

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #67; November, 2003 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY

AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER

This is my sixty-seventh monthly teaching letter and continues my sixth year of publication. In the last few lessons, we have been covering the prophecies of Daniel. Then to get a clearer picture of Daniel's prophecies, we took up the subjects of race and the Genesis 10 table of nations along with the creation of Adam. If you don't have the lessons on these topics, you may not fully understand this current presentation.

Once comprehending the origin of the Genesis 10 White nations, we will then grasp the unusual world in which Daniel found himself. To give you some idea of that world, I will quote from *History Of The Persian Empire* by A. T. Olmstead, page 229:

"... 'If now you shall think,' he tells us in his tomb inscription, 'How many are those lands which Darius the king seized?' then look at the representations of those who bear the throne. Then you shall know, then shall it be known to you: The spear of a Persian man has gone forth afar; then shall it be known to you: A Persian man has smitten a foe far from Parsa.' Once each representative was properly labeled; today the names of only a limited number have been preserved, but we can still identify the Persian, the Mede, the Elamite, and the Parthian, as well as the Pointed-Cap Scythian, the Babylonian, the Assyrian, and the man of Maka [Maka/Makran being a 1st millennium B.C. term for Egypt]."

In Daniel 8:2 we are told that Daniel had one of his visions in the province of Elam, later to be conquered and become a satrap of Persia: **"And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai."** From this we can ascertain that Daniel understood who the Medes, the Elamites, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, and the Israelite Parthians and Scythians were. He knew that the Medes were of Japheth; the Elamites of Shem; and the Parthians and Scythians as Israelites. For those who wonder whatever happened to Japheth, here is part of the answer: the Medes.

Information on the Elamites is hard to find. For a better than average, though not without error, commentary on the Elamites, I will now quote from the following, found in *A Commentary On The Holy Bible* by Matthew Poole, vol. 2, page 634, on Jeremiah 49:34-39 concerning them:

“34 The word of the LORD that came to Jeremiah the prophet against Elam in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah, saying,

“*Elam* was the son of Shem, Gen. x. 22, his posterity were called Elamites; these were the Persians, as is most probable, though some judge that the Persians were at too great a distance from the Jews to be the people meant here, but we read of no other Elam in Scripture but in Persia, Dan. viii. 2; and though they were indeed at a great distance, yet it is probable that Nebuchadnezzar, having conquered the Assyrians, might also make some inroads into Persia, the emperor of which afterward conquered Babylon. This prophecy being in the first year of Zedekiah must needs be long before the thing was done, for it was ten years before the king of Babylon took Jerusalem.

“35 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Behold, I will break the bow of Elam, the chief of their might.

“All those Eastern people were famous for the use of the bow, the Elamites in special, Isa. xxii. 6: those bows were the *chief of their offensive armour*, though by *the chief of their might* may also be meant their most mighty and strong warriors. This prophecy is probably judged to be fulfilled when the Persians made a defection from the king of the Medes, who was son-in-law to Nebuchadnezzar. Others think that this prophecy was accomplished by Alexander the emperor of Greece, or rather by his successors.

“36 And upon Elam will I bring the four winds from the four quarters of heaven, and will scatter them toward all those winds; and there shall be no nation whither the outcasts of Elam shall not come.

“The prophet threateneth the destruction of the Persians by a confederacy of enemies, supposed Babylonians, Medes, &c., which should assault them on all sides, as when the wind blows at the same time from all quarters, which causeth a whirlwind, which driveth the dust every way hither and thither, so he saith the Persians should be scattered into all nations.

“37 For I will cause Elam to be dismayed before their enemies, and before them that seek their life: and I will bring evil upon them, even my fierce anger, saith the LORD; and I will send the sword after them, till I have consumed them:

“We met with the like threatenings ver. 5, 24, 29, as to fear; and as to their destruction, we have often met with the like threatenings.

“38 And I will set my throne in Elam, and will destroy from thence the king and the princes, saith the LORD.

