

## Abstract

Neorealism and Institutionalism are two essential theories of International Relations. Both of them try to describe, explain and predict events and states' behaviors in International Politics. In the field of International Relations, the two theories are famous of their long debate about how they view International Politics. Though they converge on some aspects, they view the elements they are studying from different angles, and, thus, have major different interpretations. In other words, these two theories study the same phenomena; however, they differ in their interpretations for these phenomena. Furthermore, sometimes, one of the two theories accuses the other of ignoring an aspect the field or it exaggerates the importance of another.

In the study proposed here, an attempt will be carried out to answer the question: *"In the current International Scene, which of the two theories is more valid?"* In addition, this question will be attempted to be answered in the shadow of exposing two late case studies from the Middle East that are relevant to the Palestinian Question. Those two case studies are "The Oslo Accords, 1993" and "The Israeli Invasion of the West Bank Cities in spring, 2002". Applying both theories concerned on each of the aforementioned case studies might help in answering the question of this thesis. That is to say, a part of this work will be dedicated to studying each of the two case studies and how the two theories look at each of them. That would help in figuring out which one is more valid in relation to the related case studies, and, so, reach some generalizations.

In this study, then, the basic purpose is to pinpoint the validity of two major International Relations theories; Neorealism and Institutionalism, in the context of the two proposed case studies. Nonetheless, the aim is not to answer the question: are they valid or not? Rather, it is to examine which one is more valid in the current international scene with the help of the chosen case studies.