Reconciliation, Integrity and the Holy Spirit: Ethic and Ethos of Mission

Reconciliation has in the last decade emerged as the dominant ecumenical paradigm for mission, eclipsing the paradigm of liberation that prevailed from the 1960s on. In the present context of fragmentation and conflict, the church’s reconciling role has come to the fore (for reasons see Schreiter 2004: 11-15). The preference for reconciliation also implies a critique of the use of the goal of liberation to justify violence, or at least aggressive tactics, to achieve revolutionary change (Schreiter 1998: 3) and a tendency to use political and legal strategies to the exclusion of religious and spiritual considerations (: 4). Robert Schreiter, the leading missiologist promoting the paradigm of reconciliation, gave his second book on the subject – *The Ministry of Reconciliation* – the subtitle: “spirituality and strategies”. Schreiter explains in the introduction to the book how his work for justice and peace in a number of conflict zones convinced him that “reconciliation is more a spirituality than a strategy”:

It seemed to me that reconciliation had to be a way of living, had to relate to the profound spiritual issues that reconciliation raises and requires. To think of it only as a strategy is to succumb to a kind of technical rationality that will succeed at best partially (: vi).

Schreiter’s observations suggest that reconciliation as a paradigm moves away from a mechanical approach in which mission is understood as performing a task, or achieving an end result, by the most efficient and effective means. The reconciliation of human beings to God and to one another cannot be legislated; it has necessary personal and religious dimensions.

The state can set up commissions to examine the wrongdoing of the past, but it cannot legislate the healing of memories. The state can offer amnesty or mete out punishment to wrongdoers, but it cannot guarantee forgiveness. Social reconciliation sets up conditions that make reconciliation more likely, but those conditions cannot of themselves effect it. That is why secular NGOs frequently turn to their religious counterparts and ask for help with this necessary spiritual dimension. Most religious NGOs find themselves caught off guard, and they too must seek help for this spiritual dimension. Reconciliation had not been part of their portfolio either (: 4).

The integrity of mission demands that, if the goal is reconciliation, the means will also be reconciliatory and this has implications for processes and attitudes in mission. In this paper, I will examine reconciliation in the teaching of the Apostle Paul to suggest that, in describing mission as the ministry of reconciliation, he was making a similar point about mission spirituality in order to uphold the integrity of mission. I will then give some implications of the mission paradigm of reconciliation for both the ethic and the ethos of mission.

**Reconciliation in Paul: relationships and spirituality**

In the New Testament, the term reconciliation, but not the idea, is exclusively Pauline, with the single exception of Matthew 5.24 (where a different verb is used). The verb *katallasso* (reconcile) and the noun *katallage* (reconciliation) are used by Paul eleven times and in some
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central passages of his theology where he attempts to express what God has done in Christ and the meaning of the gospel. Paul applies the term reconciliation to the new relationship we have with God as a result of the death of Jesus Christ (Rom 5:10-11; 11:15). He describes the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile with one another as an integral part of our reconciliation with God (Eph 2:14-16). The reconciliation achieved by Christ is cosmic in its scope and within which the reconciled lives of faithful believers are set (Col 1:19-22). Furthermore, Paul describes the participation of the church God’s reconciling mission to the world as a ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor 5:18-20).

Notwithstanding its prominence, the theme of reconciliation in Paul has received comparatively little attention until recently. This is largely because of a fixation in the Western church (Catholic and Protestant) with the doctrine of justification that may be traced back to Augustine and was reinforced by the controversies of the Reformation. In the second half of the twentieth century a number of new perspectives contributed to freeing Pauline studies from captivity to Reformation controversies. Johannes Munck drew attention to the fact that Paul was a missionary before he was a theologian and that his theological reflections stemmed from his experience as a Jew of mission to the Gentiles (Munck 1959). Krister Stendahl argued that Paul’s agony in Romans was not caused by the “introspective conscience” of Reformation Europe which worried about individual salvation. Given Paul’s often expressed confidence in his own righteousness in the Law because of his Jewish heritage (e.g. Phil 3.4-6), the passage in Romans 7 (vs 7-25) with which Luther so closely identified should not be understood as a personal crisis of confidence but as a more general human experience (Stendahl 1976: 78-96). Paul’s personal dilemma is found in Romans 9.1-5, where Paul expresses his worry about the salvation of his own people, the Jews in the light of the great turning of Gentiles to the living God that he experienced in his missionary work. Furthermore, E.P. Sanders convincingly argued that first century Judaism was not a religion of works-righteousness, as Luther and European scholars of religion had portrayed it (see Sanders 1991: 44-76). In so doing he exposed how the deep roots of roots of anti-Semitism in European culture had influenced biblical scholarship and revealed the extent to which Martin Luther’s reading of Paul was influenced by anti-Semitism and conditioned by his own struggle with Rome. This opened up the possibility that the doctrine of justification by faith (alone) might not be the core of Paul’s theology after all and allowed theologians to appreciate a range of ways in which Paul explains the atonement.

