

# The Political Implications of Generational Demographic Change

**David Schultz**

Departments of Political Science, Legal Studies, and Environmental Studies  
Hamline University  
Saint Paul, Minnesota, USA  
Email: [dschultz@hamline.edu](mailto:dschultz@hamline.edu)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7863-8694>  
<https://ror.org/01bcdmq48>

**Abstract.** Demographic changes such as aging and fertility portend many things. They include impacts for labor and employment, pensions, and schooling. But do demographic changes implicate political change? A generation ago, American scholars examined racial demographic changes in the US and forecasted an ‘emerging Democratic majority’. This did not occur. But, since that prediction, the US as well as the rest of the world has experienced generational shifts, seeing the exiting of the pre-WWII and now the post-WWII or Baby Boomer generations and their replacement with the Millennials and Gen Z. Using the US as a case study, this paper examines the political impact which the shift in generations has had upon American politics, along with predictions regarding what this shift will mean for the immediate future. The thesis is that much of the conflict in US politics in the last twenty years has been driven in part by generation differences. Moreover, while there are generally significant generation differences in political attitudes in the US, such differences are not uniform, and they are mediated by race, class, and gender such that while there are possibilities for significant political change in terms of party composition and public policy, there is no guarantee regarding the exact direction.

**Keywords:** demographics, generations, generational change, living memory, history.

## Introduction

Demographics are not destiny, but they do portend momentous change across the globe. Over the next 25 years, we will experience numerous demographic shifts that will have global, regional, and state-specific impacts. These changes include aging populations in many parts of the world, growing proportions of young people in others, and demographic transformations driven by migration. These shifts will influence economies, public health systems, and many other sectors. However, among the most significant consequences are the political implications of generational change – both globally and, more specifically, in the United States.

**Received:** 2025-10-05. **Accepted:** 2026-03-06.

Copyright © 2026 David Schultz. Published by Vilnius University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution Licence](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

This article examines the political implications of generational change in the United States. The article begins with a general discussion of demographic changes globally. It then focuses on the concept of generations as a political variable, or force for political change. It examines the theories of generational politics, and then specifically discusses how it will impact the United States over the next twenty-five years.

Contribution to the Literature.

A substantial body of scholarship has examined the demographic dimensions of political change, yet much of it has approached the subject from sociological, public health, or economic vantage points rather than from the perspective of political science. Works in the sociology of aging have emphasized how population change restructures labor markets, welfare systems, and intergenerational resource transfers (Beard & Bloom, 2015; Prskawetz, Fent, & Guest, 2008). Public health scholars have concentrated on the burden that aging and youthful populations place on healthcare infrastructure (Viner & Barker, 2005; Kontis et al., 2017). Even within political science, landmark studies such as Judis and Teixeira's (2004) *The Emerging Democratic Majority* framed demographic change primarily in terms of racial and ethnic shifts rather than generational dynamics rooted in shared historical experience. More recently, Duffy (2021) and MacManus (2018) have examined generational differences in political attitudes, whereas the edited volume by Friedman and Schultz (2024) has begun to map generational politics systematically within the American context.

What distinguishes this article from prior work is its explicitly political lens. Rather than treating demographic change as background context for economic or public health analysis, this paper places generational change at the center of political inquiry. Drawing on Mannheim's (1952) sociological theory of generations and extending it into the domain of contemporary political science, this article argues that the cohort, period, and life-cycle effects associated with generational succession are themselves primary causal mechanisms of political change – and not merely correlates of it. This approach differs from purely sociological treatments in that it is concerned not simply with how populations change, but with how those changes restructure political competition, reorder partisan coalitions, reshape policy agendas, and ultimately alter the way entire societies remember and respond to history. It also goes beyond the public health literature by attending to the specifically political consequences of the disappearance of living memory and the emergence of new generational touchstone events. In doing so, this article situates demographic change within the theoretical tradition of electoral realignment and political socialization research, while extending that tradition to a global and comparative frame.

## **I. Global Demographic Changes**

The second quarter of the twenty-first century will usher in major demographic transformations across the world. Let us briefly explore ten of the most significant trends.

*Aging Population.* The global population of individuals aged sixty-five and older is projected to double by 2050, reaching nearly 1.6 billion (He & Howal, 2016). This trend will be especially pronounced in high-income countries and regions such as Japan and South Korea (Sastrowardoyo, Benson, & Scott-Young, 2016). A key driver of this aging is declining fertility rates across much of the world (Roser, 2014). In some nations, birth rates have fallen below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman. In China, for example, the one-child policy has resulted in a rapidly aging population with a much smaller younger generation available to support them (Jian & Wang, 2022).

