

# MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

---

## THE TOWER OF SILICON — ADDENDUM

---

### THE SEVEN INSTITUTIONAL BREACHES O'LEARY'S TRUST-THE-FRAMEWORK DEFENSE AND THE EVIDENCE THAT THE FRAMEWORK IS ALREADY GONE

---

**Institution:** Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution | Louisiana/Texas

**Addendum to:** *The Tower of Silicon — Tucker Carlson Transmission, May 15, 2026*

**Document Date:** May 15, 2026

**Contact:** miqdashbethel@gmail.com | 985-250-9060 | miqdashbethel.org

**Authority:** The Tanakh — The Word of **Yahweh** (יהוה) Alone

**Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 — Two or Three Witnesses**

---

## THE CORE CLAIM AND ITS COLLAPSE

When Tucker Carlson pressed Kevin O'Leary on the surveillance dimensions of the AI-data center infrastructure — asking specifically how a government that already monitors its citizens can be trusted with compute power that multiplies that capacity by orders of magnitude — O'Leary's answer was institutional trust. He pointed to the Supreme Court, the Constitution, the founding framework of separated powers. His argument, reduced to its structural claim, was this:

**O'Leary's implicit argument:** *We have laws regarding surveillance and we have laws that restrict the government and they are built into the Constitution. We have free speech. All of these things remain the same. They don't change with AI. Every administration is kept in check by the Supreme Court including this one and so that is why the founding fathers created this structure and I think it works and I trust it.*

This is the argument of a man who has not examined the present condition of the institutions he is invoking. The structures O'Leary named as safeguards against abuse of AI power had **already been breached — publicly, legally, and in real time — during the very broadcast in which he made this argument.** Tucker named several of the breaches directly. This addendum documents them fully, with the specific mechanism of each breach, the constitutional or covenant principle violated, and the Tanakh's prophetic word on what happens when a people trust rulers who have already shown they will not be constrained.

The logical contradiction Tucker identified deserves its full weight: **you cannot defeat totalitarianism by building totalitarian infrastructure and trusting that different people will use it differently.** This is not political rhetoric. It is a structural argument. If the constitutional framework is sufficient to prevent abuse of AI power, then it should already be preventing the specific abuses Tucker was naming in the same conversation. The fact that it was not — that the very people O'Leary was trusting had just that week breached the framework — destroys the argument at its foundation.

---

## THE PROPHETIC TEMPLATE: SHEMUEL ALEPH (1 SAMUEL) 8

The covenant witness does not approach institutional corruption as surprising. **Yahweh** warned through **Shemuel (Samuel)** exactly what would happen when the people demanded a king — a concentrated human institutional authority — rather than walking under covenant governance. The warning was specific, sequential, and exhaustive:

**Shemuel Aleph (1 Samuel) 8:11–17** — *"And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen... And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed... and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and you shall be his servants."*

The *Shemuel Aleph (1 Samuel) 8* pattern is not a warning about bad kings specifically. It is a warning about **institutional power without covenant accountability as a category**. The king will take your sons (military conscription), your daughters (service labor), your fields (taxation and asset seizure), your servants and animals (forced productivity), and your seed (economic extraction). Every one of these categories has a precise 2026 equivalent in the AI-data center system: electricity conscripted from communities (Lake Tahoe), land seized under the claim of economic development (Utah), taxpayer funds extracted and transferred to private capital (O'Leary's subsidies), and civic voice eliminated by reframing dissent as foreign propaganda. **Yahweh** was not predicting a specific evil king. He was describing the inherent structure of concentrated human institutional power.

---

## **BREACH 1 — THE FOURTH AMENDMENT — WARRANTLESS SURVEILLANCE**

**What Tucker said:** Tucker stated explicitly during the broadcast that the U.S. Congress, with bipartisan support and presidential endorsement, had just voted to allow the federal government to spy on American citizens **without a warrant** — eliminating even the pro forma requirement of obtaining judicial approval from a secret FISA court. He said: *The U.S. Congress just voted to allow the U.S. Government to spy on American citizens without even going through the normal pro forma rigmarole of getting a warrant from a secret judge to do this, do it. And the president pushed for this and both parties were totally on board with it.*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** The Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution — the specific constitutional protection most directly implicated by mass AI surveillance — **was altered by statute in the very week O'Leary was citing the Constitution as the safeguard against AI surveillance abuse**. O'Leary said: *We have laws regarding surveillance and we have laws that restrict the government and they are built into the Constitution. But the law he was pointing to as protection had just been amended to remove the protection.* The safeguard was removed by the same bipartisan political establishment that is simultaneously building the surveillance infrastructure. O'Leary's response — *Every administration is kept in check by the Supreme Court* — is the answer to a question about a future violation. The violation was present-tense and already accomplished.

