The Israeli Experience "Part two":
Struggle for the national leadership between
Herzl's dream, Weizmann's soft diplomacy, and al-Husseini's recklessness

Khaled Abdelhay Elsayed

PhD candidate of Politics and International Studies, Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS),
National University (UKM), Malaysia
Email: hassaninkhaled@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the struggle for the national leadership in the Israeli Experience, and answers the question: what was the direct and indirect historically effective role of the famous leaders – Herzl, Weizmann and al-Husseini – in the Israeli Experience? In addition, this paper aims to achieve various goals, such as explaining the Israeli experience, which is considered a great historical lesson and added value to the human knowledge, and the consideration of the historical and religious rights of Palestinians and Israelis in the same land, and the direct and indirect influential role of national leadership in the Israeli experience. The researcher concludes that there were two different types of struggle for the national leadership that led to the success of the Israeli experience; one being the effective, very positive and direct role by Herzl and Weizmann, and, in contrast, the second being the indirect role of the Grand Mufti, al-Husseini. In summary, the researcher could not ignore the Israeli experience as being a great historical lesson and of benefit to human knowledge. In addition, various socio-historic-political benefits can be gained from the experience. Moreover, there are numerous conflicting considerations in the historical and religious rights for the Palestinians and Israelis in the land of Palestine.

Keywords:
Israeli experience, Struggle, leadership, dream, soft diplomacy, Herzl, Weizmann, al-Husseini.

1. The Israeli experience and national leadership: A great historical lesson and benefit to human knowledge

Genuine leadership is defined as "a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development." While others have defined genuine leadership as a prototype of transparent as well as ethical leadership behavior that gives confidence and honesty in the allotment of the facts required to make an assessment while accommodating the contribution of followers. Another type of leadership is religious leadership, which is defined as "comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate own self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership". While other scholars mentioned that "the ultimate effect of spiritual leadership is to bring together or create a sense of fusion among the four fundamental forces of human existence (body, mind, heart, and spirit) so that people are motivated for high performance, have increased organizational commitment, and personally experience joy, peace and serenity"(Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009).

In my opinion, the Israeli experience started from Jacob "Israel" and his successors "the children of Israel/Israelis" until the establishment of the state of Israel or the Jewish homeland in the sacred, historic and Promised Land until the present moment (and, certainly, it will continue until the Doomsday), which is considered as a unique and very rich experience in human history. Moreover, the Israeli experience contains considerable benefit and several lessons and meanings for human knowledge. Historians need to undergo long-suffering to write about the real happenings of the earlier times of Israel, and, specifically, the religious insinuation, and political and cultural construction of the ancient Israeli state. These are the elements, not previously disclosed but included in the discussion, of which, on the surface, very few appear, together with the most important and basic assumptions.

However, the researcher considers the Israeli national leadership as a mark of identification in the history of the Jewish people, which succeeded in leading the Israelites from the historical and first Passover with Moses to end all suffering and diaspora by the new and second Passover with Ben-Gurion in 1948, to gather all the Jews/children of Israel "again" in their Promised Land in the modern era. In one of the most tragic and incredible historical and religious stories of the trans-history struggle until the current moment to achieve the great goal of all Israelis through the theorization of the dream in the "religio-secular framework" (by Herzl), soft diplomacy (of Weizmann) and wise leadership (by the fighter youthfulness and the new builder of the Israeli dream, Ben-Gurion) by pursuing (gradual and systematic) the policy of self-termination. This story is of the

people, national leadership, and solidarity toward one dream and aim: "the third Israeli temple and kingdom" which translated into "the Israeli experience".

In this matter, every year, the Jews end Passover Seders with the lexis, "Next year in Jerusalem." The same expression is said at the end of Yom Kippur, and nearly all the solemn days of the Jewish year (Hertz, 2011). In the same context, the Zionist movement is called the "state on the way," this movement comprised a set of institutions that were built under the British mandate. Moreover, it was legitimized among the Jewish population through different nationalist programs, e.g. immigration, education, and development of the infrastructure. On the other hand, the Israelis never found a paved road to achieve their goal of returning to the historic homeland in Palestine, or even a suitable condition in the global atmosphere. In reply to the struggle to "build the Jewish state" in the territory, which is outside of the 1949 armistice lines, as earlier, "conquering cores" did in contemporary Europe with respect to politically feeble neighbors. Israel has been confronted with serious global limitations in opposition to the conversion of its political aspirations, cultural claims and local military superiority into state expansion, similar to Somalia in Oegden, Morocco in the Western Sahara, the Falkland Islands in Argentina, Libya in Chad, South Africa in Namibia and North Vietnam in Indochina. (Lustick, 1987).

Additionally, in human history, the ambiguities and nebulous character of European cultural identity contrasts strongly with the dramatic and powerful diaspora nationalism of the Greeks, Jews, and Armenians, along with their affluent reminiscences of golden ages of saints and heroes, their stark symbols of trauma and anguish and their powerful well-liked fables of glorious restoration in their ancient homelands (Smith, 1999). Therefore, the Israeli experience is surely associated with ethnicity, religion (linked to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), the Holy Book, sacred texts, and the Promised Land, all of which represent the culture of this experience. On the same point, whenever the Israelis started to take steps to return to their historic homeland in Palestine, they perceived that they would face ethnic, cultural, historical and religious clashes and conflicts with their cousins, the Arabs/Palestinians.