*Population Growth Concentrated in Africa.* Africa is expected to account for more than half of the world's population growth by 2050 (Klingholz, 2020). Countries such as Nigeria, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo will be major contributors. The continent's population is projected to exceed one billion, with a half the population under the age of eighteen (You, Hug, & Anthony, 2014).

*Declining Fertility Rates.* Many nations – including China, South Korea, Japan, and much of Europe – are experiencing fertility rates well below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman (Bongaarts, 2015). These trends will lead to a population decline in certain areas, raising critical questions about how shrinking populations can sustain economic systems and government services.

*Urbanization.* By 2050, approximately 70% of the global population is expected to live in urban areas, compared to 56% today (Gu & Dupre, 2021). This shift will be most significant in Asia and Africa, where mega-cities will face immense pressure to accommodate rapid growth, while rural regions may struggle with depopulation and economic viability.

*Changing Workforce Dynamics.* In developed nations, aging populations will reduce the size of the working-age population, leading to potential labor shortages (Prskawetz, Fent, & Guest, 2008). Unless mitigated by immigration or automation, this could strain economies and public service systems. For example, China is already facing a crisis in labor supply due to its one-child policy (Chen, Swee, & Yang, 2023).

*Youthful Populations in Developing Regions.* While developed countries contend with aging demographics, Sub-Saharan Africa will maintain a youthful age structure. As noted above, by 2050, nearly half the region's population will be under the age of eighteen. This offers both opportunities for economic growth and challenges related to education, employment, and governance.

*Migration Pressures.* Global migration will increase due to climate change, economic disparity, and political instability. Migration will occur both internally (rural to urban) and across borders (Massey, 2023). Europe has already experienced this through the Syrian refugee crisis and Ukraine conflict. The U.S. also faces significant migration at its southern border due to unrest in Latin America.

*Increasing Life Expectancy.* Medical advances are expected to continue improving life expectancy globally, although disparities will persist between high-income and low-income countries. Access to adequate food, nutrition, and healthcare will influence these gains (Kontis, Bennett, Mather, Li, Forman, & Ezzati, 2017).

*Rising Multicultural Societies.* Immigration and interracial marriages are transforming many nations into multicultural societies (Lanzieri, 2021). In the U.S., historically a white, majority-European society, demographic trends indicate a shift toward a majority non-white population within the next few decades (Colby & Ortman, 2015).

*Gender Imbalances.* Cultural preferences in some societies have created significant gender imbalances (Newman, Chama, Mugisha, Maksiko, & Oketcho, 2017). In countries such as China, the skewed male-to-female ratio has led to challenges in finding partners for marriage. These disparities, particularly among older populations, may become more pronounced as women generally live longer than men.

## **II. Economic, Public Health, and Political Implications**

While many more demographic shifts are occurring globally, and each of the ten trends discussed could merit in-depth analysis by virtue of its own, the essential question is: *What are the implications of these changes?*

One major area of impact is the economy. Much of the world's economic growth has historically been linked to population growth (Kuznets, 1967; Lewis, 2013). If current demographic trends continue – particularly those showing population decline or stabilization in many regions – we must ask: How can economic growth be sustained in a world of zero or negative population growth?

This issue was raised decades ago by economist Lester Thurow (2001), and it echoes the classic concern posed by the Malthusian trap (Macfarlane, 2003). Economist Thomas Malthus (1986) argued that while population grows geometrically, economic resources expand only arithmetically, creating scarcity and stress on societal systems.

Public health is another area that will be significantly influenced. Aging populations will require extensive healthcare resources, with most health expenditures occurring in the final years of life (Beard & Bloom, 2015). At the same time, younger populations – particularly in developing regions – will need investment in nutrition, vaccination programs, and preventive care (Viner & Parker, 2005). These divergent needs will place enormous pressure on global health systems.

## **III. Generational Political Shifts and Socialization**

These economic and health issues are only part of the picture. Just as critical are the political implications of demographic shifts – particularly those involving generational change over the next twenty-five years.

A central concept in political science is the study of public opinion and political attitudes (Donsbach & Traugott, 2007) based on various demographic characteristics such as race, class, gender, region, religion, education, and age (Hochschild, 2005). However, one important and often overlooked variable is the role of generations in shaping political outlooks (Friedman & Schultz, 2024). To understand generational political impact, we must first understand how individuals acquire their political values – a process known as political socialization.

Political scientist Roberta Sigel, who was active half a century ago, focused extensively on political socialization (Siegel, 1970; Siegel & Hoskin, 1981). Her core argument was that children, and eventually adults, learn about politics primarily through family upbringing. Parents play a key role in shaping the early political views of their children. Schools also contribute, but the degree to which this influence is due to parenting styles versus genetics remains debated (Harris, 2011).

Developmental psychologists – such as Freud (1964), Erikson (1968), Piaget (1967), and Kohlberg (1968) – have also explored how children develop a sense of identity and self-awareness, particularly during adolescence. It is during this phase that individuals become more attuned to the world around them and more influenced by their peers. This is also when generational identity starts to emerge.