“God here calls the throne of Nebuchadnezzar, or Cyrus, or Alexander, (whoever he was that conquered the Persians,) his throne: 1. Because God gave it the conqueror. 2. Or because God showed himself the Lord of hosts, or the Lord of the whole earth, by disposing the kingdom of Persia at his pleasure. He doth not threaten the destruction of the whole nation, but the making of it all tributary, so as it should have no kings nor princes of its own.

“39 But it shall come to pass in the latter days, that I will bring again the captivity of Elam, saith the LORD.

“We had the like promise as to Moab, chap. xlviii. 47, and as to Ammon, ver. 6; the same *latter days* either signify after many days, or in the time of the Messias. In the former sense it may refer to Cyrus, who conquered Persia. In the latter sense it is referring to the spiritual liberty which some of these poor heathens were brought into by the gospel. We read, Acts ii. 9, that some of these Elamites were at Jerusalem at Pentecost, and were some of those converted to Christ.”

While I agree with much of Poole’s commentary, I do not concur entirely at verses 36, 38 & 39. Inasmuch as Jeremiah was prophesying about Persia some one hundred plus years ahead of time, the “outcasts of Elam” at verse 36 would have been more likely the Israelites within Persian

territory. Surely the divorced, deported Israelites, while under Persian authority, could rightly be called “the outcasts of Elam.” Naturally, Poole being blind to the Identity Message would, like many other commentators, assume that it is speaking about Elam. That being true, then the “throne” in verse 38 can only be either Cyrus, Darius or maybe both. If we can accept this, then we will have no trouble understanding who it is speaking about when it says: **“... I will bring again the captivity of Elam ...”** **It’s Israel that was in “captivity”, not Elam. In fact, some members the lost tribes were called “Parthians”, and “Medes”, and “Elamites” at the Feast of Pentecost with the Baptism of the Holy Spirit at Acts 2:9: “Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia.”** Whether or not the “*latter days*” refers to that time or our day is uncertain, but my own opinion is that it is now. We can be quite sure of this, as the punishment period was to last 2,520 years. In view of this, let’s now take a look at some Elamite history.

For a bit of Elamite history we will use some excerpts from the book *The Heritage Of Persia* by Richard N. Frye, pages 44, 56-59, 67 & 69. Before reading this documentation, it should be pointed out that the term “Semitic”, (like in many books and cases) may be misapplied, and at times the author is only guessing on such things as race and language. I must remind you again that all the references I use are not perfect, and must be scrutinized for content. Nevertheless, Frye brings us some interesting information about the subject we are discussing, and therefore we must sort out the useful from the invalid. In order to accomplish that, we must use all the resources we can find: Biblical, historical and archeological. When we can achieve that end, it will all fit together very nicely. In order to get an overall view, one should read several authors on the subject. While in many cases we can attain such a goal, there are still many blank places to be filled in. Please consider these things as you read the following:

“The land of Bactria was the most important satrapy in eastern Iran under the Achaemenids, and later was the centre of the post-Alexander Greeks who established a kingdom here and then proceeded to the conquest of north-west India but successive invasions of the rich plain between the Oxus river and the mountains changed the composition of the population, so we know nothing about the ancient inhabitants ...

“The Elamites were known by the Persians as Uja or Huja after a mountain people to the east of Susa probably closely related to the Elamites. Classical authors knew them as Uxii (a mistake by Alexander’s historians for Uzii?) found in the modern name Khuzistan. Elam appears early in history but little is known about it The name ‘Japhetic’ has been given to the languages in the area of western Iran which were neither Semitic nor Indo-European, among which Elamite is one, but this classification tells us little ... In any case, the Elamites had a long history and acted as the intermediaries between mountains and plains. They were greatly influenced first by the Sumerians in southern Mesopotamia, probably the inventors of writing, and then by the Semitic Akkadians.

“It is impossible to detail the history of Elam here, and much is unknown since it is reconstructed primarily from Akkadian cuneiform tablets, but Elam had some features of interest different from the small states of Mesopotamia, with whom the Elamite princelings warred. The role of the woman in ancient Elamite society seems to have been conspicuous, for the right to the throne was transmitted through the mother ... The divinisation of the king is uncertain, but the descent of kingship from brother to brother, instead of father to son, seems to be peculiar to Elamites, though not unknown elsewhere in different times and places ...

