

embarrass themselves of complicated theoretical and abstract constructions of reality, however well tested they may be, in order to be responsive to the constraints they are operating under and/or to their polity. However, they can, with caution, benefit from the various methodologies developed by political scientists.³ In turn, the results of such methodological applications in the world of politics from the reality of ideas can also assist the scholar in his theory-building process.⁴

4. Our argumentation will be presented from a very particular point of view, our goal being to offer practical tools of analysis to international affairs governmental practitioners.⁵ Thus, our first step will be to identify the External Affairs Department's particular practitioners who can benefit the most from those tools, why, and how they can do so. Secondly, a particular set of

³ Moreover, they can benefit from the data and different interpretations emerging from the theoretical discourse, as well as from criteria of critique which may be absent or underdeveloped in the practitioners' context. I thank Professor von Riekhoff for having brought my attention on these points.

⁴ This argument is based on the premise that the political practitioners we are focusing on in this paper need intrapolitics knowledge to operate effectively in their field, which is by nature international. This is a slightly modified view of the one expressed by Chadwick F. Alger years ago to the effect that comparative politics theories can serve explanatory functions in the international relations field. See his "Comparison of Intranational and International Politics", American Political Science Review, Vol. 57, No. 2 (June 1963). Our focus here is different since we are concerned primarily with comparative politics methodologies and their use by actors whose primary area of activities is dissociated from theory-building.

⁵ We assume that diplomats will not consciously engage in theory building. Instead the comparative politics' methodologies will assist their formulation of general or even specific generalizations in relation to their dossier upon which either policy-making will be based or policy planning done. In other words, we do not assume that those generalizations will necessarily be systematically related in order to form a theory's nucleus subject to observation and empirical testing.