In the new perspective on Paul, the centre of the book of Romans is not Romans 8, from which Luther derived the assurance of salvation but Romans 9-11, where Paul puts forward his understanding of how, despite Israel’s current reluctance to believe, they will eventually respond, and Jew and Gentile will together be vindicated in accordance with the promises to Israel. Their current rejection is understood to be part of a process of “reconciliation of the world” that culminates in the final resurrection (11.15). That is, Paul’s concern goes beyond justification to reconciliation. His efforts in ministry are toward building a reconciled community of Jews and Gentiles. In the church, in the body of Christ, the dividing wall of hostility between Jew and Gentile is broken down and “both have access in one Spirit to the Father” (Eph 2.18). Though Paul refers to other aspects of reconciliation – socio-economic and gender reconciliation (Gal 3.28) – the focus of his efforts is on Jew and Gentile, that is on racial and cultural reconciliation.

R.P. Martin put forward reconciliation as the central motif of Paul’s theology. He proposed that, in the letter to the Romans, Paul moved from the theme of justification in chapters 1-4 to that of reconciliation in chapter 5 because he preferred reconciliation imagery as a tool of
communication to the Gentile world, since it related to a universal human need for forgiveness and personal relationship, and could embrace both the personal and cosmic dimensions of the work of Christ (cf. Col. 1:15-23; Martin 1981: 153). Since in Romans 5, reconciliation and justification are clearly in parallel, Martin may have overstated the case (Dunn 1998, 387-88). Nevertheless, the use of reconciliation instead of justification points to a shift from the legal context to the personal and religious. Though critical of some new perspectives, Kim Seyoon has added weight to Martin’s view by calling scholarly attention to the seminal importance of what is recounted as Paul’s initial conversion experience on the Damascus Road (Acts 9.1-8; 22.4-11; 26.12-15) to his later developed theology. His conversion was a personal experience of reconciliation; in it “God reconciled his enemy to himself” (Kim, S.Y. 1997). Furthermore, Paul identified the church (which he was persecuting) with the body of Christ, an image which he later used to urge Christian unity and reconciliation (1 Cor 1.13; 12.12-27). Use of the term reconciliation helps to make clear that justification for Paul is not about self-righteousness but about relationships; it is about the justification or vindication of Israel before the nations, the enlarged Israel into which the Gentiles are grafted (Rom 11.17-24). The attention is turned away from the legal and institutional aspects of salvation preferred by the Western church and toward the therapeutic and inter-personal, which have long been preferred by the East (Schreiter quoted in Dorr 2000: 132).

The ministry of the Spirit as reconciliation

At the same time, the new perspectives have revealed the role that pneumatology plays in Paul’s theology and the appropriateness of reconciliation to express the Spirit’s work. James Dunn shifts the centre of Paul’s thought away from polemic about faith versus works, as if the two were opposed to one another, to a discussion of the relationship between the Law and the Spirit. He draws attention to the Pauline phrase “in the Spirit” and the extent to which it parallels the equally Pauline term for church life, “in Christ”. What is distinctive about the Christian community is the Spirit of Christ, which Christians are given as a foretaste, a guarantee or a down-payment of what is to come (2 Cor 1.22; 5.5; Eph 1.13-14; Rom 8.23). The admittance of Gentiles to the community was on the basis that they too had received the gift of the Spirit (Gal 2.7-9; cf. Acts 10.47; 11.17; 15.8). Whereas Paul uses the legal term justification to describe the “crucial transition” of entry to Christian faith only in Galatians and Romans, the gift of the Spirit is used to describe the same event throughout Paul’s writings, and this seemed to be “common ground” with all the communities to which he wrote (Dunn 1998: 425). So Paul argues it is the indwelling of the Spirit which defines the community not outward signs of the flesh (Gal 3.3; Rom 8.9; Dunn 1998: 419-425). He describes new life in Christ as characterised by “the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph 4.3) and peace as characteristic of the Spirit-filled life (Rom 8.6; 14.17; Gal 5.22). Paul’s theology of the Spirit is therefore crucial to safeguard the integrity of the reconciled and reconciling community.

