

exploited the memories to both interpret and shape the risk-based landscape of global capitalism since the cities founding.” It seems obvious to me that the Moravians have an unseen, if not appreciated, control over the past, present, and future control of Bethlehem’s history. Looking at events in Bethlehem more closely, the lead players in this transition had ties to the Moravian community. The lead developer and co-founder of Beth Works was a graduate of Moravian College, as was his primary rival, who teamed up with Foxwoods Casino. Furthermore, the developer and part-owner of Martin Towers was also a Moravian College grad, as was the mayor of Bethlehem. They, like myself, were not vested directly in Bethlehem Steel—none of them, as far as I know, had any interest in The Steel—that is, in working there. And there were many more like them who fall outside of this book’s central narrative.

From *Steel to Slots* portrays the transition from industrial to postindustrial as a narrative of winners and losers propelled by an expanding global neoliberalism. It portrays a new world, greased by fluid monetary assets and facilitated by online communications. We have yet to find ways to manage and control this world. In this sense it would appear that the world economy has become a speculative game, one that values steel mills no more than casinos, and casinos no more than anything else. Still, to me, the economic and cultural cost—the human cost—of turning Bethlehem Steel into a casino has been too steep.

Because this was part of my history, I could not help but admire this analysis, the back story, and the individual players, the former steelworkers, and the casino magnates cast as the villains. I lived parts of this book and I remember something different. The book is not about me. Nevertheless, it is true to its source materials, and it shines a welcome light on the story of people directly affected by The Steel’s demise.

LOUIS RODRIQUEZ
Kutztown University

Andrew R. Murphy. *Liberty, Conscience & Toleration: The Political Thought of William Penn* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016). Pp. 320. Notes, index. Cloth, \$74.00.

In this intellectual biography of William Penn, Andrew Murphy uses Penn’s writings to trace the development of his political theory while placing

Penn and his work in the historical context of Restoration England. This contextual approach leads to a deeper understanding of Penn's theory on toleration, or liberty of conscience, and encourages a balanced assessment of the choices he made as he worked to put his theory into practice in Pennsylvania. As Murphy shows, Penn, like many other intellectuals of his day, theorized about politics, but unlike most, Penn also experimented and tried to put his ideas into practice. This unique position makes him an ideal case study for examining not just the theoretical aspects of religious toleration, but also the practical application of religious freedom and the challenges involved in creating a society that allowed individuals to openly follow the religious creed of their own choice rather than one prescribed by the state. His efforts in Pennsylvania set him "apart from contemporaries who outlined theories of toleration yet were never forced to grapple with the concrete practicalities of governance" (x). According to Murphy, four "major political episodes" affected Penn's development as both a political thinker and an actor: the controversy over the Second Conventicle Act, the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, the founding of Pennsylvania, and the reign of James II.

Murphy begins by explaining how, although Penn never produced a major canonical work on the subject, his political thought was foundational "in the emergence of toleration as both a philosophical principle and a political reality" (12). Penn lived and wrote during an age in which individuals more openly questioned laws that forced them to follow the Church prescribed by their monarch, and this questioning led to a number of arguments for toleration. But, as Murphy points out, "toleration," which is often seen simply as "liberty of conscience," was a complex matter that involved questions not just of conscience but also of behavior. Catholics, Quakers, and other non-conformists wanted not only to believe as they chose, but also to act upon their beliefs through customs and church attendance. Those who sought to uphold the status quo by maintaining the custom of having the government support an established church argued that people could believe whatever they wanted, so long as they conformed to laws requiring them to outwardly follow the state church. Men like Penn maintained that this was not good enough. They insisted upon the right to meet in groups and worship as they chose. This was a direct violation of the Conventicle Act, which forbade religious assemblies of more than five people. Penn's arrest for this infraction led to his famous trial, which in turn led to "Bushel's Case," a case that resulted in the right of jury nullification.

Murphy shows that Penn's understanding of toleration had far-reaching implications that affected people beyond the Society of Friends in both the colonies and the mother country. His theories relied on a range of toleration arguments—from Christian to historical/political to epistemological/psychological to prudential/interest-based—to make his case, emphasizing different facets of his argument in accordance with the political context of any given moment and taking maximum advantage of any opportunity to make his case for allowing freedom of conscience and worship. All the while, he had to contend with discourses of orthodoxy and uniformity that, as Murphy showed, made perfect sense to many people still in recovery from the turmoil of civil war and religious dictatorship under Oliver Cromwell.

Penn entered the movement for religious tolerance shortly after his Quaker conviction (conversion) led him into the Conventicle Act controversy. He and William Mead were arrested for disturbing the peace by preaching on the street after their meetinghouse had been closed by authorities. Penn used their trial to present “an impassioned defense of religious assembly and the rights of Englishmen” (23), and he published a dramatized transcript of it to make a case for toleration to a wider audience. It was this publication that made Penn a widely known figure in the toleration movement as he brought together a number of important arguments that had been circulating in England and presented them in one place.

Penn's ideas on toleration were fairly typical of a broader current of theory that emerged during the Restoration, but what set him apart was his effort in founding, promoting, and governing Pennsylvania. Murphy discusses how Penn's theories were worked out on the ground in the colony, arguing that early Pennsylvania provided “both a concrete example of Penn's practical political career and a way to highlight both the importance and the limits of political theory to the study of politics” (126). He also compares Penn, who developed a theory and then set out to test it in reality, to Roger Williams, who developed theories in response to his reality in the colonies.

In Penn's fight for liberty of conscience and practice, he ended up supporting James II's unilateral efforts to impose toleration by royal decree, and this move backfired and ruined him politically. His efforts to put his theories in place in the colonies ruined him financially, and he found himself in debtor's prison.

Perhaps the best feature of *Liberty, Conscience & Toleration* is that it places Penn in a historical context that makes it easier to understand his opponents, his theories, and his behavior. Murphy provides a thorough analysis of the

key figures and writings that opposed toleration, explaining their sincere belief that religious liberty would lead to a repeat of the unrest of the 1640s and 1650s, a tumultuous time that included civil war and regicide. He does not excuse their resistance, but he shows the complexity of both sides of the debate. He also writes about Penn in a balanced way, admitting his limits. Though Penn argued for toleration, he never pushed for disestablishment of the Church of England, so Murphy shows how his ideas may have laid the groundwork for the notion of separating Church and State, but he explains that Penn himself did not quite make it that far.

The William Penn who emerges from this account is a complex man, dedicated to egalitarian ideas of toleration yet deeply affected by his own belief in hierarchy and deference. What appeared to be a shift in political loyalties from support for Parliament to support for the king actually makes sense when viewed from the perspective of someone who wanted, above all, to secure toleration. Penn's puzzling absence from his colony (he lived in Pennsylvania for only four years), which Murphy contends "virtually ensured that his high hopes for Pennsylvania would go unfilled" (10), even makes sense when his long-term work in England is taken into account. In the end, Penn's colony grew prosperous, but the proprietor never gained the economic success he sought. The success of his holy experiment and its offering of liberty of conscience and action to the settlers fell on shaky ground at times, but in the end it played an important part in shaping the American concept of the separation of Church and State. Murphy's insightful intellectual biography gives scholars and general readers who just know Penn in the American context an opportunity to understand him on a deeper level by explaining clearly the English background that led Penn to participate in New World colonization. This complex Penn is even more intellectual and interesting than many may realize.

BEVERLY C. TOMEK

University of Houston–Victoria