



Give them homes, of course.

[at the end of this essay, you will find some related materials on the circumstances of the homeless, and how we have failed to address our own attitudes and myths in our declarations that “we are working on the problem.” It is my contention that we haven’t even identified the real problem yet. We are still so fixated on removing the homeless from our midst that we may forget there is a problem. There is one, and its closer than we think it is.]

“I am so weary of talk about the homeless as if they were the problem. They’re not. We are.” -- Red Slider, Facebook.

"What community, what society could be so deranged, so degenerate, as to deny its own kind a place to stand, sit or even lay down on the earth — Red Slider, The Sacramento ‘Z’

This essay presents two failed visions in attempts to find solution sets that address the core issues hidden in every conversation about “homelessness” and what needs to be done about it. What these alternate visions hold in common is their refusal to regard homelessness as some kind of

disease or character disorder that infects an irresponsible and unworthy subset of our population. That is the underlying mythology you will find in almost every public conversation on the matter, whether it issues from pronouncements of our public officials, or from very well-intended and necessary programs of private agencies trying to prevent the worst of deprivations suffered by those who have been so labeled and cast from the social compass of ordinary, home-provisioned life.

That mythology presents in a variety of costumes: 'The homeless are sick, addicted and mentally ill', 'The homeless are fit only for case by case mainstreaming into entry level, frayed-collar work from which they must work their way up', 'The homeless have no regard for social norms or simple decency', 'The homeless got themselves that way by laziness and personal failings of character'. On and on it goes. Whatever the costume, whatever the circumstance, one can produce some anecdote to make the case that one or another of those conditions give proof that the homeless are a less qualified, inherently flawed subspecies of human beings. Not to say that those who sleep rough don't exhibit a disproportionate number who develop serious symptoms of emotional distress and social dysfunction.

Rather, characterizing them as a group as being more subject to such maladies than any other group in our society is no different than stereotyping any group or culture. More so in that subjecting any other group or class to the same stresses that chronic homelessness brings with it, one will find comparable results in the counts and kinds of casualties.

What is presented here are two projects which were deliberately meant to ignore such opportunities for further marginalizing and demonizing the most depressed and vulnerable of all our economic classes. First of all they regard that the homeless, as a class, possess a unique identity, traditions, bonding and friendships, ways of sharing and exchange, self-protection and other means by which communities and cultures express themselves. Neither good nor bad in themselves, these techniques and presentations of homelessness are as valid as those used by any other culture group in America. Clearly, the solution sets used by the homeless to survive on a daily basis are more efficient and serviceable than many other groups. What we tried to avoid was viewing the homeless as an amalgam of isolated, individual failures.

In considering the nature of community organization within homeless populations, both of the projects presented here implicitly acknowledge the value of preserving formal and informal structures of community to the extent that the homeless, themselves, wish to do. First, of course, was to provide the homeless with homes. If that isn't the bedrock of any program for the homeless, you can be sure it isn't really going to solve anything. Moreover, they describe home ownership, not simply 'shelter' or 'tenancy'. The accrued value, we suggest, must ultimately go to and belong to the residents or the homeless community, not to those that will merely extract surplus value by passing non-productive costs along to the residents in the form of rent. That doesn't serve the poor at all. It only chains them to an already precarious existence mired in dependence and exploitation and the ever present chance of failure.

Profit-taking from the poor is not the way to solve problems of poverty and homelessness. Private or public social programs which deal with the homeless only on an individual basis are largely doing little more than replacing the devastating 'move along' policies of police and city

officials with an equally disruptive, officially endorsed ‘divide and scatter’, move-along policy which exposes the homeless to the most exploitative applications of the power and character of the “mainstream” to be found at the bottom of the ‘mainstream ladder’.

