John P. Ingerslew and the Bast Case

by Donald C. Malone

Since writing my paper on "Anton Bast: The Poor Man's Preacher of Copenhagen," which was published in the October, 1973, issue of Methodist History, new sources have been made available to me. These sources shed additional light upon the case and uncover the struggles which occurred below the surface of the main events. In my paper I credited John P. Ingerslew as the man "who began all the trouble." Many viewed Ingerslew in this way, making him appear to be a trouble maker and a quarreler. Ingerslew protested this view, insisting that the trouble began long before he knew Anton Bast and that there were many others opposing Bast. Nevertheless, Ingerslew takes a central position in the fight against "episcopal corruption" in Denmark and emerges from the Bast case as a man of rare courage and moral conviction.

I

John P. Ingerslew, who was born in Denmark in 1887 and immigrated to the United States at age seventeen, returned to his homeland in July of 1919 to be with his dying mother. On board the ocean liner with him was Bishop William Anderson who was on his way to speak at the Danish Annual Conference in Vejle. Anderson, who had heard of Ingerslew's work with the Seamen's Mission as pastor of the Scandinavian Methodist Episcopal Church of Baltimore, Maryland, insisted that he move to Copenhagen to assist Anton Bast. Ingerslew returned to the United States and then moved to Copenhagen in November 1919 with his two children. His wife, who was delayed because of pregnancy and ill health, joined him nine months later. He immediately took up responsibilities as Bast's secretary and instructor at the theological school.


Reservations about Bast’s behavior began as early as 1912 — long before Ingerslew came to Copenhagen. L. C. Larsen, delegate to the 1912 General Conference, expressed concerns about Bast at a lecture in Chicago. In 1914 he and another district superintendent, G. Thaarup, made complaints in Denmark. Both were promptly replaced by Anton Bast and Christian Jensen. Larsen never spoke on the matter again. In the same year Sophus Nielsen, accountant for the Central Mission, raised opposition to Bast’s financial affairs by having the Central Mission books audited by the firm Rivisions og Forvaltningsinsitutet, with Judge Christian Riise as decisor. The integrity of the books was rejected, but was accepted the following year on the provision that Bast thereafter provide vouchers of receipts. Many lay people and clergymen, including Christian Jensen, were disappointed that the books were approved even provisionally, but no one spoke. In 1916 the death of Sophus Nielsen removed the opposition he had raised.4

As Bast’s secretary, Ingerslew had no direct responsibility for the finances of Jerusalem Church or the Central Mission and did not concern himself with the charges. He was required to translate into English Bast’s book, *The Central Mission Through Ten Years*, for presentation to the 1920 General Conference, the conference which elected Bast to the episcopacy. However, the book was also sold, allegedly for a profit. Ingerslew was irritated by the book’s misrepresentations, especially in the chapter on the Central Mission’s newspaper, *Fyrtaarnet*, by Bast’s son, Jorgen Bast [alias Jorn Uhl]. However, Ingerslew was responsible only for the translation.5 It was not until Bast returned from the 1920 General Conference as a bishop and Ingerslew succeeded him as pastor of Jerusalem Church that a conflict developed between Bast and Ingerslew, for then Ingerslew was responsible for the finances of the church.6

Election to the episcopacy also posed serious problems for Bast. Previously he had been in control of Methodist work in Copenhagen at several levels — pastor of Jerusalem Church, chairman of the church’s Board of Trustees, leader of the Central Mission, and publisher of *Fyrtaarnet*. His power was broken since he was no longer pastor of Jerusalem Church and, as bishop, could no longer keep tight control of the Central Mission. He immediately appointed two non-Methodists, auditor William Nielsen and attorney J. Wenzzel, to be in charge of the Central Mission books. For a time suspicions were silenced.7

In November of 1920 District Superintendent S. N. Gaarde called a meeting of the Jerusalem Church Quarterly Conference while Bast was at a
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meeting in the United States. At that conference Gaarde proposed the formation of "The Copenhagen Methodist Union" to supervise the work in Copenhagen. The union was to be composed of Bast as chairman, Gaarde, and the Board of Management of the Central Mission. Secondly, he proposed that those persons recommended by Bast, Bast’s two daughters and son and several of Bast’s associates, be elected to the Board of Management. Both proposals were rejected and Gaarde closed the conference without the election of a Board of Management.8

