see who he is and place their trust and faith in Jesus).

Justice

Hill describes the concept of justice as interconnected with the holiness and love in God’s character, which he says Christians are called to reflect in all things. He breaks the concept of justice into two components: rights and duties. Dignity and freedom are two rights he points out, purporting that anything that “attacks our sense of dignity or that severely impairs our freedom of choice is morally suspect” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 3, Section 1, para. 2). In terms of discernment of what is moral and what is not, this may be a

workable compass.

There are occasions in the Bible, however, when we as Christians are called to lay down our rights and suffer for the cause of Christ rather than fight for our rights. Hill (2008) does bring this out later in the book. Initially, however, he says that Christians have the “right to be treated with dignity” (Chapter 3, Section 1, para. 2); however, Jesus said,

You have heard that it was said ‘an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,’ but I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. If anyone wants to sue you and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also. And whoever compels you to go one mile, go with him two. (Mt. 5:38-41)

Paul said to the Romans that God declared, “Vengeance is Mine; it is mine to repay” (Rom. 12:19). Therefore, they were called to love their enemies and do good to them, not to fight for their rights and seek justice themselves.

So, although we may be able to recognize moral versus immoral behavior based on what God wants for us to have (dignity, freedom, etc.), to call these gifts of God and rewards for a society that values them “rights” is a far stretch and not one that is founded in the Bible.

Hill also provides no Bible verses to back up his claim that we have these “rights” at all, and the author cannot find a place in the Bible that promises Christians “rights” such as dignity and freedom, although Jesus does promise us “life and life to the full” (Jn. 10:10).

In terms of duties, Hill (2008) says they are the “flip side of the justice coin (and are) inextricably linked to rights. One person’s right becomes another’s duty” (Chapter 3, Section 1, para. 3). Hill differentiates between “negative injunctions,” or things we are obligated not to do, and “affirmative duties,” or things we are responsible to do. This idea is highly controversial in the business world. For example, in the field of marketing, if hearing the truth is the public’s right, it is the duty of businesses to not engage in deceptive advertising.

Hill (2008) describes four basic aspects of the justice view, including procedural rights, substantive rights, merit, and contractual justice. “If any of these rights are breached, compensation is owed” (Chapter 3, Section 1, para. 7). He describes justice at its core as “taking others’ interests into account in all our decisions” (Chapter 4, Section 1, para. 1).

Back to biblical definitions, what Hill describes as justice is not purely biblical but rather contains elements of judgement, a term that is highly distinctive and differentiated in the Bible from justice. It is the author’s view that some of Hill’s statements such as, “justice tends to be cold and dispassionate, lacking the emotional heat and relational pas-

sion of holy love” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 3, Section 8, para. 3), are out of touch with modern-day Christian “justice movements,” such fighting to end child slavery and human rights violations across the globe. It disputes the reality of humanitarian organizations that fight injustice, such as the Peace Corps and Samaritan’s Purse, who put themselves in harm’s way to aid refugees facing intense suffering as well as escaping the Boca Haram. What about justice in the workplace when American companies picket foreign factories that have poor working conditions and unjust wages? Does that kind of justice lack passion and “emotional heat”? The author does not think so.

What Hill describes as justice is key to understanding the “Christian business ethic” in that it can help businesses make good decisions, set standards, and enforce them consistently for the good of the business and its stakeholders. Hill’s concept of justice might help to elevate the understanding and application of ethical activity within the field of marketing through realizing that consumers, employees, and all other business stakeholders have rights and it is the duty of businesses to honor those rights as well as their own.

Underlying beliefs about reality undergirded by Hill’s definition of the concept of justice include the idea that it can be a fight to uphold justice when conflicting opinions exist regarding what is right and wrong in any given situation, influenced in part by differing worldviews and ethical outlooks.

Love

Informing the “Christian business ethic” is also the concept of love. As Hill (2008) notes, it may “be tempting to define love as a ‘soft’ virtue, implying that it has no place in the rough-and-tumble of the marketplace” (Chapter 4, Section 1, para. 3). The reality, however, as Hill points out, is that “without a solid relational foundation, no group effort can succeed in the long term...successful commercial ventures depend more on cooperation than competition” (Chapter 4, Section 1, para. 4). Is this true, however, between truly competing firms? And is competition opposed to love? Does love oppose or prevent competition?