To see the close relationship in Paul’s mind between the ministry of the Spirit and the ministry of reconciliation, we will look in more detail at 2 Corinthians. It is as well to remember that “glory” and “power”, in Paul and elsewhere, are often synonyms of “spirit” (Ridderbos 1975: 539). Keeping together the diverse and gifted community which he had planted at Corinth was a challenge for Paul. In his previous letter, he had emphasised the overriding importance of unity and love. Unity in Christ was essential “lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power (Spirit?)” (1.10-17). He encouraged Godly wisdom (another synonym for the Spirit; 1.18-3.23) to combat some of the problems of community life at Corinth so that Jews and Greeks should not offend one another (10.31-33). The reconciled
life of the community was to be expressed in the Lord’s Supper, shared among all and eaten together (11.17-34). The gifts of the Spirit cannot be effectively exercised apart from the Spirit of love in which they were given (13.1-13; cf 16.14). After that, there seems to have been a breakdown of trust between Paul and the congregation, perhaps because Paul had been away from Corinth for some time and, though he promised to visit, he had not done so, and also because the collection he arranged to be taken up for God’s people in need in Jerusalem at the end of his previous letter may have aroused suspicion in some quarters that he was seeking to make himself rich at their expense. So in this second letter, Paul needed to restore his relationship with the Corinthians and in order to do so explains himself and defends the integrity of his mission (see Young & Ford 1987: 12-16).

After explaining his difficulties, Paul describes the ministry of the Spirit (2 Cor 3.8) in which he is involved and contrasts it with the ministry of Moses. He compares the two ministries by considering two letters: one written by the Spirit of the living God on human hearts and the other inscribed on tablets of stone; one bringing righteousness and the other condemnation (2 Cor 3.1-11). In so doing, he recalls the prophecy of Jeremiah that in the new covenant, God will write the law on their hearts so that they would know God instinctively (Jer 31.31-34), and the prophetic association of the outpouring of the Spirit with the last days (Joel 2.28; Ezek 39.29). The point is not to diminish Moses but to put into relief the difference that the new life in the Spirit makes. He describes the Lord as the Spirit, the fullness of God’s glory, which Moses saw only in a veiled way but which believers, having their veils removed when they turn to the Lord, see with unveiled faces. In the Spirit, believers are changed into Christ’s likeness, from one degree of glory to another (2 Cor 3.12-18). In Paul’s mind the Spirit represents a higher law, a greater glory than that of Moses (2 Cor 3). In every respect, the Spirit surpasses (but does not obviate) the law and so the Christian life is (or should be) on a higher plane.

Reading on in 2 Corinthians, Paul assures the readers of the transparency of his ministry and ascribes the power of his ministry to God, who by the gift of the Spirit, guarantees the glory that is as yet unseen (2 Cor 4.1-5.15). From the viewpoint of the Spirit, Paul sees a new creation, which results from God’s reconciling work in Christ (5.16-19). The “ministry of the Spirit” is now described as the “ministry of reconciliation”, modelled on that of Jesus Christ, through whom human beings are reconciled to God (2 Cor 5.18-19). As Paul describes it in 2 Corinthians, the reconciling ministry of the Spirit in which he is engaged is an effective ministry resulting in living communities that show the glory of God (2.12-3.18). It is a ministry that is transparently faithful to Jesus Christ (4.1-6) and the weakness of those who mediate reconciliation only serves to reveal the glory of the Spirit more brightly (4.7-5.10). Paul goes on to spell out some of the implications of reconciliation in the fellowship of the Spirit. The suffering of the ministers is shown to be an occasion for a demonstration of the solidarity that reconciliation in the Spirit means, by empathising with their suffering (6.11-7.16). Paul makes a plea for the Corinthians to widen their hearts (6.13) and extend the reconciliation they have received in Christ to him also (7.2-16). Paul’s gospel of reconciliation means participating in the practical sharing of their riches with the poor in Jerusalem through the collection, which Paul is taking up (8-9). Their giving will be the proof of their love (8.24) as they follow the example of Jesus Christ, whose reconciling ministry meant that “though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich” (8.8-10). However, this reconciliation does not extend to unbelievers (6.14-7.1) or false apostles (10.1-11.15). These people do not share the same Spirit (12.18), they are not indwelt by the living God (6.16) and they do not have the Spirit of the same Jesus Christ (11.4), who set an example of suffering and vulnerability in mission and thus
demonstrated God’s power (12.9-10; 13.3-4). Reconciliation does not take place everywhere (13.10), it is a feature of life in the Spirit of Jesus Christ, it takes place in “the fellowship of the Spirit” (13.11-14).