In June of the next year a compromise constitution was adopted by the Danish Annual Conference and the Jerusalem Church Quarterly Conference placing the Central Mission under a Board of Directors, a Board of Representatives, and a management [Board of Managers].9 Bast was ex-officio chairman of all three boards and still exercised control. Ingerslew was on the Board of Management, but was never consulted. Suspicions about Bast’s financial dealings were not satisfied but grew.10

Between September and December of 1922, grave questions about the report of the Central Mission for 1921-1922 were raised by Ingerslew and the Board of Trustees of Jerusalem Church. Claims were made that reports about the program were erroneous and misleading and that the financial figures were deceiving. Especially deceiving was the report about Fyrtaarnet. Bast repeatedly stated that the newspaper belonged to the Central Mission. While it was an organ of the Central Mission, it was actually Bast’s own private enterprise. In the confusion about the position of Fyrtaarnet, Bast was apparently able to divert funds from the Central Mission to the publication which belonged to him.11

Since April 1, 1917, a lease agreement between Jerusalem Church and the Central Mission was in effect for the use of the church’s property by the mission. However, the Central Mission neglected to pay the rent in spite of repeated requests from the trustees. Instead, Wenzzel and Nielsen billed the church Kr. 20,000 for administering the property. In early 1922 settlement of Kr. 10,000, less than one quarter of what was allegedly owed, was accepted by the trustees. Ingerslew believed that the reduction of rent also helped Bast finance Fyrtaarnet.12

The most serious financial breach also had its roots in early years and erupted later. This mishandling of funds was most serious because it involved the church outside of the annual conference bounds. In 1916 Bast had received a promise from the Board of Foreign Missions for funds to rebuild Jerusalem Church which burned on January 21, 1914. On this

10. Ibid. Ingerslew, op cit., pp. 47f.
assurance the trustees borrowed funds to rebuild the church. In mid-1920
Bast announced that he had received $20,000 but was holding the funds
until the date matured. But $15,000 of the funds was never paid to the
trustees and remained in the treasury of the Central Mission. The trustees
made repeated attempts to secure the funds from Bast but to no avail. In
September 1926, after a complaint had been filed with the Ministry of
Justice, the Board of Directors of the Central Mission informed the trustees
that they had assumed the debt of Jerusalem Church thus settling the
matter of the $15,000. However, checking with the bank the trustees
discovered that the Central Mission had not assumed the debt. 13

Ingerslew regularly confronted the discrepancies in Bast's financial
affairs and was constantly agitated by them. When Bast made
arrangements for Mrs. Ingerslew's journey to Denmark from the United
States, the Ingerslews noticed that Bast's accounting for the trip was higher
than the actual amount Mrs. Ingerslew had spent. However, the Ingerslews
supposed that there might have been expenses that they did not know
about. At Bast's trial it was discovered that Bast had withdrawn even more
money from the church funds for the trip than the Ingerslews knew about.
Apparently Bast had used Mrs. Ingerslew's journey as an opportunity to
embezzle funds. 14

Not all of the charges brought against Bast were of a financial nature.
His personal behavior was also called into question by churchmen and
ministers with whom he served. Ingerslew seemed to be especially irritated,
either because of his growing personal animosity to Bast or because as
pastor of Jerusalem Church he was working close enough to Bast to be
more easily disturbed.

In October 1920, Ingerslew was requested to preach the funeral
service of Dr. Matti Helenius-Seppälä of Helsingfors, Finland. The service
made the Methodist Episcopal Church known in Finland and eventually a
mission was started there at Karelia, with help from the Finnish govern­
ment. It seemed to Ingerslew that Bast took credit not only for establishing
the mission in Finland but for preaching the funeral service as well. 15