In short, the researcher highlights some of the great lessons from the Israeli Experience:

- For all Jews, the strong yearning and correlation with the return to the Promised Land since they were in diaspora until the establishment of the state of Israel.
- Almost all Israelis from all time and all walks of life had one dream; a "Jewish homeland" in "Eretz-Israel".
- The emergence of Zionist leaders "in the modern history" who it is believed put an end to the sufferings of the Jewish people all around the world, by their effective role, such as Herzl, Ahad Ha'am, Weizmann, Jabotinsky and Ben-Gurion.
- Although the Israeli leaders and people seem to have had different visions or ideologies, undoubtedly, all of them are entirely consistent with one goal; motivating their people toward the establishment of a Jewish homeland in the whole (not part) of Palestine, before the coming of the Messiah on Doomsday.
- A great lesson concerning patriotism in respect of Herzl's story; an example of how national leaders live and die for their people and national cause.
- Among all the monotheistic religions, there is a continuous disagreement between the traditional and the secular views concerning the notion of the founding of a sovereign nation or state, the Israeli national and secular leaders succeeded in achieving the national aim for the scattered people, which is described by the "Israeli experience".
- The actual motivation for all Jews/Israelis for modernizing and developing the Land "Eretz-Israel" from the arrival of the first Aliyah (1882-1903) until the founding of Israel in 1948.
- The impressive success of the Israeli experience stems from the efficiency of Israeli leaders in exploring all the opportunities that were offered by the international supporters, as well as by the recklessness and irrational mentality of the Palestinian leaders since the fall of the Ottoman Empire until now.
- The state of Israel was born in a storm of military superiority and was the product of the victory of power and national will that had no precedent in the history of the struggle of other nations for independence.
- For all successful historic and modern civilizations and experiences, it is essential for the emergence of nationally motivated generations, all of which have the same one clear goal; they have a sincere desire and a true ability to achieve their goal by all various available and unavailable means by utilizing and establishing very obvious plans and their factual alternatives (for instance, the emergence of conservative religious leaders, rabbis, and the Zionist organization with its national and secular leaders, whose entire efforts were toward the same goal and within approximately the same period).

2. The considerations of historical and religious rights for two peoples in the same Land

In fact, there are many questions in our mind, such as: how do we know what we believe we know regarding the past? Moreover, how do we recognize the "real truth" of history when we see it? We might commence to

answer that question by evaluating the degree to which others deal with historical partiality. In contrast, Zionism, which is seen as a belated expansion of European colonialism imperialism, as well as the expropriation of Palestinian terrain, is considered to be the basis of the divergence (Isacoff, 2005).

Historically, the fact remains that the two peoples point to this millennia-old story as their "origin myth." More importantly, the Palestinians and Israelis point to the land bequeathed by the shepherd Abraham and call it their own. Because this is not a religious text, but an academic inquiry into a modern political situation, this story cannot be the basis of our analysis or argument. Neither is it particularly useful to itemize the subsequent regimes in the region. As fascinating as the Babylonian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman, Old Kingdom, Caliphate, and Ottoman – in no particular order – governments may have been, they will serve as little more than a backdrop (Mahler, 2010).

Although the majority of contemporary historians view that the land of Palestine or Eretz-Israel was host to two opposing national projects; a local Palestinian Arab project as well as the Jewish-Zionist one. Both sides were prepared with logical narratives of the past as well as of prerogative: the Palestinians consider themselves as native inhabitants or indigenous, and that they had all constitutional rights. On the other hand, the Zionists highlighted prehistoric biblical assurance as well as deliverance from a dangerous diaspora in Europe (Rabinowitz & Monterescu, 2008). Then the Jews were returning to their ancient homeland from which they were expelled by the Romans and the crusaders; they brought with them the means of developing the country and wished to become close to the Arab civilization. They wished to revive their Hebrew language and establish their own schools in which the Arabic language and history would be taught. Moreover, the two peoples have long used statistics as an extension of the conflict with each side attempting to bolster its case by maximizing its population while minimizing that of the other (Strawson, 2010).

Religiously both the Palestinians and the Israelis have common ground to live peacefully in one land. For example, the Wailing Wall, one of the sites, is holy to both Jews and Muslims, albeit in quite different ways. The Wailing Wall or Western Wall (in Hebrew, Ha-Kotel Ha-Ma'aravi) to the Jews is holy as the last remnant of the Temple, while Muslims regarded it as the outer limit of the holy district (al-Haram al-Sharif), to which, according to pious legend, Prophet Mohammad tethered his mount (Buraq) during his night journey and ascent to heaven; hence, the Arabic name for this part of the wall is "al-Buraq" (Kramer, 2011).

Therefore, the researcher is going to briefly review the origins and considerations of the historical and religious rights for both peoples in the land of Palestine, as shown below:

2.1 The Israeli considerations of historical and religious rights in Palestine/Eretz Israel

Actually, there are many historical and religious aspects to prove the Israeli/Jewish right to the Holy Land or Palestine, which are derived from the Hebrew Bible and the patriarch's narratives (besides the religious texts in Islam from the Quran and Sunni). Hence, the major question is: can Eretz Israel (land of Israel) be considered as a "geo-theological" term that refers to actual space in the land of Palestine? Or, according to Jewish tradition, what exactly is "Holy" about Eretz Israel? Moreover, in the Bible, Isaiah 2:5 "O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord", for this reason, the Jews had had only one great dream: "next year in Jerusalem" is the traditional expression. In addition, all Jews take business activities very seriously, inasmuch as they always say "We shall live at last as free men on our own soil, as well as die serenely in our own homes" (Mahler, 2010).

However, the Israelite ethnic group engaged Palestine by a steady, and for the most part peaceful, process of infiltration. However, although the Israelite occupation of Palestine was more complex than a casual reading of the schematized narrative of Joshua might lead one to suppose, it may be that it was far more than a largely peaceful infiltration of semi-nomadic clans, but involved heavy fighting and violent conquest, as the Bible itself declares (Bright, 1976).

Ethnically, the distinguishing characteristic of the Jews has been their exile, because of living among other cultures and in order to maintain cultural identity, living in diaspora, an element of Jewish consciousness for 1900 years has been to return to Eretz-Israel, or Zion. From a theological perspective, the Jews were cast out of their land and into exile for transgressions against Yahweh. Therefore, some believe that the Jews are serving a penance and awaiting redemption from God. Jewish redemption and return to the Holy Land can only in certainty be divinely provided on Judgment Day, when the Messiah comes to bring peace to all nations; however, the idea of a homeland was never considered an actual political ideology until the nineteenth-century (Harms & Ferry, 2008).

Although all Jews feel a religious tie to the land that today is known as Israel, the movement for a "Homeland" was predominantly secular. In fact, many religious Jews considered it an affront to God for man to construct a Jewish state, rather than waiting for it to occur naturally when the Messiah arrived. Without a strong religious mooring, proposals for a location ranged from rural areas of Argentina to Uganda or the island of Madagascar (Mahler, 2010).

