

What the Bible Teaches About Interracial Marriage and Reproduction

Part II Bible Answers to Incorrect Assumptions by Robert McCurry

Introduction

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim 3:16-17).

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” (2 Tim 2:15).

All Scripture must be rightly divided. Scripture is to be rightly divided by (1) taking the verse(s) or subject in context and (2) by association of Scripture. It should be according to the analogy of faith, i.e., Scripture must be interpreted in light of Scripture (1 Cor 2:13).

It is a historical and scientific fact that different races exist. (See Addendum II and III) God created the three races and ordained that each race retain their original purpose and racial purity by remaining separate and refraining from interracial marriage and reproduction.

God ordained that His promised Son, Jesus Christ, the second Adam, have a pure, unmixed lineage from Adam to His birth. The promise of Micah 5:2: “But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” was declared fulfilled in Matthew 2:6: “And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.” The lineage of Jesus Christ was a racially pure and unmixed lineage.

As you read this article, it is important that you understand that it is untenable that the Lord Jesus would have been born of a forbidden lineage:

Deuteronomy 7:1-3 When the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, **the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites . . . thou shalt make no covenant with them . . . Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.**

Bible answers to seven incorrect assumptions:

1. Moses married a black African woman and was approved by God.

Numbers 12:1 And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman.

Response:

According to Hebrew dictionaries, “Ethopian” means *Cushite*. There is nothing prior to Numbers 12 about the death of Zipporah, Moses wife, and so we must assume that this chapter refers to her. Zipporah was a Midianite, and her people were related to the Hebrews through Abraham’s wife Keturah. The Midianites lived in the land of Cush, which is modern-day Ethiopia. The 1599 Geneva Bible agrees: “Zipporah, Moses’ wife, was a Midianite, and because Midian bordered on Ethiopia, it is sometimes referred to in the scriptures by this name.” John Calvin: “It is, therefore, sufficiently clear that they refer to Zipporah, who is called an Ethiopian woman, because the Scripture comprehends the Midianites under this name: although I have no doubt but that they maliciously selected this name, for the purpose of awakening greater odium against Moses.”

Exodus 2:15 Now when Pharaoh heard this thing [the slaying by Moses of an Egyptian], he sought to slay Moses. But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh and dwelt in the land of Midian.

Midian was a son of Abraham and his descendants became Cushites, living in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. It was during this time of Moses’ exile that he married Zipporah, the daughter of the Priest of Midian. “*He [Reuel] gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter, and she bore him a son*” (Exodus 2:21-22). Reuel, means ‘friend of God’, and is sometimes referred to as Jethro and means ‘his excellency’; a title of respect. There wouldn’t have been any black African priests in this land of Cush.

Zipporah and her people were not black Africans. They were descendants of Abraham. Zipporah and her family were Midianites and lived in the land of Cush, which is modern-day Ethiopia.

Moses did not marry outside of his race; he married outside of the geographic location of national Israel.

2. Miriam was stricken with leprosy for criticizing Moses for marrying a black African wife.

Num 12:1-2, 10: And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman. 2 And they said, Hath the LORD indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken also by us? And the LORD heard it.

And the anger of the LORD was kindled against them; and he departed. 10
And the cloud departed from off the tabernacle; and, behold, Miriam became
leprous, white as snow: and Aaron looked upon Miriam, and, behold, she was
leprous.

Response:

The context shows that the criticism of Moses by Miriam and Aaron and God's subsequent punishing Miriam with leprosy on this occasion was not for criticizing Moses because he allegedly "married a black African woman." The criticism was precipitated by their jealousy that Moses had failed to consult or include them in appointing the seventy elders (Num 11:16, 24, 25). As Matthew Henry wrote: "The sedition of Miriam and Aaron was (1) [B]ecause of Zipporah, whom on this occasion they called, in scorn, an Ethiopian, and who, they insinuated, had too great an influence upon Moses in the choice of these seventy elders. (2) About his government; not the mismanagement of it, but the monopolizing of it (v. 2). They reasoned: 'Hath the Lord spoken only by Moses? Must he alone have the choice of the persons on whom the spirit of prophecy shall come? Hath the Lord not spoken also by us? Might not we have had a hand in that affair?'"

3. Rahab was a Canaanite, but she is an ancestor of Christ.

Response:

Rahab is often alleged to be a Canaanite. The seven nations listed in Deuteronomy 7 were all descendants of Canaan who were forbidden to Israel for marriage. Nevertheless, there is no reason to conclude that Jesus was born of a forbidden lineage because Rahab is never identified as a Canaanite in the Bible. She *lived* in the Canaanite city of Jericho. However, it is speculation to identify Rahab as a Canaanite from this fact alone. **As an example**, Moses, who was unquestionably an Israelite, was identified as an Egyptian after departing from Egypt: "And when they [the daughters of Reuel] came to Reuel their father, he said, How is it that ye are come so soon today? And they said, **An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds....**" (Exodus 2:18-19). Moses was known as an Egyptian not because he came from *the loins of the Egyptians* but because he came from *the land of Egypt*.

Furthermore, if Rahab was a Canaanite, Christ, being a descendant of Rahab, could not legitimately sit on the throne. The law of God demands that no one but an Israelite is to rule over Israelites:

Deuteronomy 17:15 Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom The LORD thy God shall choose: **one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.**

Christ came from Judah, not Canaan, to rule over His people Israel:

Matthew 2:6 And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among **the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.**

Furthermore, Rahab is listed in the book of *Hebrews* in the *Hebrew and Israelite* faith hall of fame (Hebrews 11:31). Rahab, therefore, must have been a Hebrew or Israelite

that happened to reside in Jericho, possibly a slave or a descendant of a slave. This could possibly explain why the two Israelite spies sought her out and also why the king of Jericho went to her looking for the two spies. (Joshua 2:1-3).

4. Ruth was a Moabite and therefore was not racially pure, but she is an ancestor of Christ.

Response:

The territory of the Moabites was originally east and northeast of the Dead Sea. From the name of the people who lived there, it was called Moab. It kept that name for many centuries after all the Moabites were gone from it.

When the Israelites entered the Promised Land, after their 40 years wandering during the exodus, the land of Moab was the first land they conquered. God had commanded Israel to totally exterminate the occupants of the lands they were to settle.

The Israelites conquered the land of Moab, killing all the people found there. We read in Deuteronomy 2:32-34, “Then Sihon came out against us, he and all his people, to fight at Jahaz. And LORD, our God, delivered him before us: we smote him and his sons and all his people. And we took all his cities at that time, and utterly destroyed the men and the women and the little ones of every city: we left none to remain.” In Zephaniah 2:9 we read, “Therefore, as I live, saith the LORD the God of Israel, surely Moab shall be as Sodom and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah.”

