

Concordia Theological Monthly



S E P T E M B E R ♦ 1 9 5 7

Visitation Evangelism in American Churches

By A. KARL BOEHMKE

(Continued)

V. *The Development of Visitation Evangelism 1921—1954*

THE story of the development of Visitation Evangelism is here viewed in general chronological sequence, with principal emphasis on the individuals associated with the movement, their experiences and thoughts (as they may be apprehended), and their expressed attempts at contribution to the evangelism field.

Two notable pioneers appeared in the visitation-evangelism field: A. Earl Kernahan and Guy H. Black.

A. Earl Kernahan. A. Earl Kernahan is credited by some with having originated the visitation method.

Kernahan was a Methodist minister, pastor of several churches in both the Southwest and New England, an organizer and speaker in revival campaigns, an Army chaplain in Europe during World War I. Having made repeated appraisals of the effectiveness of the revival method in his own campaign and some of Billy Sunday's campaigns with which he was associated, he became convinced that the mass-evangelism technique was not accomplishing its intended purpose of winning new souls. At the close of a revival in Boston he declared himself finished with the traditional method:

I said, "I will never hold another series of evangelistic services for the specific purpose of winning people to a public decision for Christ."

I was absolutely determined to find some way to accomplish this work satisfactorily. It occurred to me that it would be wise to try and discover just how Jesus did this work. I found clearly, to my delight, that Jesus won every outstanding follower by the personal contact method. . . . I also found that the immediate followers of Jesus carried on their work by personal interviews. . . . I turned my attention to the early history of the Church, and I found that here, again, there was unmistakable evidence that during the phenomenal growth of the Church in those early years, the work was done by religious conversations in which one Christian talked with another, or at the most, to a few. The laws of

the day made it impossible to hold mass meetings, and yet, during this very period, one of the striking miracles in the history of the Christian Church occurred, namely, the conversion of the Roman Empire.

I was now convinced that it was time to experiment. . . . We could appeal to society . . . with every reason to believe that we would get a response that the early disciples could not have expected to get. Just at this time I met a man by the name of Guy H. Black. He had been experimenting in exactly the same field. We had come to exactly the same conclusions. We worked together in the city of Chicago for several weeks. Our results were a revelation to the Christians there. I resigned from my pastorate and consecrated my life to the purpose of demonstrating what laymen can do toward winning the fifty million or more people in our country who are now outside the Roman Catholic, Jewish, or Protestant churches to friendship with Jesus Christ and membership in some body of His followers.¹

With that, Kernahan began a twenty-year career as director of visitation-evangelism campaigns. From that time forward his name has been associated with the beginnings of the movement. Dawson Bryan, director of the visitation-evangelism department of the Methodist Church, after 1946, wrote: "Historically, it seems as though Earl Kernahan was responsible for the pioneering. He laid out basically many of the fundamental ideas. His campaigns [however] were purely local and did not catch the imagination of ministers."²

Guy H. Black. The other important pioneer in the visitation field was Guy H. Black. Black, too, is credited by some with having originated the method.³

Black has left little printed material to reflect his thinking or experience in this period. However, Charles Goodell, evangelism secretary for the Federal Council of Churches in 1926, observed:

Among those who have used this [visitation] method with large success is Rev. Guy H. Black, a pioneer in this field. He organized

¹ *Visitation Evangelism, Its Methods and Results* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925), pp. 15 ff.

² Letter to me, March 12, 1954.

³ Jesse Bader, for example, referred to Black as the originator of the plan (Interview, July 17, 1953).

work in a dozen cities, training the workers, showing them how to go about the work, what methods to use and in what spirit to conduct the work. The results in those cities were far beyond the expectations of himself and of those who were associated with him. While he claims no right as a discoverer of this method, he has used it with such signal success as to challenge many others to undertake a similar work. Rev. A. Earl Kernahan also has been very successful in training of workers and in uniting churches in a given community to carry this method to actual success. Far greater results in ingathering have been accomplished through this method, by the men whom we have named and by many others who have adopted the same general plan, than has been accomplished through great tabernacle meetings or by vocational evangelists of proved ability and devotion. If "new occasions bring new duties," it happens that new conditions bring new opportunities; and new methods succeed where old methods have failed.⁴

Dawson Bryan wrote concerning Black: "Guy Black was responsible for overcoming much of the lethargy and prejudice toward visitation evangelism — as well as developing basic methods and adding the training schools for ministers and conducting campaigns with numbers of churches and pastors participating."⁵

George Irving. This is a third name sometimes mentioned in connection with the beginning of the visitation method.

