

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT ASSEMBLY

Pearl River, Louisiana | miqdashbethel@gmail.com

Tanakh as Sole Doctrinal Authority

March 19, 2026

Mr. Shawn Ryan

The Shawn Ryan Show | Vigilance Elite

Dear Mr. Ryan,

Your episode with Michael Lester — Episode 289 of the Shawn Ryan Show — entered some of the most important and least-understood territory in the current conflict. The questions you both raised about the Third Temple, the Dome of the Rock, the Talmud, and the religious foundations driving this war deserve direct, documented answers. You deserve more than speculation. You deserve the Tanakh.

My name is Kepha Arcemont. I am the Elder and founder of Miqdash Bethel, a religious institution, a Covenant Assembly in Pearl River, Louisiana — a Hebrew covenant ministry grounded exclusively in the Tanakh as doctrinal authority. I am also a former New Orleans firefighter, retired early due to an on-the-job injury, and a Gold Star son. My father, **SFC Terry Gilman Arcemont**, was killed in action in 1967.

I have spent the past several weeks producing a comprehensive covenant peace initiative directed at the Iran-Israel-USA conflict — including a detailed research brief titled **"The Third Temple: A Covenant Solution"** already delivered to Tucker Carlson and Israeli Ambassador Yechiel Leiter, among others. That brief documents the Kaufman northern location theory, the Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 40-48 architectural blueprint, and the engineering confirmation that the Third Temple can be built without displacing a single Islamic holy site.

The attached brief responds specifically to the claims and questions raised in Episode 289 — pulling exact statements from your conversation with Lester and answering each one from the Tanakh, from primary historical sources, and from the two-or-three-witness standard of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15**. This is not a religious argument. It is the covenant record.

Lester is asking the right questions and doing serious research. But several of his claims — particularly about the Talmud and what it teaches about non-Jews — require careful correction from the Tanakh standard, lest the real enemy of peace go unnamed

while a secondary target gets blamed. **The Tanakh is the answer to everything raised in Episode 289.** The brief that follows makes the case.

I respectfully ask that you read it, share it with Michael Lester, and consider whether this framework deserves a dedicated episode. The conversation you began is one of the most important on your platform. It deserves a Tanakh anchor.

In covenant and in truth,

Kepha Arcemont

Elder and Founder, Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly

Pearl River, Louisiana

miqdashbethel@gmail.com

402-218-9530

THE THIRD TEMPLE, THE DOME OF THE ROCK, THE TALMUD, AND THE WAR IN IRAN

What the Tanakh Actually Says

A Point-by-Point Response to The Shawn Ryan Show, Episode 289

Prepared by Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly | March 19, 2026

Tanakh as Sole Doctrinal Authority

In Episode 289 of the Shawn Ryan Show, Michael Lester and Shawn Ryan raised several questions about the Third Temple, the Dome of the Rock, the Talmud, Christian Zionism, and the religious motivations behind Israel's conduct in this war. What follows is a direct, point-by-point response to the specific statements made in that conversation — grounded exclusively in the Tanakh, primary historical scholarship, and the Hebrew covenant standard of two or three witnesses.

Every claim in this brief can be verified. None of it requires accepting any religious tradition. It only requires reading the primary sources.

POINT 1 — "THE GOAL IS TO TEAR DOWN EVERYTHING AND BUILD THE NEXT TEMPLE"

Lester stated that from the religious Zionist perspective, the goal is to tear down what is currently on the Temple Mount and build the Third Temple. He referenced the red heifers being prepared for sacrifice to purify the land.

"Right now, I mean, the goal is we need to tear down everything that's there and build the next temple. And we've got the red cows that we need to sacrifice to purify the land." — Michael Lester, SRS #289

Lester is accurately describing what a specific movement within religious Zionism advocates. He is not wrong about what some are saying. But he is presenting it as the goal without identifying the crucial distinction: **this position is not supported by the Tanakh.** It is supported by Talmudic and messianic tradition — the very distinction between Torah and commentary that Lester himself raised.

What the Tanakh Actually Says About the Third Temple

The only prophetic blueprint for the Third Temple in the entire Hebrew canon is **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 40-48**. This vision was given to the prophet **Yechezkel** in 573 BCE and contains precise architectural measurements, orientations, priestly assignments, water systems, and land boundaries.

Critically: **Yechezkel's Temple does not require the destruction of any existing structure**. It requires a specific location — and that location has been documented by modern scholarship.

