

GRAND OPENING

Briarwood Park

\$23,900 - \$24,500
 * PAYMENTS OF \$125.00 MONTH
 FREE...6' REDWOOD FENCE...FREE
 TO FIRST BUYERS

CUSTOM BUILT HOMES

- FIREPLACES
- CUSTOM LIGHTING
- INSULATION
- LANDSCAPING
- POURED AIR HEATING
- DISHWASHER
- BRASS TUBS
- WALLS
- WARRANTED APPLIANCES
- 100% NYLON CARPET
- CERAMIC TILE
- OIL GAS LIGHTING
- CUSTOM PAINTING
- CUSTOM PAINTING

SOLANO & TROWER AVE., NAPA

SAM J. HARRIS CONST. CO.

255-5166 or 255-4055

MODELS OPEN

DAILY FROM 12 NOON

FROM \$17,950

SUTHERLAND PARK

3 & 4 BEDROOMS WITH FAMILY ROOM

* G.I.'S BONUS MOVES YOU IN * MINIMUM DOWN PAYMENT

TRADE IN YOUR PRESENT HOME OR WE WILL GUARANTEE SALE OF YOUR HOME

"IF YOU CAN BUY A HOME IN NAPA LIKE THESE, FOR LESS MONEY... YOU'D BETTER BUY IT!"

DIRECTIONS: Rt. Helena Highway to Redwood Road, West on Redwood Road to MacLeod, turn left to MacLeod to the model homes.

GUS J. SOUZA - BUILDER

LARRY MILLHOUSE - REALTOR

3840 BEL AIR PLAZA, NAPA 255-1222



SKYVIEW TERRACE

FLEMING AVE., EAST

YOU ARE A STEP AHEAD in a value packed home by TEICHEIRA. Custom-designed with features for the entire family. Dad (and mother, too) will be especially impressed with the maintenance-free construction of these fine homes. Large 3 or 4 bedroom plans are available. A few choice view lots are still obtainable.

SEE MODELS TODAY

NOON TIL 7 P.M. (EXCEPT THURS.)

E. TEICHEIRA & SONS

644-3238 642-9136 642-9619

FRENCH REALTY INC.

643-0171

- 2 bedroom, 1 bath. Large lot. Newly decorated. \$15,500
- 2 bedroom, 1 bath. Large lot. Full dining room. \$15,500
- 2 bedroom, 1 bath. 3 years old. Carpets, drapes, patio. \$16,650
- 2 bedroom, 1 bath. Fully equipped, large yard. \$17,500
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Low payments to be assumed. \$22,000
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. VACANT. Move in on credit approval. \$18,500
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Carpet, patio, landscape. \$18,500
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Owner will carry 2nd. \$19,000
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Full 1/2 x 1/2 patio. Extra. \$20,500
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Wall to wall carpet. Drapes, patio. \$20,500
- 2 bedroom, 2 bath. Assume 1/2 x 1/2 loan. Owner will help. \$20,550
- 4 ACRE RANCH - Lowly rustic home. Pool. \$20,000
- COMMERCIAL LOTS AVAILABLE. Excellent location. \$20,000
- INCOME PROPERTY - 2 on 1. Owner will finance. \$20,000

COMPLETE REALTY SERVICE AVAILABLE THROUGH OUR PROPERTY MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

11111 BOYD 643-6666 PAT VALINZ 643-6134

644-3824 MEL RODRICK 643-0612

BILL FIERCE C KOZLOSKY

PRAYER FOR YOUR JOURNEY

May God grant to you on your journey a glorious adventure. May you never see sunshine. May you behold nature in its overwhelming glory. May you enjoy the freedom of the road. May your vacation time be a time of physical recreation and spiritual restoration, bringing peace of mind, strength of spirit, quietness of heart, and the happiness of health to all of you; in the name of the Son of God, towering in stature above every tree that grows. Amen.

—Elwell M. Drew, San Diego, Calif., minister, North Park Community Advent Christian Church.

EDITORIALS

Firmness Eases Tension

Even as the Soviet Union rearms the Arabs and sends them military and political missions, critics of the Johnson administration blame U.S. policy in Vietnam for undercutting the so-called detente with Moscow.

Underlying their argument is the notion that a warmer, softer relationship with the Soviets was achieved for a while by extraordinary displays of good will. It could have been maintained, they say, by our not doing anything to anger Russia—like fighting in Vietnam.

Since times like the nuclear test ban treaty, reduced European tensions and a mood of continental prosperity are seen as the direct products of detente, the critics deem it to be of greater importance.

They are undisturbed that the Russians for their part do not see the kind of good with which the critics want to display. Soviet misbehavior in Arab lands is almost excused as an understandable response to our "falling from grace" in Vietnam. They insist that we, not Moscow, must take the soft initiatives.

History puts these notions in a rather curious light. The record indicates that the detente which the critics speak of was not newly invented, generous attitudes by American leaders toward Russia, but from U.S. firmness in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

In his book, "The Atlantic Community," New York Times correspondent Drew Middleton writes:

"This was the great divide in East-West relations since the war. The relaxation of Soviet military pressure in the Caribbean was accompanied by a sensible relaxation of political pressure in Germany and West Berlin. . . . In a shrunken nuclear world, a nation that backs down in one area backs down in all."

He adds that easing of external Soviet pressure on Germany and West Berlin was a necessary "foremost cause" of the relaxed mood that allowed Europe to turn happily to its own inner concerns.

