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The last chapter introduces the rules associated with money in the surrogacy market. Surrogates are trained and socialized to accept surrogacy as paid work. However, they are not allowed to frame it as reproductive work primarily for the purpose of profit or monetary reward. This contradiction makes surrogates invisible among the scope of traditional occupations.

Surrogacy is a rapidly growing occupation in recent years, and acknowledgement of this type of work as an occupation still has social, ethical, religious, and legal strictures in American society. This book documents the processes, relationships, and structures of American gestational surrogacy and provides original and thoughtful insights into the world of contemporary reproduction. Overall, this a book of very readable research, accessible to anyone interested in understanding more about the gestational surrogacy. This book should become a valuable reference for policymakers to reconsider strengths, challenges, and future of surrogacy in the U.S., as well as the rights of surrogates and other relevant parties.

Yanfeng Xu
The School of Social Work
University of Maryland, Baltimore


The contention of this book is that Donald Trump’s rise to the American presidency produced a crisis so profound that the reaction in its wake could be a harbinger of democratic renewal. Stated this way, especially if it had come from a group of lesser lights, this would easily strike the reader as partisan wishful thinking at best, to be dismissed as some sort of naïve neo-Hegelian political negative dialectic. But this particular group of writers is hardly partisan; they span from center-left to center-right, and they all are easily counted among the top ten of current American public intellectuals. So without a doubt, when they speak with one voice on matters of social policy,
even in a consciously non-academic, though well-documented forum, such as this book, they do command our attention.

The Trump phenomenon, they write, did not come out of the blue yonder, but has been brewing piecemeal in the Republican party for decades. If Trump himself represents anything of note, it is in his ability to gather together many of the disparate but increasingly radicalized strands of ideological voices presented in one form or another in the Republican coalition. These include voices of populist religion, nationalism, nativism and economic protectionism. Over the past few decades, the Republican establishment has been relatively successful in playing each of these factions off against one another, with each feeling itself heard just enough to remain within the Republican umbrella. Trump reveals the long-term instability of this coalition; the Republican establishment has been increasingly preparing for its own demise. Trump exposes the Republican establishment’s unwillingness to really push the agenda of any of these factions to conclusion, while he, Donald J. Trump, is the standard bearer for actually doing so.

In the demise of the Republican establishment, these writers see a great opportunity for a new era of democratic renewal. But for this to happen, there must be a clear vision set forth of compelling and practical ideas and policies that can rally the support not only of those who voted against Trump in the 2016 election, but also of that significantly large faction of voters who did vote for Trump but are now quite dissatisfied with the results.

The first and longest part of the book is devoted to analysis of how the ground was prepared for Trump throughout the post-War period, but especially since the rise of Ronald Reagan. Chapters devoted to the dog whistles of race and class offer significant insights into veins of resentment and discontent stoked by political and media culture warriors for many years, largely under the radar of those not tuned in to it directly. Alternative media sources on the right continuously eroded the respect and authority for the norms of social reporting based on deep research and garnering of factual data. This coincided with a growing sense that “minority rule” was not only legitimate but even inevitable in the complex world of modern America.

This aspect of “minority rule” deserves special attention, as it has a long history in the American republic. Although we Americans think of ourselves as a democracy, and democracy
means rule by majority, there have always been compromises to this principle. Our sacred Bill of Rights, as well as other amendments to the U.S. Constitution, can be seen in many ways as anti-democratic in spirit. That is to say, they are explicitly constituted to put limits on rule by majority. Likewise, many of the compromises allowing for a United States to emerge at all are explicitly tuned to give smaller and less populated states outsized power in relation to larger and more populated states.

An obvious example of this is simply the fact that every state has two senators. Thus Wyoming has one U.S. Senator representing approximately 290,000 citizens (half of the state population) while California has one U.S. Senator representing approximately 19 million citizens. In other words, in terms of representative power in the federal legislature, a Wyoming citizen has something like 65 times that of a California citizen. Similarly lopsided power distribution favoring minority rule is found in many areas of government, most notably for the Trump election, in the Electoral College. It needs to be emphasized that while Republicans and conservatives of late have been very effective in efforts to increase their minority ruling power through highly gerrymandered voting districts and partisan purging of voter registration lists, it has been Democrats and liberals who for decades reflexively moved to bypass majoritarian political solutions to social policy in favor of judicial solutions. The point here is not to pose questionable equivalencies, but simply to underline that the drift we have seen away from the slow process of consensus building and toward the notion that a legislative faction of 50% plus one is a sufficient mandate to authorize imposition of an even radical social policy agenda has been brewing for decades and has been utilized across the political spectrum. Trumpism would be unimaginable if these practices were not already firmly in place.