Consequently, it is not possible to articulate due to the passage of centuries when Abraham, Isaac, as well as Jacob "Israel" really lived. The researcher is quite different to those who depend on the holy books only as a historical reference in the story of the Holy Land or Palestine, like some researchers who said that the Bible presents that "the history of Israel began with the migration of the Hebrew patriarchs from Mesopotamia to their new homeland in Palestine" (Bright, 1976). In contrast, according to the Holy Quran and Sunni sect, it is found that that God "Allah" specifically told the "children of Israel" that you should dwell in the Holy Land. Although the Israelis rely solely on the Bible to prove their religious right to the Holy Land, scholars cannot simply consider just one reference to prove any political, historical, or geographical right.

Historically and religiously, King David acknowledged the city as the capital of the foremost Jewish kingdom. David's heir as well as son, King Solomon, erected the First Temple there, consistent with the Bible, as a holy place to worship the Almighty. Unluckily, history would not be kind to the Jewish people. Four hundred and ten years after King Solomon finished the building of Jerusalem; the Babylonians captured as well as shattered the city, and forced the Jews into exile. After Fifty years, the Jews, or Israelites were permitted to come back after Persia dominated Babylon. The Jews' first order of business was to retrieve Jerusalem as their capital as well as rebuild the Holy Temple, witnessed in history as the Second Temple (Hertz, 2011). In other words, after Solomon, the kingdom was disrupted; ten tribes formed the kingdom of Israel in the north, and the other two formed the kingdom of Judah based on Jerusalem (Tibawi, 1977).

In addition, the Bible tells how the sons of Jacob, having gone down into Egypt and sojourned there a long time, were led thence by Moses and brought to Sinai, where they received that covenant and law, which made them a peculiar people; subsequently, after further wanderings, they entered Palestine and took it. Beyond this, the pattern of promise and covenant embedded itself in the minds of the Israelites (Bright, 1976).

2.2 The Palestinian considerations of historical and religious rights in the land of "Palestine"

In fact, all Palestinians look at "Palestine" with a similar natural adoration as well as factual passion similar to how Mexico appeared to any Aztec or any Sioux who looked upon his grassland. Notwithstanding, some writers tend to label all Palestine and indeed the whole of geographical Syria (ash-sham) with the appellation of "Holy Land". Added to that, for all Muslims, is the significance of Palestine because of Prophet Muhammad's miraculous nocturnal journey from Mecca to Jerusalem and his ascension to heaven from there. However, culturally, Palestine remained an integral part of the Arab-Islamic civilization (Tibawi, 1977).

For all Arabs, it is necessary to provide this sketch of the history of Palestine from the seventh-century until the present. In this regard, Kramer (2011) concluded that "under both Ottoman and British rule, Palestine was predominantly Arab." In contrast, Hertz (2009) deemed that "there are no age-old Palestinian people", next to the majority, supposed Palestinians are comparative newcomers to the "Land of Israel". Moreover, the supposed loyalty of indigenous Muslims barely thrived when non-Muslim units, the Jews, the British, and the Crusaders, took control of the Holy Land. When political control proceeded to Muslim hands, the enthusiastic loyalty of the Palestinians magically disappeared, no matter how remote or how tyrannical the government. Hertz himself sometimes theorizes that the Palestinian Arabs shed themselves as an inhabitant people in "Palestine" – like the Native Americans in America or the Aborigines in Australia. In a decade, the Arab armies won control of Constantinople's Middle Eastern holdings: Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and Cyrenaica (Libya).

Based on all of the above, the researcher believes that it is difficult to prove that the Palestinians had historical or religious rights to the land of Palestine, except the two holy sites linked to the event of "Prophet Muhammad's miraculous nocturnal night journey" and "al-Aqsa Mosque". There is nothing to say about that issue. Therefore, from the researcher's viewpoint there is a lack of evidence regarding the Palestinian's religious and historical rights to that land!

3. The direct and indirect influential role for national leadership in the Israeli experience

In my opinion, some people are born leaders, and some of these leaders become national leaders for their people, however, very few of these become a great leader, and are able to drive a successful experience. When one of them becomes a humanitarian and historical model, then his people and all generations should be proud of his influential role in the national memory. Undoubtedly, the effective national leadership has played a vital role in the success of the Israeli experience, whether it was religious or secular leadership. In sharp contrast, nobody can erase from human and historical memory the many reckless leaders, who have led their people to devastation, dispersion, killing and loss of all national historical rights, as they will never be considered as national leaders. Moreover, both national and local leaders are highly visible in their societies. Their attitudes towards different ethnicities can make a great contribution to maintaining peace and winning hearts and minds. However, some ethnic leaders might seek personal benefit from people's grievances by increasing the likelihood of conflict rather than solving it. However, ethnic leaders seek to make ethnicity the dominant political issue in order to increase their own power. Under the conditions of an actual or perceived security dilemma, status

concerns, and hegemonic domination, such a leader can produce immediate and profound polarization within the society (Can, 2006).

Therefore, from the above discussion, the researcher in this section debates two different types of struggle for national leadership in the Israeli experience, as shown below:

3.1 The direct influential role of the Israeli leadership in the Israeli experience

For all Israelis, there has only ever been one dream a "Jewish home land"; "to the Jew as a man – everything to Jews as a nation." In the same sense, the researcher considers that the real fruit of the Israeli experience is the recreation or rebuilding the "State of Israel" in the "Promised Land". In this regard, Hertz (2007) underlined that the two most important events in the current history before the formation of the "Jewish National Home" were: first, the origin of modern Zionism, and, second, the Balfour Declaration.

Therefore, to deal with the role of Israeli national leadership in the success of the Israeli experience, it is impossible to ignore the great role of the Zionist Movement/Organization, which has influenced the modern history of Israel, and also produced the greatest national leaders who have represented the Jews and wrote the conclusion of the Israeli experience in the modern era, such as Herzl, Weizmann and Ben-Gurion.