Ingerslew had many complaints against Bast. He witnessed the taking
of a picture of Bast feeding two children from the children's home for
publicity in the Fyrttaarnet. However, the children were not orphans but
the janitor's children, and the soup came from a nearby restaurant rather
than from the home. 16 Ingerslew was often frustrated by being unable to
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September 27, 1926, pp. 1f. (in the files of the Commission on Archives and History).
15. Letter from Ingerslew to Stamm, op. cit., pp. 11f.
secure help at the Central Mission for those who came to him. The services were not as available as publicity indicated. Bast's nephew, Eugenius Bast, was in charge of the hostel and administered the facility with the assistance of a police dog. He closed the doors at 10 p.m., leaving homeless men outside in the freezing cold.17 Bast's son, Jorgen Bast, published sensational "street novels." This was made worse to Ingerslew by the fact that Anton Bast was his publisher.18

However, the worst offense was Bast's relationship to a married woman, Mrs. I. V., which began even before the death of Bast's wife. The relationship, which Bast admitted but refused to dissolve, was an embarrassment to the church for many years.19

Ingerslew became known to the authorities as the man who brought charges against Bast which led to Bast's imprisonment and eventually to his defrocking. Less well known are the numerous efforts of Ingerslew and others to resolve their complaints with the bishop, both in private and within the confines of the church.

Bast was attending a meeting of bishops in the United States in November 1920, when District Superintendent S. N. Gaarde made his abortive attempt to establish the Bast controlled "Copenhagen Methodist Union" at the Jerusalem Church Quarterly Conference. Concerned about stabilizing the disrupted work in Copenhagen, Ingerslew met Bast at Christiana (Oslo) as Bast made his journey home. On the ocean liner they talked of the Central Mission and Bast's relationship with Mrs. I. V. About the latter Bast refused to do anything, but he promised to propose a new constitution for the Central Mission.20 Although the constitution was adopted by the Annual Conference meeting at Frederikshaven in 1921, nothing changed. Technically the Central Mission was incorporated under the Annual Conference, and all Danish ministers shared responsibility for the mission. However, the management, composed of Bast as leader, Christian Jensen as General Secretary, and the pastor of Jerusalem Church, administered the finances of the mission.21

When the 1921-1922 report of the Central Mission was released

17. Ibid., pp. 86-89.
25. Extract from the Judgement Book, op cit., p. 3.
Ingerslew inquired of Christian Jensen for more information about a large sum of money going to Bast for the *Fyrtaarnet*. Church funds going to a private enterprise seemed compromising to Ingerslew, but he failed to receive a satisfactory reply from Jensen. Ingerslew then drafted a letter to Bast raising questions about his private life and about the financing of *Fyrtaarnet*. However, he never sent the letter because Bast called a meeting of the management on December 6, 1922, in reply to a similar letter sent by eight laymen of Jerusalem Church on the previous day. There Bast presented a declaration stating that he, Bast, was free of any dishonesty in the administration of the Central Mission. Of course both Bast and Jensen signed the document, but Ingerslew refused. Bast responded to the refusal by dissolving the Board of Managers.²² Leaving the meeting Bast appealed to Ingerslew privately, saying, "Ingerslew, Ingerslew, Ingerslew, do you really hook yourself onto such minor matter?"²³

Bast sent his reply to the laymen’s letter of December 5 to Otto Allin, appealing to brotherly love and loyalty to the church, with many Biblical references. But no answers to the complaint were given. The laymen then replied with another letter threatening to go to the Board of Bishops if a satisfactory answer was not received. They also sent copies of the December 5 letter to the five Danish district superintendents and the Copenhagen ministers. Bast objected that it would be improper to take the matter to the Board of Bishops, so a preachers’ meeting was held on January 5, 1923, with the Danish superintendents and Copenhagen ministers present. No provision was found in the *Discipline* against a minister operating a private business, but Bast was found guilty of "imprudent conduct" (*Discipline* ¶ 233). Jensen agreed to furnish an accounting of the Central Mission funds and Gaarde was to prosecute further the charge of "imprudent conduct." However, the accounting which Jensen presented was unsatisfactory, and Gaarde failed to prosecute the charge.²⁴

On January 11 Bast called a meeting of the Board of Directors and again presented the declaration which had been signed by Bast and Jensen on December 6, 1922, insisting that it now be signed by all the members of the board. Ingerslew again refused to sign the document. The declaration was then revised to state that no dishonesty was "known" about Bast’s operations. All except Ingerslew signed the statement, and Bast was satisfied. Another meeting of the Board of Directors was called six days later. All members except Ingerslew were present, and the Board of Managers was declared intact.²⁵ The complaints had been dealt with administratively, but the situation remained essentially the same.