Common to the two examples in this paper is the attempt to illustrate ways that empower the homeless and associate a community with some scale of civic or community projects in a relationship of mutual real-valued exchange. The two examples given below are meant to be illustrative of possibilities for thinking beyond the narrow scope of services and programs we presently use to resolve “the homeless problem”. Most of those who work in current homeless programs will agree they are little more than temporary solutions, woefully inadequate to meet the needs and often demeaning or undignified to those who qualify. A number of common design goals were identified and embedded in both these concepts, ones that are seldom discussed in conjunction with plans for addressing homelessness. Most of all, they attempt eliminate the ‘move-along’ policies which lie just beneath the surface of most of our homeless programs and are the bedrock of the Great Divide between ‘them’ and ‘us’. These design provisions include:

- the program should be operated as democratically as possible, with the homeless trained to serve as leaders and in leadership roles and positions related to the management of their own community;
- relative privacy for the program and its beneficiaries, freedom from the types of intrusive "mainstreaming" which tend to crowd the participants with goals and ambitions coming from outside;
- available on-site, on-demand supportive services such as health, education and social service assistance which the community may find consistent and supportive with its own missions (on-site daycare, for example).
- attempt to preserve the existing positive communal social network and those elements regarded by participants as sustainable positive features of their lives;
- promote diversity within the participant population, encouraging variety in work skills, social skills, interests, leadership potentials, problem solving abilities, arts and child-nurture faculties, and many other ways the homeless present themselves as resources rather than liabilities.

Project 1. Mather Base Housing

In 1995, when Mather Air Force Base in Sacramento had been closed, there were 1100, 1-3 bedroom homes (a complete neighborhood, on-base and in pristine condition.) On a hill, overlooking this community was a church and community center. I spoke to a number of politicians and others about turning that community directly over to the working poor, students and the homeless for them to create their own community and take care of their own.

In my preliminary work I found developers, architects and other professionals who thought the idea intriguing and were interested in lending a hand. Institutions such as the Department of Social Work at Sacramento State University were interested in working closely with such a project and even showed interest in locating a campus branch facility on-site to assist new residents in such a community.

In concept, the idea was not to simply turn the houses over to the homeless and the poor. It was to use that core block of empty housing to build the nexus of a new community from which the residents could then design, operate and provide for themselves. In addition to the existing homes, there would need to be new amenities such as schools, small businesses and other supports and services in place to help the community get on its feet and become self sustaining. There was much that might have been done.

However, when I pursued the matter, stakeholders in traditional approaches to exploiting base closures, as well as non-profit community services were not interested. One city politician I spoke with said “You’re too late,” even though nothing had yet actually happened. The city was firm. As far as they were concerned, what they already had in mind was a done deal. As one public official explained, “We already have a place for the homeless. They will be housed in two enlisted mens’ dormitories. A job-training program will be available for those that qualify (for less-than-minimum wages, as interns and trainees). The dormitories will be across from the site of the new Police Academy. It’s a location from where we can keep an eye on them.” That was the attitude officials had about the homeless. My proposal got no traction or serious consideration and, of course, I did not have the juice to get it any.

So, what happened to all those “pristine houses?” When last I checked in 2015, the developer who had ultimately bought those properties stated that the homes, which had remained empty for twenty years, were so dilapidated, infected with mold and rot that they could not be salvaged and would all have to be torn down.

Expo Green - Real People, Imaginary Ideas

‘ExpoGreen’ is a concept for transforming the land-holdings of Cal Expo into a 640 acre environmental education park to serve as a nexus and global showcase for advanced technologies, environmental exhibits, along with university and college campuses dedicated to environmental engineering and sciences, and related themes. It was planned to serve as a center-piece for promoting world consciousness about the environment, along with

facilitating and encouraging products and services to sustain the repair and preservation of our planet. As a centerpiece for the new California economy, it would offer a way to shift the active responsibility for these efforts from the uncertainties of Washington, D.C. to much greater and stable commitments to be found in the capitol and state of California.

The following sections present imaginary “walk-throughs” of two venues with direct importance to the homeless, which could be included in a large scale civic project concept such as ‘ExpoGreen’. The overall project specifies a variety of facilities and exhibits associated with creating a world showcase and destination for presenting advanced environmental technologies, products, services and ideas, along with two new college campuses devoted to environmental education and research, international conference facilities, Knowledge Transfer Centers, a Culture Center, public art and performance facilities and many other venues. It was a concept for a permanent, evolving Green World’s Fair and a world-destination on the site of what is now the relatively obsolete State Fair and its 640+ surrounding acres of largely neglected, undeveloped land.

In full realization, the project might have employed something in the neighborhood of 5000 or more permanent full-time positions at all skill levels with a very long list of occupational titles. The two ‘walk-throughs’ (Imagine #17-#18) of a venue related to onsite housing for the working poor, students and the homeless, in a tiny homes setting. It moves beyond traditional ideas of programs for the homeless as a reset for a failed group or a problem which “needs to be solved”. Instead it regards the homeless, by and large, as a fully capable and important human resource that can be included in our social fabric without the need for treating them through the lenses of indignity and violence that our concepts of individualized ‘mainstreaming’ and ‘move along’ policies so often foster.