**The mechanism of breach:** The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), specifically Section 702, authorizes collection of communications of foreign nationals. The repeated expansions of Section 702 authority have extended its practical application to the communications of American citizens through what is called *incidental collection* — meaning that any American who communicates with a

foreign national has their communications swept into the database without a warrant. The 2026 reauthorization Tucker referenced removed further procedural protections, allowing that data to be queried and searched without individualized judicial authorization. At the exact moment Kevin O'Leary is building a nine-gigawatt computer infrastructure capable of processing and cross-referencing this data at previously impossible scale, the legal protection that was supposed to prevent its abuse has been legislatively dismantled.

**Shemot (Exodus) 20:16** — *"You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor."*

The *Shemot (Exodus) 20:16* prohibition on false witness is not merely about individual testimony in a legal proceeding. The covenant framework understands it as the protection of the **epistemic integrity of the community** — the right of every covenant member to have their actions and words judged by true testimony in a transparent process, not by surveillance-gathered data processed through opaque algorithms and acted upon without judicial review. Warrantless surveillance is institutionalized false-witness infrastructure: it gathers data without the accused's knowledge, processes it without accountability, and acts upon it without the covenant's two-or-three-witness standard.

---

## **BREACH 2 — THE SOCIAL COMPACT — LAKE TAHOE ELECTRICITY SEIZURE**

**What Tucker said:** Tucker reported that the 55,000 permanent residents of Lake Tahoe were informed by their Nevada-based power company that **all electricity generated by the utility would be rerouted to a nearby data center**, and that residents had until the end of 2027 to find an alternative electricity source. Tucker described it: the power company told residents all electricity goes to the data center and they have until the end of next year to find a new source.

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** The foundational premise of public utility regulation in the United States is that essential services — electricity, water, communications — operate under a public interest obligation. A utility company is granted monopoly authority over its service territory precisely **in exchange for the obligation to serve all customers within that territory**. The Lake Tahoe situation represents the inversion of this compact: the utility's private commercial interest in serving the higher-paying data center customer is being allowed to supersede its regulatory obligation to its residential customers. This is not a failure of enforcement. It is a structural demonstration that

when capital interests conflict with residential welfare, the institutions designed to protect residential welfare stand down.

**The mechanism of breach:** Public Utility Commissions in both California and Nevada have regulatory authority over utility companies operating in their jurisdictions, including the obligation to ensure adequate and reliable service to all customers. The Lake Tahoe situation represents either (a) a failure of regulatory enforcement — the PUC allowed the utility to abandon its service obligation — or (b) regulatory capture — the data center's financial and political weight was sufficient to obtain a regulatory accommodation that no residential customer could have obtained. Either mechanism is a breach of the institutional framework O'Leary cited as protection.

**The Shemuel 8 correspondence:** *He will take your fields... and give them to his servants.* The electricity infrastructure of Lake Tahoe's 55,000 residents is their *field* — the essential productive resource upon which their domestic and economic life depends. It was taken and given to the data center. No vote. No compensation. No alternative provided. A year and a half's notice and a goodbye.

**Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2–4** — *"Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy, and say unto them, Thus says Yahweh Elohim unto the shepherds; Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? You eat the fat, and you clothe you with the wool, you kill them that are fed: but you feed not the flock. The diseased have you not strengthened, neither have you healed that which was sick, neither have you bound up that which was broken, neither have you brought again that which was driven away, neither have you sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have you ruled them."*

The shepherds of *Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34* are not negligent by accident. They are **structurally self-serving** — the system is designed to benefit the shepherd class at the expense of the flock. The regulatory capture that allows utility companies to reroute residential electricity to data centers is the *Yechezkel 34* structure: the regulatory shepherds feed themselves (take the higher-paying customer) and leave the flock (residential customers) to find their own pasture. **Yahweh's** verdict on such shepherds is not ambiguous: *'Behold, I am against the shepherds' (Yechezkel 34:10).*

---

### **BREACH 3 — DEMOCRATIC CONSENT — THE THREE-COMMISSIONER VOTE**

**What Tucker said:** Tucker pressed O'Leary repeatedly on the democratic legitimacy of the Utah data center approval. O'Leary's defense was that the project was approved by a unanimous 3–0 vote of the Box Elder County commissioners. Tucker's response was precise:

**Tucker Carlson:** *Three people voted, the people of the county. They're elected officials, that's how you do it. How hard is it for Kevin O'Leary and Amazon and Microsoft and Google to subvert three county commissioners in rural Utah?*

