gling and helping illegals, identity and identification, carrier’s liability in Europe and elsewhere. Regularisation, it seems is going out of fashion, deportation seems to be the coming thing. Much attention is given to the internationalization of policy, and the move of migration matters to the EU ‘first pillar’.

In the final chapter the author sets himself the hard task of finding a comprehensive strategy on push and pull factors, accepting that policies so far are inadequate. We are warned against putting too much emphasis on ad hoc measures which avoid root causes. Anti trafficking measures are seen as essential, employer sanctions as potentially useful. Regularisation is full of problems, its main benefits being to the irregular migrants themselves, workforce benefits depending on the effectiveness of controls.

Nonetheless to this reviewer the fundamental problem is that receiving country governments acquiesce in the presence of large numbers of people with no lawful entitlement to remain. In line with the humane tenor of the whole of the book, Ghosh favours voluntary return, recognizing correctly that many illegals want to go back, but he flinches on human rights grounds from expulsion. Easing legal entry as a ‘relief point’ is also proposed, although critics might think it pointless given the large potential supply. Various means are considered of addressing root economic causes through aid, trade and training, although their drawbacks – and their possible marginal effect – are frankly admitted. The harshness of structural readjustments can provoke migration, for example. Economic disadvantages of third world economies are listed: but the easing of agricultural subsidies in rich countries might only reduce poverty by two per cent. Trade-related labour mobility for skilled and professional workers requires more freedom for temporary movement – a Ghosh favourite. While the economic discussion here is very interesting, inevitably the comprehensive solutions were long on generalizations and short on detail, and in this reviewer’s opinion, no substitute for controls.

Everyone interested in migration will want to read this book. Possibly no-one else could have written it from a viewpoint so well educated both in the human processes of migration and in the realities of politics and economics.

D.A. Coleman  
University of Oxford  
Department of Applied Social Studies and Social Research


Yet another book by the Jefferys, again based on research in the North-Indian state of Uttar Pradesh where the authors have conducted fieldwork since the 1980s.
And, again, the book presents an enormous amount of information on the (Indian) context of (Indian) demographic behaviour. The present study deals with a politically sensitive topic, the reasons behind higher fertility among Muslims in the research area. Total fertility among women who have finished their reproductive career is 8.3 for Muslim Sheikhs while it is 6.3 for Hindu Jats. Compared to the latter group, Muslim women marry at an earlier age, have a lower sterilization rate, and desire a larger family. In addition, their socio-economic status and educational level is lower and child mortality is higher. All factors are commonly found – in surveys – to be related to higher levels of fertility. The strength of the present study, however, is that the authors go beyond statistical associations and try to identify what is behind the figures. They study the strategies of people themselves; strategies which evolve from the socio-political situation in which they live.

The authors describe four possible explanations for the differences in fertility level between Muslims and Hindus: differences in socio-economic situation, gender politics, the empowerment of women through schooling and the position within the political economy.

Although Muslims are economically worse off than Hindus, economic differences between the two groups cannot explain the fertility differences, the Jefferys conclude. Both groups are aware of the disadvantages of having a big family and the costs of raising children. The case studies among Muslims, however, also seem to indicate a lower perceived control over the desired number of children: many respondents indicate that it is ‘up to God’.

In addition, the authors conclude there is no evidence that either Hindu or Muslim girls have any more say in the arrangement of their own marriage, or have more freedom within their family-in-law, or freedom to decide about contraceptive use. And although Hindu women indeed use more contraceptives (sterilization and spacing methods), they mainly follow the decisions already made by their husbands or in-laws. Sheikh women are not in favour of sterilization as it would be non-Islamic and lead to exclusion from paradise.

Muslim women receive less education and the main objective of schooling is to be able to fulfill religious duties. An interesting observation is that Hindu girls receive more education, but parents send their daughters to school to improve their marriage chances, not to enable them to take better care of their own lives. The authors conclude that although highly educated Hindu women do not have more decision-making power, they seem to be more able to deal with medical personnel and to have a better understanding of spacing methods.

Hindu boys are also better educated than Muslim boys. The Jefferys argue that Hindu fathers send their sons to school mainly with the objective of improving their chances in the labour market. Even if their sons fail to get a job, they can at least demand a higher dowry at the time of marriage. On the other hand, Muslim fathers do not send their sons to school because they do not believe their sons can get good jobs.