The ‘Tiny Homes Village’ concept embraces the homeless as a resource, not a liability. It relates them to performing necessary functions in the larger community that not only help keep their own community intact, but are joined to other communities in a real-valued way. The solution set contains little of the stigma of social service, welfare or other sources of humiliation that attend most traditional approaches. It is a program which presumes self-responsibility on the part of village residents from the outset, and it offers a real-valued return for that investment of responsibility. Most importantly, there is no trace of the contempt or barbaric practices of criminalization we see in our more generalized ‘move-along’ policies. For the homeless, criminalizing them on various kinds of technicalities, or employing them in court-ordered “community service” (forced labor) when they obviously can’t pay their fines is de-humanizing practice which needs to end.

But that is precisely what we now do in Sacramento (Sacramento Bee, Dec 20, 2016, 1B) as is done elsewhere. It needs to be added that ExpoGreen is an imperfect concept that has not been developed into an actual proposal. It has never received any serious official consideration nor the workups necessary to determine its feasibility. The Tiny Homes venue discussed here is only to illustrate that there are alternative ways to view the problem of homelessness. It turns around the common view of solving the “problem of homelessness”. Tiny homes and Future Life Village suggest that it may be the homeless which are needed to help those with homes to solve some serious problems in our own communities rather than

the homeless needing us to make their lives more difficult than they already are. It is no joke to suggest that a community which would deny their own kind a place to stand, sit or lay down and rest on the earth may be seriously dysfunctional. Hi Ari, Not often I can say that about you/your p

IMAGINE #17 - DESIGN YOUR LIFE

Imagine there is a small area, an acre or so, nicely landscaped with a variety of native plants and trees, a feeling of separateness, but not isolation, from the other busy fair activities and venues to the north. When one enters this area, by way of a nicely paved garden path of attractive patterned-brick, lined with fragrant smelling herbs and attractive shrubs and flowers, they come upon a small collection of houses built to a scale that makes one wonder if they have arrived at some tiny Lilliputian village. It is quiet and peaceful here and, save for a few very normal-sized people working at various projects around the grounds, there is relatively little traffic. A kind of 'space away' from the busy crowds elsewhere at Cal Expo Green, the new environmental World's Fair and showcase.

One of the workers looks over as you enter the area and breaks away from his work collecting a sample of seeds from an endangered species of native California plants which he will later test for viability and genetic resource banking. He approaches and asks if you would like to tour the collection of demonstration 'tiny homes' and see some of their features. You accept his invitation, and follow as he leads you toward one of the nearby houses. You notice, on the way, that each house is quite different in design from the others. Some are ultra-modern, of glass and steel design; some are very rural and rustic; still another seems altogether ordinary with conventional but attractive stucco exteriors with a familiar, though small-scale, front lawn and porch. Each structure seems to accentuate a different concept using different construction materials and methods.

The worker, turned guide, explains that every one of these homes has been designed to maximize efficiency and the use of resource conserving technologies. These are, indeed, 'greenhouses', in a very new application of the term. They are comfortable dwellings that can accommodate people with a variety of life-styles and needs; they do not skimp on features that people might wish in their homes, and they do not create feelings of being cramped or confined, a common myth about 'tiny houses'. They are demonstration models of how we might live well, yet with a smaller foot-print, on the lands we occupy. When we enter the first house, the guide points out various features which we'll not detail here. We do notice this one is occupied by several mannequins mimicking occupancy by two adults, two children and a dog. It presents a picture of fairly comfortable and adequate living-space for a family of 4 (and a half).

The other homes, each quite distinct in style and features, is occupied by staff of Cal Expo Green engaged in very special kinds of work. One is a horticulture station where seeds, like the ones our guide was sampling, would be taken for further analysis, grow-outs and tests which help to maintain the health of plants around a number of venues at Cal Expo Green. Another tiny home has a couple drawing tables and a desk at which staff and some architects seemed to be discussing possibilities for some new 'tiny home' designs that might be tried next year. Yet another is occupied by staff going over some kind of billing and administrative tasks and

procedures they are implementing for their project. In still another is a classroom setting where we see several people learning basic skills for work at the Sacramento County Planning Department. You surmise it is some kind of 'job training' session. You note, I use the term 'staff' here, but you will see as you read on, many of these staff are of a very special kind. The tour is over.

