

"We outspent the opposition [in 1978] but we weren't able to change people's minds quickly enough," she said. When the conservatives' effort succeeded, McClain said, "I was blown away because I felt completely emotionally drained. I felt tremendous disappointment. I had thought we would win . . . I was unable to work on legislative campaigns for years."

In the decade since then, McClain said, she and others have gained perspective as well as the skills of organizing, fund-raising and planning that will make this campaign look and sound different.

"I think there are lots of feelings of: we can really learn from the lessons of the past; here's a chance to do it again. We're ten years older, ten years more mature. There are a lot of lesbians and gays in this state who know how to run a real professional campaign," she said.

Some signs of change are already visible. Ten years ago, McClain said, organizers were almost obsessed with creating a democratic campaign structure — so obsessed that the process sometimes became more important and more draining than the goal.

Today, while campaign organizers around the state are trying to involve their communities and seek ideas from others, they also stress the need for strong leadership, a unified message and a sophisticated media effort to rival the OCA's organizing. The Bijou gathering was a clear example of this shift in style. Siemens led a crisp, informative meeting and, while she invited ideas from participants, she guided the discussion away from tangential matters and focused on the goal: "The job of OFF is to win this in November."

To do that, organizers are trying to learn as much from history as they can — what went wrong in the Eugene campaign in May 1978, as well as what went right six months later in Seattle, when voters said no to an attempted repeal of city ordinances banning discrimination in housing or employment on the basis of sexual orientation. In that campaign, a coalition of gay groups raised more than \$100,000, registered 5,200 new voters and stressed the issue of privacy in their literature and advertisements. In November 1978, 62.9 percent of Seattle voters rejected Initiative 13 and preserved the city's gay-rights ordinances.

From anger to action

In Portland, a chain of recent events that seemed like repeated slaps to the gay community may be spurring enthusiasm for the OFF campaign. First, *The Oregonian* failed to publish even one line about June's Gay and Lesbian Pride march, which drew 4,100 participants. Then, five days before OCA filed its petitions in Salem, *Oregonian* Associate Editor David Reinhard wrote a column criticizing Cascade AIDS Project posters aimed at educating gay men. The posters, showing two smiling men with their arms on each others' shoulders and the slogan, "We can live. Together," hung behind the driver's seat on 15 Tri-Met buses. Reinhard labeled the poster "a valentine to homosexuality" and made his own bias clear, stating that "all sexual orientations are not equal."

On the first business day after the column appeared, Tri-Met received about 20 complaints about the ad, and Transit Ads Inc. ordered the posters removed. Ironically, the poster itself, which *The Oregonian* had refused to run as an ad, made the front page of the Metro section along with an article about the posters' removal.

Jack Jost, president of Transit Ads Inc., a Los Angeles company that manages advertising on Tri-Met buses, said removing the ads was "strictly a business decision. . . . We did not have a problem with [the ads] or we wouldn't have accepted them in the first place." Although no advertisers had threatened to cancel their contracts if the posters stayed up, Jost was afraid new advertisers would decide to open accounts elsewhere. "Apparently there was a flurry of complaints about it," he said.

Those complaints were about homophobia, not business, said Tom Koberstein, director of

the Cascade AIDS Project. "People who expressed revulsion at the ad were revulsed by the picture of two men who were obviously gay."

Jost and Koberstein plan to meet in Portland to try to resolve the issue. "I'm willing to compromise," said Koberstein, "but that does not include watering down an ad so it does not target the audience of gay men."

Since Reinhard's column appeared July 3, *The Oregonian* has published at least a dozen letters about it, the majority of them disagreeing with Reinhard's stance. That's just one way the community has responded. In another demonstration of anger, about 150 persons protested outside *The Oregonian* building on July 14, shouting, "We can live. Together," and "Out and outraged." One by one, protesters lay down on white butcher paper while someone else traced their silhouettes in colored markers, then wrote inside each one the name of an Oregonian who had died of AIDS.

Terri Salvino, holding a multi-colored flag out toward passing traffic on Broadway, said Reinhard's editorial made her feel "angry and hurt — and scared. This is being read by the whole state, and it has an impact. It really promotes hatred."

Across the street, a counterprotest of half a dozen persons sported a banner reading "Thank you Mr. Reinhard." Priscilla Martin, longtime anti-abortion picketer and nemesis of the gay community, carried a bright orange sign that said, "You don't have to be gay."

The counterprotest may have been tiny, but it was a continuing, sobering reminder of conservatives' presence on an issue that will surely outlast the November election. For now, *The Oregonian* articles and the poster controversy have brought passion and immediacy to a campaign that might otherwise have seemed remote to some gay men and lesbians.

"All of those happenings have really contributed to an atmosphere of frustration and anger for a number of people in Portland," said Siemens. "I hope OFF will be able to harness some of that energy toward a successful campaign that will win in November."