Irving was a Young Men's Christian Association worker. Apparently he had no contact with Kernahan and Black, but proposed independently an evangelism plan identical in most respects to visitation evangelism. Termed "united witnessing," the plan followed the pattern of worker recruitment, prospect list, training talks, supper meetings, and home visits. George Irving wrote in 1934: "While these experiences are my own, I claim no originality for the simple plan, except it is original with me. Other men have apparently been led to the same conclusion by different routes. That to me is always a sign of the leading of the Spirit of God."⁶

Irving's experience would tend to lend substance to the view that

⁴ Charles L. Goodell, *Motives and Methods in Modern Evangelism* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1926), p. 122.

⁵ Bryan, loc. cit. See n. 2.

⁶ *Experiences in Witnessing for Christ* (New York: the Association Press [c. 1934]), p. 20.

different men in different parts of the church were, at varying times, looking for new methods with which to meet new circumstances, and that these circumstances affected the type of method developed.

It may be noted in this regard that the visitation method was still being discovered as recently as the year 1952. There was found an instance of a group of businessmen in a Lutheran congregation in Verona, N. J. In that year, with no apparent knowledge of visitation-evangelism methods or literature, these men devised a "Sharing Christ" plan, similar in many respects to the plan Kernahan and Black had proposed thirty years earlier. Such an instance throws light on the process whereby churches facing similar problems of a changing culture in varying times, places, and degrees devise, adopt, or adapt new methods to meet new problems after traditional methods have proved inadequate.

VI. *Years of Early Development*

During the fifteen-year period, 1925—1940, visitation evangelism became modestly established on the American scene. Certain leaders promoted the method with a whirlwind borrowed from the older revival method. Others advanced the plan in a still, small voice—which in the long run may have proved more effective. But all appeared willing to follow the Kernahan-Black plan of procedure, which now became increasingly fixed and routinized.

Methods Put to the Test. The period roughly bracketed by World War I and World War II was not marked by large over-all church membership gains. Over the thirty-year period, 1910 to 1940, the ratio of church members to total population showed an increase of but 6 per cent. This compares unfavorably with the 7-per-cent increase during the ten-year period, 1900—1910, or the 8-per-cent increase during the ten year period, 1940—1950. Moreover, the 4-per-cent rise recorded between 1920 and 1930 may appear larger than the fact would warrant, since in connection with the 1926 census a change of an inflationary nature was made in the method of counting members.⁷ Winfred E. Garrison, noting the

⁷ Landis points out that some churches which prior to 1926 reported only family heads now reported individuals; some previously reporting adults only, now reported all baptized members. (*Yearbook of American Churches*, 1952 edition, pp. 256 f.)

meager index of membership gain during the late 1920's and early 1930's, was led to observe: "It may be that the immediate destiny of the church is not gradually to draw into its membership an increasing proportion of the population, but to become relatively smaller, even absolutely smaller."⁸

Under such circumstances evangelism methods of whatever description were put severely to the test. The revival was increasingly suspect. New methods were multiplied; attrition among new methods was rapid; survival was presumed to have been a mark of basic health.

The Revival Defended. If there was a tendency on the part of some to blame the revival for the waning effectiveness of evangelism, there was a corresponding readiness on the part of others to defend the revival as a still useful tool. A Methodist bishop, for example, issued a call for meeting the secularism of the day with a new use of the old revival evangelism. Those who maintained, he said, that "the pulpit is a waning power and that it is only a question of time until more modern agencies take its place" were judged to be wrong.⁹

Lin D. Cartwright, of the department of education of the Disciples of Christ Church, writing in this period, also defended the revival-method evangelism. He disagreed with Weber's harsh criticism, and saw the failure of revivalism only in ". . . certain clap-trap or sensational methods. . . . Perhaps the mass type of evangelism has made no more serious mistakes on the whole than some of the newer methods will make, which are today being so enthusiastically suggested to take its place."¹⁰ Both Leonard and Cartwright modestly endorsed the new visitation method, but pleaded for strong continued use of the revival.