Therefore, the researcher will "briefly" review in this section the Zionist Organization, Herzl and Weizmann, as follows:

3.1.1 The Zionist Organization toward one dream – "Homeland for an Exiled People"

First, the fundamental definition of Zionism – according to Ben-Ami (2005) – as the movement for the liberation of the Jewish people, and its justification as the inevitable response to the Jewish question, were shared by all:

> "The word Zion is one of the many biblical names of Jerusalem. It was born in Europe at the end of the nineteenth century as a national movement that gave political expression to the millenarian yearning of the Jews to return to Zion. It aimed at gathering the exiled Jews in their ancestral homeland, Eretz Israel, and restoring Jewish sovereignty in what was now Palestine. Zionism was never a religious dogma. It was always a widely democratic and diversified movement that encompassed right and left, moderates and extremists, the champions of compromise with the Arabs in order to partition the land, and those who would settle for nothing less than the whole of Eretz Israel."

The Zionist movement believes that Jews have a right to a state in Palestine because of religious and historical ties to the region. Zionists point to the first Jewish inhabitation of Palestine, which dated before 1200 B.C.E., as a justification for choosing Palestine as the location of a Jewish state. This argument paints the Palestinians as just the most recent conquerors of their ancient homeland. However, it is important to understand that Zionism is a nationalist and not a religious movement; Zionists have never wished to create a utopian religious state. The purpose was to create a homeland where Jews would be welcomed and remain safe. In the early twentieth-century the Zionists were successful in motivating Jews to migrate to Palestine. Between 1881 and 1914, the Jewish population in Palestine increased from 24,000 to 85,000 (Taylor-Weiner, 2009).

In fact, rarely in history has a national movement marched to the Promised Land, as the Zionists did, with such a brilliant display of diplomatic savior faire and military skills! A keystone of Zionist diplomacy, Britain remained throughout vitally important for the consolidation of the national home. The British connection, as well as the persistent drive of the future state of Israel for a strategic alliance with a Western power, reflected the inherently Western-orientated inclination of Zionism. In sum:

> "The Zionists clearly enjoyed major advantages in the approaching conflict. Theirs was an essentially democratic movement, rich and diverse in social, cultural and political expressions, and formidably well organized in a modern, state-like structure. However vital, the military option was always to be accompanied by a diplomatic effort, the Zionist way of achieving the dream of Jewish statehood was a double-edged strategy, namely, a powerful military response and a subtle deployment of diplomatic skills" (Ben-Ami, 2005).

In short, the origins of modern Zionism probably derive from the work of two rabbis, Yehuda Alkalai (1798-1878) from Sarajevo, and Zvi Hersch Kalischer (1795-1874) from Poland. Both these rabbis reversed the existing religious orthodoxy that had long held that Jewish return to Israel would only be possible with the coming of the Messiah and that human intervention was justified and indeed necessary in establishing a center for Jewish life in historical Israel. While both of them framed their arguments in spiritual terms both attempted to prove that the Jewish people had a connection with the land of Israel. Alkalai mentioned that, "we as a people are only properly called Israel in the land of Israel." In other words, there was no Zionist organization established until 1897, Zionism predated it. Notions that nationhood should be recreated on a territorial basis were well established by the late nineteenth-century. Nevertheless, many traditional rabbis forbade their supporters to have anything to do with Zionist activists. They considered Zionism as interfering with God's will and that the Jews ought to stay in exile until the coming of the Messiah.

There is no doubt that Zionism began as a European national movement but turned into a colonialist movement once its leader decided to implement their vision of national revival in the land of Palestine (Pappe, 2004). Specifically, the Zionist movement was based on three propositions: (1) the Jews constituted a nation, (2) the Jews had a historical connection to Palestine, and (3) the Jews had a right to a national home. As a result, the movement confronted two related tasks; the first was the diplomatic campaign that sought to achieve legal recognition of the Jewish national presence in the country, while the second was to safeguard and expand the Palestinian Jewish community (Strawson, 2010). In this matter, the researcher would describe Zionism as a conscious revolt as follows:

> "Most revolts are an uprising against a system; Zionism was a revolt against Jewish destiny. Unlike the European colonialists who acted as the beachhead and promoters of the strategic interests of the mother country, the Zionists cut off their links with their countries of origin and inaugurated for themselves a new beginning as a community that represented a radical break with Jewish history. A new culture and an old-new language were to be two fundamental pillars of this fresh start. Zionism was a Social and Cultural Revolution, a movement that, in its beginning, believed innocently that it would not even require the use of force in order to assert itself." (Ben-Ami, 2005).

However, the Basel conference in 1897 was the first step to unify the Zionist movement. One of the policies that was outlined was to build an establishment for Jewish people "Eretz Israel". It was expected that the policy would be backed by international law. Practical Zionism was advocated by Herzl himself (Mitchell, 2007).

Even though Zionism subjugated the thought that Palestine fitted in with the Jewish people through God's covenant with Abraham, Zionists imagined a mainly worldly project commencing with Herzl, who argued his case for a Jewish state in Palestine almost entirely in terms of modernization (Fields, 2010).

In summary, according to Ben-Ami (2005), the Zionist way of achieving the dream of a Jewish statehood was a double-edged strategy, namely, a powerful military response and a subtle deployment of diplomatic skills. Finally, the Zionists played their diplomatic cards wisely. The decision of Zionist executives in August 1946 to depart from the Biltmore plan and endorse the idea of partition was a brilliant move that a few months later received the support of the United States. America's endorsement of the partition would be one of the main reasons that would force the British to refer the question of Palestine back to the UN. Therefore, the researcher considers that no other state in modern times was born with such a degree of international sympathy and feelings of guilt as "Israel".

3.1.2 Herzl, from the Israeli dream to a theoretical and realistic framework

Certainly, all humans since ancient history until now, especially the followers of the three monotheistic religions, all knew "Prophet" Moses and his story concerning the pharaoh of ancient Egypt. The followers were aware of the stories, of how God commanded and helped him to banish slavery from ancient Egypt. Subsequently, God guided him and the "Israelis" to settle in the Holy and Promised Land. However, the Israeli experience produced a modern version of Moses, who was considered the "second Mosses' or "new David"; Theodor Herzl, who spent his life pursuing the important national and religious goal, to gather his people (same Mosses) and return from diaspora to the sacred and Promised Land.

