“Social Holiness as a Means of Realizing the New Creation”

Calling herself a city missionary, Mattie Perry in 1891 visited door to door in Spartanburg, South Carolina, prayed with people, nursed the sick and ministered to the poor, providing food, clothing, and bathing supplies for some children who lacked care. Like John Wesley, Perry and other Wesleyan/Holiness women combined evangelism and social ministry. Mary Alice Tenney’s study of John Wesley confirmed that ministry was never an either/or proposition for him: “Social amelioration in the early years of the [Wesleyan] Revival held a place of equal emphasis with religious experience. Wesley could not have conceived of divorcing the two.” Wesley and his Wesleyan/Holiness heirs believed that meeting people’s material needs went hand in hand with sharing the gospel. Tenney documented that Wesley envisioned “a society where the principles of Christianity worked as leaven to create a new order.”

Social Christianity is often mistakenly equated with the social gospel, yet the social gospel is only one segment of the broader spectrum of social Christianity. Another expression of social Christianity is social holiness, which encompasses the social impulses of Wesley and his followers in the Wesleyan/Holiness movement. The social gospel emphasized the motif of the kingdom of God. Walter Rauschenbusch, a primary theologian of the social gospel, contended that the kingdom of God embraced the whole of human life and that “the doctrine is itself the social gospel.” Wesley’s emphasis on love is the motivation for social holiness. Social ethics based on holiness is an ethics of love. Wesley frequently paraphrased Luke 10:27 as the mandate for social holiness: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind and strength, and your neighbor as yourself.

While the social gospelers developed a comprehensive theology to justify their beliefs, Wesleyan/Holiness women did not undertake this task. A few provided Bible verses to support social holiness, but most implicitly lived their convictions rather than explicitly articulating them. Wesleyan/Holiness women did not use terms such as “new order” or “new creation” much less “inaugurated eschatology.” The closest synonym was “upward grade.” Holy living did not necessitate a highly developed theology. Sanctified women saw no need to formulate a theology to legitimate their ministry; following the biblical mandate to love their neighbor was enough. For the most part, Wesleyan/Holiness believers did not express a theological rationale to justify their social holiness efforts. They were practitioners rather than theorists. They merely contended that Jesus called them to love their neighbors and then acted on that belief. For Wesleyan/Holiness advocates, sanctification resulted in social holiness. Phoebe Palmer was convinced that God required sanctified Christians to be useful to others and contended that holiness enabled one to live a life of service.

Jane Dunning stated her conviction bluntly, concluding with several verses to support her position: “Those who do not feel a tender pity for the poor, and a desire to do all that is in their power to relieve them are not true disciples of Christ. ‘Whoso hath this world’s goods and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?’ (I John 3, 17.) ‘Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to..."
visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction.’ (James 1, 27.) The destitute widows and orphans are here meant, as is shown by our Saviour’s words, ‘Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.’ (Matt. 25, 40.).”

Jesus told a parable, recorded in Matt. 25:31-46, which reveals God’s agenda for Christians prior to the end of time. Jesus listed God’s expectations: meet the needs of those who are hungry and thirsty, those who are strangers, those who need clothing or need to be taken care of because they are sick, or those who need to be visited in prison. Emma Ray offered a rationale for her work at the Olive Branch mission in Seattle based on this parable: “It was all done not unto tramps, or hoboies, or drunks, but unto the Lord. ‘Inasmuch as ye have done it unto these, ye have done it unto me.’” Ray went beyond Christ’s admonition in these verses to visit those in prison when she and her husband took former prisoners into their home upon their release from the Seattle jail. Wesleyan/Holiness women showed their love to God by sharing love in tangible ways with others. They demonstrated Wesleyan/Holiness theologian Leon Hynson’s thesis that “love sets the tone for action.” Love motivated their social holiness activities rather than theological treatises.

Meeting people’s physical needs takes several forms. Ron Sider has contended: “Social action is that set of activities whose primary goal is improving the physical socio-economic and political well-being of people through relief, development and structural change.” He briefly described three types of social action:

1. relief—providing for immediate needs
2. development—helping people to care for themselves
3. structural change—dealing with the cause; through politics, changing societal structures to create justice.