Hill highlights three prominent characteristics that exemplify to him “Christian love,” including empathy, mercy, and self-sacrifice. He provides a few biblical examples of how he views God as embodying all three characteristics and describes how each one can be expressed in the marketplace. For empathy, words such as “kindness,” “flexibility,” and “sensitivity” are used (Chapter 4, Section 2, para. 4), for mercy, “forgiving,” “redeeming,” and “healing” (Chapter 4, Section 3, para. 2). Self-sacrifice, Hill notes, includes at times the sacrificing of human rights, a point made earlier

in this paper. Hill’s comments on the necessity of love being accompanied by his working definitions of holiness (goodness — Hill’s view) and justice (concern for others and sound judgement — Hill’s view), fits within his model of holiness, justice, and love being intertwined representations of God’s character.

Hill’s idea of love is key to understanding his outlook on Christian business ethics as it helps to address a much-needed component to business success that does not misalign with morality. Through empathy, mercy, and self-sacrifice, coworkers can bond better, managers can lead more effectively, and customers can trust quicker. Within the framework of marketing, long-term customers that have become loyal advocates of a firm can make or break a business and cause it to succeed or fail. The principles of love Hill points out can help to facilitate these long-term relationships and even aid referral marketing. Love within Hill’s definition may also help elevate the understanding of firms and assist them in resisting the temptation to take advantage of the public through practices such as price gouging and deceptive advertising.

Underlying beliefs about reality undergirded by Hill’s concept of love include the fact that because God is love, reflecting his character automatically includes being loving. As demonstrated by Hill’s text, this also demonstrates God’s care for business because as Christians reflect his character in this way, businesses thrive and tend to succeed more than they would otherwise.

THREE SECULAR APPROACHES TO BUSINESS ETHICS

Hill (2008) identifies and describes three secular approaches to business ethics that would not rise to the Judeo-Christian conception of moral excellence, including dual morality, law, and agency. Hill notes, “The primary deficiency of these three arguments is that each relies on an external force to define what is ethically acceptable.” He calls them “false exits” because “they deposit ultimate ethical authority in human instrumentalities — business culture, government and corporate management — rather than God’s character” (Part 2, Section 1, para. 3).

Dual Morality

Hill (2008) describes dual morality as a “species of cultural relativism,” which responds, “to the contention that ‘business culture’ establishes its own definition for what is acceptable behavior in the marketplace” (Chapter 5, Section 1, para. 1; Part 2, Section 1, para. 2). Dual morality suggests that there is no universal principle of right and wrong

but rather that it is up to each culture to decide ethical and moral standards that line up with what makes sense for them. Individuals, according to this ethical outlook, should abandon their own personal belief systems, if necessary, to fit the cultural perspective on an ethical challenge and in doing so, they would be acting in an ethical way.

Hill gives an example of a chief executive officer of United Fruit, a large multinational corporation. He ended up committing suicide after facing an ethical dilemma that challenged his Jewish faith and pressured him to conform to the cultural norm, which included accepting bribes. Rather than make a hard decision in either direction, CEO Eli Black chose to end his own life (Hill, 2008, Part 2, Section 1, para. 3-5). Hill describes the responses of three writers — Albert Carr, John Ladd, and Milton Friedman — who expressed that had Black yielded to dual morality, assumed the cultural norm, and kept his beliefs to himself, he would be alive today. The assumption among the writers was that dual morality is legitimate and should be ascribed to in cases of ethical challenges when one's personal ethics oppose those of a cultural business norm or ethical standard.

There are problems with the outlook of dual morality from a Christian perspective. Hill affirms this and attempts to answer the question “Is dual morality inherently un-Christian? If so, why?” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 5, Section 2, para. 3). According to Hill, dual morality “should be rejected, because it subtly attacks each of the three undergirding principles of Christian ethics he selected to highlight in this book — holiness, justice, and love” (Chapter 5, Section 2, para. 4). While he continues to use an incomplete and unscriptural definition of the word “holy” and a marginally defined operation of the word “justice,” Hill does make some valid points when it comes to dual morality opposing Christian principles. Hill commented, “[D]ual morality challenges Christ's lordship over all things by carving out a special niche that is somehow exempt from His rule” (Chapter 5, Section 2, para. 6).