Among many different paradigms of mission, reconciliation assumed central importance for Paul because of his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles. Paul struggled to establish the integrity of his mission and with it the recognition of Gentiles as full members of the body of Christ. For Paul reconciliation meant the communion of Jew with Gentile in the one Spirit (Eph 2.11-22): that is, life in community, fellowship in the Holy Spirit, working cooperatively, and – most significantly – eating together (Gal 2). For Paul, reconciliation is a ministry of the Spirit and takes place in the Spirit.

The integrity of mission – ethic and ethos

The shift from justification to reconciliation, from the Law to the Spirit, in New Testament studies is mirrored in missiology in the move from the paradigm of liberation to that of reconciliation. Schreiter notes that the theologies of liberation, “honed so well to resistance of oppression”, are not equipped for the widely shared mission concern to bring an end to violent conflict, to reconstruct and make peace (Schreiter 2004: 12,14). Justice, writes Donal Dorr, is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for reconciliation because justice alone “cannot heal old wounds and wipe out past offences”. He stresses that “reconciliation should accompany liberation from the start”. A commitment to reconciliation is shown by “whether those who struggle for justice show a respect for human rights during their struggle”. As Dorr puts it, “If we can resist the temptation to win at all costs, this indicates that the germ of reconciliation is already present in the midst of our struggle” (Dorr 2000: 128). Having a view to future reconciliation with our enemy, Dorr’s words suggest, we will not try to crush them but wage our struggle in a way that does not breed future resentment and bears witness to the rightness of our cause. Christian love is to be extended even to our enemies (Matt 5.43-48) and so the ministry of reconciliation must be carried out in a reconciliatory way.

Mission is not only an activity of the church but a participation in the ongoing mission of God in the world through the Spirit. Thus mission is described as “bearing the witness of the Spirit” (Newbigin 1995: 56-65) and mission takes place “in the Spirit” (Kim, K. 2003). Liberation theologians such as Samuel Rayan were quick to see the connection in Jesus’ sermon at Nazareth between “the Spirit of the Lord is upon me” and “preach good news to the poor” (Luke 4.18). They realised that the mission enterprise of liberation had to be accompanied not only by the theological justification provided by Gustavo Gutiérrez and others but also by a spirituality of liberation (Gutiérrez 1990). Unless God’s mission is done in God’s way, mission movements are discredited or else they alienate others before their aims, however worthy, can be achieved. The integrity of Christian mission depends on the means of mission being compatible with the Gospel of Christ. Miroslav Volf writes, citing two pillars of liberation theology: Gutiérrez and Jürgen Moltmann, that in the Christian gospel, “love” must “tower over freedom”. Insisting on “the primacy of love over freedom means to transform the project of liberation, to liberate it from the tendency to ideologize relations of social actors and perpetuate their antagonisms. We need to insert the project of liberation into … a theology of embrace” (Volf 1996: 105).

Mission spirituality challenges missionary activism by turning attention to the processes and attitudes of mission. Interest in mission spirituality originates from consideration of the spirituality of the missionary or for the missionary task, a “spirituality of the road” (Bosch 1979). However, under the influence of liberation theology, it has come to mean spirituality
of or for mission (e.g. Rayan 1997). Mission spirituality is not primarily a matter of following religious or cultural traditions of spirituality but about doing mission in the Spirit of Christ. In this respect it focuses on the way in which mission is carried out, on the path and motivation of mission, or on what we might call the ethic and ethos of mission. Attention to mission spirituality helps to make the means of mission consistent with its end and to ensure that the medium or messenger embodies the gospel message to safeguard the integrity of mission.

