

problem with this type of case study is that it is difficult to find those especially precious cases to theory-building. But, as previously mentioned, the policy planners generally have no theory-building goals. Instead they have policy goals, for which they have to possess, for policy formulation to occur, analyzed intrapolitics information susceptible of generalizations. Thus, the heuristic method, allied to the continuity of diplomatic experience and a continuous input into policy planning can be purposeful. The political scientist can always pick what would be of interest. The other types of case study (plausibility probes and crucial-case) proposed by Eckstein are of theory-building relevance primarily. The time necessary to their conclusion would probably deter the most determined policy planner.<sup>27</sup>

18. Our discussion has been concerned exclusively by the applicability of the comparative politics' grand methodologies: the traditional and the case study approaches, very similar in scope, and the behavioral approach in the world of the policy planners. We have argued that the traditional and case study approaches have some relevancy in relation to the goals pursued by the policy planners and that the behavioral approach can be dangerous. We also considered a synthetic combination of both and argued that this would give a better perspective to the policy planner. Albeit imperfect, all of these comparative politics' grand methodologies

---

<sup>27</sup> Space constraints do not allow us to demonstrate in greater length our argument on these last two type of case studies.