### ***Generational Theory: Ferrari and Mannheim***

As individuals mature and become more influenced by their peers, they also become increasingly aware of the broader world. It is during this formative period that generational political identities begin to take shape. There are two main schools of thought regarding how generations influence political values:

The first is attributed to 19<sup>th</sup>-century sociologist Giuseppe Ferrari (1874) who argued that each cohort of individuals – those born around the same time – naturally acquires a unique set of political values. According to Ferrari, the simple passage of time ensures generational impact, as cohorts are socialized during different historical contexts that shape their beliefs differently than those of earlier or later cohorts.

A more influential theory comes from Karl Mannheim, particularly in his 1928 essay “*The Sociological Problem of Generations*”. Mannheim (1952) contended that merely being born at the same time does not automatically make a group of individuals a ‘generation’. While they may share a birth period, that alone does not create a shared identity or sense of solidarity. For Mannheim, a true political generation emerges when a cohort not only shares a birth era but also develops a collective consciousness – a sense of identity shaped by common experiences during a critical phase of their lives, typically adolescence or early adulthood.

Both Ferrari and Mannheim – and especially Mannheim – identified three key factors that help explain how generations form and influence politics: the cohort effect, the period effect, and the life-cycle effect (Duffy, 2021; Stoker, 2024).

The cohort effect refers to the development of distinct attitudes among people born at around the same time, due to the shared context of their formative years. The period effect captures how all members of a society – regardless of age – respond to significant historical events such as wars, economic crises, or pandemics. The life-cycle effect describes how political attitudes evolve as individuals age, typically becoming more stable and more conservative over time. These effects help explain why individuals from different age groups and generations may hold different political beliefs – even when facing similar challenges.

Building on Mannheim's work, scholars like William Strauss and Neil Howe (1991) proposed a two-stage generational theory. In this model, Stage One occurs during adolescence (often between ages 13 and 17), when individuals experience key events that form their generational identity. These events instill values and perspectives that distinguish them from earlier or later generations. Whereas, Stage Two unfolds 20 to 25 years later, as members of the generation enter positions of power and influence – be it in politics, business, culture, and society. They begin to act on the values developed in adolescence, gradually replacing the previous generation in leadership roles.

### ***U.S. Generations in Practice***

A classic example of this two-stage model can be seen in the Baby Boomer generation in the United States, born roughly between 1946 and 1964 (Hogan, Perez, & Bell, 2008). This generation came of age during a period marked by pivotal events: the Cold War, the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., the Vietnam War, and eventually, the Watergate scandal. These events shaped the worldview of this cohort during adolescence – forming the basis of their generational consciousness (Stage One) (Friedman & Schultz, 2024).

However, few adolescents have the political power or agency to act on their values at that time. Stage Two of the model occurs 20 to 25 years later, when this cohort has reached its 30s and 40s. At this point, they begin to enter positions of leadership in politics, business, and society. It is here that they start reshaping institutions in alignment with the values formed in their youth.

This pattern continues with each generational wave: new cohorts form their attitudes in response to the world they inherit, and, as they mature, they replace previous generations in leadership roles. These generational shifts become fundamental drivers of political change, not necessarily because people change dramatically with age, but because each generation starts from a different historical and social baseline.

### ***Generational Variability and Context***

While socialization in adolescence creates lasting impressions, it is not the only force shaping political attitudes. New historical circumstances and social changes can influence younger generations to adopt different views than those who came before or after them (Siegel, 1989). Yet, generational impact is significant. Although individuals may continue to learn and adapt throughout life, the lens through which they interpret political events is often rooted in values formed during their formative years. While some people do shift ideologically – becoming more liberal or conservative as they age – most remain within the broad parameters set during adolescence. In effect, while age is an important issue when it comes to understanding political values, generational influences are very potent (MacManus, 2018). This point challenges the famous quote often attributed to Anatole France: “If you're not a socialist at 20, you have no heart; if you're not a

conservative at 40, you have no brain”. Research shows that political attitudes are largely formed in Stage One and acted upon in Stage Two.

Generations are not monolithic. Generational identity intersects with other variables like race, class, gender, religion, education, and geography (Ross Manzo & McLennan, 2024). By that, it is, of course, true that political attitudes are not the same for all individuals, even within one generation. There is clear evidence that one’s life experiences influence attitudes. These life experiences include factors such as race, etc. Race, class, and other life variables determine one’s upbringing and also impact the lens through which one views or experiences political events. To be African-American in the United States means that one may experience racial discrimination or view events differently than to be a White Caucasian, especially if one were growing up poor or affluent, or in different parts of the country.