---
²³ Ingerslew, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
But the eight laymen of Jerusalem Church continued to press their case, especially concerning the $15,000 from the Board of Foreign Missions. After repeated appeals to Bast and Jensen for a financial accounting and a settlement of the Board of Foreign Missions' payment, and after the Annual Conference of 1923 affirmed full faith in Bast, a letter was sent dated July 17, 1923, from six trustees of Jerusalem Church to Dr. David G. Downey of the Board of Foreign Missions in New York City. No reply being received, another letter was sent on September 10th outlining the complaints in more detail. Dr. Frank Mason North, secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, replied to the laymen in a way which dismissed the whole matter, and at the same time Dr. North sent Ingerslew a letter in which he expressed disapproval of Ingerslew's cooperation. 2

The six trustees, Otto Allin, J. Christian Nielsen, L. C. Hansen, Carl Petersen, Sven A. Nielsen, and Robert Gyldentorp, then sent their complaint in a letter dated November 28, 1923, to the 1924 General Conference. In the letter were four points: (1) Bast's relationship with Mrs. I. V., (2) the close connection between Bast's private enterprise and the Central Mission, (3) the incorrect accounts of the Central Mission, and (4) Bast's undependability in word and promise. 27

In the meantime complaints of character were being leveled against Ingerslew. Ingerslew learned that he had been accused of being a liar at a meeting of the bishop's cabinet, and the district superintendents refused to disclaim the expression although they were requested to do so. Ingerslew met with Bast and the cabinet on April 9 and 10, 1923, to settle the disagreement. At the end of the meeting Gaarde called Miss Adils, a leader of slum women's work, from an adjoining room. Miss Adils made charges of the vilest nature indicating that Ingerslew had long harbored malevolence for Bast and was the source of the charges of the laymen. However, by pointing out impossibilities of time and circumstance, Ingerslew proved Miss Adils' charges false. The meeting ended with Bast's admission that it had all been a waste of time. 28

The work of Miss Adils had long been of concern to the congregation of Jerusalem Church, even when Bast was pastor there. Her competence was questioned and, being involved in a holiness movement, her doctrines did not conform to the doctrines of the church. Ingerslew was instructed by the church to write to Miss Adils to set up a conference and, if she did not comply, to release her. In conformity with the request Ingerslew wrote her on October 30, 1923, and receiving no reply he informed her that she was relieved of her responsibility. On November 19, Ingerslew went to a meeting with the slum women since he had no one to replace Miss Adils.

However, Miss Adils and a friend, Miss Holsig, were present, and a disturbance occurred in which Miss Adils publicly stated that she would not meet alone with Ingerslew. Presumably Bast and Gaarde had warned her about meeting alone ("meeting under four eyes") with Ingerslew. Ingerslew took the statement to be a reflection on his moral character, and being upset by the rumor he presumed was being passed about him, he went to the St. Kongensgade police station for advice. 29

Assistant Chief of Police Hansen drafted a conciliatory statement which the two women refused to sign. Therefore, an ecclesiastical court was appointed within Jerusalem Church. The court meeting on November 29 pronounced that the two women should be expelled from the congregation unless a written apology was received within three days. 30

But the Adils matter was not laid to rest. By telegraph Bast called a meeting of the Annual Conference for December 4, but later altered the date without Ingerslew's knowledge. At that meeting a resolution was passed to bring action against Ingerslew on a complaint from Miss Adils and Miss Holsig for bringing the police into the matter and for being deceptive to the police. An ecclesiastical court was convened under District Superintendent Gaarde on December 12, 1923. At that meeting Ingerslew was suspended from his ministerial duties for conduct immoral and unworthy of a minister. However, he retained his salary and residence at Jerusalem Church's villa. Also Gaarde declared the Jerusalem Church ecclesiastical court decision of November 29 invalid. 31

