FOR RELEASE: THURSDAY AM, JULY 28, 1966

NOTE TO EDITORS: THIS STORY IS BEING SIMULTANEOUSLY RELEASED IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AND NEW YORK CITY

The American Civil Liberties Union urged the United States Supreme Court yesterday (July 27) to review the constitutionality of Virginia's state laws making racial intermarriage a criminal act.

The civil liberties organization argued that the miscegenation laws violate the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the right of privacy, the right to marry, and civil rights provisions of the U.S. Code.

The ACLU's jurisdictional statement submitted to the high court is on behalf of Richard Loving, a 31-year-old white construction worker and his part-Indian, part-Negro wife, Mildred. Five weeks after their Washington, D.C., marriage, the Lovings were arrested on July 11, 1958 in Caroline County, Virginia, where they were living, and charged with attempting to evade the Virginia ban on interracial marriages. One-year prison terms were suspended for the Lovings on condition that they both leave Virginia "at once and do not return together or at the same time...for a period of 25 years." The couple lived in Washington, for a few years, but in 1963 they decided to fight the conviction and the sentence of banishment from their home state.

On March 7, 1966 the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia upheld the state miscegenation statutes, and the jurisdictional statement filed with the U.S. Supreme Court is an appeal from that decision.

Asserting that "there can be no doubt that the conviction of the Lovings was based on race," the ACLU's jurisdictional statement argued that the essence of the Lovings' claim that "the anti-miscegenation statutes violate the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment, is that it is the color of their skin which makes their marriage constitute a criminal offense." Any statute, said the statement, "which bases the criminality of the act on race alone is a gross abuse of equal protection."

Emphasizing the unequal treatment inherent in the Virginia statutes, the Union pointed out that they permit "white persons" to marry only "white persons" but
allow "colored persons" to marry anyone except "white persons." In passing an "Act for the Preservation of Racial Integrity," the ACLU contended, the Virginia legislature clearly "was not concerned with equal protection of the 'integrity' of the Negro race." The ACLU statement stated that the statutes, which "stamp one group of citizens inferior," are "relics of slavery which deny equality under the law," adding that "there are no second class citizens before the law."

Pointing to Supreme Court decisions affirming that "the sacraments of marriage are beyond the arbitrary grasp of the state," the ACLU maintained the freedom to choose one's mate "cannot be infringed by the state setting standards which unreasonably and arbitrarily apply race criteria." The statement argued that the constitutional right of privacy protects the right to marry freely.

The ACLU statement also noted that the Virginia ban on marriage between races violates Mrs. Loving's civil rights under provisions of the U.S. Code. "She has been denied the right 'to make and enforce contracts' in the same manner as a white citizen," said the Union, and "she has been denied 'the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings' that is enjoyed by white citizens." The brief asserted that Richard Loving, too, was denied his right to the marriage license contract.

The Union argued that the anti-miscegenation statutes abridge many "rights and benefits contingent upon the marital relationship." The Lovings "are prohibited from establishing a family abode and raising their children in places where they and their family have often been long established and where many blood relatives still reside," the ACLU said. "Their children live under the stigma of bastardy," added the statement, and "victims of these statutes are prejudiced in their rights to certain tax, insurance, social security, workman's compensation benefits, to bequeath or inherit property; to certain criminal defenses, and other benefits and privileges too numerous to mention."

The Union brief was prepared by ACLU cooperating attorneys Bernard S. Cohen and Philip J. Hirschkop, of Alexandria, Virginia, David Garliner, of the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union, and ACLU legal director Melvin L. Wulf.