Part Two of this book looks at what can be done in the arena of social policy to create new democratic norms and values in the near and more distant future in America. These authors contend that the absolute bottom line for a way forward is a reassessment of our economic system, the distribution of costs and rewards within that system, and a strong and steady move away from “winner takes all” policies and toward policies facilitating more economic equality. We must assume that once we get into the weeds, Dionne, Ornstein and Mann would have substantive
disagreements on the details. Yet the very fact that this basic demand for curbing current practices is agreed upon by writers representing the Brookings, American Enterprise and Manhattan Institutions respectively, is itself an important fact.

In further chapters, these authors outline ideas for reviving an understanding of patriotism based on mutual respect among citizens rather than jingoistic nativism, and on reviving and expanding more traditional norms of behavior in the political sphere. This latter point is quite interesting because, as is shown throughout this book, much of what we value most about the American social and political system is based not in laws per se but rather in the implicit behavioral norms we expect from politicians. While these norms have certainly been tested at various times in our history, appeals to these norms (basic honesty, civility toward and respect for the integrity of opponents) also have carried strong authority in the face of violations. Think, for example, of Joseph Welch’s public challenge to Joe McCarthy—“Have you after all no sense of decency, sir?”—which historians of the era often cite as the turning point in McCarthy’s communist witch-hunting. Beginning at least with Republican Newt Gingrich’s skillful use of C-Span cameras to launch his “back bench” campaign against leading House Democrats, and then on to the founding of the so-called Tea Party and Freedom Caucus groups among Republicans, it has become an explicit tactic to loudly violate these “norms of decency” in relation to political opponents. Violation of these norms is not illegal, and thus respect for these norms cannot be legislated. Trump has been the master at such norm violation, turning it not only against Democrats but against the Republican establishment itself. At the same time, Trump’s flaunting and flagrant violations drive home the point that restoration of norms is an essential component of a post-Trump revival of democracy and a civil society.

While I highly recommend this book, especially for those in our profession who, even as we speak, are giving serious thought to those elements we need to include in future policy discussions, I have to say that the phrase going through my mind most often while reading this book was “that’s a lot easier said than done!” I tend to agree with these authors’ contention that a heavily skewed economy lays at the root of our current situation. If that means anything, it is that our current situation is contoured by decades of neo-liberal exaltation of money as the highest good.
According to neoliberal logic then, those who have money and wealth will utilize it with increasing precision to create for themselves even more money and wealth. This being the case, we are not now simply in need of better social and economic policies. We are in need of a rather thoroughgoing spiritual revolution, a broadly cultural change in values throughout our entire society away from neoliberal exaltation of money, profits and wealth display. Frankly, I don’t see anything nearly so fundamental coming from these authors. They seem confident that the reward of a future sustainable and pleasantly civil society shared by all is sufficient to maintain allegiance to their vision. I am much less confident. It is a replay of the old commons dilemma, in which the common good of all is pitted against the selfish good of individuals. The results when such games are played out in human history are not usually very encouraging.

Nevertheless, we do need to be thinking in terms of common good social policies, and this book is at least one potent starting point for diagnosing our current problems and pointing a finger in a positive direction forward.

Daniel Liechty  
The School of Social Work  
Illinois State University


Whether approaching this book as a family therapist, social work educator, policy analyst or simply as a sibling, this presentation of adult sibling relationships is a highly readable and accessible contribution to the literature on family relationships. The book shares key findings and in-depth case studies gleaned from interviews and questionnaire data from 262 siblings aged forty and older, with at least one living sibling.

The authors provide a comprehensive contextualization of the study of sibling relationships, long overlooked in favor of parent-child and spousal interactions within the family, taking the reader through a review of relevant studies on family relationships ranging from biology to history, social sciences to culture,