Social holiness embraced all three aspects of social action. I began this paper with an example of a woman engaged in relief efforts. However, due to space restrictions, I will focus on development and structural change, since relief activities are probably more well-known.

**Development: Rescue Homes for Prostitutes**

Before initiating developmental programs for prostitutes, Wesleyan/Holiness women had to come to grips with the repugnance they initially felt toward prostitutes. With God’s love, they overcame their negative feelings, and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit they manifested God’s love to the women they served. Sanctified women ministered to prostitutes by offering them an alternative occupation. They provided homes where women could be trained to earn a legitimate living rather than being dependent on prostitution for their income.

Emma Whittemore initially resisted working with prostitutes. She explained the transformation of her attitude: “Something innate, however, caused a shrinking from it all, for up to this time I had ever felt such a loathing for anything bordering upon impurity that I never could tolerate a wicked woman. Even when in the Mission, where they would sometimes come, I always gave plenty of opportunity to the other workers to labor amongst them rather than get into close contact with them myself. [God] caused me to realize that there was in my heart a serious lack of love for such a class, and in great gentleness He gave me distinctly to understand that though He does not hold one responsible for traits not naturally possessed, He does hold one responsible for not accepting His unchangeable love.” Motivated by love, Whittemore became acquainted with some of the women and soon realized that gospel work was not enough: “It became evident that something more than an occasional visit or a kind word was required. If ultimate results in reclamation were to be attained, there must be a loving nurture and care that were impossible when contacts were only occasional.” Comments relating to her early ministry among prostitutes revealed Whittemore’s emphasis on love: “Sympathy and love combined with
God-given tact gained an entrance for Christ into many a stubborn heart . . . Endeavors were lovingly made to enter into their trials and griefs while conversing and praying with or amongst them.” Whittemore shared her insights for successful ministry among prostitutes: “In dealing with such girls my experience has invariably been that a kind look, a warm pressure of the hand, and Christ-like compassion often recalled days of purity and home. Unless one can prove one’s interest through actions as well as words, little comparatively, will ever be accomplished in rescuing these poor girls. Often they are far more sinned against in the beginning of their downfall than willingly entering a wild life of debauchery and shame. In the majority of cases, too, they are more cruelly censured than they deserve.” Whittemore knew that words alone would have little impact on women’s lives.

Whittemore’s plan of action involved founding a home for prostitutes. She contrasted her approach with popular attitudes toward prostitutes: “Loving consideration such as the Master Himself gave will be much more effective in helping poor sinners regain their womanhood than will the brutal publicity of self-righteous critics.” She opened the first Door of Hope mission in 1890 in New York City. The name came from Hos. 2:15: “And I will give her her vineyards from thence and the Valley of Achor as a Door of Hope; and she shall sing there as in the days of her youth.” Intended to minister to “fallen and outcast” women, the home provided three types of training: “instruction in housework, in dressmaking and fancy sewing, and in gardening and the raising of poultry.” The women received ten percent of the proceeds from their work, which was deposited in a bank account that was turned over to them when they left the home to begin their new careers. Whittemore explained how love influenced the operation of Door of Hope missions: “We never forcibly restrain such girls from leaving the Home; no bolts nor bars are ever upon the doors. Our only restraint is love; if that does not keep them with us, nothing else is likely to win them to Christ.” Her approach was both nonjudgmental and nonpunitive. Near the end of her book, Whittemore reiterated the crucial role of love in her ministry: “We trust enough evidences have been given to prove without a question that those who are so often despised and shunned are capable of responding to higher things if only some one will seek to love them back. God grant that these incidents may spur many into holy activity in behalf of such broken human material that the Great Potter is able to gloriously remake.” Whittemore’s emphasis on love illustrates the social holiness approach to ministering among those whom Christ had identified as “neighbors.” The primary approach of social holiness workers was one of love rather than judgment. They believed their activities fulfilled Christ’s injunction to love their neighbors.

Subsequent Door of Hope ministries were independent auxiliaries that formed a Door of Hope Union. By her own wish, Whittemore had no jurisdiction over the homes. There were ninety-seven Doors of Hope established before her death. Ultimately, there were about 250 Doors of Hope.