Ruth 1:1 records that Elimelech a man of Judah, with his wife Naomi and his two sons “went to sojourn in **the country of Moab.**” Note the accuracy of that expression, it doesn’t say **among the people**, but in the **country** of Moab, which was occupied by Israelites exclusively. Elimelech’s sons married women of this country, one of them being Ruth, who became an ancestor of David and through David, an ancestor of Jesus Christ. She could not have been of any race except Israel, for no others lived there. For Ruth to have been of any other race would have polluted the bloodline of Christ. Ruth was a pure Israelite, from the **land** of Moab, but not from the race of Moab.

5. God has removed all spiritual and physical distinctions between people.

Galatians 3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

Response:

Galatians 3:28 has been used to endorse the abandonment of race distinctions, encourage miscegenation*, unisex, sodomy, same-sex marriages, and other perverted sexual habits since the text says, “there is neither male nor female.”

[*Miscegenation (Latin *miscere* “to mix” + *genus* (“kind”)) is the “mixing” of different “races”, that is, marrying, cohabiting, having sexual relations and having children with a partner from outside of one’s racially or ethnically defined group]

Galatians 3:28 is perhaps the most abused text in modern times. Modern abusers of Scripture come in many varieties. Some have distorted this verse to make it conform to their racial, social, and sexual views. These believe in the nullification of racial distinctions, the leveling of the social rank and the removal of sexual differences not only in the spiritual realm but also in the physical realm. For example, the verse was quoted as an endorsement encouraging the acceptance of homosexuals in an Atlanta church. One writer said the meaning of this verse “does away with all human distinctions.” Later the writer said, “all human barriers are broken down.” Another writer said, “All class distinctions disappear in the new fraternal life in Christ.” One feminist gave the following distortion of the text, “There is no distinction between heterosexual and homosexual, cleric and lay, white and multicultural.”

When Galatians 3:28 is interpreted as a theory of egalitarianism, feminism, homosexualism, multiculturalism, pluralism, miscegenationism, same-sex marriageism, and socialism, then the true meaning of the text is removed. The truth of God’s Word is then substituted with secular humanism.

The Humanist Manifesto II: “We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate. Thus we look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based upon transnational federal government.”

“We want to become a multiracial, multiethnic society. This will arguably be the third great revolution...to prove that we literally can live without...having a dominant European culture.” Bill Clinton. Quoted in a speech by Harry Seabrook

Sadly, politically correct Christians are willfully ignorant of race. Sam Francis writes: “Almost literally every time I have argued or debated about race in a public forum, I get a response from whites of quoting the Bible verse of Galatians 3:28 — ‘There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus.’ This verse apparently has become the basic text for Christian universalism and race denial, although if it were interpreted as literally as those who use it for that purpose do, it would also deny the existence of sexual differences, a conclusion that is not only absurd but would appear to gut the Christian argument against gay marriage.” And this is exactly correct. **The very same interpretation that denies racial distinction also logically undercuts rejection of feminism, sodomy, and same-sex marriage.**

William Eskridge, a Yale law professor, says, “**views on same-sex marriage will follow the same path as those on interracial marriage.**” Sadly, he is correct. Christians with such flexible principles will not bother to mount a sustained defense of marriage at this late hour.

According to Dr. Ron Rumburg, “Galatians 3:28 is perhaps the most abused text in modern times. Klyne R. Snodgrass in an article asserted, ‘This text, like some others, has become a hermeneutical skeleton key by which we may go through any door we choose. More often than not, Galatians 3:28 has become a piece of plastic that people have molded to their preconceived ideas’ . . . It is a long way from no difference in salvation in the spiritual realm to destroying all differences in race, authority or sex in the physical world. The result of such an interpretation would be anarchy.” Harry Seabrook, Kinism .A speech delivered in South, Lexington, VA, September 25, 2004.

“If Galatians 3:28 means that all class distinctions disappear as some claim, does this mean that we should allow the mentally challenged equal access to operating rooms so they can perform brain surgery? Does this mean that pedophiles should have equal access to our children? Does this mean that heterosexuals are no different than homosexuals? Does this mean that there is no place for the husband to be the head of the home? Does this mean that you cannot be a partisan to your race, your family, your wife or husband, your church, your Bible, your Scriptural convictions, your state, or your friends?

“God was the one who ordained distinctions and divided by lands, languages, races, and nations (Gen 10:5; Deut 32:8; Acts 17:26). And God condemned those who would remove these distinctions (Deut 7:3; Ezra 9-10; Neh 9:2; 13:3, 23 ff [see Neh 9-13]).

“Miscegenation or racial interbreeding violates God’s orderly way as His Word bears out in the passages just mentioned and others (Judges 6:5-7; Num 25:1-9; Deut 7:1-6). Abraham and Isaac forbade that their sons should marry Canaanites (Gen 24; 27). Esau’s rebellion was seen in his miscegenation” (Gen 25-28). Dr. Rondel Rumburg, Raping of Scripture, 1999

At the time of creation, God set the natural laws into existence. This included the law of procreation, each species of life having the ability to reproduce after its own kind. The Scripture reveals also that, “. . .God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good” (Gen 1:11-12).

God prohibits the mixing of seeds. “Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woolen come upon thee.” (Lev 19:19). Compare Deut 22:9-11 [A parallel passage which does not have copulation in view]:

- Deut 22:9 Do not plant two kinds of seed in your vineyard; if you do, not only the crops you plant but also the fruit of the vineyard will be defiled.
- Deut 22:10 Do not plow with an ox and a donkey yoked together.
- Deut 22:11 Do not wear clothes of wool and linen woven together.

What was true of plant life was also true of all other species of life. All other types of life were fully developed with the ability to reproduce its own kind, including Adam and his posterity (Gen 1:20-28).

God created the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, the beast of the field, cattle, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. He ordained that they reproduce “after their kind.” Genesis 1:21-25 plainly says, without any interpretation, that God created fish to reproduce after their own particular kind, birds after their particular kind, and cattle after the cattle kind. Each kind may have many varieties within it, but all creatures reproduce only after their own “kind.” That is why dogs reproduce dogs, monkeys reproduce monkeys, sheep reproduce sheep, etc. For example, whales interbreed with whales, not dolphins; a canary interbreeds with a canary, not sparrows; lions interbreed with lions, not wolves; horses interbreed with horses, not cows, etc. Animals don’t have the capacity to disobey God’s commands. They were created by God to function as God sovereignly created them. So one will not find an animal choosing to violate God’s command and copulating with an animal of a different kind. Only when man interferes with God’s orderly way of animal interbreeding by crossbreeding are hybrids produced.