“Furthermore Elamite was the language of the records at Persepolis under Darius, an indication of the presence of many Elamites as inhabitants of the region. We may suppose that there was an important

Elamite influence on the Persians, perhaps to be compared to the local Iranian influence on the Turkish invaders of Azerbaijan so many centuries later ...

“About 1175 BC a king of Elam, Shutruk-Nakhunte, captured the great and ancient city of Babylon carrying back to Susa, his capital, great booty, among which was a diorite stone engraved with Hammurabi’s law code, excavated by the French in 1901 ... After 1150 BC Elam is in decline and is not mentioned in sources, the spotlight of history having turned to the north ... When the Elamites reappear in history in the seventh century BC, it is as a conglomeration of principalities friendly or more often hostile to Assyria. The final result of years of intrigues and partial success at times against Assyrian power was the decision of Assurbanipal to ravage and crush the country. About 636 Susa was sacked; its famous ziggurat was razed to the ground and statues of the deities of the Elamites were carried to Assyria. Elam was finished as a power in the world.

“One must always be careful with ancient, cuneiform names, for the temptation to relate tribal or ethnic names to later geographical names is great and it can lead to error. Furthermore, designations sometimes change greatly; for example, the name Magan in cuneiform texts of the third millennium BC may designate a country on the Persian side of the Persian Gulf (the name Maka/Makran has been compared with it), but in the first millennium BC it is used for Egypt!...

“Also under Sargon Israelite and Syrian prisoners were settled in Babylonia and probably in parts of the Zagros mountains as well ...

“The Scythians then dominated Media for twenty-eight years from *circa* 652-625 BC, when they were defeated by the son and successor of Khshathrita, called Uvakhshtra or Cyaxares. It is likely that Kashtaritu had already united the Medes in Central Iran, the task which Herodotus attributed to Deioces, but under Cyaxares the power of the Medes grew greater than ever before and the Persians, now in their final home of Persis, submitted to the Medes.”

From the book *Clash Of East And West* by Daisy More and John Bowman, pages 19 & 22 we read: “The bold, expressive Persians tried to copy the more sophisticated Elamites, who lived on the flat plains of Susiana at the base of the outer Zagros, where they had easy access to the Mesopotamian cities. In 1175 B.C., the king of Elam stormed the walls of Babylon and wrested the city from its overlords. He sent many trophies home to the Elamite city, Susa. Susa had always been a hub of roads and water-ways, and it soon developed into a great city with a thousand men on the palace payroll.

“Despite the refinements of Elamite influence, Persian life remained relatively rustic. The extended family provided structure, with the father ruling as an all-powerful patriarch. Family groups formed clans, and the head of a clan could ally his fighting men with those of other clans to form a tribe of roughly a thousand warriors. The Persian headmen began the practice of choosing one of their number as chief headman, or tribal king ...

“Of the several hundred tribes of Aryan and indigenous peoples scattered across the Iranian plateau, ten were the tribes of Persis itself. Four of these were composed of families who were still nomadic herders, three of farmers who had settled permanently, and three more of people who also worked the land and who were in the position to claim ownership. The Pasargadae (as the Greeks called them — ‘Parsagard’ may have been the true name) were one of these three landholding tribes. Among them was a family the Achaemenids — from whom it became customary to choose the tribal king ...

“In the northern part of the plateau, in what is now the Hamadan-Tehran-Isfahan area, the Medes had formed half a dozen large tribes. In about 670 B.C., the six tribes pledged themselves to follow a single leader in hopes of protecting their land from the aggressive Assyrians, who had taken Mesopotamia from the Elamites and held it for almost five hundred years ... They had stolen horses from the Medes, taken men as slaves, and put the Medes under their tribute system.

“As the Persians had copied the Elamites, the Medes tended to copy the Assyrians, especially in the manner in which they treated their king. Like the Assyrian king, the Median king, or *khshayathiya* (from which the word ‘shah’ comes), was no rude chieftain ...