We take our leave and a whole lot of knowledge and pamphlets about new possibilities for living choices available in this age of consciously constructed life-styling. There is much to think about, later when we travel home from the Fair. However, we haven't seen the "Future Living" venue of the new Cal Expo adjacent this part of Tiny Village. It is over there, to the south of the small compound we visited. There is an abundance of vegetation that serves as natural barrier to keep out ordinary Fair visitors. If you happen to venture into that area, signs and staff are there to remind you that it is a 'Cal Expo Green Staff Only' area and visitors are not allowed. Privacy is important to those authorized to be on the 'Tiny Homes Village' site.

IMAGINE #18 - AND THE LAST SHALL COME FIRST

Beyond those barriers, is a reserved living section of Cal Expo Green. Quite a sizable chunk, about thirty acres. On about a half-dozen acres is sited an entire village, some one-hundred and fifty 'tiny homes' in a variety of shapes and styles. What would otherwise be very cramped high-density space is instead relatively roomy and open, owing to the scale of the houses. The character of each house is quite unique, though the entire village blends into a harmonious and consonant whole. It is a marvel of design orchestration that took considerable effort on the part of some very capable and imaginative architects. Surrounding this area of homes are a variety of features: public commons areas and open spaces, cooperative community gardens and farms, outdoor and indoor daycare facilities, a Village Community Center and Kitchen, and several children's play parks.

There is even a village general store, a hardware and a small movie theater. There are no automobiles, of course, but there is ample parking for the small electric vehicles the residents use for travel within the Cal Expo Green boundaries, to and from work, along with fast-charging stations that provide free recharging for these 'mini-cars'. Two city bus lines also have stops in Tiny Village. Future Life Village is something to see, the best technology and the best design that modern ingenuity can provide. But these descriptions, wonderful as they may be, are not the real wonder of the place. It is the people who live there. 'Future Life Village' as we shall dub it here (in reality, the people who first lived there chose their own name for the place), is a project organized and created by a consortium of local and regional organizations. Housing and advocacy groups, city and regional redevelopment agencies, local academic institutions, foundations and businesses of many types all lent their expertise, effort and money to make the project a reality; and, still do.

The real creators of the project, however, are the people who live in Future Life Village. They come from a variety of places. Some are students from local universities. Some are relatively low-income workers who could not otherwise afford to buy a home. Some are local artists. Yet another group, the largest source from which residents are drawn, are homeless people from Sacramento. Some are families, some are single individuals; some younger, some older; some casualties of the economic downturn, some chronically stuck in a life situation which they

themselves do not desire. A few (from any of the above sources) may have some emotional and mental health issues that have barred them from improving their circumstances; problems that would not impact their chances of success, nor result in undue disturbances to the community. It is amazing how many who had been labeled 'mentally ill' recover quickly once the stresses of 'sleeping rough' have been lifted from their shoulders. In short, the people of 'Future Life Village' are about as diverse and varied in their interests and needs and character as those of any community in Sacramento. They are no different than any of our neighbors; except that circumstances do not permit them, at present, to be our neighbors.

What all of these populations have in common is: 1) they all are in circumstances in which there is little prospect of buying a home (the student-drawn population may be an exception to this general idea, but there are special reasons and goals set aside for them); 2) they all have a strong desire to change their circumstances, to join the general society on their own terms and to join in sharing in its responsibilities as well its rewards. For the students and artists, this would be framed somewhat differently though there are similar features in their life-designs as well; 3) they are all committed to working on their own and with the other members of the community to make the Future Life project a success.

Once qualified, the new Future Life Village resident is explained the details of the project. They will be able to own a home, a 'Future Life', small-footprint home. They will also be offered employment at Cal Expo Green. Employment is not only tailored to each individual's skills and needs, they will all be jobs leading to advancement, career development and, most of all, their own interests. Residents may have to try out several job development paths before finding the one that really suits them, but that is to be expected. Residency in Future Life Village is not free. The first group of residents who came to Future Live Village didn't even find houses there. They lived in tents, trailers and improvised temporary dwellings for quiet some time. It was their job, along with assistance from architects, builders, landscapers, farmers and others who had professional experience and know-how to offer, to create the first set of homes and other amenities that would come to take shape as 'Future Life Village'.