God likewise created Adam and ordained that he and his posterity reproduce after their own kind (Gen 1:26-28). Certainly God cannot be charged with racism since He created the three races.

Taken in context and examined in association with other scriptures, it is clear that Galatians 3:28 has nothing whatsoever to do with miscegenation and does not remove all distinctions in race, authority, or sex in the spiritual realm or in the physical world. Paul’s concluding statement is of great importance in understanding Galatians 3:28, “for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” This is an emphatic statement referring to the unity in Christ Jesus and how He saves sinners. The first three clauses become clear in their meaning when they are seen in the light of this statement. The Jew, Gentile, slave, freeman, male and female are all alike in their spiritual standing in the Redeemer. Therefore in respect to nationalities some are Jews and some Gentiles, and in respect to conditions some are slaves and some are free, and in respect to subjection some are men and some women, but in the saving relationship that is in Christ Jesus all are as one.

Galatians 3:28 is a long way from no difference in salvation in the spiritual realm to destroying all differences in race, authority or sex in the physical world. The result of such an interpretation would be anarchy. To force the interpretation of complete equality on this verse in such a general sense is catastrophic. Nowhere does the verse declare everyone in the physical realm equal in Christ, but it does say all the saved are one in Christ. The thrust of Galatians 3 is that justification is found only in Jesus Christ, regardless of whether you are male or female, Jew or Greek. And it is also clear that every person in the world is not strictly “equal”. Ibid. Dr. Rondel Rumburg.

5. Since the Bible says all races are “one blood”, God approves of interracial marriage and reproduction.

Acts 17:26: And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.

Many people quote the words found in Acts 17:26 that say, “**And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men . . .**” to prove that all races are the same. However, it is interesting to note that the verse is usually only partially quoted, omitting the second part of the verse that says, “**and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.**” The context of Acts 17:26 declares that God’s purpose in setting boundaries was so men could seek the Lord (Acts 17:27). God solemnly warns those who remove ancient landmarks (Hosea 5:10).

Let’s look at Acts 17:26 in its context and by association of scriptures.

One, Acts 17:26 has nothing whatsoever to do with miscegenation. Paul was stirred in his spirit when he saw the city given to idolatry (verse 16) and came to preach the good news of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (vs 31, 32).

Two in the context we see that Paul declared that God is the creator and sustainer of all life.

Acts 17:24-29 God that made the world and all things therein . . . seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things . . . For in him we live, and move, and have our being . . . For we are also his offspring [creation] . . . Forasmuch then as we are the offspring [creation] of God . . .

Three, Lev 17:11 “For the life of the flesh is in the blood. . . .” **Blood is the common denominator for the life of the three races, but the blood of each race is not the same.**

Scientific evidence confirms that the blood of the races are not the same.

Race is not a cultural construct or an illusion. Race does exist. It’s a genetic construct and real. That’s why people of different races have different medical needs and why race specific blood and bone marrow work better for race specific people. (See Addendum II)

“Mixed-race patients have a tougher time finding bone-marrow donors than do Caucasians.” Readers Digest - Nov 2001, p 25.

It’s also the reason that police investigators can tell the race or the race mixture of a person by DNA—a hair, a fleck of skin, a drop of saliva, or other bodily fluid.

6. Interracial marriage is acceptable if both partners are Christians and love each other.

Response:

God and His Word must always be the point of beginning of every subject -- not man and his emotions, romanticism, and human rationalizations. True love is observant of and obedient to God's Word and orderly way. God's Word does not approve of interracial marriage or miscegenation. Sadly and unfortunately, many pastors and churches have embraced a humanistic theory of "love" and "Christianized" interracial marriage and miscegenation. But God's Word and His orderly way remain unchanged.

7. Since interracial marriage is now approved, accepted, and practiced by more and more pastors and churches, it must be right.

Response:

The "everybody's doing it" syndrome or the pragmatic "it must be right because it works" mentality do not override God's Word and make wrong right. God's Word is unchangeable. God's Word does not approve of interracial marriage or miscegenation. Ps 119:89 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.

Race and political-correctness

*Miscegenation -- (Latin *miscere* "to mix" + *genus* ("kind")) is the "mixing" of different "races", that is, marrying, cohabiting, having sexual relations and having children with a partner from outside of one's racially or ethnically defined group -- is a politically-correct emphasis in the world today.*

Racial harmony [miscegenation] is the emphasis of the liberal secular media. It is the emphasis of the United Nations. It is the emphasis of the World Council of Churches. It is the emphasis of humanistic educators. It is the emphasis of many cults. I recently saw a sign advertising the Bahai faith with these words: "World peace through racial unity." It is an emphasis of the New Age movement. It was emphasized, for example, at a recently held Summit on Ethics and Meaning. An ad for this meeting appeared on page four of the March/April edition of *New Age Journal*. Participants at this interfaith gathering included Black leader Jesse Jackson, Harvey Cox of Harvard Divinity School; Matthew Fox, New Age former Catholic priest; Jim Wallis of the Evangelical Sojourners magazine; and Tony Campolo, a popular Evangelical leader. This mixed multitude emphasized racial harmony. In the book *New Age Politics*, author Mark Satin focuses on racial unity. He believes racism is one of the greatest hindrances to the development of the New Age. (David Cloud. Way of Life Literature, January 30, 2006)

The approval and promotion of interracial marriage by educators, social-planners, court decisions, religious propagandist, pastors, and churches notwithstanding --

God's Word has not changed. Interracial marriage violates God's Word and orderly way.

Isa 5:20-21 Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!

James 1:23-25 For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

*As for God, his way is perfect; the word of the LORD is tried:
he is a buckler to all them that trust in him.*

2 Samuel 22:31; Psalm 18:30

*Written by
Pastor Robert McCurry
3613 Hwy 34 E • Sharpsburg, GA 30277
770-251-3776 E-mail herbap@aol.com*

Addendum I

A Brief Historical Review of Interracial Marriage in America

In the late 1600's Virginia enacted laws against marriages of different races. In 1661 Virginia passed legislation prohibiting interracial marriage and later passed a law that prohibited ministers from marrying racially mixed couples. The fine was ten thousand pounds of tobacco. Then, in 1691, Virginia required that any white woman who bore a mulatto child pay a fine or face indentured servitude for five years for herself and thirty years for her child. Similarly, in Maryland, a white woman who married a Negro slave had to serve her husband's owner for the rest of her married life. Over time, Maryland's laws became increasingly strict, and in 1715 and 1717 Maryland's legislature made cohabitation between any white person and a person of African descent unlawful.