The political experience of a generation in the United States, for instance, will also differ greatly from that of a generation in Lithuania or Brazil. The breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 had profoundly different implications for political memory and identity in Eastern Europe than it did in the West. Thus, context matters. Although one can speculate that, in a more digitally connected world, it may be possible for generational influences to be more global than at previous times in history as information and perceptions of events can be collectively experienced on the social media (Ziebland & Wyke, 2012; Echterhoff, 2013).

### ***Living Memory and the Politics of Historical Change***

Generational shifts also influence how historical figures and events are remembered. For example, Jervis (2017) notes how there is a generational impact in terms of how political elites and masses think about foreign affairs. For those who recall the famous 1938 BBC newsreel of Neville Chamberlain returning from Munich and talks with Adolph Hitler describing the negotiations as producing ‘peace for our time’ think of this event as a form of appeasement of dictators that brought with it cruel lessons and WWII (Short, 1989).

In the United States, Mikhail Gorbachev is often viewed as a heroic reformer who helped end the Cold War and was named *Time Magazine*’s man of the decade (1990). In Lithuania, however, where Soviet occupation left lasting scars, Gorbachev’s legacy is seen far less favorably (LRT, 2022). This illustrates a broader truth: generational change has political implications, especially over time.

As generations pass, so does living memory. Philosophers and historians have long reflected on this theme. George Santayana warned, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it”. Immanuel Kant argued that “The most important lesson of history is that we do not learn the lessons of history”, and Søren Kierkegaard famously said, “Life can only be understood backwards, but it must be lived forwards”.

These reflections underscore how time, memory, and generational experience shape political consciousness.

We are currently approaching the end of living memory for events such as World War II (Finney, 2017) and the Holocaust (Auerhahn & Laub, 1998). Soon, no survivors of these cataclysmic events will remain. As firsthand memory fades, history becomes more abstract and potentially easier to revise or forget. The same will occur with the Cold War, and, as we have already seen, with events like Tiananmen Square (Tsung-Yi, 2022), which have been actively suppressed in some countries.

Moreover, think of how Russian Federation President Vladimir Putin has tried to erase or rewrite the history of WWII (Pearce, 2020) or Russian-Ukraine relations (Stoner, 2023) to downplay the autonomy of the latter and over-emphasize the role of the former with the objective to enhance nationalism and his power. Putin's ability to do this is in part enabled by the transformation of living memory into historical consciousness or propaganda.

More recent events – such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2008–2009 global financial crisis, and Russia's invasions of Ukraine in 2014 and 2022 – are likely to shape the political attitudes of today's youth. These may form the generational touchstones of Millennials and Gen Z. In an era of globalized media and communication, it is possible that generational experiences may become more globally shared than ever before.

#### IV. Generational Impacts on U.S. Political Future

Over the past century, several distinct generations have emerged in the United States. These are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. **Recent US generations**

The Greatest Generation (1901–1924)
The Silent Generation (1925–1945)
The Baby Boomers (1946–1964)
The Generation X (1965–1981)
The Millennials (1982–1995)
The Generation Z (1996–2013)
The Alphas (2014 – ...)

Each of these generations came/ will come of age during different historical moments, shaping unique political values and social identities. They also vary significantly in terms of racial composition, education levels, and religious affiliation.

Millennials and Gen Z, for example, are far more racially diverse, less religious, and more likely to come from immigrant backgrounds compared to Baby Boomers. Having come of age well after the Cold War and Vietnam War era, these younger cohorts tend to be more progressive, especially on issues like social welfare, reproductive rights, and LGBTQ+ inclusion. They generally support the Democratic Party, and, in many ways, are pushing it leftward.

However, generational patterns are complex. Among white males without a college degree, even within Millennial and Gen Z groups, political views often mirror those of older generations. This highlights how race, education, geography, and class intersect with generational identity. These demographic transitions portend important shifts in political alignment, voter behavior, and party strategies. But it is important to remember that demographics are not destiny. Despite earlier predictions of an ‘emerging Democratic majority’, political outcomes still depend on candidates, strategy, turnout, and unforeseen events (Judis & Teixeira, 2004).

The retirement and passing of the Baby Boomer generation, along with shifting racial and religious trends, along with the growing power of younger voters, are likely to reshape American politics significantly over the next twenty-five years. (Friedman & Schultz, 2024). There is a lot of evidence that the Millennials and Gen Z generations hold political values at odds with the Silents and Baby Boomers. Their partisan loyalties are different, and the stage one adolescent experiences are shaping their political outlooks and behavior. The key questions include: How will younger voters shape the future of political institutions? Will generational divides intensify policy conflicts? Could we see realignment in party coalitions and ideologies? How will global migration shape national identity and political movements? These are just some of the questions that emerge out of generational studies in the US.