On March 31 a conciliatory meeting was held at a Copenhagen hotel between Bast and Ingerslew with two ministers and a layman as witnesses. Ingerslew was promised reinstatement if charges were dropped, but Ingerslew refused to compromise. 32

The following day Ingerslew met with the district superintendent from Vejle, Christian Nielsen, in the same hotel room. Nielsen was a man for whom Ingerslew had always had respect and trust. Between the two an agreement was signed in which Ingerslew agreed to use his influence so that the complaints against Bast might be dropped, take supernumerary status, and transfer from the conference. Nielsen promised that Ingerslew would have permission to occupy the villa as long as he was in Denmark to compensate for the funds he had been promised to make the transfer in 1919 but never received, and that he would be rehabilitated in the incident with Miss Adils and Miss Holsig. However, Nielsen took ill the next day, and his promise was never executed. 33

30. Ibid.
Both Bast and Ingerslew left in April to attend the General Conference of 1924 in Springfield, Illinois. Ingerslew came armed with power of attorney dated April 8, 1924 from the laymen of Jerusalem Church to back up the complaints outlined in the letter which they had sent to the General Conference.34

Ingerslew first went to see Dr. Downey in New York City. However, Dr. Downey had already left for Springfield, and he saw Dr. North instead. Dr. North questioned the appropriateness of a suspended minister attending the General Conference. He informed Ingerslew that the charge of the laymen had not been submitted to the General Conference because no investigation of the charges had been made in Denmark. However, he promised to send a commission to Copenhagen to make an investigation. Dr. North also agreed to have the Board of Foreign Missions reimburse Ingerslew the expenses he incurred on his transfer to Denmark in 1919. Ingerslew then delayed attending the General Conference until Bast's character had been passed.35

Another conciliatory meeting was held between Ingerslew, Bast, Nielsen, and another district superintendent on July 1. The agreement signed between Nielsen and Ingerslew on April 1 was formally adopted, with the exception that compensation for Ingerslew be worked out by Bast in conjunction with Dr. North and Dr. Downey. At the following Danish Annual Conference in July 1924 Ingerslew was reinstated and requested transfer from the Annual Conference as soon as possible. Until the transfer could be arranged, Ingerslew became supernumerary with an allowance equal to his salary and with the use of the villa.36

The committee from America promised by Dr. North to investigate Bast did not arrive. Nor did Ingerslew receive the promised financial settlement. Finally, after several inquiries by Ingerslew, Dr. North wrote a letter dated December 8, 1924 informing Ingerslew that the sending of a committee had had to be abandoned.37

On December 8, 1923, before the General Conference met, Bast had requested that the Ministry of Justice form a commission to investigate the Central Mission. The report of that commission was completed on September 16, 1924 with the opinion that no further action was needed. The report came as a surprise. Those opposing Bast were certain that a conviction would be the result of the findings. Ingerslew and his friends suspected that Bast had somehow been able to influence the commission.

Two days later Ingerslew and six laymen applied to the Ministry of Justice for a public, legal investigation into Bast's affairs. The action was referred to the Public Prosecutor, and charges were filed on October 15. The charges of fraud in the Central Mission and in the printing interests of Fyrtaarnet, and the charge of embezzling $1,500, ultimately led to Bast's arrest and imprisonment.

During the Bast trial Bishop Edgar Blake of the Paris area and Bishop John Nuelsen of the Zurich area came to Copenhagen and scheduled a meeting with Ingerslew and the laymen on December 19, to persuade them to withdraw their complaints. The effort failed, and Blake ordered Ingerslew's salary stopped. He then set up an ecclesiastical court within Jerusalem Church which expelled five of the laymen from the Methodist Episcopal Church for breach of the Discipline. A session of the Danish Annual Conference was then called by Bishop Blake, under his presidency, for February 7. Ingerslew was expelled by the conference under paragraphs 30, 282, and 284 of the Discipline for going to the Public Prosecutor before taking proper action through church channels. The secretary of the conference made it impossible for Ingerslew to appeal the decision by withholding the conference minutes from him. Then civil action was taken by Bishop Blake and Jerusalem Church to expel Ingerslew from the villa. On March 20, Bishop Nuelsen and Bishop Blake published an article in a Copenhagen newspaper denouncing Ingerslew.