Laws against interracial marriage and interracial sex existed and were enforced in the Thirteen Colonies from the late seventeenth century onwards, and subsequently in several U.S. states and U.S. territories until 1967. As the number of colonies grew, miscegenation laws became increasingly commonplace; by the time of the American Civil War, at least five states had enacted anti-miscegenation laws..

Over the course of the 18th century all Southern states--and many Northern ones--outlawed all marriages between blacks and whites. Up through the Civil War, only two states, Pennsylvania in 1780 and Massachusetts in 1843 repealed their bans.

In the United States, interracial marriage, cohabitation and sex have since 1863 been termed "miscegenation". Anti-miscegenation laws (also known as *miscegenation laws*) were laws that banned interracial marriage and sometimes also interracial sex.

In the United States, anti-miscegenation laws (also known as miscegenation laws) were state laws passed by individual states to prohibit miscegenation nowadays more commonly referred to as interracial marriage and interracial sex. All of these laws banned the marriage of whites and non-white groups, primarily blacks, but often also Native Americans and Asians. Many laws also banned sex between people of different races. Although anti-miscegenation amendments were proposed in United States Congress in 1871, 1912-1913 and 1928, a nation-wide law against racially mixed marriages was never enacted. In 1924 a Virginia law was passed that prohibited whites from marrying anyone with "a single drop of Negro blood". Virginia was not unique; marriage between whites and blacks was by this time illegal in thirty-eight states.

From the 19th century into the 1950s, most U.S. states enforced anti-miscegenation laws. From 1913 to 1948, 30 out of the then 48 states did so.

As late as the 1950s, almost half of the states had miscegenation laws. While the original statutes were directed wholly against black-white unions, the legislation had extended to unions between whites and Mongolians, Malayans, Mulattos, and Native Americans.

During the 1960s, the civil rights movement helped reverse many of the legal barriers against miscegenation. The Warren Court, through its 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, was actively striving to end discrimination against blacks. So when the case of *McLaughlin v. Florida* appeared on the docket in 1964, the Court was again ready to deal with the question of racial classification. In *McLaughlin*, the Court ruled as invalid a Florida statute that allowed more severe penalties for cohabitation and adultery by interracial couples than same-race pairs. Justice Potter Stewart in a concurring opinion concluded, “it is simply not possible for a state law to be valid under our Constitution which makes the criminality of an act depend upon the race of the actor”.

McLaughlin v. Florida was instrumental in paving the way for the 1967 case of *Loving v. Commonwealth of Virginia*. In that year, sixteen states still had laws that made interracial marriages illegal. The case was brought about by Perry Loving, a white man, and his African American and American Indian wife, Mildred Jeter. Since interracial marriage was illegal in their home state of Virginia, the couple was married in Washington, D.C. When they returned to Virginia, the newlyweds were arrested and put in jail for breaking the law. Before dawn one morning, police officers barged into their bedroom, shined a flashlight on them, and demanded to know what the couple was doing. Mr. Loving pointed to their framed marriage certificate on the wall, but the officers informed them that the D.C. license was not legal in Virginia.

At the trial, the Virginia judge gave the Lovings a choice: they could spend one year in jail or move to another state. In his opinion, the judge said:

Almighty God created the races, white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.

The couple grudgingly moved to nearby Washington, D.C., and appealed their case, which eventually made it to the U.S. Supreme Court. Ultimately, the Court unanimously ruled in *Loving v. Virginia* that anti-miscegenation laws are unconstitutional. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote the Court’s decision: “Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry or not marry a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed upon by the State.” With that decision, all the remaining anti-miscegenation laws in the country were null and void and no longer in effect in the remaining 16 states that at the time still enforced them.

Alabama repeals century-old ban on interracial marriages

November 8, 2000

MONTGOMERY, Alabama (AP) — Alabama voters on Tuesday repealed the state’s century-old ban against interracial marriage, an unenforceable but embarrassing throwback to the state’s segregationist past.

The vote was 59 percent to 40 percent.

The vote removed the dubious distinction of Alabama being the only state in the country with such a relic from the segregated South remaining in its constitution.

Alabama became the last state with such language in its organic law in 1998 when South Carolina voters approved a measure to remove similar wording from their state's constitution. In South Carolina, about 62 percent of voters favored lifting the ban.

After 40 years, interracial marriage flourishing Since landmark 1967 ruling, unions have moved from radical to everyday

Associated Press April 15, 2007

NEW YORK - The charisma king of the 2008 presidential field. The world's best golfer. The captain of the New York Yankees. Besides superstardom, Barack Obama, Tiger Woods and Derek Jeter have another common bond: Each is the child of an interracial marriage.

For most of U.S. history, in most communities, such unions were taboo.

It was only 40 years ago — on June 12, 1967 — that the U.S. Supreme Court knocked down a Virginia statute barring whites from marrying nonwhites. The decision also overturned similar bans in 15 other states.

Stanford: 7 percent of couples interracial

Since that landmark *Loving v. Virginia* ruling, the number of interracial marriages has soared; for example, black-white marriages increased from 65,000 in 1970 to 422,000 in 2005, according to Census Bureau figures. Factoring in all racial combinations, Stanford University sociologist Michael Rosenfeld calculates that more than 7 percent of America's 59 million married couples in 2005 were interracial, up from less than 2 percent in 1970.

Coupled with a steady flow of immigrants from all parts of the world, the surge of interracial marriages and multiracial children is producing a 21st century America more diverse than ever, with the potential to become less stratified by race.

“The racial divide in the U.S. is a fundamental divide. ... but when you have the ‘other’ in your own family, it’s hard to think of them as ‘other’ anymore,” Rosenfeld said. “We see a blurring of the old lines, and that has to be a good thing, because the lines were artificial in the first place.”

From exotic to commonplace

The boundaries were still distinct in 1967, a year when the Sidney Poitier film “Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner” — a comedy built around parents’ acceptance of an interracial couple — was considered groundbreaking. The Supreme Court ruled that Virginia could not criminalize the marriage that Richard Loving, a white, and his black wife, Mildred, entered into nine years earlier in Washington, D.C.

But what once seemed so radical to many Americans is now commonplace.

Many prominent blacks — including Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, civil rights leader Julian Bond and former U.S. Sen. Carol Moseley Braun — have married whites. Well-known whites who have married blacks include former Defense Secretary William Cohen and actor Robert DeNiro.