There were meetings and discord and complaints and, yes, even a few who did not choose to stay in the project. But as time passed, things did take shape and a very tired but inspired and hopeful group of people started to meld themselves into a community that today, though one generally out of public view, deliberately avoiding media attention, takes substantial and well-deserved pride in what they have accomplished. How does it work? Well the home building part was relatively easy and had a good deal of experience to draw upon, namely from models such as those developed by "Habitat for Humanity" and similar organizations using 'sweat equity' and similar means to turn over home ownership to people who otherwise were left out of the home buying market.

But there are some special conditions of living at 'Future Life' which other models had never attempted. More than 'Entry', Less than 'Goal' To begin with, residency in the village is not permanent. It is limited to say, five or ten years. It was never intended that residents would live out their lives at the village. The village is a starting place, a launching platform that will provide residents with sufficient resource, knowledge and motivation to move out into the larger society and continue to improve their lives well beyond the limits of what "Future Life" can offer them.

However, it is by no means some kind of disguised entry level, temporary solution, “job training” social development program, or mainstreaming substitute for a self-made life. It is the various kinds of equity that “Future Life” offers that permits this to happen. First, for the original group of residents, there was the initial ‘sweat equity’. Added to that is that a certain and reasonable sum is taken from their regular salary each month and put into an equity savings fund which will be turned over to them at the end of their residency, with interest. The salary comes from various kinds of employment at Cal Expo, some quite challenging and interesting, some entry-level work; but, always, the jobs offered to the residents of ‘Future Village’ have clear opportunities for advancement, may require continuing education and development on the part of the worker and, above all, are useful and worthwhile jobs that one can take pride in and Cal Expo needs to have done. There are no ‘charity’ or ‘make work’ jobs. And employment will pay a living wage for Tiny Village residents.

Jobs may range from those requiring only hands-on experience, to those needing extensive apprenticeship or preparatory schooling. They may range from familiar service and maintenance jobs to very specialized science and science support occupations. We met a few of those workers, ones that were employed at the village itself as we toured the demonstration ‘tiny houses’ just outside of the village proper. All of the regular staff at that venue, incidentally, including its managers, are also village residents. Residents also work elsewhere at Cal Expo, as well; in the offices, in the exhibit and demonstration venues, in the sales and marketing divisions, on the demonstration environments and, just about everywhere else on the Cal Expo site. During the limited time that one can participate in the project, some residents have risen to managerial positions; an achievement that is really quite remarkable, considering the time it takes to accomplish a similar advancement out in the general business world. Some residents find that they simply like gardening or plumbing or other trades positions and have no desire to ‘advance’ in the ordinary sense. The work they do offers its own status and reward for them. This is fine too, as long as it leads to financial stability, developed skills and a suitable stake when they leave the project and go on to fashion their own future life. Additional equity might derived from certain grants and other financial instruments offered by HUD and other sources. One Foundation, for example, found the project so interesting and valuable that it offered to put up matching funds upon a resident’s successful completion of the project in an amount equal to the amount a resident had set aside from his salary.

No resident who complied with requirements of the project is compelled to leave before they have accumulated enough equity to find and buy a suitable home in their new location. The one radical change from the ordinary home markets we are all familiar with is that Future Life homes can be owned but they cannot be bought or sold. There is no ‘cash value’ assigned to the value of a village home and none of the homes or facilities there can be converted into cash. People need homes and the homes are for occupancy, not investment. There are ‘housing credit’ values which are assigned to each home and, from which cash equivalents can be calculated. These equivalencies may be used to determine the mustering out equities that are due a departing resident; for the sweat equity in building the home, for sweat equities that later occupants might invest in making improvements or in maintenance they elect to do themselves or, in some other related manner. But, the homes themselves remain outside of the cash markets. The one exception to this is that some of the housing credit value of village homes can be “cashed in” to purchase materials or services for improvements and repairs as needed. However, even this must

be reconverted into housing credits (paid back) by the resident either from sweat equity arrangements or from payments from their salary, made over time.

