

be developed. The constraints faced by those political practitioners (time, scarcity or overload of information, lack of resources, and organizational limitations imposed by the parameters permitted by the political system) may be comparable to those faced, at times, by political scientists. However, contextual differentiations separate them into different categories of politically interested subjects. That is, their respective realm of activity and intellectual representation of it - despite the fact that their subject of study may perfectly coincide - are in fact and to varying degrees dissociated from one to another. Of course, the rigidity of this dichotomy weakens when interpenetration occurs between the two milieux.

3. From a practical stand this interpenetration, albeit welcomed, appears too often suspicious to the non-interactive colleagues. On the one hand, political scientists are accused of misunderstanding the nature of practical political problems because of their apparent dissociation from the "real world" and of misinterpreting the practitioners' decisions on the matter for the same reason. On the other hand, practitioners, while knowing the gritty-nitty details of everything, are accused of misunderstanding too often the real conditions, causes, and nature of political phenomena for which, when their polity is affected, they are accountable to decide on acting or not. The point here is not to designate which side of the debate is right but rather how one can complement the work of the other. More precisely, our argument is to the effect that practitioners and their particular milieu cannot easily