As Hill notes, Jesus requires lordship over every area of a Christian's life, and this includes business and its operations. Jesus said,

If anyone desires to come after Me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow Me. For whoever desires to save his life [yield to the idea of dual morality out of fear of what people will say, think, or do, e.g., bosses, the public, customers, stockholders, etc.] will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it. For what profit is it to a man if he gains the whole world, and loses his own soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul? (Mt. 16:24-26)

Hill presents an alternative to dual morality, which is

vocation. While the title for this alternative is as vague as “law” and “agency” as ethical persuasions, he describes this view as a holistic way of looking at jobs and God's call on individual lives. Just because someone is not called to be a clergy member, he or she is still called of God, just to do something else. According to Hill, any Christian's vocation is subject to the lordship of Jesus, regardless of the profession or field of engagement, even if it has nothing to do with a commission to the pastorate (or evangelist, etc.).

Law

Individuals working in organizations that keep the law, but affirm unethical behavior according to the individual's personal belief system are faced with a dilemma. Do they hold firm to their conscience and follow what their faith tells them to do in the situation, or do they obey the law, even if what the law advises is still unethical according to their faith?

The “false exit” of the law “presumes that if an action is legal, it is morally permissible as well... Like dual morality, business behavior is benchmarked not to ‘holiness-justice-love, but to an external human standard” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 1, para. 1). While the law “contributes to the marketplace by ensuring predictability and by providing a level playing field for all competitors [as well as providing] a line demarking acceptable and unacceptable behavior,” because laws are established by faulty human beings, the law can still be wrong (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 1, para. 4). In such a case, a view called “positivism” comes to play.

Positivism, “the dominant legal theory in the world for the past two centuries, has three elements” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 2, para. 3). “First, it divorces law from the realm of ethics... Positivism is a concept of law that has no moral connotations whatsoever... Second, positivism accepts the law as being whatever the government says it is... Third, [it] assumes that law can be studied scientifically” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 2, para. 5). This approach states that the law is not meant to promote lofty moral ideals but rather to reflect things as they are.

There are several criticisms of positivism. First is the flawed assumption that the law can be “free from imperfections when it is a product of an imperfect political process” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 3, para. 4). Policy delays and changes in social needs contribute to this imperfection.

Second, positivism has the ability to justify immoral behavior. If, as the example given in Hill's book, a person shakes and promises to offer a product at a certain price on a certain date but gets a better offer and reneges the promise, if the promise was not made within the strict confines of the law, it does not have to be kept.

Third, positivism “dethrones God as the ultimate moral

authority” (Hill, 2008, Chapter 6, Section 3, para. 12). Of course in reality, God can never truly be “dethroned” from his position as creator and sustainer of ultimate moral authority, but in human hearts, this can take place because of the God-given gift of free will.

The fourth criticism Hill gives of positivism within the law is that it leads to more government regulation of business due to public outcry when promises are not kept or rights are infringed upon.

An “integrated Christian approach” proposed by Hill does not separate law and ethics but rather places Christian ethics over the law based on the sovereignty of God and his lordship over every area of life. Because God is the ruler of all of life in the hearts of those who believe in Jesus, his influence rises above and is to be regarded above the law of the land if the law is in opposition to the law of God.

An example of this, which Hill briefly touches on in his comment about German legal philosopher Gustav Radbruch, was the reaction of the Christian church in Germany during World War II. Many took the approach that the law of the land held ultimate authority, even quoting Romans 13:1-2: “Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God. Therefore whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God, and those who resist will bring judgement on themselves.” While this verse taken by itself, apart from the context of the rest of Scripture, may be compelling, taken within the framework of the rest of the Bible, when there is a contention, one is to fear God, not man.

As Peter and John said to the Sanhedrin who arrested them for preaching (because it was against the law) Jesus said, “Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you more than to God, you judge. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard” (Acts 4:19-20). Esther is another example in the Bible of a woman who went against the law, which said she was not to enter the king’s palace without being called, and because she boldly did it, after fasting for three days and nights, all of Israel was saved from the hand of the enemy. So then, Romans 13:1-2 must be taken in regards to the law in light of the rest of Scripture.

The four criticisms and integrated Christian approach dismantle positivism as a consistently effective ethical standard, according to Hill’s book.

Agency

While dual morality recommends keeping business and personal ethics separate and positivism replaces personal ethics with the law, agency says personal ethics should be

reduced when on the job. In other words, it should be placed on lower level of priority than a business’ ethical standard. Hill’s (2008) agency outlook deals with the “assertion that employees must lower their personal ethical standards when serving as corporate agents [employees]” (Part 2, Section 1, para. 2). Hill’s analysis of the agency outlook of business ethics focuses primarily on the question, “What should private-sector Christian employees do when ordered to commit an act that, though legal, violates their sense of obligation to God and community?” (Chapter 7, Section, 1, para. 5). This is much like the issue addressed in the rebuttal to positivism in context to the law; however the accountability is to the principle, or the boss, rather than the law in the agency perspective.

