

Abstract

Syrian Civil War has been occupying the international agenda since the year 2011. Despite the fact that most of the attention is paid to the conflict itself, peace processes are part of the international competition on Syrian arena, as well. For this reason, the thesis attempts to examine two major peace tracks: Astana and Geneva processes. The former is established among Russia-Turkey-Iran trio in late 2016 and functions as a regional mediation ground while the latter is led by the top world organization, the UN, as a ground for international actors with substantial interest in the Near East. Astana's relatively better performance in reaching certain outcomes is analyzed with hypotheses derived from three core International Relations theories: Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism. In this regard, those assumptions analyze actors that are involved in the conflict within the framework of their relevant peace track. According to the conducted analyses, findings indicate that realist hypothesis is better at explaining Astana's "fruitfulness" than the other assumptions— especially field-level agreements but not the broader cooperation among the Astana trio. Hence, Geneva track with higher level of international participation carries greater importance for an ultimate resolution to the conflict.