Last year, the Salvation Army installed Israel Gaither as the first black leader of its U.S. operations. He and his wife, Eva, who is white, wed in 1967 — the first interracial marriage between Salvation Army officers in the United States.

Opinion polls show overwhelming popular support, especially among younger people, for interracial marriage.

That's not to say acceptance has been universal. Interviews with interracial couples from around the country reveal varied challenges, and opposition has lingered in some quarters.

Bob Jones University in South Carolina didn't drop its ban on interracial dating until 2000; a year later, 40 percent of the voters objected when Alabama became the last state to remove a no-longer-enforceable ban on interracial marriages from its constitution.

Interracial Marriage's Promise

August 06, 2007 U.S. News and World Report
Bonnie [Erbe](#)

I've often thought racism will only find its rightful place on the funeral pyre of American history when Americans intermarry across racial lines so thoroughly as to erase all genetic differences. Now there's renewed talk that rising rates of interracial dating and marriage could resolve a different cultural dilemma: the black male shortage for black women.

The Associated Press reports that more black women are giving up hope of finding the perfect black mate and marrying outside the race.

"Could Mr. Right Be White?" is the article's subtitle. The concept isn't exactly new. The Free Republic website boasts an article of the same name dating to 2002.

But what is new are updated Census Bureau data showing more African-American women marrying white men and more cultural icons wedding across racial lines.

The article notes that there were some 117,000 black wife-white husband couples in 2006 according to the U.S. Census Bureau, up from 95,000 in 2000. It goes on to say, "Black women around the country also are reconsidering deep-seated reservations toward interracial relationships, reservations rooted in America's history of slavery and segregation. They're taking cues from their favorite stars from actress Shar Jackson to

tennis pro Venus Williams as well as support blogs, how-to books, and interracially themed novels telling them it's OK to 'date out.' "

Younger Americans, we're often told, don't even view race in the same ways as their parents' and grandparents' generations did. Some don't even "see" skin color. If more Americans find wedded bliss because they're freed of the cultural restraints that prevented them from marrying across racial lines in the past, this is a good thing. But will it cause an eventual end to racism? I hope so, but the more I learn about world history, I doubt it will.

Changing Times

- Millions of American children have parents of difference races.
- In the United States marriages between blacks and whites increased 400 percent in the last 30 years, with a 1000 percent increase in marriages between whites and Asians.
- In a recent survey, 47% of white teens, 60 % of black teens, and 90 % of Hispanic teens said they had dated someone of another race.

United by Marriage

Angie DeVine

May 6, 2001 -- The Tribune -- Greeley, Colorado

The number of marriages between Hispanics and non-Hispanics has ballooned in the past three decades, jumping from 600,000 marriages in 1970 to more than 1.5 million now. These marriages account for more than half of all bicultural unions in the United States and promise to happen more and more often as the Hispanic population grows.

Change of Heart

By Adam Goodheart, AARP, May & June 2004

70 percent of whites now say they approve of marriage between whites and blacks, up from just 4 percent in a 1958 Gallup poll. Such open-mindedness extends across racial lines: 80 percent of blacks and 77 percent of Hispanics also said they generally approve of interracial marriage. Perhaps even more remarkable, a large majority of white respondents—66 percent—say they would not object if their own child or grandchild chose a black spouse. Blacks (86 percent) and Hispanics (79 percent) were equally accepting about a child or grandchild's marrying someone of another race.

Mixed marriages on rise

Acceptance is growing for interracial couples

By Deborah Bulkeley

April 13, 2007 — Deseret Morning News – Salt Lake City, Utah

Fewer than 1 percent of the nation's married couples were interracial in 1970. However, from 1970 to 2005, the number of interracial marriages nationwide has soared from

310,000 to nearly 2.3 million, or about 4 percent of the nation's married couples, according to U.S. Census Bureau figures. In 2005, there were also nearly 2.2 million marriages between Hispanics and non-Hispanics.

Interracial and multiracial children

Today there are more interracial and multiracial children being born in the U.S. than at any other time in the nation's history.

Children of Mixed Race—No Longer Invisible

December 1999/January 2000 | Volume **57** | Number **4**

Understanding Youth Culture Pages 68-72

New Population

The number of interracial and biracial babies is increasing faster than the number of monoracial babies. More than 100,000 biracial babies have been born every year after 1989—more than 1 million first-generation biracial children. This increase is true across racial and ethnic groups: black/white, Japanese/white, racially mixed Native American, Hispanic mixes, and other Asian American mixes.

We can attribute the increase in biracial births to the 1967 Supreme Court decision outlawing state laws against interracial marriage, increased interaction among the races at school and in the workplace, and an increased acceptance of interracial marriage by Americans (Gallup Poll, 1991). **We do not, however, have an accurate count of interracial, multiracial and multiethnic children because we have no agreed-on definition and because the U.S. government does not count children of mixed heritage.**

Interracial and Multiracial Children

No. 71; Updated October 1999. The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP)

Interracial and multiracial children are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The number of mixed-race families in America is steadily increasing, due to a rise in interracial marriages and relationships, as well as an increase in transracial and international adoptions. Publicity surrounding prominent Americans of mixed racial heritage, such as athletes, actors, musicians, and politicians, has highlighted the issues of multicultural individuals and challenged long-standing views of race. However, despite some changes in laws and evolving social attitudes, multiracial children still face significant challenges.

Addendum II

Scientific evidence confirms that the blood of the races are not the same

“Mixed-race patients have a tougher time finding bone-marrow donors than do Caucasians.” Readers Digest - Nov 2001, p 25

C8 Monday, Nov. 27, 1995 ***** The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

Bone marrow donors of mixed race needed

Dear Abby: My 6-year-old daughter, Michelle, has acute non-lymphocytic leukemia. Like too many other children, she is in need of a bone marrow transplant.

Her doctor has said she cannot survive unless she receives a transplant with matching bone marrow. Time is running out for my daughter; the percentages are not in her favor.

There are 7 million wonderful people who are registered potential donors with the National Bone Marrow Bank. None of them has bone marrow that matches Michelle's. What makes our daughter “different” isn't that she has leukemia, nor is it because I am in the Baseball Hall of Fame. Michelle must find the “needle in the haystack” because I am African-American and her mother is Caucasian.

People with African ancestry and other ethnic minorities are underrepresented in donor pools.