Psychologically, dreaming is a "universal human experience that offers a unique view of consciousness and cognition." (Hobson, Pace-Schott & Stickgold, 2000). Similarly, Herzl had only one dream – establishing a home state for his people; "all Jews". In 1896, an Austrian journalist named Theodore Herzl wrote a volume that would prove to play a historically crucial role in world history, titled the Jewish state "Der Judenstaat". He did not invent the concept of Zionism, but his book formalized a growing belief among the Jews of the world about the need for a Jewish state (Mahler, 2010).

Surprisingly, for many years, Herzl was unfamiliar with the plight of Russian Jewry or the fledgling Zionist movements that preached and practiced; his concern being European Jewry. Herzl began work on formalizing a solution to Jewish discrimination, and, in 1896, produced 'Der Judenstaat'. A short pamphlet (less than one hundred pages) that spelled out in style and force of conviction what would become the principal statement of Zionism. Though not asserting anything conceptually innovative or new, Herzl was putting a face to the cause. What was unique was an assimilated European intellectual promoting the notion of the Jews removing themselves from their situation. Herzl's "Der Judenstaat" and the first Zionist congress held at Basel in 1897 gave Jewish immigration to Palestine a political complexion. The congress resolved that "Zionism" 'strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law'. The resolution was deliberately vague, avoiding the expressions 'state' and 'international law', which would have offended the Sultan of Turkey, the legal sovereign over Palestine.

In fact, Herzl had little contact with Zionism or Judaism until the mid-1890s, but he became the pivotal figure in generating a vision of Jewish emancipation (Strawson, 2010). Moreover, Herzl indicated that some Jews in the late 1900s began to see a potential political reality in the Promised Land "The world resounds with outcries against the Jews, and these outcries have awakened the slumbering idea" (Harms & Ferry, 2008). Considering

different facts, Herzl decided to depart Europe and make new establishments in Zion, the territory of Israel. His job was simple, he had to inform Jewish people about the possibilities of anti-Semitism behavioral outbreaks in Europe and guide them to their prehistoric homeland where they could restart their lives as a European outside of Europe (Pappe, 2004).

Herzl never formulated any plans out of Zionism. The concept of Zionism has always played a dominant role in Judaism. In fact, he mentioned his thoughts in a contemporary academic dissertation. However, the location and the characteristics of the future Jewish state was a subject of intense debate among Jewish leaders and intellects. His notion of the Jewish state was rooted in what he called "the Society of Jews." Irrespective of these differences, Zionists were still in support of Herzl and the program he had formulated, coupled with the increased exposure of his argument "Der Judenstaat", which was being smuggled into Russia in defiance of its censorship.

Herzl himself told the enthusiasts, who insisted on more explicit language, that the Jews would understand that the aim was a "State". He sought to bring it about through the patronage and protection of the Sultan of Turkey or the Emperor of Germany or both. Confirmation of this fact was included in a commissioned official report submitted to the second congress in 1898. The leadership of the Zionist movement, however, was convinced that the Arab problem would somehow disappear once a charter was obtained from the Sultan. Unfortunately, Herzl failed to obtain a charter from the Sultan (Tibawi, 1977),

With 200 friends and allies from Eastern Europe, Herzl assembled the first Zionist assembly in Basel in 1897. In the same context, Herzl's revelation of a national answer for European Jews was not unique. It allocated a great deal to a logical Jewish proto-nationalism that had started in the 1850s in Eastern Europe (Pappe, 2004).

Herzl's name and legend was growing, and on August 29, 1897, a congress was called to assemble in Basel, Switzerland, to lay the foundation of a Zionist organization. At the end of three days of speeches, reports, and arguments, a definitive program was penned for the newly formed world Zionist organization: "the aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law". However, the congress considered the subsequent means to the achievement of this end:

1. The encouragement of the immigration of Palestine agreed by Jewish agriculture and the industrial workers as well.

2. The organization along with the obligatory mutuality of the entire Jewry through suitable organizations, local as well as international, in conformity with the law of each country.

3. The intensification along with the development of Jewish national, their response as well as awareness were evident.

4. Introductory steps towards attaining government approval, where essential, to the accomplishment of the aspiration of Zionism.

The declaration of principles, also known as the "Basel Declaration", clearly stated the intentions of the congress while at the same time it tried not to create concern or panic about a "Jewish state" in Ottoman Palestine; the word "home" was used to prevent, or at least allay, those fears.

After the "Basel Congress", Herzl had jotted down in his diary: "at Basel I founded the Jewish homeland," moreover, he had thought that there is nothing less than Palestine at all (Harms & Ferry, 2008). Herzl did better in the eastern part of Europe. Herzl was acknowledged as "the new David" by an excited swarm who gathered to pay attention to him on his lecture excursion (Pappe, 2004).

Finally, time ran out for Theodor Herzl, who died on July 3, 1904, at the age of 44. Although he never achieved the international support he hoped for, Herzl left the world Zionist organization in a good position (Harms & Ferry, 2008). After the Second World War, people started to see Herzl as a visionary leader, some even tagged the status of prophet to his name. Towards the end of the nineteenth-century, further practical steps ensured the progress of Zionist movements. The Jewish people started to see their own Zionist dream, which was different from the dream of Herzl (Pappe, 2004). However, the researcher considers Theodor Herzl as one of the theorists for the re-creation of the idea of the Jewish state, "Israel", and the greatest national architect of the Israeli "dream and experience".

3.1.3 Chiam Weizmann, from the Israeli dream to academic and soft diplomacy

In accordance with the historiography concerning the British Mandate of Palestine, Weizmann was generally believed to be the person who was unswervingly accountable for the institution of the general Jewish home, particularly in Palestine. Weizmann was one of Herzl's first followers, and was a companion of Achad Ha'am. In many ways, in twentieth-century Zionism, Weizmann personified the amalgamation of Herzl as well as Ha'am's thoughts. Moreover, he supported a working class Zionism within the Jewish communities in Europe. He also stressed repeatedly that if the Zionist scheme were to work, it would have to be supported by a major European power. To Weizmann, this power was the British Empire.