Campaigning presents unique, emotional challenges to gay men and lesbians, who may face the decision of coming out to family, neighbors and co-workers if they work openly to fight the ballot measure. Many of the demonstrators at *The Oregonian* and participants at the Bijou meeting are already "out" in the community. But a winning campaign will demand the effort of many more people, some of whom have been closeted until now.

"A lot of us may be called upon to reach within ourselves during the next three months," Siemens said at the community meeting. "It may mean talking in your workplace, to your neighbors, to your family. It may take more and more of us standing up and saying who we are."

And the fight will take perspective — the awareness that, win or lose, it will not be the gay community's last legislative battle. McClain said she learned that lesson from the defeat in Eugene, and she plans to remember it as she works on this campaign.

"You really have to think like a revolutionary," she said, "and consider this a lifetime commitment. You really have to pace yourself for your whole life."

If you would like to help, here's how:

1. Crucial early money is needed now. Many contributors are donating 3 percent of their gross income in one-time sums or pledges.

2. Host a house party for your friends to inform them and encourage them to become 3 percenters.

3. Sign up as a volunteer.

Facing the challenge not only to our civil rights but to our dignity can make us stronger and more united than ever before. Working together, victory will be ours.

For more information, contact Oregonians for Fairness, PO Box 2397, Portland, OR 97208, 233-9079.

— Cathy Siemens

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. EO-87-20

Prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation

In the 200th year of our Constitution, Americans are reminded once again that each generation is obligated to preserve and extend both the right to live our private lives as we see fit, and the right to equal treatment under the law. In America, to deny a person a job or access to vital social services for reasons unrelated to his or her abilities or needs is a fundamental injustice.

Oregon was settled by those who cherished fairness and the opportunity to use their skills and talents as they saw fit. Oregon law embodies this belief in its use of objective standards for the provision of services, and in its declaration that personnel decisions be made "without regard to non-job related factors." ORS 240.306(1).

Today the State of Oregon affirms that this simple justice extends to the private sexual orientation of our citizens. The State of Oregon will not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation in hiring and providing state service.

Just as the State advocates no religion over another, this executive order does not advocate or endorse any particular sexual orientation. It does no more than recognize the right to privacy of our citizens and the right to expect equal treatment under law when private behavior does not affect the public.

This executive order does provide limited exceptions to the policy of non-discrimination, where public necessity requires. Moreover, it extends only to the provision of equal treatment by state government, and imposes no requirements on the private sector.

IT IS ORDERED AND DIRECTED:

1. No officer, employee or agency within the executive branch of state government shall discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation in the recruitment, hiring, classification, assignment, compensation, promotion, discipline, or termination of any employee.
2. No officer, employee or agency within the executive branch of state government shall, in carrying out the duties of state government, discriminate against any person on the basis of sexual orientation.
3. Nothing in this executive order shall require or authorize any affirmative action or preferential treatment of any person on the basis of sexual orientation.
4. This executive order does not apply:
 - a. To the legislative and judicial branches of state government.
 - b. To state officers and employees under the jurisdiction of an elected official other than the Governor.
 - c. To the Oregon National Guard, to the extent that the terms of this order would conflict with federal statutes, regulations or policies binding on the Guard.
 - d. To any actions by correctional institutions prohibiting sexual contact by inmates, or imposing discipline based on the violation of such a prohibition, or assigning inmates to single cells as necessary to prevent sexual conduct or while evaluating the inmates' propensity to engage in sexual contact.
5. All agency heads are directed to make their personnel aware of the terms of this order, and to take steps to ensure that it is carried out. Each agency head shall report annually to the Governor on the steps taken pursuant to this paragraph.
6. For purposes of this executive order, "sexual orientation" means heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality.

Done at Salem, Oregon, this 15th day of October, 1987.

Neil Goldschmidt, Governor

VOTE NO

THE INITIATIVE — BALLOT MEASURE 8

Revokes ban on sexual orientation discrimination in state executive branch

Question: Shall voters revoke Governor's authority to ban discrimination, based on sexual orientation, in state executive department employment and services?

Explanation: Enacts new law. Revokes Governor's order which bans discrimination, based on sexual orientation, both in executive branch employment and in carrying out executive branch duties within state government. Measure provides that no state official shall forbid taking personnel action against a state employee because of the employee's sexual orientation. Measure permits state officials to forbid taking personnel actions against state employees based on nonjob related factors. For the purposes of this measure, sexual orientation means heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality.

AN ACT

Relating to certain personnel actions.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. Executive Order No. EO-87-20 be, and hereby is, revoked.

SECTION 2. No state official shall forbid the taking of any personnel action against any state employee based on the sexual orientation of such employee.

SECTION 3. This measure shall not be deemed to limit the authority of any state official to forbid generally the taking of personnel action against state employees based on nonjob related factors.

SECTION 4. For purposes of this measure, "sexual orientation" means heterosexuality, homosexuality or bisexuality.

SECTION 5. The various provisions of this measure are severable; therefore, if any provision of this measure be declared unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall be unaffected by such declaration.