Martha Lee spoke of her “labor of love in rescuing my fallen sisters from lives of sin and shame.” Like Whittemore, Lee also expressed sympathy for prostitutes: “Do not think for a moment, dear readers, that these fallen ones have deliberately chosen a life of sinfulness and degradation.” The Good Will Mission in Omaha, which Lee oversaw, offered meals to prostitutes. If women wanted to leave prostitution, they were transferred to a home to prepare for this transition. One young African American woman who sang in a brothel barely escaped arrest when she tried to leave. Fleeing to Martha Lee and the other workers, she received suitable clothing enabling her to return home.

In 1881 Jennie Smith favorably cited a matron of a Magdalene Home for prostitutes in Philadelphia who asked rhetorically: “Is it right that we as Christians . . . should draw back, and think ourselves holier than these fallen sisters?” Smith also quoted Jesus, who said, “Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more,” to illustrate how former prostitutes should be treated. Smith, like Emma Whittemore, emphasized that love rather than judgment was the appropriate
motivation for social holiness. The love displayed by Wesleyan/Holiness women such as Whittemore and Smith exemplified John Wesley’s emphasis on love as the primary manifestation of holiness. This love inspired prostitutes to leave their former haunts and commit themselves to the developmental ministries offered by their Christian sisters.

**Structural Change**

Sanctified women did more than respond to social needs by engaging in ministries of relief and development. Martha Lee made a strong case for eliminating the conditions that resulted in the need for rescue work. Her insights sound amazingly contemporary:

> The wise mariner, seeing his fellow seamen wrecked upon hidden rocks and treacherous shoals, will endeavor to locate the causes of their calamity and steer clear of the dangers that, unavoided, brought them to grief.

> The philanthropist and the reformer who wish to accomplish the greatest amount of good possible will not only reach out the helping hand to the unfortunate and the erring, but by investigation will ascertain what are the things which make necessary their work of charity and reform; and by endeavoring to remove those circumstances and conditions will lessen the necessity for the work of philanthropy and reform in which they are engaged.

> The true rescue worker is as much, or more, interested in bringing about a condition, so far as possible, under which there will be less need of rescue work, as in rescuing those who have succumbed to temptation and gone into sin and shame.\(^{xiv}\)

Wesleyan/Holiness women supported a variety of causes intended to transform society. Activities ranged from advocating a living wage to reduce prostitution and promoting suffrage and the Equal Rights Amendment. The issue that received the most attention, however, was the campaign to promote abstinence from alcohol. Frequently aligning themselves with the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (W.C.T.U.), sanctified women worked in various capacities to address the abuse of alcohol and its effects of families and crime. While the W.C.T.U. fought for structural change in numerous areas, Wesleyan/Holiness women focused primarily on alcohol.

**A Living Wage**

Emma Whittemore’s sympathetic understanding of the occupants at her Doors of Hope reflected an economic reality many women faced before choosing prostitution: “Many a poor girl has sold herself, thinking thereby to keep body and soul together, because every other avenue seemed closed. Perhaps a mother or child was also dependent upon her.”\(^{xv}\) Whittemore advocated structural change by addressing the fact that most women could not make enough money in a legitimate occupation to support themselves, much less their families. She encouraged others to become involved in addressing the economic plight of prostitutes:

> Oh! if the women of our land would but band together and earnestly wait upon God to see what could be done regarding the starvation prices paid for the labor of so many of our dear young girls. They simply cannot live decently on what they receive. It is
truly heartrending to listen to the stories of how many a girl has been reduced to abject poverty and also robbed of the physical charm that might and should have been hers through the greed of wealthy men. They were willing to work hard, very hard, for an honest livelihood, but while their employers received the homage and compliments of individuals and organizations, these girls whose life-blood was sweated out to produce the wealth, were allowed to languish in conditions of wretchedness on a wage that would not supply a livelihood. Many in desperation have been driven into a life that is worse than death through this gateway of oppression.xvi

Florence Roberts also recognized the economic hardships that led to prostitution: “In visiting among the outcasts, I have learned from the lips of many that the primary cause of their downfall was the inadequacy of their wages as saleswomen, stenographers, etc., for their direct necessities; temptations became too great; the ultimate results were, alas! inevitable.” Martha Lee agreed. She wrote in 1906 regarding “starvation wages”: “Of the 290,000 girls and women, more or less, who work for a living, many of them receive wages entirely inadequate to meet their needs. This coupled with a desire on their part, or a demand on the part of their employers, to dress beyond their means, causes many women who would otherwise lead virtuous lives to resort to shame that they may secure the money needed to meet these demands.xvii Emma Whittemore’s, Florence Roberts’s, and Martha Lee’s insights prefigured contemporary arguments for the necessity of a living wage. Following the example of John Wesley, Wesleyan/Holiness women believed that sanctification resulted in societal holiness as well as personal holiness. They promoted changes in the structure of society, such as a living wage for women, as a means of realizing the goal of a sanctified society.