In 1983, Hebrew University professor **Dr. Asher Kaufman** published research in *Biblical Archaeology Review* placing the Holy of Holies of both the First and Second Temples **approximately 330 feet north of the Dome of the Rock** — at the site known as the **Dome of the Spirits** (also called the Dome of the Tablets). This small, unoccupied rock outcropping on the northern Temple Mount platform:

- Sits on **exposed bedrock** consistent with ancient descriptions of the Foundation Stone (Even HaShetiyah)
- Falls on the **same east-west axis as the Eastern Gate**, consistent with **Yechezkel 44:1-2**
- Was **independently confirmed as architecturally and engineering-feasible** by civil engineer James Kaufman — leaving both the Dome of the Rock and Al-Aqsa Mosque completely undisturbed

Yechezkel 47:22-23 further confirms that the covenant land allocation includes the sojourner alongside Israel:

"You shall allot it as an inheritance for yourselves and for the sojourners who reside among you and have had children among you. They shall be to you as native-born children of Israel."

The Tanakh does not authorize the destruction of Al-Aqsa. It does not require it. It specifies a location 330 feet to the north. The religious drive to destroy the Dome of the Rock is derived from **Talmudic and messianic tradition** — not from the Tanakh's prophetic blueprint. These are not the same source.

On the Red Heifers

The red heifer (*parah adumah*) purification ritual is described in **Bemidbar (Numbers) 19**. It is a genuine Torah command for purification from contact with the dead. However, the Tanakh does not connect the red heifer to a specific geopolitical timeline, to a particular war, or to the clearing of existing Islamic structures. That connection is made by rabbinic tradition and messianic speculation — not by the text of **Bemidbar 19** itself. The Torah standard is: **the text governs, not the tradition built around the text.**

POINT 2 — "I AM SHOCKED ISRAEL HASN'T BLOWN UP THE AL-AQSA MOSQUE AND BLAMED IRAN"

"I am shocked it hasn't happened yet... I absolutely am waiting for a false flag event in the US. I am waiting for a terrorist attack like 9/11 in the US blamed on Iran." — Lester, and separately: "I am shocked it hasn't happened yet... I'm afraid that somewhere somebody's planning it."

Lester is raising a serious and legitimate concern about false flag operations — and he correctly identifies Israel's documented history of such operations (he cites the Lavon Affair, the USS Liberty). The covenant response here is not to dismiss his concern but to name precisely why the destruction of the Dome of the Rock would be the most catastrophic single act in the history of the current conflict.

What Destruction of the Dome of the Rock Would Produce

The Dome of the Rock was completed in 691 CE. Al-Aqsa Mosque is the third holiest site in Islam. The destruction of either structure — by any means, attributed to any party — would immediately:

- **Unify 1.8 billion Muslims** in civilizational conflict against Israel and the United States — including every Muslim-majority country that has maintained peaceful relations with both
- **Collapse every Arab government** that signed the Abraham Accords — Egypt, Jordan, UAE, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia — as no Arab leader survives politically appearing to accept the destruction of Al-Aqsa
- **Trigger the nuclear cascade** that Col. Douglas MacGregor and Tucker Carlson discussed on March 9 — Pakistan providing nuclear capability to Turkey and Saudi Arabia, with Israel's nuclear arsenal already operational
- Create the conditions for the coalition war described in **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 38-39** — which is not a covenant goal to be hastened, but a catastrophic consequence of covenant failure to be prevented

The Torah's war laws speak directly to this. **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 20:19-20** forbade even the cutting of fruit trees during siege — the *bal tashchit* (no wanton destruction) principle. **If Torah prohibits cutting trees, on what basis does any tradition authorize the demolition of structures that 1.8 billion people regard as among earth's holiest? Bemidbar (Numbers) 35:33** provides the covenant verdict:

"Blood defiles the land, and no atonement can be made for the land for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it."

The Tanakh does not authorize false flag operations. It does not authorize collective punishment. It does not authorize the manufacture of pretexts for war. **Shemot**

(Exodus) 23:1 is unambiguous: ***"You shall not spread a false report. You shall not join hands with a wicked man to be a malicious witness."***

POINT 3 — WHAT THE TALMUD SAYS ABOUT NON-JEWS

"So you've got the Torah. The Torah is really just the five books of the Old Testament, right? You've got the Talmud, which is all sorts of other instructions and sayings. If you read through some of the Talmud, it's kind of shocking. It says things like you know, if somebody isn't Jewish, you can do whatever you want to them because they're subhuman... It's okay to kill non-Jews. Can't kill a Jew... I am shocked at the number of times I read something that is a little unbelievable from the Talmud that is not taken out of context." — Michael Lester, SRS #289

Lester deserves credit for two things here: he correctly distinguishes the Torah from the Talmud, and he applies the text-in-context discipline — reading surrounding passages before making a claim. His conclusion — that some Talmudic passages are genuinely shocking even in context — reflects his actual research.

