

Seminar 10 — Demographic and Migration Governance Cases

IR227 Politics of Change

July 2026

What you'll do in 90 minutes

[Bridge to seminar] *Take your assigned demographic-or-migration governance case. Apply the relevant frameworks (policy feedback, ACF, Hollifield's migration state, Freeman's typology). Reach a verdict. Close with a cross-transition reflection: what does this case imply for climate (Lecture 9) or AI (Lecture 11)?*

- Six cases, three pairs, deliberately paired.
- Each group: 3–4 students, one case.
- Framework application and verdict, then drafting, then exchange briefings, then present.

Three methodological points up front

1. Framework choice should follow case structure. Not every framework applies to every case.
2. Coalition analysis must specify actors and material/cultural interests, not vague appeals to “industry” or “the public.” (Goerres et al. 2021)
3. Cross-transition reflection is the seminar’s payoff and the bridge to Lectures 11 and 12.

Six cases, three pairs

Pair archetype	Case A	Case B
Demographic governance under aging	Japan	South Korea
Refugee/asylum governance under stress	EU CEAS	Australia OSB
Labour migration governance	GCC kafala system	ASEAN labour mobility

Within each pair: same archetype, different design responses, different coalition dynamics. (Goerres et al. 2021; Hollifield 2004; World Bank 2023)

Recap: the migration state

Framework: Hollifield's migration state

- 18th–19th centuries: garrison state and trading state, jointly (security + economic integration).
- 20th–21st centuries: **migration state** (security + economy + migration).
- Rights are the key instrument.
- The liberal paradox is structural, not contingent.

Recap: Freeman's typology

Framework: Four types of immigration policy

Each type produces a distinctive mode of politics. (Freeman 2006)

Concentrated distributive. Permanent-residence visas — client politics.

Diffuse distributive. Non-immigrant visas (tourism, study) — majoritarian politics.

Redistributive. Non-immigrant work visas; welfare for immigrants — interest-group politics.

Regulatory. Asylum claims — entrepreneurial politics.

Recap: cross-transition intersections

- Aging accelerates automation (Acemoglu-Restrepo: $\sim 35\%$ of cross-country variation in robot adoption explained by aging alone). (Acemoglu and Restrepo 2022)
- Automation reshapes migration politics.
- Migration governance shapes welfare-state sustainability (Ford-Sobolewska-Kootstra on UK + NL “heart-vs-head” channel for welfare chauvinism). (Ford et al. 2026)
- Welfare-state sustainability conditions political support for climate action.
- Climate-driven displacement increases migration demand.
- AI affects labour-market dynamics relevant to all of the above.

No transition can be governed in isolation.

Phase 1 — framework application (20 min, no laptops)

1. Identify which frameworks apply to your case (policy feedback, ACF, Hollifield, Freeman), with evidence.
2. Apply each: what does it predict for your case, and where does the prediction match the evidence?
3. Identify the coalitions, specifying actors and material/cultural interests.
4. Reach a verdict on governance trajectory (succeeding / partially succeeding / contested / stalled) and identify the binding constraint.

Output: a framework application, a coalition analysis, and a verdict + binding constraint — something you can defend and will report to the class.

Phase 2 — draft your briefing (15 min, Claude allowed)

Case: The diagnostic memo

- One paragraph: framework-and-verdict memo. Frameworks applied, coalitions identified, verdict, binding constraint.
- Two-to-three sentences: cross-transition reflection. What does your case imply for climate (Lecture 9) or AI (Lecture 11)?

Be specific. “Demographics affect everything” is not a reflection.

Phase 3 — exchange briefings (5 min)

- Swap your written briefing with your comparative-case group (same pair archetype, paired case).
- Read their frameworks, coalitions, verdict, and cross-transition reflection.
- Note one point of contrast to raise in the plenary: same archetype — why does the verdict differ?

Phase 4 — present (5 min per group)

Each group presents its own framework analysis and verdict, then names the contrast with its comparative case.

- Demographic governance: Japan vs. South Korea — same archetype, different pace. Why?
- Refugee/asylum: EU CEAS vs. Australia OSB — same paradox, different navigations. Why?
- Labour migration: GCC vs. ASEAN — different non-OECD migration designs. Why?

Three things to take away

1. Demographic and migration transitions are politically structured, not technical. Coalition dynamics matter; framework analysis illuminates.
2. Cross-transition intersections are pervasive. No transition can be governed in isolation.
3. Governance creativity is needed where existing frameworks fail. Tuvalu Future Now Project, NZ-Tuvalu Falepili Union, EU New Pact, Australia OSB — each represents institutional innovation.

Tomorrow: AI and automation — where labour-market dynamics get developed and the regulatory-paradigm-divergence story returns.

- Acemoglu, D. and P. Restrepo (2022). **“Demographics and Automation”**. eng. In: *The Review of economic studies* 89.1 (324), pp. 1–44.
- Ford, R., M. Sobolewska, and A. Kootstra (2026). **“What drives welfare chauvinism in Europe?”** In: *West European Politics* 49.2, pp. 321–349.
- Freeman, G. P. (2006). **“National models, policy types, and the politics of immigration in liberal democracies”**. In: *West European Politics* 29.2, pp. 227–247.
- Goerres, A., P. Vanhuysse, P. Vanhuysse, and A. Goerres (2021). **Global political demography : the politics of population change**. eng. 1st ed. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hollifield, J. F. (2004). **“The Emerging Migration State”**. In: *International Migration Review* 38.3, pp. 885–912.

World Bank (2023). **World Development Report 2023: Migrants, Refugees, and Societies**. Washington, DC: World Bank.