**Women’s Rights**

Hannah Whitall Smith and Alma White were the most outspoken Wesleyan/Holiness advocates of women’s rights in society. While maintaining that her religious tradition, the Friends, had never curbed women’s liberty in religious leadership, Smith observed the contrast with “the injustices of the position of women in the outside world.” She and White actively promoted woman’s suffrage. White believed that woman’s suffrage would be attained because “God is on the side of truth and justice.”xviii

White, by far, was the most active Wesleyan/Holiness woman in terms of promoting women’s rights in society. She sought to expand women’s opportunities into the political arena as well as in the church when she argued that women’s “intended sphere” included the ministry and involvement in legislative bodies. She declared: “The political bondage of women was unspeakable tyranny.”xix White firmly grounded her feminist views in the theology of the Wesleyan/Holiness movement and zealously preached a feminist message advocating autonomy for women in every area of their lives.

The biblical texts utilized in the Wesleyan/Holiness movement to affirm preaching by women also endorsed women’s equality in the political arena. White appropriated an egalitarian hermeneutic that was already available. She utilized Genesis 1-3, Jesus’ relationships with women, and Gal. 3:28 to argue for the equality of women in the state. White frequently preached sermons on women’s rights, such as “Woman’s Triumph,” “Emancipation of Woman,” and “Woman’s Equality in Church and State.” To supplement her preaching, she also authored pamphlets on women’s rights, explaining “that the Lord wanted me to enlighten the people, as part of the ministry to which I had been called.” White identified the “religious and political
equality of the sexes” as part of the creed of the Pillar of Fire, the denomination which she founded.xx Pillar of Fire member Ruth M. Hawkes explained in a circular letter (dated 11 March 1924) to other Pillar of Fire members that “no one can be a full-fledged Pillar of Fire and profess to preach its doctrines who fails to preach this [the equality of women].” Earlier in the letter she had insisted: “This subject of women’s rights and woman’s equality is surely the great subject of the day.” Hawkes provided specific examples of inequality such as the fact that many men “look upon their wives largely in the capacity of slaves to do their bidding attending to their comforts and think she should not look for a career in life that would interfere very much with that program.”xxi

Not content with the vote, White joined National Woman’s Party (NWP) members in promoting the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) when they introduced it in 1923. She articulated her position forcefully: “After women obtained the franchise in England and the United States they continued in subordination to their ecclesiastical and political masters, unable to rise above the handicap acquired through six thousand years of inequality and oppression.” The initial version of the amendment was as follows: “Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.” White contended: “The world continues its opposition to [woman’s] liberation in social, civic, and religious circles, determined to perpetuate her chains.” Wesleyan/Holiness women had personally experienced the new creation in that the movement maintained that Christ’s redemption restored the equality between women and men that was present at the creation of the world. White worked to extend this aspect of the new creation to all of society. She staunchly defended the necessity for the ERA. Her sermons incorporated information on laws that discriminated against women. In the early 1920s she spoke of Christ’s role in restoring woman “to the place accorded her by the Creator as the helper and co-administrator with man.” Unintimidated by the task, White asked, “Should not old traditions and customs be forgotten, and every effort put forth in this the dawning of a new era to place woman in her intended sphere, that she may help to start society on the upward grade?”xxii

Having preached against the chains that kept women “from political and ecclesiastical bondage,” it is not surprising that in 1924 White established Woman’s Chains, a magazine to promote women’s rights. By supporting the ERA, White and members of the Pillar of Fire advocated structural change that would ensure women’s equality within the legal system.