The largest percentage of donors are Caucasian, followed by African-American, Latino, Asian and, finally, a donor with mixed black and white blood types. The only donor who can give the gift of life to Michelle and others like her is a person 8 or older of mixed race — specifically African-American and Caucasian.

Our prayer is that the awareness of our daughter's need, and the need of so many others, will motivate people to action. We hope your readers will step forward. The process is quite easy and virtually painless. Donors share only a small portion of bone marrow, and the body soon replaces it. A single blood test can determine whether someone is a candidate to help Michelle and others like her.

Abby, we believe with today's technology and your wide readership, we can surely find that needle in the haystack. Time is short. The needle must be found today.

Not only for our daughter, but for all the children and adults in this country like her, my wife and I urge your readers to call the National Bone Marrow Bank (800-627-7692) to start saving lives today — before it's too late — **Rod and Marilynn Carew**

Dear Rod and Marilynn: My readers are the most caring and generous in the world, and I know they join me in praying for your daughter's recovery. Please, readers, call 800-627-7692 to obtain information on becoming a donor.

Be a bone marrow donor.

I first learned of the special need for bone marrow donors of diverse ethnic backgrounds when Rod Carew's daughter, Michelle, was suffering from non-lymphocytic leukemia and in need of a bone marrow transplant about four years ago. Michelle had a unique racial heritage. Her father is of West Indian and Panamanian background, while her mother is a Caucasian with a Russian-Jewish ancestry. Because bone marrow typing runs along racial lines, Michelle's chances of finding a donor were decreased by her unusual heritage. According to the National Marrow Donor Program, “Some characteristics of marrow type are unique to people of specific ancestry.” And while it is

possible for matches to be made across ethnic lines, a person is more likely to find a match from another person of similar racial make-up. This puts people of mixed racial heritage who are in need of a bone marrow transplant in an often difficult position to find a suitable donor. The position is made even worse by the fact that minority donors make up only small percentages of available bone marrow donors.

Michelle Carew's plight made the news when she encouraged her Baseball Hall of Famer father to use his notoriety to increase awareness of the need for minority bone marrow donors. Unfortunately, Michelle's donor came too late to save her life. She passed away on April 17, 1996 at the age of 18. Fortunately, Carew and others continue to work to raise awareness for the urgent need for minority bone marrow donors.

The Special Need for Minorities

The National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP) maintains a registry of nearly 4 million potential bone marrow donors. According to the NMPD, at any given time, there is an average of 3,000 hopeful patients searching their registry. Of the nearly 4 million potential donors, more than half are Caucasian. The remaining numbers are divided among six other ethnic groups, with only 64,562 donors categorized as "Multiple Race/Other."

Ethnic Group and Number of Donors (as of December 1999)

Caucasian	2,154,297
Unknown	740,285
Hispanic	305,724
African American	305,440
Asian/Pacific Islander	227,146
Multiple Race/Other	64,562
American Indian/Alaska Native	51,695

Statistics provided by the National Marrow Donor Program.

"While Caucasian patients searching the registry have an 80 percent chance of finding a match ... the odds of people of other races locating a match is between 20 percent and 55 percent. The odds for some patients, however, can be as low as one in a million," according to one reporter, Lesley Farrey Pacey, a donor herself, whose marrow donation saved the life of a 5 year-old boy.

Who is Helping to Raise Awareness

In addition to Rod Carew and The Carew Collection Bone Marrow Foundation, there are several other organizations devoting time and money to raising awareness of the importance of minority and multiracial bone marrow donors. ProjectRACE, which is an advocate of multiracial classification, has listed bone marrow donation by multiracial individuals an "urgent medical concern" and works with the NMDP in recruiting minority donors through community outreach drives. Organizations like NMDP also employ their own minority recruitment initiatives to help increase the numbers of minority donors. The NMDP currently hosts minority initiatives for the African-American, Hispanic, Asian & Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaskan Native communities.

While there may be many reasons for the lack of minority donors, some speculate it may be as simple as a “lack of information about how easy it can be to sign on,” according to a Kaiser Permanente report on the issue.

Copyright © 2002 About, Inc. <http://racerelements.about.com/library/weekly/aa052400a.htm>

First National Effort to Reach Multiracial Bone Marrow Donors a Success

Critical bone marrow donor drives were held simultaneously in five cities across the country on November 9, 1996. Organizations in Houston, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Chicago and Jacksonville are participated in the national drive.

Project RACE (Reclassify All Children Equally), the national organization advocating for multiracial children and adults, the **National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP)** and local minority communities teamed up to recruit donors. There is a critical shortage of donors for multiracial children and adults. Donors for multiracial people are **RARE** because of the need for racial and ethnic matching. It is critical for more people of diverse backgrounds to join the national Registry.

“This is very important for the multiracial community. We can help save the lives of children in minority communities. It is just a start in national awareness of the medical issues facing multiracial children,” says Susan Graham, executive director of Project RACE

Baseball player Rod Carew, whose Caribbean/Panamanian/African/Caucasian daughter Michelle died of leukemia at 19 because a compatible bone marrow donor could not be found. **Bone marrow is one transplant that must stay within racial boundaries**, Graham said, and finding multiracial donors can be a huge task. One action of Project RACE is to educate the multiracial community about this issue (Emphasis added).

Addendum III

Historical Facts Confirm Race Differences

United States Census forms confirm race exists

The first U.S. census in 1790, supervised by Thomas Jefferson, placed people into one of three categories: free white male, free white female, and other persons (which included free blacks, slaves, and “taxable Indians”). Seventy years later, the government began adding other categories like Mulatto, Chinese, and American Indian.

The 1890 census added further distinctions and had categories for White, Black, Mulatto, Quadroon, Octoroon, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian. By 1910 the Census Bureau had eliminated the terms mulatto, quadroon, and octoroon. Anyone with any African American ancestry would henceforth be counted as black. By the 1890 count, distinctions were made within the mulatto group down to “one-eighth or any trace of black blood.”

The “one-drop rule,” whereby black designation resulted from any black ancestry, no matter how remote, became the social rule of the land by 1900 and it was adopted by the census in 1930. The American one-drop rule also required that any degree of blackness in mixtures between black and white, black and Chinese, or black and Indian ancestry, result in black designation. As applied beyond the black category, the one-drop rule required that mixtures of white and Asian or white and Indian, result in Asian or Indian designation, respectively.

In the 1980 and 1990 censuses, a new formation developed — ethnicity, as Hispanic or non-Hispanic (replacing what was formerly labeled “Spanish”) came to be counted separately from race, but the one drop rule remained in effect for racial categorization.

