cially in the "sexual revolution," but here again there have been great denominational differences.32

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

The data assembled in this paper give evidence of a lively concern for the freedom of personal conscience at the same time they show the imperious nature of law in a sovereign country. Court cases in large number preserve individual freedom of belief and of action, but they also show the reality of political control. The grooming of servicemen and policemen may be regulated in the name of discipline, people may be forced to accept medical treatment to which they conscientiously object, for their minor children at least, in the name of public welfare, and state controls are becoming larger in employment practices, housing, health, education, welfare, and business competition.

Nevertheless, within limits of court defined public and personal safety, religious expression remains free in America. Although the sovereign state continues to increase its influence and control in more and more areas of human life, it continues to recognize and adhere to the requirements of the First Amendment. If the time comes when the government takes over religion, it will be because the churches have invited it into the tent, so to speak, by accepting piecemeal grants and subsidies (and their inevitable controls). This has begun to happen in increasing aid to private schools. It could easily become more strongly entrenched by the year 2000 A.D.

Levels of personal freedom and tolerance probably will continue to grow, and privately supported pluralistic religion, protected by sovereign law, probably will prevail despite increasing state aid and control in a heavily secularistic twenty-first century.

32 see Dialogue, Summer Issue, 1976.