

non-Muslim Europeans' misperceptions, both of Islam and of their own societies and politics).

Even as the chapters agree on Islam's diversity, they diverge regarding views of the future. Does diversity signal that voices of moderation will prevail, or, alternatively, that opportunities for extremism will endure? Neither starry-eyed romanticism nor prophecies of doom appear in this collection. Five chapters end with relative optimism (those of Mitri, Nielsen, Massignon, Anagnostou, and Amiraux), while one chapter stops at divisions (Bougarel) and two chapters conclude pessimistically (Cesari and Schiffauer). The framing Introduction and Afterword play good cop ("the potential for a happier future for Islam in Europe," Fokas on p. 14) versus bad cop ("Clearly, Europe must look forward to turbulent times," Al-Azmeh on p. 214). Apparently, even if Islam in Europe is manifold and nonviolent, challenges continue. It remains to be seen whether serious, detailed, and exemplary scholarship such as is offered in this volume can turn back waves of media coverage and redirect popular consciousness toward more positive or at least more accurate political visions of religious and cultural heterogeneity.

Scholars of European politics, religion and politics, and the politics of Islam will certainly profit from a close reading of this volume. It deserves to influence research, teaching, and broader public discussion of the future of Europe and its increasingly heterogeneous societies.

### **Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada.**

By Irene Bloemraad. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006. 382p. \$60 cloth, \$23.95 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S153759270909121X

— Noah Pickus, *Duke University*

This book compares the philosophies, policies, and practices in the United States and Canada for incorporating immigrants and refugees. It offers insights into the ways that the lived experience of immigrants can inform debates over multiculturalism. Irene Bloemraad observes that naturalization rates, the proportion of foreign-born legislators, and immigrants' sense of inclusion in the political system are all much higher in Canada than in the United States. To explain these differences, she compares the experiences of Portuguese labor migrants and Vietnamese refugees in both countries and concludes that Canada's official policy of multiculturalism and its more interventionist state facilitate incorporation. She also underscores how the public/private partnership model that characterizes Canadian integration policy—and U.S. policy for refugees—creates a sense of mutual trust, acceptance, and responsibility on the part of newcomers and native-born citizens alike.

This account differs from behaviorist analyses that focus on immigrants themselves—their country of origin,

social networks, level of education, language facility, and so forth. By contrast, Bloemraad emphasizes the influence of the institutional contexts in which immigrants are received. Too often, she correctly notes, Canada and the United States have been treated as more or less similarly liberal societies that have embraced immigration, while significant and revealing differences between them get ignored. Even more to her point, such differences illuminate ways in which government interaction with immigrant groups can increase or undermine commitment on both sides.

The book also prompts questions about the continued success of the Canadian model. Bloemraad observes, for example, that government funding has been significantly cut back in recent years, and as a result, relations between government agencies and community organizations in Canada are increasingly strained. One might also ask whether the more bureaucratic Canadian model risks undermining the cultural vitality of ethnic groups as it increases their political participation. Canadian multicultural policies might also risk reifying ethnic and racial identities and hardening divisions in society. The author acknowledges such concerns but contends that in practice, a more benign and fluid dynamic develops. Specifically, immigrants are provided resources to shoulder some of the responsibility for their own integration, and just as important, are seen to be doing so. In addition, Canadians' broad support for public institutions (such as schools), as well as for health and welfare benefits, makes it easier for immigrants to become integrated as full citizens.

Such perspectives usefully inform often-abstract philosophical debates. At the same time, they raise critical questions about the applicability of Bloemraad's analysis to the United States. In the first place, while she acknowledges the differences in overall admissions policy between the two countries—Canada's greater emphasis on admitting immigrants based on their education and skills, its more diverse immigrant stream, and the absence of a substantial illegal population—all these factors still play a significant role in increasing naturalization and participation rates up north. She may well be correct that Canadian integration policies build substantially on these factors, but they also contribute importantly both to how well immigrants are integrated and to the welcome provided by the host society. Finally, Bloemraad's suggestion that the United States should treat immigrants more like refugees begs the question of whether Americans would be willing to do so, particularly in light of the increased up-front costs and the sharp distinction they draw between refugees and migrants.