**Tucker Carlson (later):** *Amazon, Google, and Kevin O'Leary got three county commissioners in rural Utah on their side. Good work. But can I just ask you really quick, like, why don't you have a referendum? Why don't you let all citizens, all taxpayers, the ones who are paying for your project, why don't they get to vote?*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** O'Leary's institutional framework defense requires that the elected officials be genuinely responsive to and representative of the people. But Tucker identified the specific vulnerability of a three-person board approving a \$15 billion project backed by the combined financial and political weight of Amazon, Microsoft, Google, and O'Leary's own considerable influence. The question is not whether the process was technically legal — Tucker acknowledged it was. The question is whether **three county commissioners constitute a democratic mandate for a project that will consume more electricity than the entire state of Utah**. The answer is structural: three people cannot provide democratic legitimacy for a decision of this magnitude over 66,000 people, any more than three FISA court judges provide genuine constitutional protection against mass surveillance. **The form of the institution is preserved while its substance is evacuated.**

**The mechanism of breach:** Local government approval processes for large-scale development projects are designed for decisions of manageable scope — a shopping center, a subdivision, a factory. They are **not designed** to handle a project that will fundamentally alter the energy economy, water rights, land use, and political character of an entire region for a generation. When the approval mechanism is technically correct but structurally inadequate for the scale of the decision, the institution has been used to produce a result it was not designed to legitimate. O'Leary himself revealed the dynamic: *The whole idea of expediting it was so the project didn't go to Jacksonville, Mississippi. That's the competition.* Speed and competition between jurisdictions — not deliberation and consent — drove the process.

**Shemot (Exodus) 18:21** — *"Moreover you shall provide out of all the people able men, such as fear Elohim, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place*

*such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens."*

The *Shemot (Exodus) 18* governance structure — the Jethro model of distributed, layered judgment under covenant authority — requires that rulers be **men of truth, hating covetousness**. The three-commissioner vote, in a competitive process designed to attract \$15 billion in investment by offering the most favorable terms possible, is precisely the *opposite* of a covetousness-free judgment. The economic incentive structure runs entirely toward approval. The only counterweight was citizen opposition — and that opposition was reframed by O'Leary as Chinese-backed propaganda. **The covenant evidentiary standard of Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 — two or three witnesses — requires that the witnesses be unimpeachable.** A three-commissioner board approving a project that directly enriches their county's tax base cannot serve as the two-or-three-witness standard for a decision of this magnitude.

---

## **BREACH 4 — FIRST AMENDMENT — DISSENT REFRAMED AS FOREIGN SUBVERSION**

**What Tucker said and O'Leary demonstrated:** When citizens at the Box Elder County commissioner meeting raised questions about the data center — its energy consumption, water use, local impact, and democratic legitimacy — they were met with a characterization Tucker identified as a thought-terminating device. O'Leary's response to every question Tucker raised was to insinuate that the questioner might be influenced by or serving Chinese interests. He named specific organizations he claimed were CCP-connected, identified unusual social media activity as Chinese-backed, and extended this framework to the county commissioner meeting opposition. O'Leary:

*Kevin O'Leary: I want agitators. I want paid protesters. I want environmentalists. I want to shut it all down so that they can't train their models as fast as I can... The Party for Socialism and Liberation apparently shares offices with [groups] all over my social media.*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** The constitutional right to petition the government for redress of grievances — First Amendment — is the specific right the citizens of Box Elder County were exercising at that commissioner meeting. The institutional response was not engagement with their concerns. It was **classification of their concerns as foreign-influenced and therefore illegitimate**. This is the totalitarian playbook with a constitutional veneer: the right to dissent technically remains, but any exercise of it that threatens a sufficiently powerful project is reframed as enemy action. Tucker

recognized this explicitly. O'Leary's own statement — about wanting paid protesters and agitators — describes the opposition he expects. What he does not acknowledge is that citizens raising questions about water rights, electricity costs, and democratic consent are **not paid agitators**. They are people exercising the institutional right O'Leary claims will protect everyone from AI abuse.

**The mechanism of breach:** The intelligence community's practice of attributing domestic opposition to foreign influence operations is not new. It was used against the civil rights movement (COINTELPRO), against anti-Vietnam War protesters (FBI surveillance programs), and against environmental and indigenous rights activists. What is new is the **speed and scale at which the reframing can be deployed** — and the AI infrastructure being built will make it possible to do so with data-driven precision. O'Leary himself described his team of data scientists monitoring social media for unusual IP address patterns within hours of the commissioner vote. He presented this as evidence of Chinese interference. It is equally a demonstration of **the surveillance and counter-narrative capability already operational** in private hands before the data centers are even built.

**Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 10:1–2** — *"Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; To turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey, and that they may rob the fatherless!"*

The *Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 10* indictment is specifically against those who use **legal and institutional mechanisms to eliminate the rights of those who cannot match their power**. Labeling citizen opposition as foreign propaganda is the 2026 version of writing *grievousness which they have prescribed*: a formal narrative, deployed through institutional channels (social media monitoring teams, public statements, political messaging), that converts legitimate rights-holders into suspects. **Yahweh's** verdict on this practice — across every prophetic voice in the Tanakh — is consistent: woe to those who use the forms of justice to produce injustice.