The historical support is immense for this argument that the missile crisis was of crucial pertinence in softening Moscow's pressure.

Though memories of the time have quickly dimmed, East-West tensions over Berlin were in fact worse in 1962 than at any time since the Berlin blockade ended in 1949.

The first nine months of 1962 were an anguished catalogue of Soviet threats and air harassment on the approaches to Berlin—all intended to loosen the West's grip on that city. On July 13, Nikita Khrushchev flatly demanded that the West pull out of Germany.

On Oct. 9, exactly one week before President Kennedy received his first hand information on Soviet missiles in Cuba, he spoke of the "great crisis" in Berlin.

Sunday, Oct. 28, Khrushchev's decision to take out the missiles ended the perilous Cuban episode. The Soviet leader was a different man when he next spoke at a press conference. Said he:

"We do not want Berlin, we do not need it."

With the easing on Cuba, he said, there no longer was need of a "summit." It would be a good time, he added, to renew serious talks on a test ban treaty.

That was Nov. 7. Three weeks later, an official Soviet statement called for a Berlin settlement but said nothing about the Allies getting out. On Dec. 4, 1962, East German leader Walter Ulbricht said, talked on Berlin.

From that time on, there have been no major, enduring harassments over Berlin. Moscow has not once indicated, since 1962, that Berlin is on its list of critical issues.

On July 25, 1965, the test ban pact was initiated. Other easings followed. The detente grew. But present events in the Middle East show how fragile it was, and history reveals how it was really born.

Opinions of The People

Anyone in the Greater Vallejo Area is privileged to send letters to "Opinions of The People," an open forum of public opinion. Opinions in this column, however, do not necessarily represent the policy of the publisher. Letters must be confined to 200 words or less. You must sign your name and address, but your name will not be published if you make such a request and addressed to The Editor, Times-Herald.

OPINIONS OF THE PEOPLE:

Honorable Luther E. Gibson
 Editor, Publisher
 Vallejo: Times-Herald
 Dear Senator Gibson:
 I read your editorial "Adding Zip to the Zip Code" in Thursday, July 28th, Vallejo Times-Herald with great interest. We appreciate the continued and constructive support of your newspaper.

Regarding the specific suggestion, personally I think it is very good. The Post Office Department, in its manual, section 122.6, provides for the following:

44. ZIP CODE (code should appear on the last line of both the address of destination and return address following the city and state. A space not less than two-thirds inch nor more than six tenths inch is to be left between the last letter of the state and first digit of the Code. A comma should not be inserted between the state name and ZIP Code. Example:

Mr. Henry Brown
 1234 Main Avenue
 Chicago, IL 60632

When the state name is abbreviated, the use of a period is optional so long as the space precedes the ZIP Code.

For large volume mailers where space is often factors make the postmarking shown in the manual, section 122.6, provides for the following:

It is immediately beneath the city and state and so characters or digits either precede or follow it. Example:

Mr. Harold Jones
 1079 High Street
 Springfield National Park, AR 71061

You will note that the second example is the same as your editorial. Thank you again and with every best wish. I am,

THOMAS J. MCCAFFREY
 Postmaster

OPINIONS OF THE PEOPLE:

I would like to relate an incident which happened July 21st, 1965, in the Vallejo area.

Early in the morning, I noticed a car which my wife and I were driving was being followed by a car which was obviously very fast.

I called the police, but they did not seem to be too concerned. He advised me not to touch the animal, but to call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

I did not do so, but I did call the Vallejo Police Department and let them handle it.

OPINIONS OF THE PEOPLE:

Governor Ronald Reagan

Sacramento, California

Dear Governor Reagan:

What is the state? Such a simple question.

I was asked to give a simple answer, after visiting the State Assembly. I am not at all sure.

Many times mention was made of "the state." Usually it went like this: "This law says fees high enough that it actually costs the state nothing."

In the discussion I heard, there were laws for barbers and laws for beauticians. A barber can cut hair in a barber shop. He cannot cut hair in a beauty shop. A beautician can cut hair in a beauty shop, but not in a barber shop.

But women can get their hair cut in a barber shop, and now there are beauty shops that "style" men's hair. Of course, it is strictly against the law for a beautician to fix a "hair-do" for a gentleman. And, yes, there is a state board for barbers, and another state board for cosmeticians. Each barber shop must have a license. So also must each barber. And each beautician shop must have a license. And each cosmetician. And there are barber inspectors and cosmetician inspectors, each of whom drives around all day inspecting barber shops and beauty shops. And the license fees are set high enough that all the money goes into the state treasury.

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

Now they are even talking about a law to "free" the state treasury. These legislators are not thinking of the people. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

It is not really that "free" what those legislators mean by "the state." I used to think that a state was a place and its people—the only thing that was "the state." But these legislators are not thinking of the people. To them "the state" is only the government. As far as they are concerned, anything which costs the government nothing is "free." But actually these things cost the state people. The PEOPLE of this state. That is, if a barber must pay a high license fee, he must also pay the cost of the license fee, or go out of business. So he raises his prices. And the people pay for something which "costs the state nothing."

Maybe there should be a law against laws which "cost the state nothing." If the government had to contribute something from the general fund, our legislators would learn to be more careful. All these inspectors, and cosmetician inspectors, they have in mind the state treasury. And they need salaries, and desk space, and so on each town gets a "free" "free" office building. And this building "costs the state nothing." But, of course, all this costs the PEOPLE of this state.

