April 17, 1947

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

I am sorry but I cannot sign a message to the people who invited Mr. Henry Wallace to come to France.

I do not believe that it is wise for Mr. Wallace to be making the kind of speeches he is making at the present time in foreign countries.

Naturally I have no idea what my husband’s attitude would be if he were alive today, and though I am convinced he would have wanted to strengthen the UN, I doubt if he would want to do it in just the way that Mr. Wallace has found necessary. I have such complete confidence in Mr. Wallace’s integrity, I am sure he has taken this course because he felt he had to, but with all my heart I wish for his own sake that he had not done so.

Very sincerely yours,
NEW YORK NY APR 16 1947

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
29 WASHINGTON SQUARE NYK

AS YOU KNOW, HENRY WALLACE HAS ACCEPTED AN INVITATION TO SPEAK IN FRANCE. THIS INVITATION WAS EXTENDED BY LEADERS OF THE FOUR MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES. A GROUP OF DISTINGUISHED PROGRESSIVES WOULD LIKE TO SEND OF THESE FRENCH POLITICAL LEADERS THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE. QUOTE TO YOU AS CO-SIGNERS OF THE INVITATION TO HENRY WALLACE TO VISIT FRANCE AND SPEAK TO THE FRENCH PEOPLE, WE THE UNDERSIGNED AMERICANS WISH TO CONVEY OUR WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT FOR THE SENTIMENTS FOR PEACE AS EXPRESSED BY MR. WALLACE. MR. WALLACE'S TRIP TO EUROPE IS A CONTINUATION OF HIS VIGILANT AND CONSTANT FIGHT FOR FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT'S CONCEPT OF ONE WORLD. HIS DEEP CONVICTION THAT ONLY, THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS CAN THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD BE ASSURED OF LASTING PEACE ECHOES THE SENTIMENTS OF THE MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. WE TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO REAFFIRM THE DEEP FEELING OF AMITY AND GOOD WISH WHICH HAS LONG EXISTED BETWEEN PEOPLES OF OUR NATIONS AND TO PLEDGE OUR UNFLAGGING ENERGY BY YOUR SIDE IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE. IT IS OUR HOPE THAT MR. WALLACE'S VISIT WILL SET A PATTERN IN THIS ONE WORLD FOR THE FREE INTERCHANGE OF OPINION BETWEEN THE LEADERS AND THE PEOPLES OF ALL NATIONS OF GOOD WILL. UNQUOTE. WE WOULD LIKE TO ADD YOUR NAME TO THE LIST OF SIGNERS OF THIS MESSAGE. IF YOU APPROVE SENTIMENTS EXPRESSED, PLEASE WIRE COLLECT IMMEDIATE CONSENT THE USE OF YOUR NAME.

C B BALDWIN 205 EAST 42ND STREET

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE.
Dear Jane,

I hope this finds you well. I am writing to express my gratitude for the kindness shown to me during my stay. Your thoughtful gestures and the quiet support made my time here truly enjoyable. I am particularly grateful for the meals and accommodations provided.

I trust that you are doing well and I hope to see you again in the future.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Grandfather being a neighbor near you, you seem so close for that reason too. My very good wishes for your future happiness.

Most Sincerely,

Margery M. Baldwin

(Mrs. Nathan W. Baldwin)
Campobello Island, N.B.  
August 3, 1947

Personal - not for publication.

Dear Miss Ballman:

I have your letter of July 28th. My feeling is very simple. I sent my children to private school and I did not expect them to receive free transportation. When they went to boarding school, they went to a denominational school, and I certainly would not have expected them to receive free transportation.

I feel the same way about Catholic school or Baptist schools or any other schools. The only schools in this country that I think should receive free transportation are the public schools and I think they are the only schools which should receive free text books, etc.

As to opening prayers in public school, I wish that some prayer could be devised which would meet the require-
ments of all faiths and which could be said at the opening of school, because I feel the habit of feeling that way of giving thought to spiritual questions is a good one to instill in children, but if such a prayer can not be found, then I think we will have to count that every family will see that the children open the day in that way.

I agree with you that denominational schools should not receive public funds.