Further Work of Kernahan. Throughout the period, 1920 to 1940, A. Earl Kernahan exerted an important influence in the development of visitation evangelism. His enthusiasm for the method appears to have been unbounded. In 1925 he wrote: "Suppose that out of more than four million in the Methodist

⁸ *The March of Faith* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933), p. 263.

⁹ Adna W. Leonard, *Ancient Fires on Modern Altars* (New York: the Abingdon Press, 1931), pp. 158 ff.

¹⁰ *Evangelism for Today* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1934), pp. 103 ff.

Episcopal Church 100,000 are enlisted in this work. In one week they would win 1,400,000 to Christian discipleship. This is not a dream; if in winning ten thousand people, the workers of all ages have averaged fourteen won per team each week of work, it is logical to conclude that an average of fourteen won per team is a correct estimate of future success."¹¹

In 1928 Kernahan published his *Adventures in Visitation Evangelism*, offering endorsements of the plan such as that by a Reformed Church pastor of York, Pa.: "It has remained for the present decade to evolve the form that is best calculated to reach . . . unchurched thousands in the throbbing centers of population It is the method followed by the Master Himself, and as such can scarcely be improved" (p. 43).

Kernahan reported 10,000 members added to the Reformed Church, during 1927, through visitation evangelism. He reported 7,000 souls added, in 1928, to the churches of Pittsburgh, Pa., through visits, in one week (*ibid.*, pp. 86 ff.).

All in all, Kernahan appears to have carried with him into the promotion of the visitation method something of the spirit of the revival platform, on which he had begun his work. His influence in developing the visitation movement was undoubtedly great. Yet it is seldom easy to ascertain the precise direction of that influence. Did Kernahan promote the cause of visitation evangelism in the minds of some while at the same time casting doubt on its validity in the minds of others? If the record of his wide range of activity through twenty years is placed side by side with Bryan's estimate that "his campaigns were purely local and did not catch the imagination of ministers," some idea may be gained of the difficulty of evaluating the ultimate effect of Kernahan's role in the development of the visitation method.

Further Work of Guy H. Black. During this same period, 1920 through the end of World War II, Guy H. Black appears to have worked and spoken in more conservative ways. His activity was carried on largely in close co-operation with the Federal Council of Churches, for which he served as visitation-training director. Hundreds, perhaps eventually thousands, of pastors and workers came under his influence. Though less dramatic in his approach,

¹¹ P. 118. See n. 1.

Black appears to have been no less thoroughgoing a believer in, and promoter of, the visitation plan; perhaps he was ultimately more influential in the wider development of the program. No writings by him on the subject could be found for consideration here, aside from a series of pamphlets on procedure composed for the American Baptist convention in 1945. However, a number of present-day writers on evangelism acknowledge Black's influence on their thought and method.

Since Black worked so quietly, there is no great body of fact to report about the man; yet through reading and correspondence the feeling that his judgment has been widely respected, his advice highly valued, is reinforced repeatedly. When the churches adopted the plan broadly and officially in the 1940's, the work of Guy Black appears to have been instrumental in convincing many of the validity of the approach.

The Plan Unaltered. Whatever may have been the difference in temperament or mode of activity between Kernahan and Black, there seems to have developed no disparity in the plan of procedure advocated and followed. The basic plan proposed in 1921 or 1922 was continued intact. No significant modification is observable. Others who subsequently adopted the plan appear to have considered it satisfactory and workable and to have carried it on without personal or ecclesiastical alteration. Many appear to have been convinced this was, indeed, the Lord's plan, suddenly rediscovered; what need or purpose to modify the Savior's own program of evangelism?

VII. *Years of Growing Recognition*

During the years 1940—1954, visitation evangelism moved into a recognized and increasingly influential place in the American evangelism scene.

New Over-All Evangelism Emphasis. The period between World War I and World War II has been seen to have been a slack time for evangelism in general, a time of searching and experimentation, a period of difference of opinion regarding the effectiveness of methods. The period during and after World War II now saw a rapid and emphatic reversal of this trend. Across the board of American church life, evangelism experienced a sharp upsurge in interest and activity.

The word "evangelism" came into new and widespread repute. In 1952 Harry Denman, director of evangelism for the Methodist Church, reported to his colleagues: "When we started out in 1940, the word 'evangelism' was not respected in many quarters of this Church. In fact, we were told not to use the word. . . . Because of prayer, because of faith, and because of hard work, the word 'evangelism' is respected in the Methodist Church again, and there is a great evangelistic movement."¹² Observers reported, among clergy and laity alike, a similar new regard for the purposes of evangelism within other church bodies.