## **V. Global Demographics Changes and Generational Politics**

How might the theory of generational politics and changes impact politics on a national, regional, and global scale given some of the demographic changes and patterns noted in Part One of this article?

Consider, for example, the aging of Europe. How might the passing-away of generations that experienced WWII, the Holocaust, the Cold War, and communism affect political attitudes? Already, there are fewer and fewer people around us who experienced these events in person, who are only to be replaced by new generations without these experiences. They, in turn, have been impacted by the global economic collapse of 2008, the 2019 pandemic, and the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. How might these events be viewed through the eyes of different generations, and how will they impact their political attitudes? Or think of how some might view the Soviet era of alleged economic security in nostalgic ways – especially if compared to neo-liberal economies of today (Gherghina & Klymenko, 2012)?

Or consider the rise of youthful populations in Africa, or waves of immigration across the world. For, perhaps, a cohort of young Africans not yet born, global events taking place in the next twenty-five years will impact their political views until the end of this century. For those born in one state or region of the world and migrating elsewhere, will they bring Stage One imprinting and apply it in an entirely different political context and setting. Perhaps their views could alter the political culture of the place they have moved to, or they might interpret it through the initial values or socialization which they acquired

as adolescents in a different culture. How might this rewrite political or cultural identities? This point is truly important to consider, especially in places such as Europe where a combination of an aging population, declining birth rates, and migration could redefine who or what it means to be European or Lithuanian, to give an example.

But if new generations bring new political values based on new cohort or period effects, there are many potential changes. These might include a shift in party alliances or composition; the salience of specific issues (such as climate change, reproductive rights, or LGBTQ+ rights); support or decline for democracy; approach to new technologies such as artificial intelligence; the role of religion in politics; and the declining salience of colonial or even post-colonial experiences as drivers of political action. The readers of this article bring to it their generational perspective, but, as we pass, and new generations replace us, the experiences of those in the Millennial, Gen Z, and Alpha generations in the US (or their equivalents elsewhere in the world) will gradually form the basis of a different set of political experiences, attitudes, and behaviors that will structure a political world for the remainder of the century.

Demographic Forecasting and the Limits of Political Prediction. While this article has stressed that demographics are not political destiny, it is nonetheless possible – and analytically important – to identify the directions in which demographic and generational change are most likely to push political systems. Prediction in political science is always probabilistic rather than deterministic, and this is especially true when it comes to generational dynamics, because the period effects that most powerfully shape a generation's political identity cannot be known in advance. We cannot foresee today which events will prove to be the defining touchstones for the Alpha generation, or for the cohorts not yet born. What we can say with reasonable confidence is that such defining events will occur – and that when they do, they will reorder political consciousness in ways that can be neither fully anticipated nor controlled by the political actors of the present moment.

With that caveat firmly in place, the analysis developed in this article does support several directional predictions. First, as populations in many advanced democracies age and as the Baby Boomer generation is replaced by Millennials and Gen Z in the active electorate, we should expect shifts in party membership, partisan alignment, and ideological center of gravity. In the United States, where younger cohorts are more racially diverse, more secular, and more supportive of expansive government programs, an electorally dominant Millennial-Gen Z bloc would, all else equal, favor the Democratic Party and push it toward more progressive positions. Yet because generational patterns intersect with race, class, and geography, these shifts will not be uniform. Among white working-class voters without college degrees, even younger generations have shown political affinities closer to older Republican-leaning cohorts, suggesting that any realignment will be partial, contested, and subject to reversal by candidate quality, economic conditions, and contingent events. Similar dynamics, appropriately adjusted for a national context, are likely to manifest in Europe, Latin America, and other regions as their own generational succession unfolds.

Second, demographic change will compel governments to revise policy agendas regardless of which parties hold power. Aging populations will generate irresistible pressure for expanded pension, healthcare, and long-term care spending; whereas, youthful populations in the Global South will demand investment in education, employment, and physical infrastructure. These imperatives are structurally driven rather than ideologically chosen, and no government will be able to ignore them indefinitely. The political salience of immigration policy will similarly intensify, as migration flows triggered by climate change, economic inequality, and political instability force receiving countries to grapple publicly with questions of national identity, labor-market integration, and social cohesion. The generational dimension matters here too: those who grew up in more homogeneous societies may respond to these pressures differently than those who came of age in already diverse ones.

Third, and perhaps most consequentially, the political implications of disappearing living memory deserve sustained attention. As the last survivors of World War II and the Holocaust pass from the scene, as the direct human testimony of Tiananmen Square fades, as the lived experience of Soviet Marxism recedes from personal recollection into textbook abstraction, the emotional and moral weight that these memories have imparted to political discourse will diminish. This is not merely a cultural loss; it is a political one. The visceral, personal knowledge of what unchecked authoritarianism, state-sponsored genocide, and totalitarian ideology can do has functioned, however imperfectly, as a brake on certain political tendencies in postwar democratic societies. When that knowledge exists only in archives and classrooms rather than in the embodied recollection of living citizens, the constraints it imposes on politics may weaken. At the same time, the very disappearance of those memories creates space for historical revisionism of the kind already visible in Putin's rewriting of WWII history and in the suppression of Tiananmen Square in Chinese public discourse. Future generations, without living witnesses to contradict such narratives, will be more vulnerable to politically motivated historical manipulation.