The 1990 census required people to choose one of the following racial categories: White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut, or Other. These classifications had been adopted and in use since 1970. Many Americans felt that the selections available did not adequately describe who they were, and so they opted to check off “other” and use the write-in blank. On the 1990 census almost ten million people marked their race as “Other;” most of these were Latinos who are unwilling to identify themselves as white, black, or Indian. Americans using the write-in blank self-identified nearly three hundred races, six hundred American Indian tribes, seventy Hispanic groups, and seventy-five different combinations of multiracial ancestry (19).

In all of the census counts through 1990, an individual’s race was supposed to be indicated by checking only one of the boxes presumed to correspond to the main social racial categories. Thus, there was no allowance made for mixed-race identification, although the category “other” was recognized in the 1980 and 1990 census, and on many local record-keeping forms. During the early 1990s, advocates for the federal recognition of mixed race identities succeeded to the extent that the “check only one box” rule for race was rescinded in the 2000 census. This appeared to be the beginning of official recognition of mixed race in the United States.

Census 2000 can be a useful starting point in the discussion of the concept of “race,” its ever-changing nature, and the transforming face of U.S. society.

Race and ethnicity in the United States 2000 Census

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Race and ethnicity in the United States Census, as defined by the United States Census Bureau and the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), is a self-identification data item in which residents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The categories represent a social-political construct designed for the race or races they considered themselves to be and “*generally reflect a social definition of race recognized in this country*”. The Office of Management and Budget defines the concept of race as outlined on the US Census is not “*scientific or anthropological*”. The OMB’s conception of race takes into account “*social and cultural characteristics as well as ancestry*”, using “*appropriate scientific methodologies*”, but not “*primarily biological or genetic in reference*”. Race and ethnicity were considered separate and distinct identities, with Hispanic origin asked as a separate question. Thus, in addition to their race, all respondents are also categorized by membership in one of two ethnicities: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. In 1997, the Office of Management and Budget gave a Federal Register Notice called the “*Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity*” which defined new racial and ethnic definitions.

The term White refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.” It includes people who indicate their race as “White” or report entries such as Spanish, Irish, German, Italian, Persian, British, Assyrian, Iraqi, Near Easterner, Arab, or Polish.

“The term Black or African American refers to people having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.” It includes people who indicate their race as “Black, African Am., or Negro,” or provide written entries such as African American, Afro American, Kenyan, Caribbean-American, Nigerian, or Haitian.

“American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) refer to people having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment.”

“Asian refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Pakistan, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. It includes “Asian Indian,” “Chinese”, “Filipino”, “Korean”, “Japanese”, “Taiwanese”, “Vietnamese”, and “Other Asian”. It also includes Afghanistanis.

“The term Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NHPI) refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands. It includes people who indicate their race as “Native Hawaiian”, “Guamanian or Chamorro”, “Samoaan”, and “Other Pacific Islander.” The US Census counts Indigenous Australians as part of the Pacific Islander race.

Some other races includes all other responses not included in the “White”, “Black or African American”, “American Indian and Alaska Native”, “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander” race categories described above. This category was intended to capture responses such as Mulatto, Creole, and Mestizo. Nine out of ten respondents who selected this category are of Hispanic origin.

Two or more races refers to multiracial people. People may have chosen to provide two or more races either by checking two or more race response check boxes, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

Census recognizes a rainbow of races for first time in 2000 census Multiple choices

Monday, March 19, 2001

By Gary Rotstein, Post-Gazette Staff Writer

OK, who are you and where are you, you sole Pittsburgher who is a mixture of white, black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and a sixth unidentified race? Exactly one person among the 334,563 residents of the city listed six different races as part of his makeup — or her makeup — in the national census conducted on April 1, 2000.

In Allegheny County, 10 residents identified themselves as walking rainbow coalitions, listing all of the races cited on the census form.

No one really verifies that their information is correct, rather than merely someone’s idea of multiracial humor. No one is able to track them down, because of U.S. Census Bureau procedures that protect the confidentiality of respondents.

But those extreme examples reflect the choices that Americans were given for the first time in the 2000 census. Previous censuses boxed individuals into selecting either white, black, a few additional races or “other”; they weren’t permitted to combine those categories.

Leah Charles, 22, of Regent Square, spent many years listing herself as black at the suggestion of her white mother, who viewed the father’s black heritage as a potential asset whenever issues of minority preference might arise in school or elsewhere. Charles, whose skin color leads people to mistake her for Hispanic, prefers the biracial identification now allowed by the census as a better reflection of who she is.

About nine of every 10 individuals listed as multiracial locally listed just two races rather than three, four, five or six in the census. Of those biracial individuals, about one in three was a combination of white and black, and smaller percentages were mixtures of one of those plus either Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander, such as Hawaiian, or “some other race.”

Sociologists and others who study race in America say society historically viewed individuals with even a drop of black blood as African-American and forced them into that single category. Some older individuals with black and white parents, such as Oliver T. Jackson of Wilkinsburg, accepted that black identification from the outset since there was so little recognition of multiracial identity years ago.

“I thought the only way to stay in touch with reality is to stay in the black concept,” said Jackson, 61, a real estate agent. “Whether you’re a little bit or a whole bunch, you’re still black. Black is black.”

Yet, an older brother of his with the same bloodlines and same fair-skinned, Mediterranean complexion adopted a white identity after attending a predominantly white prep school in New Hampshire.

Suzanne Woods of East Liberty, who is white and married to a black man, Donald, said their three sons who are in high school and college joke about their own behavior being more black or more white on any given day. But ultimately, they’ve each come to declare themselves African-American, though she prefers to see them as biracial and listed them as a combination of black and white when filling out the family’s census form.

And Hispanics have a far more wide-open view of racial identity, though it’s not necessarily acknowledged by the federal government. One question on the census form asked people if they were Hispanic or non-Hispanic, which the government views as an ethnic or cultural status rather than race.

When people got to the separate race question immediately after that, nearly half of Hispanics nationally, rather than choosing between white or black, identified themselves as either “some other race” or a combination of white and “some other race.” They viewed their Hispanic background as an element of their racial identity even if the census form did not.

“The Census Bureau doesn’t really understand how Latin Americans think,” Massey said. “Racial identity in Latin America is almost by definition multiracial and on a continuum,” based on mixtures of European, Indian and sometimes African blood.

Joseph Culp of Clarksville, Greene County, is black and his wife, Susana, is Mexican, so he believes he listed their three children as Hispanic first, and then black on the race question, though his wife is white Hispanic. Whatever they are, he knows they’re a minority.