However, this section requires the most careful covenant correction of the entire episode, **because the conflation of the Talmud with the Torah is the source of the most dangerous confusion driving this conflict.**

What the Talmud Is — and Is Not

The Talmud is rabbinic legal discussion compiled between approximately 200-500 CE — **five to seven hundred years after the destruction of the Second Temple.** It contains legal debates, stories, ethical teachings, folk wisdom, and yes — some passages that are deeply troubling to contemporary sensibilities. Lester is not fabricating what he has read.

But the Talmud is **not the Torah!** And Miqdash Bethel's foundational principle applies here with full force: **everything after the Torah is commentary. Commentary does not override the text it comments on.** When Talmudic passages — whether troubling or laudable — conflict with the Tanakh, the Tanakh governs.

What the Tanakh Actually Says About Non-Jews

The Tanakh's position on the status of non-Israelites before **Yahweh** (יהוה) is not the Talmudic position Lester describes. The Tanakh is explicit:

Bereishit (Genesis) 1:26-27 — every human being, without ethnic qualification, is created in the image of **Elohim** (אֱלֹהִים):

"Then Elohim said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness... So Elohim created man in his own image, in the image of Elohim he created him; male and female he created them."

The Hebrew term is **tzelem Elohim** — the image of Elohim. This is not restricted to Israelites. Every human being — Iranian, Palestinian, American, Israeli — bears this image. Any legal or religious framework that declares a class of human beings subhuman on the basis of ethnicity or covenant membership is in direct conflict with **Bereishit 1:26-27.**

Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33-34 — the Torah's direct command regarding the treatment of the non-Israelite:

"When a stranger sojourns with you in your land, you shall not do him wrong. You shall treat the stranger who sojourns with you as the native among you, and you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am Yahweh your Elohim."

The command to love the sojourner *as yourself* (*kamocho*) is the same language used in **Vayikra 19:18** for the neighbor. **The Torah does not create a two-tiered humanity. It commands equal treatment.**

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 10:17-19 — Yahweh's own governance standard:

"For Yahweh your Elohim is Elohim of gods and Lord of lords, the great, the mighty, and the awesome El, who is not partial and takes no bribe. He executes justice for the fatherless and the widow, and loves the sojourner, giving him food and clothing. Love the sojourner, therefore, for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt."

The Talmudic passages Lester describes — authorizing differential treatment of non-Jews — are in direct conflict with these Torah texts. The Torah does not authorize them. The Torah explicitly contradicts them. This is why **the Talmud cannot be treated as equivalent to Torah**: where it departs from the Tanakh, it is wrong, and the Tanakh governs.

Why This Distinction Matters for the Conflict

Lester and Ryan are using the Talmud's troubling passages as evidence of Israeli motivation for this war. That analysis has some merit as geopolitical observation. But it has a critical error: it attributes the conduct of the Israeli government to **Jewish religious teaching at the Torah level**, when the Torah — the Tanakh — explicitly condemns that conduct.

The enemy of peace is not the Jewish people. It is not the Torah. **The enemy of peace is the elevation of rabbinic commentary above the Tanakh** — whether done by Jewish authorities, Christian dispensationalists, or Islamic jurists. All three traditions have made this substitution. All three are wrong by their own foundational standard. And the Tanakh calls all three back to the covenant of **shalom** (שלום) — which is the wholeness and mutual security of all peoples.

POINT 4 — "NETANYAHU WAS BORN IN POLAND. HE'S NOT A REAL JEW"

"He's not. He was born in Poland. His real name is Wowski or something like that." — Shawn Ryan, SRS #289

This statement requires careful handling because it mixes a legitimate policy critique with an ethnicity claim that the Tanakh does not support.

Benjamin Netanyahu was born in Tel Aviv in 1949. His father, Ben-Zion Netanyahu (born Mileikowsky), was of Polish Jewish descent. Netanyahu was not born in Poland. The name Mileikowsky/Woszkowski is the family's original Eastern European surname, adopted before emigration to Palestine — a common pattern among Jewish immigrants who Hebraicized their names.

