Over the last 20 years, the study of economic regulation has attracted growing attention in political research. But what is so political about regulation? And what is “new” in the political analysis of this topic? We argue that the answer to both of these questions lies in the evolution of the conception of regulatory power in political research. To validate this claim, we first review the main developments that followed the introduction of agency-theoretic models in this field. While recognizing their insights, we argue that these contributions rest on a narrow, essentially directive conception of regulatory power. With regard to more recent developments, we then show how a focus on other facets of the politics of regulation has connected it to broader political science questions. This focus significantly improves our understanding of regulation’s influence on economic activities, public policy, and ultimately, on the politics of economic regulation in the broadest sense of the term.

Starting from the idea of various regimes of attention means considering the variety of the dimensions of attention as a prerequisite to understand these processes. Too often, models are based on an essentialist vision of attention and not a pluralistic one, despite the works of cognitive science scholars (for instance, “priming” has been well defined). Too often and quite recently, “attention” obtains a status of principle, which manipulates all situations around itself, about the new value that is created through these economic processes (as Goldhaber (1997) mentioned in his pioneering papers following the traces of Simon). The chapter accounts for these economical views of attention and then for the philosophical one before getting back to a more detailed empirical analysis of these regimes of attention, from urban settings to digital platforms and videogames.

The traditional left-right divide which shaped political competition across Europe in the post-war period is increasingly being supplanted by new patterns of competition. Drawing on the experience of the 2019 European Parliament elections, Anja Durovic, Caterina Froio, Gilles Ivaldi, Sarah de Lange, Nonna Mayer and Jan Rovny explain that one of the more interesting developments is the way that old divides have taken on new meaning in European politics. Urban-rural, education and gender divisions are now key elements in the split between urban cosmopolitanism, represented by Green or Liberal parties, and more peripherally concentrated nativist traditionalism, represented by the radical right.
Partant du constat que la notion de politisation est de plus en plus utilisée dans la science politique française et que ce succès va de pair avec une forte élasticité conceptuelle, cet article se donne pour objectif d'en clarifier les usages afin d'établir une cartographie raisonnée des problématiques de sciences sociales associées au mot « politisation ». Il aborde d'abord la controverse très fournie, en histoire politique, sur la politisation des campagnes françaises. Puis, il porte l'attention sur les multiples emplois de la notion en science politique, dégageant les principales controverses qui structurent les débats sur la politisation individuelle ou celle des enjeux et activités sociaux. Les auteurs proposent une combinatoire afin d'aider à identifier et préciser les manières dont on utilise cette notion.

The striking economic agglomerations emerging in affluent democracies are generating, reproducing, and expanding inequalities. A major mechanism for this is housing, which is both a repository for wealth and, under these conditions, a magnifier of wealth. Access to urban areas – the site of educational, labor, and marriage market advantages – is contingent upon access to housing. We use comparative analysis of cases in Europe (London and Paris) and the United States (New York and San Francisco) to consider the capacities of different societies to limit or ameliorate these new sources of diverging opportunity. These seemingly local issues remain shaped by distinct national political contexts, which vary dramatically in their capacity to support local affordable housing and reduce the collective action problems confronting major metropolitan areas.
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