

be an awareness that our present "something for nothing" philosophy is a path leading to the dead end of a controlled and enslaved people. Such awareness may well be impossible without an appreciation of—and an adherence to—high moral principles.

GOING ABOUT THE SOLUTION

Staff members of the Foundation have a profound faith in free men. This is one bias they have in common. They believe that others, as well as themselves, are responsible and self-controlling and, thus, can conduct their own lives better than someone else can conduct their lives for them. Further, they believe coercion to be a destructive force and, therefore, not a means to achieve creative ends. Indeed, can coercion—*initiated* force—by persons, groups, or even governments, ever be proper or useful? Quite another matter is defense—*repellent* force—against violence initiated by others; against fraud, misrepresentation, predacity, and other hazards to life and property. If coercion as a way of life is to be checked, the distinction between these two opposed forces needs to be studied and understood, and its explanations perfected and presented.

This faith in free men and these doubts about life by coercion, held by staff members

and shared by a small minority of others in the nation are, in themselves, hardly more than a first step—though an important one—toward a solution of the social cancer. The question still remains: How can a faith in free men be instilled or restored in those who lack that faith, in those whose faith is in coercion?

The answers to these questions are, as yet, not known with any certainty by any member of the Foundation staff. This acknowledgment is important—indeed, it is an essential prerequisite to anyone's diligent search for the answers. Nothing more effectively precludes the search for truth than the assumption that all the answers are now known. The continuing swing to coercion as a way of life is evidence enough that the answers concerning freedom are not widely known.

Experience, observation, and study have revealed a great number of things *not to do* if one would promote freedom. For example, in the case of physical cancer, it would appear unwise for the doctors to spend their time campaigning among the people telling them how to effect a cure that is not known. In the instance of physical cancer, a wiser course is chosen: Research institutions are competently staffed and provided with the tools for their work of discovery. The hope is that one of these days some researcher may find