Now Ingerslew felt he had no recourse but to take legal action in defense of himself and his family. Therefore, on March 30, 1926, Ingerslew filed his case against the Annual Conference in Denmark, and a counter suit by Jerusalem Church was filed against Ingerslew at the High Court, East Division. Jerusalem Church sought reimbursed rental on the villa, while Ingerslew asked for compensation for his transfer from America in 1919, compensation for having been deprived of earning a living in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and compensation for salary and pension losses. Judgment was reached on December 20, 1926. Ingerslew was awarded 40,000 kroner (only a fraction of what he asked) for salary.
and travel compensations and 6,000 kroner for trial costs. In addition, the Annual Conference was ordered to pay 40,000 kroner in court costs. Ingerslew in turn had to pay to Jerusalem Church 2,100 kroner rental.\textsuperscript{43} Otto Fabricius, attorney for Ingerslew and later for the church in the Bast Case, considered the outcome of the trial a moral victory because Ingerslew's reputation had been restored, even though financial gains were modest.\textsuperscript{44} But the cost for Ingerslew was high. In addition to the mental agony of the strife, Ingerslew bore grief from the loss of his wife, who, weakened by the conflict, died of pneumonia in September, 1926.\textsuperscript{45}

For the church the decision of the trial posed a financial dilemma. The Committee on Judiciary at the 1928 General Conference could make no recommendations for payment to Ingerslew since there were no funds for such a contingency. Plans were made to appeal the judgment, which amounted to $24,000 in American currency, on grounds that the Danish court did not understand the American church's system.\textsuperscript{46} Still believing in Bast's integrity, Bishop Blake expressed bitter feelings toward Ingerslew in his address to the General Conference. It seemed to him that Ingerslew not only caused turmoil in the church (a strange attitude for a man who did not fear turmoil) but set a dangerous precedent by going to court to salve his hurt feelings.\textsuperscript{47}

The General Conference of 1928, the same conference which defrocked Bast,\textsuperscript{48} reinstated Ingerslew and four of the expelled laymen, L. C. Hansen, Philip Berger, Sven A. Nielsen, and Robert Gyldentorp. It was the finding of the Committee on Judiciary that the Annual Conference of February 19, 1925, was not a legal annual conference, that paragraphs 30, 282, and 284 of the \textit{Discipline} did not apply in the case of criminal offense, that proper appeal had been denied Ingerslew, and that Ingerslew had not failed to seek settlement out of court.\textsuperscript{49}

But the battle was not yet over for Ingerslew. Advised at the General Conference to seek a settlement with the Danish Annual Conference out of court, he returned to Copenhagen. In January of 1929 the Supreme Court of Denmark upheld the High Court decision. Ingerslew offered to drop all charges if he were paid his expenses for the past five years, which he estimated to be $30,000.\textsuperscript{50} However, the committee of nine appointed by
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the General Conference made arrangements to pay all expenses in the judgment against the church if the Danish Annual Conference would pay half. On February 20, 1929 Ingerslew received the full Kr. 46,000 owed to him plus Kr. 5,811.13 interest. In addition he received Kr. 10,000 in claims not included in the Supreme Court judgment, including payment of travel expenses to America. In United States currency Ingerslew received a total of $16,811.44. The total expense to the church in the settlement with Ingerslew and the Jerusalem Church laymen was $21,995.45.\(^{51}\)

In Denmark the congregation of Jerusalem Church requested that Ingerslew be reappointed to that church. However, Bishop Raymond J. Wade, episcopal leader of the area, advised against the reappointment, assuring Ingerslew that a position could be secured in the United States. Therefore, Ingerslew returned to America in April, 1929, and requested an appointment from Bishop William McDowell, who in turn wrote to Bishops Thomas Nicholson, William Anderson, and Ernest Richardson. Bishop McDowell reported to Ingerslew that no positions were open. Ingerslew bought tents and for over four months lived in tourist camps in Plymouth, Massachusetts and the Kansas City area with three of his four children and a Danish maid who had cared for the children since the death of Mrs. Ingerslew.\(^{52}\) He was appointed to the church at Grant City in northern Missouri by Bishop Ernest L. Waldorf, one of the bishops on the committee of nine which administered the Ingerslew case for the General Conference, at the meeting of the Missouri Annual Conference held September 10-15, 1929.\(^{53}\)