Fourth, new yet-to-be-identified period effects will shape the next generation's political consciousness in ways that this article, written at the moment of its own generational vantage point, cannot fully anticipate. What is certain is that some combination of events already unfolding and events not yet occurred will serve as the defining formative experiences for today's children and tomorrow's citizens. Whether those events are environmental catastrophes, pandemics, wars, technological disruptions, or political upheavals – or some combination none of us has yet imagined – they will imprint a new generational consciousness that will drive politics for decades to come. This article is being written at a moment when multiple such potentially formative events are in motion: the ongoing realignment of the global order, the rapid acceleration of artificial intelligence, the mounting consequences of climate change, and deepening anxieties about democratic backsliding in many countries. Whether and how these forces will crystallize into a coherent generational political identity for the Alpha generation and its successors

remains to be seen. What the theory of generational politics tells us is that they will, in some form, and that the consequences will be profound.

## **VI. Conclusion**

The ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus famously said, “You cannot step into the same river twice” (Narecki, 2012). Perhaps more accurately, one might say: You cannot step into the same river even once, because it is always changing.

Since the dawn of human history, demographics have been in flux – and with those changes come shifts in culture, economics, public health, and politics. Demographic trends and unexpected global events function as powerful engines of political transformation. Over the next twenty-five years, the world will undergo profound demographic changes. This article has argued that, in the case of the United States, these generational transitions will reshape the political landscape in fundamental ways. As older generations age out of influence and new generations step into leadership roles, we are not merely watching the passage of time – we are witnessing the redefinition of political priorities, values, and power structures.

This article has made three interconnected arguments that together distinguish its contribution from prior work and point toward a research agenda for the study of global generational politics. The first argument is analytical: that demographic change must be understood through a political lens, and that the generational mechanisms identified by Mannheim – cohort effects, period effects, and life-cycle effects – are the primary channels through which demographic shifts translate into political ones. The sociological and public health literatures have documented the structural consequences of demographic change in admirable detail; what this article has sought to add is an account of how those structural shifts become political, specifically through the formation of generational consciousness and the exercise of generational political agency. Placing the role of generational change at the center of political analysis, rather than treating it as a subsidiary variable in economic or public health modeling, is the distinctive contribution this article makes to the literature.

The second argument is predictive: while demographics are not political destiny, the coming demographic and generational transitions are sufficiently large and well-documented to support directional forecasts about the political landscape of the mid-twenty-first century. In many advanced democracies, the replacement of older generations by more diverse, more secular, and more globally oriented younger cohorts is likely to shift the center of gravity of party systems, expand the policy agenda to include issues that older generations deprioritized or resisted, and alter the emotional valence of international politics as living memory of the great catastrophes of the twentieth century finally extinguishes. These shifts will not occur uniformly or mechanically. Candidate quality, party strategy, economic shocks, and unforeseen events will shape how demographic potential translates – or fails to translate – into electoral and policy outcomes. But in all cases the underlying demographic forces will continue to operate, and political actors

who ignore them do so at their peril. Equally consequential will be the consequences of vanishing living memory: as the last survivors of the Holocaust, of Soviet totalitarianism, and of Tiananmen Square pass from the scene, the visceral moral authority their testimony has lent to democratic norms and the resistance to authoritarianism will diminish. Future generations, lacking living witnesses to contradict politically motivated historical revisionism, will be more vulnerable to the kind of narrative manipulation already visible in the rewriting of WWII history by authoritarian governments.

The third argument is epistemically humble: any analysis of generational politics written at a given moment in history is necessarily incomplete, because the period effects that will most powerfully shape future generations have not yet occurred. This article goes to press at a moment of considerable political turbulence and historical uncertainty, with events already unfolding whose full generational significance cannot yet be assessed, and other events not yet imagined that will follow. Generational political analysis must therefore cultivate a distinctive form of intellectual modesty – confident in its identification of structural forces and directional tendencies, but genuinely humble about the specific content of the political worldviews that will emerge from the experiences of today’s children and tomorrow’s citizens. We know that the next generation will be shaped by its historical moment. We cannot know, with certainty, what that moment will ultimately prove to be.