Briefly, there are several facts concerning Weizmann, such as, first, Weizmann, was an Ashkenazi who hailed from modern-day Belarus, which at that time was a small part of the Russian Empire. He received a doctorate in chemistry in 1899 from the University of Freiburg in Switzerland and became a British citizen in 1910.

Throughout the First World War, Weizmann was working in the British marine laboratories. From this position, he commenced to create associates in the higher echelons of the British government, together with Lord Arthur Balfour as well as David Lloyd George, who supported the Zionist cause (Mitchell, 2007). Second, Chiam Weizmann, who was the leader of the Zionist movement in Britain, was a professor of chemistry at Manchester University in 1904, and the MP for his electorate was none other than Arthur Balfour who he met when the general election was held in the 1906. However, it was from side to side Weizmann that Balfour was specified a 'proper introduction' to clarify the goals of the Zionist and Zionism (Kattan, 2009).

Adding to the above, Weizmann developed a scientific method to produce acetone, a component that was necessary for ammunition. His new position in London allowed him to persuade British politicians and diplomats to support the Zionist movement, through which he, as well as other Zionists, endeavored to increase government support for a Jewish state in preceding years, from his innovative geographical as well as societal position. In addition, it is significant to have some knowledge of how the Balfour Declaration came about. Zionist leader, Weizmann, participated in a middle role in winning this allowance for the Zionists. Weizmann was again well positioned to manage the development to the Declaration itself.

Inside the small communities of Europe, Weizmann argued for a grassroots Zionism. He also advocated that main European authoritative powers must provide backing to the workable Zionism projects, and, according to him, this power was the British Empire. Weizmann was strongly committed to the ideology of Eretz Israel, Hebrew for the land, and, once again to re-establish the presence of Jewish people there. Weizmann wrote in his letter to Lord Maurice Hankey, "Instead of 'establishment', would it not be more desirable to use the word "re-establishment"? And, by implementing this small alteration, the historical connection was depicted more clearly with the ancient tradition and the whole matter becomes evident in its true light. Moreover, Weizmann also wished and wanted that the matter of a Jewish settlement in Palestine would be perceived as the repatriation of the Jewish people to their homeland. Weizmann was well aware of the potential threat posed by the establishment of a Jewish national home to the Jews living abroad. The legal status of the Jews living in Europe could potentially be threatened and he was not a supporter of the idea to force Jewish immigration to the land of Palestine.

Rationally, Weizmann distinguished between the perception of the Jewish nation and a Jewish race. He defined the Jewish nation as consisting of a variety of ethnic groups alienated by language as well as chronological experiences, but incorporated by common descent as well as religion. He did not consider the thought of the Jewish race. In the last proposal to the Secretary Hankey, Weizmann inscribes "May I also suggest 'Jewish people' rather than 'Jewish race'." Whilst Weizmann was seen by the majority of British strategy creators as the leader of the Zionist movement, a lot of Zionists themselves guaranteed their loyalty not to Weizmann but to his competitor Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky (Mitchell, 2007).

On January 3, 1919, Dr. Weizmann signed a political accord in the name of the Zionist organization with the Emir Faisal, son of the Sheriff of Mecca, within the framework of the Paris conference ending the First World War. In this agreement, the Arabs promised to recognize the Balfour declaration and said that they would permit Jewish immigration and settlement in Palestine (Mahler, 2010).

Therefore, the researcher can summarize the desperate attempts of Weizmann to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine. In testifying at the Peel Royal Commission for the Zionists, Weizmann pressed for the partition of the country even if the territory assigned to the Jews "was the size of a tablecloth." The "Peel State" was only the beginning. As he said: "the Kingdom of David was smaller", but, "under Solomon, it became an empire." Moreover, Ross (2009) considered that Weizmann was mythologized for gaining the ear of Lloyd George. In more recent years, although historians have doubted the degree of influence Weizmann had over the War Cabinet, Weizmann was considered one of the great engineers (same as Ben-Gurion) of the re-establishment of "Israel" and the modern national maker of the "Israeli experience".

3.2 The indirect influential role of the Palestinian leadership in the Israeli experience

In modern history, once anyone read the biography of Haj Amin al-Husseini, they would view him as an acclaimed leader. Although, logically, his role should be acknowledged in the national, historical and religious rights for his people, like all national leaders throughout history, in general, or even from his rivals "the Israeli leaders", the strange thing is that al-Husseini played a negative role in the Palestinian cause, although it was "indirectly" a positive role for the success of the Israeli experience, as will be explained:

Al-Husseini, from devout and wealthy to a reckless leader

Practically, the muftis in Palestine (at least in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) seemed not to have been integrated into the "ilmiyye" (knowledge qualified), and were less closely tied to the state courts than was the case in Istanbul, Bursa, or Edirne. To attain influence, they therefore needed local recognition, which was most easily gained by someone belonging to a respected family, who added learning, achievement, and possibly charisma to their inherited rank and status. In the nineteenth-century, the trend toward greater bureaucratization

also reached Palestine, so, here too, the function of the mufti was increasingly formalized and defined more strictly in terms of imperial hierarchy (Kramer, 2011).

In 1922, Herbert Samuel – the first High Commissioner for mandatory Palestine – who was a liberal, a Jew, and a Zionist, appointed Haj Amin al-Husseini, the 26 year old scion of one of Jerusalem's leading Muslim families, to the position of Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, charged with overseeing the city's Islamic holy places. Al-Husseini was in charge of the country's Muslim religious courts and schools as well as the Waqf, the body administering Muslim social services. Nevertheless, as a clerical leader, the mufti did not intend to render unto Caesar the things that were Caesars. A charismatic speaker and ruthless politician, al-Husseini used his new office to fuel the bonfires of hatred in Palestine. He became the most powerful Palestinian leader during the Mandate period and beyond. He led his people down the path of Islamic extremism and murderous anti-Semitism and into a disastrous military confrontation, first with the British and then with the nascent state of Israel. If the Palestinian people really suffered a Nakba, it was largely of their own making, and that of their Grand Mufti (Stern, 2011).