To be entirely honest with you, I think many churches today, but particularly the Catholic church are taking a good deal in the way of temporal power under their wings. For instance, in our community a great deal of land is owned by various type of religious institutions. I find a growing murmur of discontent and I think the day will come when only the actual land on which churches and public schools and playgrounds are built, will be free of taxation. That will have
The about because some of the churches will have acquired too much land. If you will think back, you will realize that is what has happened in some of the countries and that troubles me.

I believe in complete freedom of worship, but I see in this country criticism arising and the moment you get criticism on one side, you get it on all other sides. That is what I was trying to say without actually naming particular groups as I did not want to hurt anyone's feelings. In certain ways, the Episcopal Church to which I belong, and some of the other denominations, are doing exactly the same thing though the Catholic Church has acquired more property than any of the others, at least in a number of places that I happen to have seen of late.

Believe me, I have the greatest regard for certain of the Priests and the high church people, so this is an objective question with me.

Very sincerely yours,
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I know you are a very busy woman, but I do wish you would read this letter personally, if that is at all possible. It would give you a better understanding of how the Catholic laity really feel. I am just a plain Catholic citizen.

After reading your article entitled "High Court Ruling Seems to Change Freedom of Worship", I have these comments to make:

I believe very strongly in the complete separation of Church and State as does almost every Catholic with whom I am closely acquainted. I do not see where transporting the children of taxpayers to any kind of school they choose to send their children is any violation of freedom of religious worship. The State of New Jersey provides transportation of children to "non-profit schools". You see the true believers in either case.

The opponents of free transportation for Catholic children to Catholic schools are also the opponents of Catholic schools and everything else that is Catholic. Bills introduced at different times prove this. A bill recently introduced in the State of Washington requested that Catholics be forced to get permission to send their children to anything but a public school. Now that is a violation of religious freedom. Fortunately the bill did not pass.

Peoples of several faiths could complain of the laws of the District of Columbia in regard to the daily opening of public schools providing:

1. That the Lord's Prayer be said at the opening of school each morning. And, of course, this is the King James version.
2. That the Bible be read also. And, of course, that too is the King James version.
3. That the flag be saluted.

The first two are in opposition to Catholic and Hebrew teaching. The latter is in opposition to Jehovah's Witnesses. So I ask you: ARE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS REALLY PUBLIC? I have attended both Catholic and public schools. In the public schools the teachers bent over backward to keep the schools public. However, it was the law of the State of Kentucky that the King James version of the Bible be read in turn by the students each morning. I would like to hear the Baptist Convention's views on a Catholic student's privilege of reading the Douay version of the Bible in public (?) schools where they have tried to inject Protestantism with some success. If you want to find the true reason they oppose free transportation to religious schools Mrs. Roosevelt, suggest this in your column or in a letter to them and you will find that they oppose the Catholic Church as a whole and would violate our religious freedom if only they could. I do not believe they would permit a choice of Catholic or Protestant Bibles in the schools.
I, as many Catholics do, oppose public funds for religious schools. I can see that a provision of that sort would destroy our freedom of worship, which means so much, so very much to us. However, I sincerely believe that if the State owes one child transportation to the school of his choice it owes every child that transportation, rich or poor, Catholic, Hebrew, Lutheran, Baptist, etc., Negro, white, Chinese, Japanese, or what have you. I think that transportation and education can be just as separate as Church and State.

I too have been troubled lately about that old safeguard slipping away from us. Who is injecting religion into everything public? As long as we are not of the same faith in the United States, and if we are to have complete separation of Church and State, don't you think our inner conscience should guide us in our civic affairs, instead of being called upon to recite our different versions of prayers and scriptures in public?

I support your opinion in almost everything, but in this I do not think you see the true motives on either side.

Very truly yours,

Regina Ballmann
Mrs. Eleanor ROOSEVELT

Washington
U.S.A.

Thousands of sons of my native country, Ukraine, cannot return home. They were compelled to choose the hard and troublesome way of a restless wandering.

Owing to the generosity of Your noble Heart my compatriots were protected from being attacked by obscure powers.

I, son of a country which had sacrificed millions of people in their struggle against the aggressors, will lay at Your feet my little work as a building-stone of gratitude cultivated in our Ukrainian hearts.

Yours respectfully

Hanover, on the 10th of March 1947.