The implications for political practice are significant. Parties and political movements that aspire to long-term viability must attend carefully to the values and experiences of younger cohorts, even when those values diverge sharply from those of the existing base. Policy makers who ignore the demographic imperatives of aging or youthful populations do so at the risk of political and fiscal crisis. Educators, civic institutions, and democratic defenders must grapple with how democratic norms and historical lessons can be transmitted across the generational divide when the witnesses who embodied them are gone. And scholars of politics must continue to develop the theoretical and empirical tools needed to understand a political world in which the generational composition of electorates, the salience of issues shaped by new period effects, and the content of political memory are all in constant flux. The study of generational politics is not a niche subfield; it is a window into the deepest drivers of political change, globally and over the long term.

The river of history is always flowing, and with each passing generation, the current shifts. The political implications of this generational evolution will be significant – not only in the United States but, rather, across the world.

## Acknowledgments

Paper originally presented at the “*The Demographic Transition: Policy Implications of Fertility and Aging Trends*” conference held in Vilnius, Lithuania, May 23–25, 2025. I wish to thank the participants for their thoughtful comments.

## References

- Auerhahn, N. C., & Laub, D. (1998). Intergenerational memory of the Holocaust. In Y. Danieli (Ed.), *International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma. The Plenum Series on Stress and Coping* (pp. 21–41). Boston, MA: Springer US. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5567-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5567-1_2)
- Beard, J. R., & Bloom, D. E. (2015). Towards a comprehensive public health response to population ageing. *The Lancet*, 385(9968), 658–661. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61461-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61461-6)
- Bongaarts, J. (2015). Global fertility and population trends. *Seminars in reproductive medicine*, 33(1), 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0034-1395272>
- Chen, Y., Swee, E. L., & Wang, H. (2023). Little emperors in the workplace: Labor market consequences of China's one-child policy. *China Economic Review*, 80, Article 101985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2023.101985>
- Colby, S., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). *Projections of the size and composition of the US population: 2014 to 2060* (Current Population Reports, P25-1143). U.S. Census Bureau. <https://wonder.cdc.gov/controller/pdf/PublicationNationalProjections2014-2060.pdf>
- Donsbach, W., & Traugott, M. W. (Eds.). (2007). *The SAGE Handbook of Public Opinion Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Duffy, B. (2021). *The Generations Myth: Why When You're Born Matters Less Than You Think*. New York: Basic Books.
- Echterhoff, G. (2013). How communication on the Internet affects memory and shared reality: Talking heads online. *Psychological Inquiry*, 24(4), 297–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2013.842878>
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Ferrari, G. (1874). *Teoria dei Periodi Politici*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Finney, P. (2017). Politics and technologies of authenticity: the Second World War at the close of living memory. *Rethinking History*, 21(2), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2017.1315967>
- Freud, S. (1964). *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (J. Strachey, Transl.). New York: Norton.
- Friedman, S., & Schultz, D. (Eds.). (2024). *Generational Politics in the United States: From the Silents to Gen Z and Beyond*. University of Michigan Press.
- Gherghina, S., & Klymenko, L. (2012). Why look back? Citizens' attitudes toward the communist regime in Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 59(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PPC1075-8216590105>
- Gu, D., Andreev, K., & Dupre, M. E. (2021). Major Trends in Population Growth Around the World. *China CDC weekly*, 3(28), 604–613. <https://doi.org/10.46234/ccdcw2021.160>
- Harris, J. R. (2011). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- He, W., Goodkind, D., & Kowal, P. R. (2016). *An aging world: 2015* (International Population Reports, P95-16-1). U.S. Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2016/demo/P95-16-1.html>
- Hochschild, J. (2005). Race and class in political science. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, 11 (1), 99–114. <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjrl/vol11/iss1/6>
- Hogan, H., Perez, D., & Bell, W. (2008). *Who (Really) are the first baby boomers*. Washington, DC: Census Bureau.
- Jervis, R. (2017). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jiang, Q., Tai, X., & Wang, L. (2022). One-child policy and population aging in China. In D. Gu, M. E. Dupre (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging* (pp. 3657–3662). Cham: Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22009-9\\_652](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22009-9_652)

Judis, J. B., & Teixeira, R. (2004). *The emerging democratic majority*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Klingholz, R. (2020). Chapter 3. Twice as many people in 2050: The need for agricultural transformation in Southern Africa. In R. A. Sikora, E. R. Terry, P. L. G. Vlek, J. Chitja (Eds.), *Transforming Agriculture in Southern Africa* (pp. 17–26). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429401701>

Kohlberg, L. (1968). Moral Development. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan & Free Press.

Kontis, V., Bennett, J. E., Mathers, C. D., Li, G., Foreman, K., & Ezzati, M. (2017). Future life expectancy in 35 industrialised countries: projections with a Bayesian model ensemble. *The Lancet*, 389(10076), 1323–1335. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(16\)32381-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(16)32381-9)

Kuznets, S. (1967). Population and economic growth. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 111(3), 170–193. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/985714>

Lanzieri, G. (2011). *Fewer, older and multicultural? Projections of the EU populations by foreign/national background*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2785/17529>

Lewis, W. A. (2013). *Theory of economic growth*. London: Routledge.