IV

Throughout the ordeal Ingerslew did not expect from the church more than he thought was owed to him. Otto Fabricius was amazed that Ingerslew had not sought indemnities beyond his actual losses. Furthermore, Ingerslew expressed to Fabricius that he had never lost faith in Methodist leadership and knew that ultimately American Methodist preachers and leaders would stand for what was right and honest.\(^{54}\) Therefore, Ingerslew never gave up; he never abandoned his church and never relinquished his call to preach, although he could have pursued another career.\(^{55}\)

In correspondence between Otto Fabricius and Charles P.


\(^{52}\) *The Kansas City Star*, op. cit., pp. 1f.


\(^{54}\) Letter from Otto Fabricius to the Honorable Charles P. McClelland, April 2, 1927 (in the files of the Commission on Archives and History).

\(^{55}\) *The Kansas City Star*, *loc. cit.*
McClelland, an influential Methodist layman and associate Justice in the United States Customs Court in New York City, Fabricius expressed bitterness about failure of Methodist leaders to permit the case against Anton Bast to be heard. Doctors North and Downey and Bishops Nuelsen and Blake were the special focus of his bitterness.\textsuperscript{56}

It indeed seems incredible that these great men in the history of Methodism actually engaged in such a cover-up. It is just as incredible that a Methodist bishop should be found guilty of fraud and immorality, that he should be arrested and imprisoned, and that he should be defrocked by the church which once celebrated him. Certainly it was far more believable to the leaders of the church that a preacher was being vindictive toward his bishop, especially when there were efforts to discredit that preacher.\textsuperscript{57} It must have been almost impossible for those accustomed to defending the church to admit that there was disgrace in the brilliant career of Bishop Bast. That such a horrible thing could occur within the church was more than most Methodists were able to face.

But John P. Ingerslew was able to face it. In the closing remarks of one of the conciliatory conferences Bast said, “My last words shall be this: I want peace at any price (\textit{sic}), don’t you want peace, Ingerslew (\textit{sic}).”

Ingerslew replied, “Yes, Bishop, I also wants (\textit{sic}) peace, but not at any price.”\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56. Letter from the Honorable Charles P. McClelland to Otto Fabricius, September 14, 1926. Letter from Otto Fabricius to the Honorable Charles P. McClelland, September 27, 1926. Letter from Otto Fabricius to the Honorable Charles P. McClelland, October 7, 1926, p. 2. (In the files of the Commission on Archives and History.)

57. Disproven charges of fraud were brought against Ingerslew in 1924 for alleged mishandling of funds during his service with the Seaman’s Mission in Baltimore. The events resulting from that charge fall outside the scope of this paper. Cf. Letter from Ingerslew to Stamm, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 51-54.

58. Letter from Ingerslew to Stamm, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 43.
In *Methodist History* (October, 1973) an article was published on Anton Bast by the Rev. Donald Malone. The article told the story as Mr. Malone and many others at that time understood it. An unfortunate statement was made in that article about the Rev. Mr. John Ingerslew, which seemed quite appropriate as seen in the records available to Mr. Malone. Since that article’s appearance in *Methodist History*, a large collection of records have come into our purview which had not been accessible to Mr. Malone and the General Commission on Archives and History. This has put an entirely different picture before us of the ministry and services of John P. Ingerslew.

At our request Mr. Malone has made a new appraisal and study which has resulted in the preparation of another manuscript which we are happy to present in the interest of fairness to Mr. Ingerslew and historical accuracy.

The editor of *Methodist History* has had occasion to meet Mr. Ingerslew, who is retired and living a quiet life in the Middle West. He is one of the most gracious and understanding persons. We apologize to him if we have caused him any unpleasantness in the references to him from the October, 1973 article. Mr. Malone’s use of the records at his disposal for that 1973 article was accurate and honorable. However, with the opening of a new body of material, we appreciate his present article which we are happy to provide for our readers.

—John H. Ness, Jr., Editor