More importantly: the question of *who is a Jew* has no bearing on the covenant critique of Netanyahu's governance. **The Tanakh does not validate or invalidate a leader based on ethnic genealogy. It validates leaders based on whether their governance upholds covenant justice.**

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17:18-20 is the Torah's standard for the king — any king:

"And when he sits on the throne of his kingdom, he shall write for himself in a book a copy of this law... And it shall be with him, and he shall read in it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear Yahweh his Elohim by keeping all the words of this law and these statutes, and doing them, that his heart may not be lifted up above his brothers, and that he may not turn aside from the commandment, either to the right hand or to the left."

Netanyahu's governance is subject to that standard — and by that standard, the documented record of civilian casualties, the destruction of Gaza, the manipulation of American foreign policy, and the conduct Lester describes represents a profound failure of covenant governance. That critique is fully supported by the Tanakh. The ethnic genealogy argument is unnecessary and distracting.

POINT 5 — THE SCOFIELD BIBLE AND CHRISTIAN ZIONISM

"In 1909, a guy named Cyrus Scofield wrote a reference Bible... It was picked up by a guy named Untermyer who was a Jewish Zionist lawyer in New York and he bankrolled it, got the money for publishing, made sure it

got out... And this has been one of the bestselling Bibles other than the King James for decades. — Michael Lester, SRS #289

Lester's account of the Scofield Reference Bible's history is substantially accurate and deserves to be taken seriously as documented history. The Scofield Reference Bible was published in 1909 by Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, a self-taught theologian whose legal and personal history was checkered. The role of Samuel Untermyer — a prominent New York attorney and Zionist activist — in its promotion and distribution has been documented by historians including Joseph Canfield in *The Incredible Scofield and His Book* (1988).

Lester correctly identifies the core problem with the Scofield Bible: it is **one man's interpretation of what the text means**, presented alongside the text as though it were equal to it. When Scofield comments on **Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3** — *"I will bless those who bless you and curse those who curse you"* — and interprets it as a permanent, unconditional covenant obligation to support the modern state of Israel, he has made a doctrinal claim that the Tanakh does not authorize.

What Bereishit 12:3 Actually Says

Bereishit (Genesis) 12:1-3 is the covenant call to Avraham:

"Now Yahweh said to Avram, Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonors you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed."

Several observations the Tanakh requires here:

First: the covenant was made with Avraham — a specific individual — not with a nation-state established in 1948. The identification of the modern state of Israel with the Avrahamic covenant is a theological claim that requires substantial supporting argument, not assumed identity.

Second: the covenant's purpose is explicitly stated — "in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed." This is a universal covenant, not a tribal one. The blessing flows *through* Avraham to all peoples — which is the very framework of the Miqdash Bethel covenant peace initiative.

Third: the Tanakh's own prophetic tradition consistently held Israel accountable to covenant justice as the condition of covenant blessing. Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 7:3-7 — the Temple Sermon — makes this explicit:

"Thus says Yahweh of hosts, the Elohim of Israel: Amend your ways and your deeds, and I will let you dwell in this place... For if you truly amend your ways and your deeds, if you truly execute justice one with another, if you do not oppress the sojourner, the fatherless, or the widow, or shed innocent blood in this place, and if you do not go after other gods to your

own harm, then I will let you dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your fathers forever."

The Tanakh's covenant blessing is conditional on justice. Scofield's interpretation — and Christian Zionism's application of it — strips out that conditionality and produces an unconditional theology of support that is directly contradicted by the prophetic corpus of the Tanakh.

On Christian Zionism as a Voting Bloc

Lester identifies approximately **25% of Americans as Christian Zionists**, representing an outsized voting bloc driving congressional support for Israel. This analysis is demographically well-supported. The Pew Research Center has documented that white evangelical Protestants are the demographic most supportive of Israel among all American religious groups.

But the Tanakh's response to this political reality is not condemnation of Christians — it is education. If 25% of Americans are voting on the basis of a one-man interpretation of one verse of Bereishit published in 1909, the answer is to return them to the Tanakh itself. That is precisely what the covenant peace initiative is designed to do.

POINT 6 — "THEY NEED TO SPEED UP THE PROCESS" — RABBINIC CLIPS ON HASTENING THE END TIMES

"I've seen clips of a rabbi talking to a younger Netanyahu saying that we need to speed this process up... It's been said that that's the biggest sin of all — to try to manipulate God into the end times." — Lester and Ryan, SRS #289

Shawn Ryan articulates the Tanakh's own position here — and he is correct. The attempt to **force or hasten divine prophetic fulfillment through human military action** is condemned in the most direct possible terms by the Tanakh.

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 18:10-12 forbids divination and the attempt to manipulate future events through ritual or other means:

"There shall not be found among you anyone who burns his son or his daughter as an offering, anyone who practices divination or tells fortunes or interprets omens, or a sorcerer or a charmer or a medium or a necromancer or one who inquires of the dead, for whoever does these things is an abomination to Yahweh."