Theologically the Protestant churches had entered the day of the new orthodoxy. In an era of severe economic, political, and social dislocation, there had appeared a new emphasis on Biblical thought and doctrine. The cleavage of theological opinion of the previous period had given way to a trend toward convergent theological thought. A new eschatological emphasis within this movement pointed the churches to the need for intensified evangelistic activity.

The period was marked by a rapid increase in church membership. In certain estimates both Weber and Garrison appear to have been corrected by subsequent events. On the basis of study of the Civil War and World War I periods, H. C. Weber had concluded that war cuts down the effectiveness of the churches and halts the evangelistic process, ". . . reducing the area of possible response with depressing finality."¹³ If this was true previously, it did not hold true during World War II. During the years of this conflict, the movement toward new evangelistic enterprise gained substantial strength. Garrison had questioned, on the basis of the low evangelism index for the early 1930's, whether the churches would continue to grow at all; the possibility of decline in relative and absolute membership had been seen.¹⁴ Now, between 1940 and 1950, the churches added a substantial 8 per cent to their membership ratio (from 49 to 57 per cent). The

¹² General Board of Evangelism, the Methodist Church, *Yearbook of the General Board of Evangelism* (Nashville, 1952), p. 26.

¹³ *Evangelism: A Graphic Survey* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), pp. 97 ff.

¹⁴ Loc. cit. See n. 8.

single year 1951 saw the membership proportion increase another full percentage point; 1952 saw a similar gain of a full one per cent.

Official Adoption of the Visitation Plan. Within this intensified evangelistic emphasis, visitation evangelism played an increasingly prominent role. During the 1940's the Protestant church bodies, one after another, adopted the method as part of their official evangelism programs.

Previously the visitation method had been largely the interest of individual congregations, or of individual promoters (such as Kernahan), or of the Federal Council of Churches. Now most of the major denominational bodies incorporated the method into their official programs, producing specific literature and training aids for promotion of the plan and calling full or part-time directors of visitation evangelism.

The Methodist Church is cited as a prominent example:

Within the Methodist Church limited and sporadic employment of the visitation method had been made prior to 1940. Leslie J. Ross, assistant director of the department of evangelism of the Methodist Church, reports that on a significant local scale the plan was first recognized during the 1930's.¹⁵ During the war years interest rose rapidly. By the year 1946 there was sufficient enthusiasm to warrant the setting up, under Dawson Bryan, of a special department of personal and visitation evangelism. Training aids in the form of filmstrips, recordings, turn charts, manuals, and tracts were prepared and distributed. The board adopted as its aim the preparing of "tested methods and materials so effective that every Methodist minister, whether he has had previous experience or not, can successfully train his own lay people to witness effectively to secure the maximum number of Christian commitments" (see n. 12 above. 1950 *Yearbook*, p. 34). Training in the techniques of the plan was offered to pastors and local directors. During the single year 1949, Dawson Bryan is reported to have trained 406 leaders and workers in the techniques of the method (*ibid.*).

Other denominations, following similar patterns, officially adopted visitation evangelism, generally in the years during and

¹⁵ Reply to questionnaire.

immediately following World War II. Of seventeen denominational boards replying in 1953 to the first questionnaire for this paper, fourteen reported visitation evangelism to be part of their officially sponsored programs. Official recognition was undertaken according to the following chronological pattern:

- 1936 American Baptist Convention
- 1940 United Lutheran Church in America
- 1943 Evangelical United Brethren (approximate date)
- 1945 African Methodist Episcopal Church
Congregational Christian Churches
Evangelical and Reformed Church
United Presbyterian Church
- 1946 The Methodist Church
Church of the Nazarene
Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod
Presbyterian Church, U. S.
Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.
- 1950 Church of God
Disciples of Christ

By 1954 two major denominations had not yet adopted the visitation plan: the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. At that time no plans for adoption within either of these groups were foreseeable.

Similarity Among Formerly Divergent Groups. Visitation evangelism has been seen to have derived originally and substantially from church groups *within* the revival tradition. It is now noted that churches *outside* the traditional revival pattern adopted the plan quickly and with comparable enthusiasm. The method became operative, in varying circumstances and degrees, in most major American church bodies.