**Alcoholism**

Women also sought structural change by opposing the sale of alcohol. Numerous Wesleyan/Holiness women preachers, such as Julia Foote and Maggie Newton Van Cott, promoted the prohibition of alcohol prior to the organization of the W.C.T.U. in 1874. Foote admonished Christian men to pray and to vote to abolish the legal traffic in alcohol. After encountering a drunk person in a revival service, Maggie Newton Van Cott experienced “a most fervent desire to battle the monster intemperance, and pour a withering flame of rebuke upon any who gave aid, countenance, influence, or votes in support of the nefarious traffic.”xxiii She ultimately joined the Sons of Temperance in New York and encouraged others to follow her example.

Several women aligned themselves with the W.C.T.U. The extent of their involvement varied from membership in the group to serving as local and national W.C.T.U. officers to lecturing under the auspices of the W.C.T.U. Anna Prosser preached her first sermon at a W.C.T.U. mission. Emma Ray served as president of the W.C.T.U. for African American women in Seattle. While segregated chapters were more common in the South, the Seattle W.C.T.U. succumbed to separation as well. Upon moving to Kansas City, Ray discovered that there was only a W.C.T.U. for white women, and no organization for Black women.xxiv Despite
the racism explicit within the organizational structure itself, the local W.C.T.U. extended its support to Ray’s ministry.

Jennie Smith led temperance meetings and also spoke. Following one temperance speech at Berkeley Springs, West Virginia, several confessed: “You have won us; we will vote the temperance ticket.” She organized temperance unions in various cities, including Martinsburg, West Virginia, and Baltimore. Smith also directed a temperance convention at Mountain Lake Park, Maryland, in 1882.xxv

Lizzie Miller also affiliated with the W.C.T.U. She labored for several months under the auspices of the W.C.T.U. in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1875. She reported her work to the group monthly. She understood her ministry as a “labor of love.” Later, she spent many months working for the temperance cause in Missouri. Her book included a temperance sermon, in which she quoted verses from Proverbs, Leviticus, and Luke, to fortify her plea for total abstinence. She concentrated on the dreadful consequences of drinking.xxvi

Women had witnessed the harmful results of alcohol firsthand in their ministries of social holiness. In 1906 Martha Lee identified “the 250,000 licensed saloons, beer gardens and wine rooms” as “the natural ally of the brothel.” Elizabeth Wheaton addressed her readers pointedly: “Sisters, brothers, are you and I clear? Are we doing our best to stop this horrible traffic in whisky and girls, for one of these places can scarcely exist without the other. How many girls and boys are sacrificed yearly to fill the saloonkeepers’ coffers and fill up hell? Think of these things.” Wheaton’s ministry among prisoners offered her ample opportunities to observe the positive correlation between alcohol and crime. In one instance, she commented on three men sentenced to die. She placed the blame where it belonged, but also revealed her compassion for these men: “Poor boys! far away from home and friends, with few to care and many to cry out, ‘They deserve to die’—never seeing the cause, the rum traffic.” She concluded with a plea to her readers: “Why not stop that which sends our young men by the thousands to a drunkard’s or a criminal’s grave?”xxvii

Florence Roberts, another W.C.T.U. speaker, blamed “the downfall of masses . . . at the door of the licensed saloon.” Like Elizabeth Wheaton, she specifically attributed crime to alcohol: “The prison-ship was filled with young men serving short terms or awaiting trial for some serious offense. In almost every instance liquor was responsible for their being to trouble. It was heartrending.”xxviii

Wesleyan/Holiness women worked in close association with those who suffered from the deleterious effects of alcohol and discerned the influence of drinking on home life. They knew that drinking ruined families and contributed to crime and poverty. Often mistakenly faulted for being naive, these women had experienced firsthand the harm caused by alcohol and attacked the problem at its source. Advocating structural change by eliminating alcohol throughout society, they hoped to reduce its negative ramifications and contribute toward the creation of a sanctified society.

Just as they relied on the Holy Spirit to transform themselves, Wesleyan/Holiness women trusted that the Holy Spirit would aid them in transforming society as well. Motivated by love, sanctified women ventured beyond the church walls and revival tents to engage in social holiness. They addressed societal problems by offering relief, by supervising developmental programs where individuals could be trained to help themselves, and by advocating structural changes in society.
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