Reconciliation and the ethic of mission
If mission is reconciliation, then it is greatly concerned with human relationships and right behaviour toward God and neighbour; in other words, it is ethical. New perspectives on Paul have highlighted the continuing importance of good deeds in obedience to the Law in Paul’s theology of salvation, and in particular the practice of reconciliation. N.T. Wright insists (in the face of strong opposition from those for whom it overturns the central tenet of the Reformation that salvation is by faith alone) that throughout the NT it is attested that judgment is according to works of righteousness (Matt 25.31-46 is the clearest statement) and therefore they are far from irrelevant to salvation. He notes that Paul upholds most aspects of the Law of Moses for Christian living. The phrase “works of the law”, works which Paul denies are of use to salvation, does not refer to morally and ethically right conduct but only to those aspects of the law which stand in the way of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in Christ. Paul’s adversaries were not law-abiding Jews but the Judaisers, that is those who insisted that, in order to be acceptable to God, it was necessary to adopt the Jewish culture defined by circumcision and food laws. It was these “badges of membership” (Dunn’s phrase) that separated Jew and Gentile in the Christian community to which Paul objected not the Law itself. As E.P. Sanders argued by the term “covenantal nomism”, in Christianity as in Judaism entry to the covenant community is by grace appropriated by faith. However, once part of the community, there are clear expectations about obedience to God’s Law (Wright 2003).

What is also important is that justification is not on an individual basis but is a judgment of God on the obedience of the whole people of Israel together. The people were looking to the vindication of the whole nation of Israel before the world. The cosmic and community dimensions of the term reconciliation, used in parallel to justification, make this clear. Being reconciled in Christ is not a matter of an individual’s standing but of a person’s relationships. The process of the reconciliation of the cosmos is being worked out through the practice of Christian love in the community (Eph 2.14-16). Understanding this may help to overcome the separation of mission from church life and witness that has so afflicted Christian movements in the West. Mission is governed by the same ethic that Paul enjoined for the Christian community. If we love our neighbour as ourselves, we will treat the objects of mission with the same respect as we show to fellow Christians.

So the paradigm of reconciliation has profound implications for the ethic of mission. The reconciled community, practising the requirements of the Law – love of God and neighbour, is at the heart of the mission of reconciliation. It is often said that reconciliation is both vertical – with God – and horizontal – with our fellow human beings. However, to think of two directions may lead to the suggestion that we can have one without the other, whereas it is the ministry of the Spirit to connect the two. It might be more true to say that our reconciliation, which is a gift of God, is worked out in reconciled relationships within the community. Indeed, “Reconciliation with others is the only convincing evidence that we are reconciled with God” (Dorr 133; see Matt 5.23-24). There is comparatively little in Paul’s letters about personal relationship with God and much more about relationships with others.
The ministry of the Spirit that is reconciliation is that of the ambassador, one who builds human relationships: “God making his appeal through us” (2 Cor 5.20).

However, “the ultimate goal of God in reconciliation is broader than human attempts at conflict resolution” (Burrows, 82). The vision of reconciliation encompasses the whole creation. God in Christ was reconciling the world and bringing about a new creation (2 Cor 5.19,17). Through Christ, God was pleased “to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven” (Col 1.20). As the late Colin Gunton pointed out, Romans 8 begins with life in the Spirit and goes on to the reconciliation of creation before returning to the Spirit again (Rom 8.1-27). The Spirit, understood by the Cappadocian Fathers as the “perfecting cause” of creation, has been bringing order out of chaos since she first moved over the face of the waters. The Spirit in the church, the new creation, is the earnest of what is to come. So the reconciling work of the Spirit extends from the resurrection of Christ through the ethics of church life until it pervades the whole of the created order (Gunton 2002).