Hill provides several examples of individuals facing this dilemma and addresses them using two models to solve the challenge: submissive and purist views. In the submissive view, adherents are to put aside their personal ethics to accommodate their employer (principle). In the purist view, the adherent maintains their allegiance to conscience and does not obey the order, despite pressure from the principle (or the greater community). In the purist view, the individual’s highest source of moral authority is God and what the Bible has to say rather than their boss or the community at large (or any other agent for that matter).

ADDRESSING ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN MARKETING

There are several ethical challenges within the discipline and field of marketing. One is deceptive advertising. Hill’s conceptual framework and its application allow people of faith within the marketing industry to understand both ethical challenges and respond to them in a faithful manner.

Deceptive advertising opposes what Hill’s describes as justice, comprised of rights and duties. If it is the right of consumers to be told the truth about a product, it is the duty of companies to tell the truth. This right, along with many others is up for debate but undergirded in part by Thomas Jefferson and John Locke’s ethical theory of human rights, including the right to free consent, privacy, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, due process, life, and safety. If organizations are communicating deceptively about products (goods or services) being offered, some of these basic rights may be being infringed upon. How can one exercise freedom of conscience and purchase, for example fattening food made with harmful chemicals for their child, if they are not made aware of the risks of unhealthy fat and destructive chemicals? In this example, the right to freedom of conscience might in a sense be there, but if the truth

were communicated, a different purchase decision might be made, which would not be in favor of the business. This act, according to Hill's definition of justice (rights/duties) would be a breach in ethical behavior.

The ethical challenge of deceptive advertising also violates Hill's understanding and model of "holiness-justice-love" as the nature and character of God. So while businesses that are not led by Christians may stretch the truth without violating the law (for example, saying a product is "the best on the market," the "healthiest," or "fat free" as a symbol for healthy, etc.), businesses that ascribe to Christian values would consider it unethical within the framework of Hill's model. If Christians would take a stand on deceptive advertising, they would be opposing what Hill termed dual morality, which would permit deception among even Christian employees, due to there being a separation between business and personal ethics.

While the law might allow for certain degrees of deceptive advertising and positivism might allow for it, a purist and integrated Christian approach to ethics would discourage the practice on the basis of fearing God, who is the "Way, the Truth, and the Life" (Jn. 14:6). The agency outlook might also allow and even encourage the practice of deceptive advertising from the perspective of prioritization of business over personal ethics (especially the need for "agents" to submit to "principles"), but the word of God would still be opposed to it.

Hebrews 6:18 says, "It is impossible for God to lie." If we, as Hill noted, are called as Christians to reflect the nature of God, who cannot and never would lie, then we are called to be truthful in all things, including in advertising. We are called to put God first as Lord over every area of our life, including our vocation and even our corporate structure and its ethical norms.

CONCLUSION

In his book *Just Business*, Alexander Hill (2008) detailed his views on biblical concepts and applied them to business ethics. He highlighted three elements of holiness, justice, and love to describe his views on how Christians might address ethical challenges in the workplace while still maintaining integrity within the framework of their faith. He highlights three secular "false exits," or approaches to business ethics and rebuts them using the principles of holiness, justice, and love, as well as alternative approaches to viewing business ethics, such as the integrated Christian approach. Within marketing, the ethical issue of deceptive advertising was discussed in light of the earlier biblical con-

cepts and their relationship to business ethics. The author relayed concepts from Hill's book as well as described ideas from the Bible and other academic authors surrounding the relationship between Christian faith and business ethics.

Some of the key takeaways from this review and reflection were that holiness is actually a state of being, not a way of doing. It is being set apart for God and his purposes. Reflecting God's image, as Hill noted, is key, not only to cause business to thrive but to represent Jesus to a world who is desperate to know his love and salvation. The three "false exits" of dual morality, law, and agency, while practically workable within the context of certain secular and humanistic frameworks, oppose the lordship and ultimate sovereignty of God over every area of a Christian's life, including their vocation.

REFERENCES

- Hill, A. (2008). *Just business* (Kindle DX Version). Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/s?url=search-alias%3Daps&field-keywords=just+business+alexander+hill>
- The Holy Bible (n.d.). New King James Version.
- Wellman, J. (2014, May 24). What does the word "holy" mean? Bible Definition of Holy. *Christian Crier*. Retrieved from <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/christiancrier/2014/05/24/what-does-the-word-holy-mean-bible-definition-of-holy>