The attempt to engineer geopolitical conditions that will force the arrival of the messianic era is a form of prophetic manipulation — using military power and political maneuvering to produce what **Yahweh** has reserved for His own initiative and timing. The Talmud itself, in multiple tractates (notably *Ketuvot 111a*), contains the famous

Three Oaths — attributed to Rabbi Yosi bar Hanina — which prohibited the Jewish people from "*ascending the wall*" (mass forced immigration) and from "*rebelling against the nations*." Even within the rabbinic tradition that produced these end-times frameworks, there was a counter-tradition warning against forcing the hand of Heaven.

The Tanakh's vision of restoration is consistently initiated by **Yahweh** — not by human military campaigns. **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 36:22-24**:

"Thus says the Lord Yahweh: It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which you have profaned among the nations to which you came... I will take you from the nations and gather you from all the countries and bring you into your own land."

The restoration is *Yahweh's* act — and its precondition is covenant faithfulness, not geopolitical manipulation. A war that kills 194 children and destroys a nation's infrastructure to engineer prophetic conditions is not covenant faithfulness. It is covenant violation.

POINT 7 — "NEVER AGAIN" — ONLY TO US

"I used to think 'Never Again' was a very laudable, wonderful thing to say. Then I realized that's not what they mean. They mean never again to us. We can do the same thing to you or others, just never again to us." — Michael Lester, SRS #289

Lester identifies something important here: the collapse of a universal ethical principle into a tribal one. His observation is pointed and worth engaging seriously. The covenant response, however, must be honest in multiple directions.

The phrase "*Never Again*" emerged from the Holocaust and was intended as a universal moral commitment — genocide must never happen again, to anyone. Lester is correct that in some expressions of contemporary Israeli political culture, it has been narrowed to a tribal claim: never again to **us**, whatever we do to others.

The Tanakh agrees with Lester's critique — and applies it universally.

Amos 1:3 - 2:3 — the prophet **Amos** delivers covenant judgment against every nation surrounding Israel for war crimes and collective punishment — against Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab. And then in **Amos 2:6**, he turns the same standard on Israel itself. **The Tanakh does not have a double standard. Yahweh does not grade atrocities by the ethnicity of the perpetrator.**

Amos 9:7 delivers the most equalizing statement in the entire prophetic corpus:

"Are you not like the Cushites to me, O people of Israel? declares Yahweh. Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?"

Yahweh brought Israel out of Egypt. He also brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir. Covenant election does not create a license for atrocity. It creates a higher standard of accountability.

This is the Tanakh's answer to Lester's observation. "Never again" must mean never again — to anyone, by anyone. That is not a political position. That is **Amos 1:3 - 2:16. That is the word of Yahweh.**

PART FIVE — THE COVENANT SOLUTION SHAWN AND LESTER COULDN'T FIND

Lester and Ryan are asking the right questions — and they are doing it with more intellectual honesty than most of the mainstream media combined. But every question they raise ends in the same place: a secular wall. They can diagnose. They cannot prescribe.

The Tanakh is the prescription.

Not because religion should govern geopolitics. But because the **covenant framework of shalom** (שָׁלוֹם) — the ancient Hebrew word for wholeness, completeness, and the mutual security of all parties — is the only framework large enough to hold Israel's legitimate security concern, Iran's legitimate national dignity, and America's legitimate interest in withdrawal from manufactured wars, *simultaneously*.

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 2:2-4 is the Tanakh's covenant vision for what this moment could become:

"It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of Yahweh shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be lifted up above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it, and many peoples shall come, and say: Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh, to the house of the Elohim of Yaakov, that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the covenant, and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem. He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide disputes for many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

This is not a vision of a war that clears the Temple Mount by force. It is a vision of nations flowing voluntarily toward covenant justice — because covenant justice is more

compelling than any military victory. The Third Temple in Yechezkel is not a nationalist monument. It is the dwelling place of Yahweh's covenant of shalom with all creation. And it can be built — at the Dome of the Spirits, 330 feet north of the Dome of the Rock — **without destroying a single Islamic or Christian holy site.**

That solution exists. It has been documented. It has been sent to the relevant parties. And it is available to anyone with the platform and the courage to carry it forward.

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 30:19 is the covenant's final word:

"I call heaven and earth to witness against you today, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse. Therefore choose life, that you and your offspring may live."

The choice is before the nation. The Tanakh has named the questions Shawn Ryan and Michael Lester raised. It has the answers. And it is ready to be heard.