“Shortly after the Medes chose their first king, the whole area of the Mesopotamian plain, the adjoining Anatolian peninsula, and the Iranian plateau were threatened by a new wave of savage Indo-European horsemen from the pasture lands between the Danube and the Volga. In the third quarter of the seventh century B.C., these Scythians and their relatives, the Cimmerians, depopulated many of Assyria’s tribute paying towns. The Median king, Cyaxares, was forced to pay tribute himself to some of these hordes. He finally managed to poison several of their leaders at a feast and then joined with many of the remaining Scythians to attack the already weakened Assyrians. Cyaxares and the Scythians also had an invitation to meet with a rebel governor in Babylon, a potential ally who wanted to free his province from the Assyrian oppression. The Median king and the Babylonian governor, Nabopolassar, met in 612 B.C.”

On the other hand, the term “Media” is summed up quite well by the *Illustrated Dictionary & Concordance of the Bible* by Geoffrey Wigoder, et al, pages 668-669:

“MEDIA, MEDES (MEDE) Madai, the Hebrew name for Media, is listed in the Table of Nations (Gen 10:2; I Chr 1:5) as the third son of Japheth, a people living east of Mesopotamia. Media and Medes are often mentioned together with Persia (Est. 10:2; Dan. 5:28; 8:20, etc.). The history of the Medes, a people apparently of Indo-Iranian origin, is reflected in Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian and Greek documents. In the 9th century B.C., Media was invaded by various Assyrian kings. At this time the Medes began to settle in towns administered by local rulers, without any central authority, which made it easy for the Assyrians to fight them but failing to subdue them, the Assyrians often resorted to large-scale deportations. The Median kingdom was founded by Diokea who united the seven Median tribes (best known of whom were the Magi, a tribe of priests) and ruled for 53 years (699-646 B.C.). The kingdom was consolidated under Phraortas (646-624) who headed a league that endangered the Assyrian hold over the Zagros mountains. Under his successor, Cyaxeres (625-585), a serious threat to the Median kingdom was posed by the Scythians; the latter were, however, eventually thrown back by the Medes in alliance with the Babylonians. As Babylonian power grew, the Medes too became a significant political and military factor. They were included in Jeremiah’s enumeration of foreign peoples (Jer. 25:25). The last king of the Medes was Astyages (585-550 B.C.); in 553 B.C., the kingdom was overthrown by Persia., its former vassal, under Cyrus. The Bible depicts Media as the enemy of Babylon (Isa. 13:17-18; 21:1-10). The Book of Daniel considers Media and Persia as a single political unit, prophesying that this combined power will defeat Babylon (Dan 5:26-28).

It should now be quite apparent why it is important to understand the Genesis 10 table of nations. Further, one should now comprehend to a greater degree the environment in which Daniel lived and to whom his prophecies pertained. Above all, it is important to understand how race fits into the picture. All we have to do is observe Iran today, for they represent what is left of the old Persian Empire. When we consider the fact that Persia was once dominantly an Aryan group of people, today’s Iran is a disgrace to the utmost degree. It demonstrates beyond all question that race-mixing is the “unforgivable sin” (or sin unto death)! Not only that, but America and all the White Israel nations, like Iran, are fast becoming third-world mingled countries.

! WE DARE NOT CHANGE OUR POSITION ON RACE !

As I pointed out in the last few lessons, the Bible does not record Yahweh creating the other races. I will not retract from that tenet. I absolutely denounce the idea of a sixth and eighth day

creation. Genesis 2:4-7 is simply the first chronicle of the Bible giving the history of Genesis chapter one. I will repeat that passage again: **“4 These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that Yahweh Elohim made the earth and the heavens, 5 And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for Yahweh Elohim had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. 6 But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. 7 And Yahweh Elohim formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”** Because man was formed of the “dust of the ground”, he was part of the “generations of the heavens and of the earth.” A chronicle is simply a record similar to the books of Chronicles (an account, a history, a narrative, a report, a story, or annals, a rehash (or to discuss or say again), a reiteration, an act of repeating, a rephrase, to restate something such as a paraphrase (a restatement of a text giving the meaning in different words)). In other words, a review, a summarization, an analysis, a recap! To imply the other races were a part of the creation is to give them unjust dignity they don't merit. Such a position will only invite further miscegenation!