In brief, most historians, as well as the researcher, wonder about the selection of al-Husseini by the High Commissioner Herbert Samuel, as al-Husseini lacked formal qualifications for the office. In this regard, Kramer (2011) argued that:

> "What and when recommended Amin al-Husseini for the office of mufti of Jerusalem, in spite of his obvious lack of proper qualification? Above all, the British hoped to cultivate him as a promising young man from an elite family who in the tense atmosphere of the early Mandate years could credibly defend a policy of "reason and moderation" against all forms of "extremism," a policy that would ultimately serve British interests."

In 1931, al-Husseini became the head of the Supreme Muslim Council, and he organized a large international gathering in Jerusalem attended by Muslims from all over the world to defend al-Aqsa and the Islamic holy places. Although the British eventually suppressed the al-Husseini led uprising, they again tried to appease the Arabs at the expense of the Jews. In 1936, the mufti and the Arab Executive Committee called for a general strike (Kattan, 2009).

The objectives of the Grand Mufti, al-Husseini, were gradually moved from pan-Arabism, the dream of unifying all Arab countries into one and where Palestine's Arabs would join with their brothers of Syria, to stop Palestine from being divided into parts, more precisely, his goals shifted to ensure the very survival of Palestine. Besides the non-Muslim presence in Palestine, al-Husseini had to deal with riots in 1929 and Arab revolts between 1936 and 1939.

Based on the suspicion that Jews had come to Palestine to deprive and rule Arabs, he gathered a large number of followers to protest, despite the reality that Jewish immigrants were bringing capital and skills, which constituted the single most important factor driving Palestine's rapid economic development, and, therefore, was increasing the country's capacity for even more immigration. In the same context, Hertz (2009) stated that al-Husseini, a tough religious leader with strong anti-Zionist beliefs, violently opposed Jewish immigration in the 1920s and 1930s. This two-sided strategy can be termed as the "Diplomacy of Rejection". Along with brutal measures, the Grand Mufti sought diplomatic help from Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan and Iraq - despite these countries were formed to reorganize themselves after the Ottoman era, moreover, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan and Iraq were recognized by the United Nations, the British and the French-.

In this matter, Ross (2009) considered that the Mufti of Jerusalem was behind the collapse of the "national movement" -despite the fact that al-Husseini had been one of the instigators of the Nabi Mussa riots in 1920; the Mufti was not a nationalist leader-. Notables like the Husseini family benefited under Turkish rule and continued prospering under the British. It is for this reason that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem cannot be classified as a nationalist leader. Although charismatic, charisma is no substitute for the Mufti's inability to commit himself to the political vision needed to sustain a nationalist movement. The Mufti outlined a general vision into practice. If anything, the Arab Rebellion of 1936 exposed the Mufti's reservations about such an ambitious plan. The fact was, he avoided leadership during the first ten days of the general strike, which suggested that the Mufti did not fully sympathize with the national aspirations of Palestinian Arabs, or that the Mufti lacked a firm commitment to the nationalist cause, which indicated that the Mufti was more concerned with the preservation of his own office and authority. What Palestinian nationalism lacked was the political leadership committed to the development and maturity of a Palestinian movement that could equal the Zionist movement.

In the case of Palestine, immediately following Hitler's ascension in 1933, Palestinian Arabs circulated Nazi propaganda, arguing that nationalist socialism was in concert with their own aspirations for driving the Yishuv out of Palestine. However, a distinction must be made between supporting fascism as a political ideology and implementing policies based on racial discrimination and hatred. Based on the Nazi regime's persecution of Jews in general, Germany's race policies undermined the Arab cause in Palestine at every turn. While according to al-Husseini's attitude, between 1933 and 1936, for example, the rate of "German Jews" entering Palestine more than doubled, leading to an increase in the Yishuv's total population. Not only did the Palestinians and their

grand mufti (and most Arabs too) fail to see the connection between German anti-Semitism and Jewish immigration, they also failed to recognize that Hitler was more interested in courting Britain as its partner in both Europe and the Middle East (Ross, 2009).

The researcher cannot understand al-Husseini's attitude to reject all peace proposals and attempts to coexist peacefully with Israelis/Jews, rather than killing his people in rebellions, wars and establishing suspicious relations with bloody figures and more brutality and racism, such as his relationship with Hitler and Hassan al-Banna. Although the most powerful leader of the Palestinian people became a Nazi collaborator, this should not be allowed to tarnish the historic justice of the Palestinian cause. After all, other anti-British nationalist leaders did not establish ties with Nazi Germany based on the aphorism that; "the enemy of my enemy is my friend". The problem with that analogy is that there is considerable evidence that al-Hussein was attracted to Nazi and Fascist ideology. During the 1930s, al-Husseini arranged a Palestinian-Arab youth movement, subsequently copying Hitler's youth model. Moreover, he sent a delegation team from Palestine to attend the Nazi Nuremberg rallies (Stern, 2011).

Following his escape from Palestine in 1937 (he only sparked the flame of war and hatred between two sides, then ran away, just as any adolescent would), he allied himself to Nazi Germany and supported its anti-Semitic policies. However, the Arab population of Palestine and its political elite did not follow him in this direction (Kramer, 2011). On the other hand, in June 1946, the postwar French government permitted him to enter Egypt, where he was given refuge by King Farouk. In addition, the leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood greeted him as a returning hero. Hassan al-Banna – who was the founder of the radical, bloody and extremist religious party, the Muslim Brotherhood – called "al-Husseini a brave leader who challenged an empire and fought Zionism with the help of Hitler and Germany. Germany and Hitler are gone but Amin al-Husseini will continue the struggle." In the same context, both al-Banna and al-Husseini gathered forces and mobilized thousands of volunteers to go to Palestine to fight during the 1948 war.

Certainly, a headless leadership represents a similar social attitude, in which the radical or extremist leadership becomes widespread and produces the Nazi and Fascist culture in its society. Certainly, an impetuous leader drives his people to a sea of blood, shattering the land and its people, with the loss of homeland, and the result, homeless people.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes two different types of struggle for the national leadership that led to the success of the Israeli experience; one of them, the effective, very positive and direct role like Herzl and Weizmann, while, in contrast, the other one is considered to be the indirect role of the grand mufti, al-Husseini. In summary, the researcher could not ignore the Israeli experience as a great historical lesson and benefit to human knowledge, and the several socio-historic-political benefits that can be gained from that experience. In addition, there are numerous conflicting considerations in the historical and religious rights for the Palestinians and Israelis in the land of Palestine.