**Reconciliation and the ethos of mission**

However, Volf reminds us that the “crucial question” “is not how to accomplish the final reconciliation”, that problem, he rightly notes, “ought not to be taken out of God’s hands”. He believes much harm has been done by “grand narratives of emancipation”, whereas the real question is “what resources we need to live in peace in the absence of the final reconciliation” (Volf 1996: 109). Paul urged upon the churches not only an ethic of reconciliation but also an ethos of reconciliation, an attitude or spirit that refrains from provocation and revenge and, as far as possible, aims to be at peace with all: “Live in harmony with one another; do not be haughty, but give yourselves to humble tasks; never be conceited. Repay no one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all. If possible, so far as it depends upon you, live peaceably with all” (Rom 12.16-18).

Participation in the Spirit means having the mind of Christ, which is characterised by humility (Phil 2.1-11).

The Western missionary movement achieved many things but also generated much resentment: an indication that its weakness was not in strategy but in spirituality. Many worthy aims were achieved but the colonial ethos was its downfall. Arrogant and superior attitudes did immeasurable harm to the cause of Christ and built up resentment rather than reconciliation. So closely was mission associated with the imperial mindset that many have assumed that the end of empire should also be the end of mission. Paul warns that ministry or missionary work is ineffective unless it is done in a spirit of love, which is patient and kind and does not insist on its own way (1 Cor 13). The Judaising mission that came to Antioch from Jerusalem were inclined to insist on their own way: they wished to impose their criteria for membership of the community on others. The result was separation rather than reconciliation. In trying to bring the two sides together, Paul insists that no one is justified (or reconciled) by works of the law but by the Spirit of God’s Son received by faith (Gal 3.1-5; 4.6-7). For Paul it was not the marks of the flesh – of circumcision or keeping the food laws – it was by the Spirit that Christians recognise one another. What is regarded as “Christian” is often a contentious issue now as it was then and is often defined by cultural, legal or theological considerations. Reconciliation can only take place, when such issues are overridden by a shared ethos that respects and aims to love one another. So Paul appeals to the Galatians that the Spirit of Christ, who saves them, should also guide them to live in reconciled community. “If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. Let us have no self-conceit, no provoking of one another, no envy of one another” (Gal 5.25-26; cf 5.16-24).
Reconciliation or restoration is achieved by the “spirit of gentleness” not by compulsion (Gal 6.1,12). It is a gift of the Spirit that cannot be brought about by force of law. The image of the ambassador that Paul chooses to use in 2 Corinthians implies an ethos of persuasion not force. Paul’s ethos of reconciliation does not mean that he is “soft” on issues of justice and morality. It does not override his ethic. He is expecting the Christian community to be obedient to the Law of justice. However, if the Spirit of Christ or Christian spirituality is the mode of reconciliation, if reconciliation takes place “in the Spirit”, then the character of the Spirit delimits the strategies of the ministry of reconciliation. Not all methods are compatible with the Spirit of Christ. As Schreiter explains it, in Christian tradition, reconciliation is brought about by identifying with the sufferings of Jesus Christ, being united with Christ in his death. It is in God working through the believer to bring about resurrection to new life that reconciliation takes place. This is not predictable and is not achieved by slavish obedience to a set of rules but comes about when the reconciliation with God that Jesus Christ brought about sets us free (in the Spirit) to be reconciled to one another (Schreiter 1998). The reconciliatory Spirit of Christ should characterise his followers, whose reconciliation has been brought about by his life and death. If so, this will be evidenced in the ethical way in which Christian mission is carried out and in the peaceable ethos of Christian mission.
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Summary

Reconciliation has gained prominence as the new ecumenical paradigm for mission. In this paper, I will examine reconciliation in the teaching of the Apostle Paul, noting how recent new perspectives give it prominence and particularly emphasise its application to racial-cultural reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles. I will show how in 2 Corinthians the ministry of reconciliation is connected with the ministry of the Spirit and suggest that in describing mission as the ministry of reconciliation, Paul was drawing attention to the need for mission to be done “in the Spirit” (or “bearing the witness of the Spirit”) if it is to have integrity (in the third sense indicated in the statement of the theme of this conference). The Spirit is creatively at work in the world to bring about reconciliation and participating in this Spirit of reconciliation affects the means as well as the goals of mission. Consideration of mission in the Spirit, or mission spirituality, challenges missionary activism and safeguards the integrity of mission by focusing on relationships (over and above legalities) and on the processes and attitudes of mission. Building on this premise, the paper will put forward implications of the mission paradigm of reconciliation for both the ethic and the ethos of mission.