To put this whole thing in perspective, I will quote Jeremiah 31:27: **“Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast.”** The last four words of this passage means exactly what it says, “the seed of beast” (fallen angel and animal kind). We are observing the product of this type of thing today everywhere we turn. This prophecy by Jeremiah is being fulfilled today before our very eyes. We know this type of thing is not in the sovereign will of Yahweh, so it can only be in His permissive will. If this is true, it can only be for the purpose of teaching us a lesson, and what a terrible lesson it is. But we shouldn't be surprised, for it has happened before but our people never learn.

For this we will go to the *Apocrypha*, 1st Esdras 8:68-71: **“68 Now when these things were done, the rulers came unto me, and said, 69 The nation of Israel, the princes, the priests and Levites, have not put away from them the strange people of the land, nor the pollutions of the Gentiles, to wit, of the Canaanites, Hittites, Pheresites, Jebusites, and the Moabites, Egyptians, and Edomites. 70 For both they and their sons have married with their daughters, and the holy [set apart] seed is mixed with the strange people of the land; and from the beginning of this matter the rulers and the great men have been partakers of this iniquity. 71 And as soon as I had heard these things, I rent my clothes, and the holy garment, and pulled off the hair from off my head and beard, and sat me down sad and very heavy.”**

Now skipping to verses 82-85: **“82 And now, O Lord, what shall we say, having these things? for we have transgressed thy commandments, which thou gavest by the hand of thy servants the prophets, saying, 83 That the land, which ye enter into to possess as an heritage, is a land polluted with the pollutions of the strangers of the land, and they have filled it with their uncleanness. 84. Therefore now shall ye not join your daughters unto their sons, neither shall ye take their daughters unto your sons. 85 Moreover ye shall never seek to have peace with them, that ye may be strong, and eat the good things of the land, and that ye may leave the inheritance of the land unto your children for evermore.”**

Now jumping to verses 92-94: **“92 Then Jechonias the son of Jeelus, one of the sons of Israel, called out, and said, O Esdras, we have sinned against the Lord God, we have married strange women of the nations of the land, and now is all Israel aloft. 93 Let us make an oath to**

the Lord, that we will put away all our wives, which we have taken of the heathen, with their children, 94 Like as thou hast decreed, and as many as do obey the law of the Lord.”

Now let's go to 1st Esdras 9:7-9: **“7 So Esdras arose up, and said unto them, Ye have transgressed the law in marrying strange wives, thereby to increase the sins of Israel. 8 And now by confessing give glory unto the Lord God of our fathers, 9 And do his will, and separate yourselves from the heathen of the land, and from the strange women.”**

But this is not the end of the story!!! Many have come to the conclusion when reading Ezra and Nehemiah that all the Judeans of that time resolved the situation and got rid of their foreign wives and children by them, and they lived happily ever after. This is not true. For proof of this, I will refer to the *History Of The Jews* by Heinrich Graetz, vol. 1, pages 368-369:

“One of those present, Shechaniah, touched by sympathy, uttered a weighty suggestion: ‘Let us make a covenant to put away all the strange wives, and such as are born of them.’ Ezra seized upon the idea at once; he rose and demanded that the heads of the families, who were present on that occasion, swear before the Sanctuary, and by their God, that they would repudiate their foreign wives and their children. That moment was to decide the fate of the Judæan people. Ezra, and those who thought as he did, raised a wall of separation between the Judæans and the rest of the world. But this exclusiveness was not strictly in agreement with the letter of the Law, for Ezra himself, with all his knowledge, was not able to point out any passage in the Torah, implying that mixed marriages were forbidden when contracted with those who acknowledged the God of Israel.