References

Avolio. Bruce J. , Walumbwa. Fred O. ,& WeberTodd J. ,(2009) , Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions, Published in Annual Review of Psychology 60 (2009), pp. 421-449; doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621 Copyright © 2009 by Annual Reviews. Used by permission. http://psych.annualreviews.org.

Ben-Ami, Shlomo, (2005), scars of wars wounds of peace; the Israeli-Arab tragedy. Published in great britain in 2005, by weidenfeld. 13579108642. ISBN-13 9 780297 84883 7. ISBN-10 0297 84883 6.

Bright. John, (1976), a history of Israel, 2nd edition- printed in the United States of America-06070809-1098765-Philadelphia; Westminster press, 1972, ISBN 0-664-22068-1. UKM library.

Can. Levent,   (2006), ethnic conflicts and governmental conflict management, First Lieutenant, Turkish Army-B.S., Turkish Military Academy, 1999, Thesis of Master Of Science In Defense Analysis From the Naval Postgraduate School. December 2006.

Fields. Gary, (2010). Landscaping Palestine: Reflections Of Enclosure In A Historical Mirror, Int. J. Middle East Stud. 42 (2010), 63–82,doi:10.1017/S0020743809990535. © Cambridge University Press 2010 0020-7438/10.

Harms, Gregory& Ferry, Todd M. (2008) .the Palestine Israel conflict: a basic introduction, second edition published 2008, New York, NY 10010, ISBN 9870745327341 paperback, 1098765.

Hertz.Eli E, (2011), Jerusalem: One Nation's Capital Throughout History; The Legal Aspects f Jewish Rights, Copyright © 2011 Myths and Facts, Inc. PO Box 941, Forest Hills, NY 11375, 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code ("IRC"). Library of Congress Control Number: 2011900093- ISBN 10: 0-9741804-4-0- Printed in the United States of America.

Hertz, Eli E, (2009). Palestinians, http://www.mythsandfacts.org/Conflict/7/palestinians.pdf.

Hertz, Eli E, (2007), Mandate for Palestine"; the legal aspects of Jewish rights to a National Home in Palestine, Copyright © 2007 Myths and Facts, Inc. and Eli E. Hertz. ISBN 10: 0-9741804-2-4, Library of Congress Control Number: 2007930693, Published by: Myths and Facts. ww.MythsandFacts.org, Printed in the United States of America.

Hobson.J. Allan ,Pace-Schott. Edward F & Stickgold.Robert, (2000), Dreaming and the brain: Toward a cognitive neuroscience of conscious states, behavioral and brain sciences, (2000) 23, 793–1121- Printed in the United States of America. 2000 Cambridge University Press 0140-525X/00.

Isacoff. Jonathan B. (2005), Writing the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Historical Bias and the Use of History in Political Science, March 2005 | Vol. 3/No. 1.http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract;jsessionid=DB5973A8EEBC4D8C36CDF4B4695DD8CB.journals?fromPage=online&aid=286257.

Kattan, Victor. (2009). from Coexistence to Conquest – International Law and the Origins of the Arab–Israeli Conflict, 1891–1949, London: Pluto Press, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 456 pp, ISBN 9780745325781, (pb). Doi: 10.1017/S092215651000052X.

Krämer, Gudrun. (2011). A history of Palestine: from the ottoman conquest to the founding of the state of Israel. Published by Princeton University Press, Third printing, and first paperback printing 2011, ISBN 978-0-691-15007-9.

Lustick. Ian, (1987), Israeli state-building in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip: theory and practice, International Organization 41, 1, winter 1987, © 1987 by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the World Peace Foundation.

Mahler, Gregory S & Mahler, Alden R. W, (2010), the Arab-Israeli conflict; an introduction and documentary reader, first published 2010, by Routledge, DS119.7.M2245 2010-956.04-dc22- 2009008512- ISBN 13:978-0-415-77460-4 (hbk).

Mitchell, Nicholas Ensley, (2007).Towards Nakba: the failure of the British mandate of Palestine, 1922-1939, Mitchell, Nicholas Ensley, Masters of Arts, Summer Commencement, 2007 (a thesis).

Pappe, Ilan, (2004). A history of modern Palestine, one land, two peoples, Cambridge university press, printed in the United States of America- ISBN 0 521556325 paperback.

Rabinowitz.Dan & Monterescu. Daniel, (2008), reconfiguring the "Mixed Town": urban transformations of ethnonational relations in Palestine and Israel, Int. J. Middle East Stud. 40 (2008), 195–226. Printed in the United States of America DOI: 10.1017/S0020743808080513.

Ross. Jared S., (2009), British foreign policy and the Arab rebellion in Palestine: the transformation of Middle East politics, 1936-1939, A Thesis submitted to the department of History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Degree Awarded: Summer Semester, 2009. Florida State University- college of Arts and Sciences.

Smith, Anthony D, (1999), myths and memories of the nations, first published 1999, published in the United States by Oxford University press Inc., New York, JC312.s55-1999-320.54-dc21, 99-36963-ISBN 0-19-829684-3, 357910864. http://www.amazon.co.uk/Myths-Memories-Nation-Anthony-Smith/dp/0198296843.

Stern, sol. (2011), a century of Palestinian rejectionism and Jew hatred, by encounter books, New York, ISBN-13:978-1-59403-620-0, Ds126.7.s74, 2011.

Strawson, John. (2010), Partitioning Palestine; legal fundamentalism in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, first published 2010 by Pluto press, New York, NY 10010, ISBN 9780745323237 paperback, 10987654321.

Taylor-Weiner, Hermes, (2009), "One State or Two States?" 2009 AHS Capstone Projects. Paper 23.http://digitalcommons.olin.edu/ahs_capstone_2009/23.

Tibawi.A.L, (1977), Anglo-Arab relations and the question of Palestine 1914-1921, printed in great Britain – by Luzac & Company Ltd, ISBN 0718922913, 9780718922917. First published in 1977-UKM library.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar