

as the Greek Orthodox Youth of America volunteer time to serve as tutors or big brothers and sisters to the youth of the ghetto. One of the great curses of segregated society is the isolation of peoples. The absence of intellectual and social contact explains to a great extent the absence of understanding. Individuals, not government, must fill this vacuum.

Government's role should be limited to securing the opportunity for individual fulfillment, to making it not only possible but profitable for private individuals and private enterprise to invest their time and money in diversified human renewal projects from job training to low cost housing. Government's role also extends to assuming that lawful avenues of redress are accessible to the citizens of the ghetto, to securing the peace and assuring the swift administration of justice.

But the individual not government is the focal point of the new orthodoxy. The individual is the first line of defense in our war against violence. It is not up to the Federal Communications Commission but to individual parents to monitor television programs. No system is more responsive to public opinion than private enterprise. If enough people refuse to watch programs depicting violence, sponsors will quickly switch to more intelligent and equally amusing fare.

In the same vein, it is not enough to bemoan the Supreme Court decision banning prayer in the public schools; faith and spiritual values begin in the home. Nor is discipline in the province of the school or the court, but of the home.

Finally, the new orthodoxy provides bedrock principle as the answer to anxiety and violence. History shows that while violence will survive repression and thrive on appeasement, it will dash itself to pieces on the rocks of principle.

One of the prime contributors to our age of anxiety is the insidious relativism that has crept into our thinking. Relativism is epitomized by the agonizing of a police officer who couldn't bring himself to kill a looter over a pair of shoes, or the youngster contemplating whether he will serve as a soldier in what he considers an unjust war. But where does this line of reasoning end? Do you kill a thief over a pair of boots? — a diamond ring? When a person is looting another's property, can his depth of involvement be measured by the monetary or material value of his loot? What war is ultimately, totally just? Would it have been unjust for the United States to