“Such members of the community as, in a moment of enthusiasm, had taken this vow, were now obliged to keep it. With bleeding hearts they separated themselves from their wives, the daughters of neighbouring tribes, and repudiated their own children. The sons and relations of the high-priest were forced to set an example to the rest. Those of the elders of the people who were the most ardent disciples of the Law formed a kind of senate. They issued a proclamation throughout Judah, commanding all who had been guilty of contracting mixed marriages, to appear within three days in Jerusalem, on pain of excommunication. A special court of enquiry was instituted for this one question. Ezra himself selected the members who were to make the needful researches to discover whether the Judæans had really repudiated their wives. So thoroughly was the work of this court of enquiry carried on, that all those who were living in the towns of Judæa separated themselves from their wives and children, as the inhabitants of Jerusalem had done. Still there were some who, influenced by family feelings, made some show of resistance.”

We will now skip to page 372: **“Many noble families made peace with their neighbours, took back their repudiated wives, and contracted new connections with the stranger. They pledged themselves by a reciprocal vow of constancy to respect these new [racial] ties.”** [*emphasis mine*]

If you will carefully reread this last passage again, you will see the “Jewish” mind-set written all over it. From this point on, they started to take a “universalist” view in order to legitimize their race-mixing. Shame on any Identity pastor who promotes this identical doctrine (leaven) of the Pharisees. After their attempt at trying to justify their taking of foreign wives, they endeavor to vindicate themselves, relating to the story of Ruth on pages 370-371 of the same book. Many in Identity today, just like the “Jews”, haven’t figured out yet that Ruth was an Israelite, not a Moabite! I can just imagine there are some people who don’t believe what I am saying, so I will quote it:

“The poetical author of the Book of Ruth relates, apparently without a purpose, the simple idyllic story of a distinguished family of Bethlehem which had migrated to Moab, where the two sons married Moabitish wives; but he touches at the same time upon the burning question of the day. Ruth, the

Moabitess, the widow of one of the sons, is described as saying to her mother-in-law, 'Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God, my God: where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried; the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.' And the Moabitess kept her word faithfully. Upon her marriage with Boaz, the people exclaim: 'The Lord make the woman that is come into thine house like Rachel and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel.' The son born to Ruth was the ancestor of David, the great king of Israel. The several incidents of this exquisite story are most delicately and artistically developed. But the author meant to place two facts before his readers, namely, that the royal house of Israel sprang from a Moabitess, and that the Moabitess, after having connected herself closely with the people of Israel and acknowledged their God, gave proof of such virtues as grace a daughter of Israel: chastity, refinement of feeling, and cheerful self-sacrifice. The reference in this tale to the all-absorbing question of the day was too pointed to be passed over unnoticed. Among those unfortunate wives who had been, or who were to be repudiated by their husbands, might there not be some who resembled Ruth? And the children born of foreign women, but having Judæan fathers, – were they to be looked down upon as heathens? If so, then not even the house of David, the royal family, whose ancestor had married a Moabitess, belonged to the Judæan nation!"

This "Jewish" mode-of-reasoning is enough to make one vomit! But it's the same mind-set as we have today among our White people! We even have it in Identity! The mainstream church people will usually say, "Oh, it's all right as long as the other party is a Christian."

All this race-mingling by those returning from Babylon is analogous to *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* by John Lightfoot, volume 2, pages 7-8:

"... *Common persons*, as to the priesthood: such whose fathers, indeed were sprung from priests, but their mothers unfit to be admitted to the priests' marriage-bed ... such as were born in wedlock; but that which was unlawful ... *bastards*: such as came of a certain mother, but of an uncertain father ... Such as were *gathered up* out of the streets, whose fathers and mothers were uncertain.

"A defiled generation indeed! and, therefore, brought up out of Babylon in this common sink, according to the opinion of the Hebrews, that the whole Jewish seed still remaining there might not be polluted by it ... Therefore he brought them to Jerusalem, where care might be taken by the Sanhedrim [Sanhedrin] fixed there, that the legitimate might not marry with the illegitimate ..." [*emphasis mine*]