There are other sources of equity income. Everyone does some work at the village itself, in addition to their regular employment. Some, such as the daycare specialists, farm or garden managers, store clerks and other essential positions are full-time and fulfill the employment requirements, as well as equity investments for the project. Others, such as farm and garden work, general village upkeep, daycare aides, and such, are part-time, equity-fulfillment jobs done on week-ends or at other available times. There are many types of work that people do in maintaining the necessary elements of village life. Some offer equity payment in return; some are simply voluntary and non-paid tasks that people do because it is needed and because it is good for their community.

Thus, a fair number of formerly homeless people and working poor, who could not have hoped to gain entry into a reasonably secure and sustaining middle-class life, gain that passage by designing their own future lives; the way they had imagined it might be, but had never dared hope for it before. There is much, much more to be seen and learned about the “Future Life Village Project”. The students and artists, are special classes of residents (though indistinguishable from other residents in their community roles and other activities). Their inclusion adds some needed “class/goal” diversity and energy to the general character of the residents, in that, unlike the other people of Future Life Village they do not share in the common experience of difficulties that qualifies other residents for participation. Students and artists come to the project already engaged in a substantial positive work-choice commitments prior to qualifying for the project. They are already hopeful and engaged in the process of building their portfolios and applying their creative energy. Both populations are usually very skilled at finding and using resources that the poor have generally been excluded from acquiring. Generally speaking, students and artists are less likely (though not always) to be conditioned by mythologies and prejudices that create barriers to forming mutual relationships with people of other classes and life circumstances.

There is also one other very important advantage that students and artists bring with them to the Future Life community. There have been numerable studies demonstrating that positive role models have a direct bearing on the future success of the children of a community. One, very early, study (cit.?) had shown that an overwhelming number of children who lived within a mile of a major airport facility eventually took careers related to the airline industry (pilots, stewards, aircraft designers and engineers, mechanics, air-traffic controllers and the like). The inclusion of artists and students in the makeup of Future Life will undoubtedly contribute greatly to modeling healthy accomplishment and creativity to the children of the village. Students and artists, need not do anything special. By virtue of their presence they impart messages of the value of education and the rewards of hard work and application simply doing what they do. Artists, in particular, add another quality of role modeling that is quite essential and upon which no price can be set. In their choice of life-design, artists, more than most people, understand that there is far more to a satisfying or productive life than simply financial success. Knowing that art-making is not likely to result in getting wealthy or even making one financially comfortable, artists have had to consciously face the choice, do I wish to make a lot of money or, do I want to do what I want to do? They can dream about money, but most of them know they are making a

sacrifice when they choose to become artists.

While it is true, one of the objectives of the project is to insure that everyone in it can eventually leave with the benefit of having gained a measure of sustainable economic security and the capacity to purchase their own home, it is equally important that the achievement of that goal does not overshadow a more important underlying purpose. Gaining wealth at the cost of personal satisfaction and self-expression with what one does in their life is a terrible price to pay for security. Artists, on the whole, are not a wealthy class. Most do not own their own home and few can afford to do so. But, they do model that even modest circumstances can be filled with creativity, resourcefulness, joy, useful productions and other qualities that money cannot buy. The success of the project, especially for the children, will depend on that knowledge being made available to other residents. This leads to one final observation.

The project, as a whole, has one source of modeling under the alternate proposal that is of enormous value. That is, their proximity to the realized vision of Cal Expo Green as it is outlined in the proposal concept. Recall that Cal Expo is envisioned as a world-class venue and showcase for the most advanced technologies, products and activities of the 21st century. The people and venues of Cal Expo, to which the residents of Future Life Village will be exposed on a daily basis, are at the leading edge of discovery and success in the modern world. There is even a campus of a major university and a variety of research stations included in the alternate vision. There are people working at Cal Expo from all walks of life who have achieved successes, both material and spiritual, that most people hardly imagine for themselves. At Future Life, the dreams and the possibilities of achieving that success are but a very short distance from one's doorstep. Residents at the village will work and play, in their everyday lives, among Cal Expo Green's vision of the future and people who are actually bringing that future into existence. Whatever the price-tag might be for building and sustaining the Future Life venue, the rewards to those who participate in the project will certainly be of far greater value. Indeed, the Future Life project gives new meaning to the phrase, "And the last shall come first."

- red slider, December 17, 2016

Related Materials: ['Wringing in the Homeless'](#) - The Sacramento 'Z', Feb 2015
'Orwell's ['The Spike'](#) and ['Down and Out in Paris and London'](#)