By way of alternate illustration (and at the risk of extreme oversimplification) the experience of the United Lutheran Church in America may be cited. This church developed, in part, from synods formed during the nineteenth century as a protest and defense against the evangelistic methods of the so-called left-wing evangelical groups. These synods remained outside the revival tradition, concentrating largely, from an evangelism point of view, on the absorption of European immigrant Lutherans. Along with traditional patterns of worship and education the immigrant society

might be considered an evangelism tool. With the cutting off of large-scale European immigration during the early part of the twentieth century, and with the intensification of problems under the rising industrial-urban culture, traditional methods were variously and increasingly found to be wanting. At this point the United Lutheran Church in America found itself increasingly attracted to the visitation method in ways not unlike those affecting the churches of the revival tradition.

Theological and Sociological Influence Compared Again. The question again arises whether this chiefly sociological interpretation of events is valid. Might not the growing similarity of evangelistic method among formerly divergent groups have been more directly a reflection of converging theological thought? The direct influence of the new theology in the intensification of over-all evangelistic interest has been noted. Might not this causal relationship have also modified this method? Again, little evidence is found for such an explanation.

If similar theological inclination produces similar evangelism methods, then the various groups within individual denominations, having closely conforming theological points of view, might be expected to show close similarity of method. However, this is not the case. Wide divergence of method is noted within single denominational complexes. For example, among the Baptist groups, the American Baptist Convention officially adopted the visitation method early (1936) and became one of its strongest proponents; whereas the Southern Baptist Convention, in 1954, still had made no move toward the method. Other Baptist groups, such as the National Baptist Convention of America, similarly had not been moved to adopt the plan. Among Methodist bodies the same situation was seen to prevail. The Methodist Church showed early and enthusiastic support of the visitation method, while the African Methodist Episcopal Church (as one group available for comparison) showed but mild adherence to the plan. Divergence of method was likewise observed among Lutheran synods where theological conformity strongly prevailed. Something apart from theological conviction again appears at this point to have influenced certain groups to make adjustments in method which others did not make.

We do not mean to discount all relationship between theology and method, particularly after method has become established and wedded to theological concept. In the initial process of change, however, sociological factors appear to be the chief determining force.

VIII. *Recent Trends*

Two observations are made concerning the visitation method during the past ten years. One deals with the continued rigidity of method, the other with the recent trend toward the combining of evangelism methods in a broader parish emphasis.

Continued Rigidity. The rapid enlargement of the plan produced no basic change or variation in procedure. Instead, continued formalization and rigidity were apparent. To all intents the plan of 1954 was the plan of 1924. In his recent book Dawson Bryan spoke of the method as having been "adjusted and adapted to meet modern times."¹⁶ Yet the adjustments appeared to be little more than minor revisions of training talks or refinements in the measurement of, say, the number of workers required to complete a given number of calls. Some apparently felt that the ultimate in refinement had been reached; a congregation need but follow the method properly and fully to secure the guaranteed results. Adaptation and experimentation were discouraged. Bryan counsels: "Don't experiment. Follow these proved methods in detail. . . . When you take a member of your family to a physician . . . you do not want him to experiment on your loved one. . . . You expect him to use the best proved method which will bring the quickest and most permanent relief. . . . The pastor is under a sacred obligation to use the best and most widely proved methods and means to accomplish this spiritual healing" (*ibid.*, pp. 44 ff.).

The visitation method had evidenced an ability to speak to the needs of people within a framework of changing cultural circumstances. However, on a wave of widely increasing popularity, the method itself showed little tendency to change.

Combination of Evangelism Methods. A very recent trend in the evangelism field was the practice of combining methods in a wider parish-evangelism emphasis.

¹⁶ *Building Church Membership*, p. 13.

In a number of important respects the period following World War II differed from that following World War I. The earlier period had seen a low general response to evangelism, the new period was marked by a vigorous response; the former period had witnessed a rash of new methods, the latter period produced few new methods; the earlier period had seen established methods in comparative disrepute, the more recent period saw established methods achieve a new popularity.