LRT English. (2022, August 31). *Why Gorbachev will not be remembered fondly in Lithuania*. LRT English. <https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/1770099/why-gorbachev-will-not-be-remembered-fondly-in-lithuania>

Macfarlane, A. (2003). The Malthusian Trap. In *The Savage Wars of Peace: England, Japan and the Malthusian Trap* (pp. 11–24). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

MacManus, S. (2018). *Young v. old: Generational combat in the 21st century*. London: Routledge.

Malthus, T. R. (1986). *An essay on the principle of population* (). London: Pickering & Chatto Publishers. (Original work published 1798).

Mannheim, K. (1952). The sociological problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 276–322). Routledge. (Original work published 1936).

Massey, D. S. (2023). The Shape of Things to Come: International Migration in the Twenty-First Century. In L. Lerpold, Ö. Sjöberg, K. Wennberg (Eds.), *Migration and integration in a post-pandemic world: Socioeconomic opportunities and challenges* (pp. 29–81). Cham: Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19153-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19153-4_2)

Narecki, K. (2012). The Image of the River in the Fragments of Heraclitus. *Philotheos*, 12, 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philotheos2012126>

Newman, C., Chama, P. K., Mugisha, M., Matsiko, C. W., & Oketcho, V. (2017). Reasons behind current gender imbalances in senior global health roles and the practice and policy changes that can catalyze organizational change. *Global health, epidemiology and genomics*, 2, e19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gheg.2017.11> Pearce, J. C. (2020). *The use of history in Putin's Russia*. Vernon Press.

Piaget, J. (1967). *Six Psychological Studies*. New York: Random House.

Prskawetz, A., Fent, T., & Guest, R. (2008). Workforce aging and labor productivity: The role of supply and demand for labor in the G7 countries. *Population and Development Review*, 34, 298–323. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25434769>

Roser, M. (2014). *The global decline of the fertility rate*. Our World in Data. Retrieved from: <https://archive.ourworldindata.org/20260304-094028/global-decline-fertility-rate.html>

Ross Manzo, W., & McLennan, D. B. (2024). Gender and generations: You haven't come a long way yet, baby. In S. Friedman & D. Schultz (Eds.), *Generational politics in the United States: From the Silents to Gen Z and beyond* (pp. 34–84). University of Michigan Press.

Sandhu, S., Sastrowardoyo, S., Benson, J., & Scott-Young, C. (2016). Chapter 21: Aging in Asia: Challenges and Opportunities in China, India, Japan, and South Korea. In A.-S. Antoniou, R. J. Burke, C. L. Cooper, CBE (Eds.), *The Aging Workforce Handbook* (513–536). Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78635-448-820161021>

Short, K. R. (1989). A note on BBC television news and the Munich Crisis, 1938. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 9(2), 165–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01439688900260141>

Siegel, R. S. (1989). *Political Learning in Adulthood: A Sourcebook of Theory and Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Siegel, R. S. (1970). *Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization*. New York: Random House.

Siegel, R. S., & Hoskin, M. B. (1981). *The Political Involvement of Adolescents*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Stoker, L. (2024). Generational change in partisanship: An age-cohort accounting. In S. Friedman & D. Schultz (Eds.), *Generational politics in the United States: From the Silents to Gen Z and beyond* (pp. 34–84). University of Michigan Press.

Stoner, K. (2023). The Putin Myth. *Journal of Democracy*, 34(2), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2023.0020>

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: Quill.

Thurow, L. C. (2001). *The Zero-sum Society: Distribution and the Possibilities for Change*. New York: Basic Books

Time Magazine. (1990, January 1). *Mikhail Gorbachev, Man of the Decade*. Time. <https://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19900101,00.html>

Tsung-Yi, P. (2022). The Making of Tiananmen Square as a Realm of Contested Memories: National Salvation, Revolutionary Tradition and Political Modernity in Twentieth-Century China. In C.-H. Wu (Ed.), *Cultures of Memory in Asia: Dynamics and Forms of Memorialization* (pp. 28–62). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003242253>

Viner, R. M., & Barker, M. (2005). Young people's health: the need for action. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 330(7496), 901–903. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.330.7496.901>

You, D., Hug, L., & Anthony, D. (2014). *Generation 2030/Africa: Child demographics in Africa*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.cn/media/10631/file/Generation%202030%20Africa.pdf>

Ziebland, S. U. E., & Wyke, S. (2012). Health and illness in a connected world: how might sharing experiences on the internet affect people's health?. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 90(2), 219–249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00662.x>