“They’re proud of their heritage as far as being Hispanic, but they don’t have a whole lot of those friends or black friends because there’s not a whole lot of them out here,” Culp said. “We’re kind of limited in that respect.”

If he thinks it’s difficult for them, just imagine how lonely that six-race person in Pittsburgh feels.

Racial Classification in the United States (Nov 18, 2005)

How your race is determined in the United States Census and other government documents.

In the United States of America, several factors contribute to your ethnicity. On the United States Census, you will first be asked if you are of Hispanic/Latino heritage.

The Office of Management and Budget defines Hispanic or Latino as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race. Federal agencies are required by law to use a minimum of two ethnicities when asking questions about race or ethnicity: “Hispanic or Latino” and “Not Hispanic or Latino”.

The OMB also requires federal agencies to use a minimum of five racial categories. Here is how the OMB classifies each race:

White refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa. It includes people who indicate their race or races as “White” or wrote in entries such as Irish, German, Italian, Lebanese, Near Easterner, Arab, or Polish.

Black or African American refers to people having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicate their race or races as “Black, African Am., or Negro” or wrote in entries such as African American, Afro American, Nigerian, or Haitian.

American Indian and Alaska Native refers to people having origins any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment. It includes people who indicate their race or races by marking this category or writing in their principal or enrolled tribe, such as Rosebud Sioux, Chippewa, or Navajo.

Asian refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent. It includes people who indicate their race or races as “Asian Indian”, “Chinese”, “Filipino”, “Korean”, “Japanese”, “Vietnamese”, or “Other Asian”, or wrote in entries such as Burmese, Hmong, Pakistani, or Thai.

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands. It includes people who indicated their race or races as “Native Hawaiian”, “Guamanian or Chamorro”, “Samoan”, or “Other Pacific Islander”, or wrote in entries such as Tahitian, Mariana Islander, or Chuukese.

Some other race is used for those who are unable to identify with the five Office of Management and Budget race categories. This includes people who provide write-in

entries such as Moroccan, South African, Belizean, or a Hispanic origin (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban).

Distinguishing racial traits from cultural traits

We must distinguish racial traits from cultural traits, since they are so often confused with each other. As defined in physical anthropology and biology, **races** are categories of human beings based on DNA and average differences in physical traits that are transmitted by the genes not by blood. **Culture** is a shared pattern of behavior and beliefs that are learned and transmitted through social communication. An **ethnic group** is a group with a sense of cultural identity, such as Czech or Jewish Americans, but it may also be a racially distinctive group. A group that is racially distinctive in society may be an ethnic group as well, but not necessarily. Although many blacks are racially mixed, most blacks in the United States are physically distinguishable from whites, but they are also an ethnic group because of the distinctive culture they have developed within the general American framework.

Addendum IV

The Face of Tomorrow: Reflection on Diversity in America

By Scott London

Editors note: Excerpts taken from this article written in 1998 to illustrate the consequences of miscegenation in America. Although the data references have increased dramatically, the message is an important one for today.

Some years ago *Time* magazine published a special issue on multiculturalism in America. The cover featured a beguiling mestizo woman over the caption “the New Face of America.” The cover girl was at once familiar and exotic. With her placid smile and somewhat ambiguous features, she looked like someone you might encounter in tomorrow’s Los Angeles or Toronto — a curious melange of Asian, Middle Eastern, African, and Anglo-Saxon traits.

As it happened, *Time*’s model was not a real person but a cybernetic crossbreed. The image was created on a computer by “morphing” men and women from various racial and ethnic backgrounds. As *Time*’s editors explained, this was a preview of the sort of offspring likely to emerge in tomorrow’s multicultural society.

The magazine cover captured an essential truth about America at century’s end. We live in an increasingly diverse and increasingly mongrel society, a nation of blurred boundaries and bizarre extremes. Never before in history has a society been as diverse as the U.S. is today.

For all the platitudes about melting pots, mosaics, and rainbow coalitions, many regard the “browning” of America as a profoundly disturbing trend. Miscegenation is still regarded as culturally taboo on Main Street. As recently as 20 years ago, some states still had laws in place forbidding interracial marriage.

Many people complain that miscegenation waters down their culture. Some Jews, for example, blame the disintegration of Judaism on the growing rate of interfaith marriages in America. Similarly, a number of Indian tribes are concerned that thinning bloodlines will lead to the “statistical extermination” of their people. A century ago, half of all Indians in the U.S. were considered fullbloods. Today the number is down to about 20 percent. On Indian reservations, there is now a suicide problem among young half-breeds who don’t feel sufficiently “pure.”

As writer Richard Rodriguez has pointed out, we have never had an especially rich vocabulary for miscegenation. While other cultures speak of themselves as mestizos, mulattoes, and creoles, we persist in referring to ourselves using clumsy designations like Asian-American, African-American, Native American, and even Anglo-American. Curiously, the 1990 census form had boxes for “white,” “black” and “other,” but not for “multiracial.” Bureaucrats in Washington are now preparing a form for the 2000 census. How about a box for “all of the above”?

Some say that America is actually less diverse than it was a century ago. There is some truth to this. A hundred years ago one could stroll along the wharves of New York City and hear a dozen languages and encounter immigrants from every corner of the old world. But this argument hides an essential fact: the main reason America is less diverse today than it was at the turn of the century is because of all the criss-crossing that has occurred in the intervening generations. We are no longer a nation of Scandinavian farmers, Chinese laborers, and Polish merchants, we are a nation of crossbreeds. In the last two decades alone, the number of intermarriages in the U.S. has jumped from 300,000 to over a million. The incidence of births of mixed-race babies has multiplied 26 times as fast as that of any other group.

This essay appears in the anthology *At Issue: Interracial Relationships* (Greenhaven Press, 1999). It was originally published in *HopeDance* magazine, September/October 1998. Copyright 1998-2005 by Scott London

Conclusion

The approval and promotion of interracial marriage by educators, social-planners, court decisions, religious propagandist, pastors, and churches notwithstanding -- God's Word has not changed. Interracial marriage violates God's Word and orderly way.

Racial tension, problems, and conflicts continue to increase and become more intense across America. Why? God's Word is ignored and denied. The solution? God's Word and orderly way must be acknowledged and obeyed.

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!

Isaiah 5:20-21

*As for God, his way is perfect; the word of the LORD is tried:
he is a buckler to all them that trust in him.*

2 Samuel 22:31; Psalm 18:30

Written by

Pastor Robert McCurry

3613 Hwy 34 E • Sharpsburg, GA 30277

770-251-3776 • E-mail herbap@aol.com