In addition to the visitation method, the following types of evangelism were in significant use at the halfway mark of the century:

1. *Preaching Evangelism*. Preaching evangelism was widely employed, a twofold development having affected its appearance. First, there was a resurgent interest in the *traditional revival* form. Notable evangelistic voices were heard over radio and television as well as in the stadiums and auditoriums throughout the country. The Billy Graham revivals struck a nostalgic chord of evangelistic fervor long unfelt on the wider American scene. In some localities, tabernacles were swept and repainted for new use. However, it might well be that this resurgent interest marked a new peak on a generally declining graph for the traditional revival. One might speak of the Graham revivals, but not of a great revival movement of which Graham was the central figure. The Graham revivals had difficulty in touching areas of basic evangelistic response.¹⁷ The continuing influence of revivalism, particularly under essentially rural circumstances, was by no means to be underestimated. Yet even as the revival's popularity appeared to be increasing, its base of effective operation appeared to be diminishing.

The other significant vehicle of preaching evangelism was the *preaching mission*, a modified form of platform evangelism. Inaugurated by the Federal Council of Churches during the late 1930's, this method engaged teams of volunteer preachers for preaching

¹⁷ Esther H. Artman, Paul L. Hammer, and James McAllister, "Greensboro and Billy Graham" (Yale Divinity School, New Haven: an unpublished term paper, 1952), *passim*. Four months after the Graham revival of October 1951 a survey was made of the community, churches, and persons won to commitment. While some effective results in the rejuvenation of previous members were to be observed, few results could be seen in new members added to the churches, new activities initiated, or basic spiritual attitudes modified.

campaigns in many areas. A full-time preaching evangelist, Charles B. Templeton, was subsequently employed by the Federal (National) Council. Principal emphasis in the preaching mission was on the strengthening of the over-all spiritual program of the churches; the method was frequently used in support of other forms of evangelism activity.

2. *Educational Evangelism.* This was also receiving wide attention within the churches. The teaching agencies of the parish—Sunday school, Bible classes, adult study groups, etc.—were receiving new emphasis with a view to winning a greater number of souls.

3. *Fellowship Evangelism.* Increased efforts at evangelism were also being made through the established fellowship organizations of the church: youth groups, men's clubs, women's guilds, choirs, etc.

One significant method, combining pertinent elements of both educational evangelism and fellowship evangelism, was the *National Christian teaching mission*, a plan first proposed during the early 1940's. Through personal invitation this method sought (1) to bring the prospective member into the fellowship of the church's organizations; (2) to draw him into the educational program of the parish; and (3) to integrate him more fully into parish life once commitment to faith had been accomplished.¹⁸ This method appeared to be a new attempt to answer basic problems left unanswered by previous evangelism techniques.

4. *Public Evangelism.* Increased evangelistic use was also being made of the media of mass communication: newspapers, magazines, radio, motion pictures, and television—a field sometimes termed "public evangelism."

In the recent intensified evangelistic effort the emphasis was not so much on the development of new methods as on the combining of established methods into broader patterns of activity. Weldon Crossland, for example, in a volume published in 1949, listed various types of soul-winning in current use, with the observation: "Every one of these successful techniques was used in its

¹⁸ Harry C. Munro, *Fellowship Evangelism Through Church Groups* (Saint Louis: The Bethany Press, 1951), *passim*.

first-century form by Jesus in His matchless ministry. What Christ has joined together in a well-rounded program of Christian Evangelism, let no man put asunder. While no one church will employ all these evangelism methods, each church will use several of them, accenting the visitation, educational and preaching types, from which over 90 per cent of the converts and new members come.”¹⁹ In his recent *Effective Evangelism* Sweazey endorsed the same well-rounded approach to evangelism.

Visitation evangelism apparently is being increasingly advocated for use in combination with other evangelism methods.

IX. Summary

Visitation evangelism, developed principally under the influence of A. Earl Kernahan and Guy H. Black, appears to have been a synthesis. Certain points of method already in use in the evangelism field were combined with others borrowed from the field of business organization. Justification and motive, as well as additional details of method, were taken from the New Testament ministry of Jesus. Visitation evangelism was only one method among dozens of new methods proposed during the years after World War I. That it survived and grew where others failed is taken as evidence of its having touched certain fundamental areas of response in the shifting pattern of culture. After World War II the influence of the method widened rapidly under the official sponsorship of all major denominations but two. At the same time other methods, sometimes in combination with the visitation method, were devised or modified for use within the changing cultural context.

(To be concluded)

Farmington, Mich.

¹⁹ *How to Increase Church Membership and Attendance* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), pp. 14 f.