Applying the Canadian model to the United States thus highlights the peculiar combination of self-interest, shared cultural or ideological commitments, and moral obligations that undergird a particular society's willingness to

admit and integrate newcomers. In practical terms, is there a relationship between the numbers and kinds of immigrants admitted and the willingness to welcome them? If so, then better integration of newcomers in the United States may well require a reconsideration of admissions policies. In addition, it may also be easier for immigrants to become integrated into Canada, where a weak national identity is regarded as less threatened by newcomers than in the United States, where identity is often at the core of debates over immigration. Put differently, if maximizing the number of immigrants who naturalize or participate in politics is the goal, does achieving it entail costs to the value or nature of citizenship itself? Lastly, how much do Bloemraad's arguments imply fundamental changes to the delicate institutional mix of public and private initiative in the United States? Perhaps it is the author's intention to suggest that if the United States developed a different national identity—a less demonstrative, more open, more multicultural one—as well as a larger welfare state, then it would do better at increasing naturalization rates and the political participation of newcomers. In fact, this turns out to be more or less what the author recommends. Indeed, this comparative analysis in effect ends up concluding that if only the United States were Canada, things would be better.

Bloemraad herself points to a signal difference between the two countries, one suggesting how difficult it may be to transfer the Canadian model to the United States, while also illuminating how the latter's attention to race may have retarded the inclusion of immigrants. Multicultural policy and practice has succeeded in Canada in part because it helps to defuse the question of Quebec separatism: The more plural the society, the more room there is for special provisions for different groups and the more need for a common citizenship. In contrast, immigrant groups in the United States are brought under a racialized paradigm and set of policies in ways that harden the divisions within the country and make special provisions controversial.

*Becoming a Citizen* offers analytic and strategic insights into central problems facing immigrant-receiving countries today. In particular, it draws attention to the real downsides attendant on the U.S. *laissez-faire* model, which bewilders immigrants, troubles citizens, and so roils our politics that it has proven difficult to build a humane, democratic, and coherent approach to admitting and integrating newcomers. At the same time, such comparative and institutional analysis also needs to be informed by America's historical self-understanding. If a book like this is to take democratic self-governance seriously, it has to acknowledge the possible costs as well as the benefits of the proposed changes in admissions criteria, institutional reform, and even national identity. Unfortunately, the book fails this critical test.

**National Health Insurance in the United States and Canada: Race, Territory and the Roots of Difference.**

By Gerard W. Boychuk. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008. 234p. \$26.95.

**Differential Diagnoses: A Comparative History of Health Care Problems and Solutions in the United States and France.**

By Paul V. Dutton. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2007. 253p. \$29.95.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592709091221

— Michael Moran, *University of Manchester, United Kingdom.*

These two ambitious books tackle one of the great analytic and practical policy puzzles facing any observer of American society. The American health-care system looks like the quintessence of national exceptionalism, and making sense of that exceptionalism has occupied the energy of a generation of scholars. Two features make the American system stand out by comparison with the health-care systems of other advanced capitalist democracies: It is stunningly expensive, and it fails to meet the health-care needs of a significant proportion of the population. The figures are widely rehearsed: The United States spends about 15% of its gross domestic product on health care; even the comparatively profligate French spend only about 10%, and most countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development spend much less. Meanwhile about 46 million Americans (15% of the population) have no health-care insurance coverage. (The particular figures cited here are from *Differential Diagnoses*, pp. 5–6, but the order of magnitude has been plain for a generation.) The problem is almost certainly getting worse by the day: All projections point to continuing cost increases; the economic crisis that we are now entering will undoubtedly further shred the American system of workplace-based health insurance and leave millions more Americans without coverage.

Gerard W. Boychuk and Paul V. Dutton have now made distinguished contributions to the literature seeking to make sense of this policy fiasco, though they approach the task in rather different ways and end up with different conclusions. To put it simply—maybe too simply for books that are models of subtle scholarship—Boychuk dissents from the predominant explanations of American exceptionalism; Dutton dissents from the thesis of exceptionalism itself.

Boychuk's study has a familiar starting point: Why are the United States and Canada different in respect to their health insurance arrangements? That starting point links, of course, to a wider literature that has engaged in a kind of extended "most similar" comparison of the two nations. *National Health Insurance in the United States and Canada* begins with a skeptical review of the existing explanatory literature on health care, notably of accounts that stress differences in political culture, differences in the institutional structure of policymaking, and—the latest