---

## **BREACH 5 — EQUAL PROTECTION — THE CRIMINAL PENALTY ASYMMETRY**

**What Tucker said:** Tucker made one of the most revealing observations of the entire broadcast when he noted the sentencing asymmetry that Larry Fink's drone-attack concern implies:

**Tucker Carlson:** *Trust me, if you attack a data center, you're gonna get a lot longer sentence than you would if you say raped someone or molested a child on an island in the Caribbean, in which case you're fine. You attack a data center, part of a BlackRock investment? Are you joking? A Spencer Cox property? You're going away, buddy. For real and not to some club-fed farm, like Supermax in the hole.*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** Equal protection under law — the principle that the law applies equally to all persons and that punishments correspond to the actual harm caused — is foundational to the constitutional framework O'Leary cited as AI's safeguard. The criminal penalty structure Tucker described inverts this principle: **property of billionaires is protected more aggressively than the bodies of children.** This is not hypothetical. Federal infrastructure protection statutes carry mandatory minimums that in practice exceed sentences for many violent crimes. When the institutional framework already protects capital more than people, that framework cannot be trusted to hold AI power accountable to human welfare. The hierarchy of protection reveals the hierarchy of values — and the hierarchy O'Leary is building into the data center system is already embedded in the legal system that is supposed to constrain it.

**The mechanism of breach:** The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, critical infrastructure protection statutes, and economic sabotage laws create a federal penalty regime for attacks on data infrastructure that operates largely independently of the harm caused. A vandalism act against a data center — breaking a window — can trigger federal terrorism-adjacent charges under critical infrastructure protection frameworks. Meanwhile, state-level prosecution of violent crimes against individuals — including sexual violence — routinely results in sentences that are lighter than federal infrastructure charges. This is not an accident of drafting. **It reflects whose interests Congress, at the direction of the lobbying class, has chosen to protect most aggressively.**

**Amos 2:6–7** — *"Thus says Yahweh: For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes; That pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek."*

The *Amos* (*Amos*) 2 indictment names the specific covenant violation of a society that has **priced human beings below property.** *They sold the righteous for silver* — the judicial and legal system has been captured by economic interest to the point where a righteous person's claim is worth less than the monetary interest of the powerful. Tucker's observation about the sentencing asymmetry is *Amos 2:6* in contemporary dress. When a data center's physical integrity is worth more — in terms of legal protection and sentencing severity — than a child's physical integrity, the covenant verdict is the same verdict Yahweh rendered on Yisra'el before the Assyrian exile.

---

## BREACH 6 — THE PUBLIC TRUST — TAXPAYER SUBSIDY WITHOUT EQUITY

**What Tucker said:** Tucker pressed O'Leary on why taxpayers are required to subsidize a private business whose tenants are among the richest companies in the world — and whose profits will accrue entirely to private investors — without the taxpayers receiving any equity in return:

**Tucker Carlson:** *If you want to start a business, why am I, as a taxpayer, forced to pay for your business?... You are not giving taxpayers shares. In other words, if you want to start a business, why am I, as a taxpayer, forced to pay for your business?... This is not incentives, it is a forced transfer of wealth from taxpayers to people who are richer than taxpayers.*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** O'Leary's response was: *Tucker, welcome to America, buddy. This is how it's gone on for 200 years.* This is an accurate description of a longstanding practice — and **it is precisely the institutional problem, not its defense.** The fact that the forced transfer of wealth from taxpayers to private capital through government incentives is 200 years old does not make it a safeguard. It makes it a **200-year-old breach of the public trust that has been normalized into invisibility.** O'Leary is citing the corruption of the institution as proof that the institution is sound. Tucker's response was exact: *I don't know, lots of bad things go on for a while.*

**The mechanism of breach:** Tax increment financing, enterprise zone incentives, property tax abatements, accelerated depreciation, and direct subsidies to large-scale private development projects represent a systematic transfer of the tax burden from large capital enterprises to small businesses and individual taxpayers who cannot negotiate equivalent treatment. O'Leary acknowledged this directly: *If you're getting a tax break and they're not, they're making up the difference.* He then offered this as unremarkable. It is not unremarkable. It is the institutionalized mechanism by which **government power — which derives its authority from the consent of all taxpayers — is deployed to serve the interests of those who can most effectively command it.** The data center subsidy is this mechanism operating at unprecedented scale.

**Mishlei (Proverbs) 17:15** — *"He who justifies the wicked, and he who condemns the righteous — both of them alike are an abomination to Yahweh."*

The *Mishlei (Proverbs) 17:15* standard applies to judicial and institutional processes that produce verdicts contrary to covenant justice — regardless of whether they are formally correct by the internal rules of the system. O'Leary's *this is how capitalism works* argument is the institutional equivalent of justifying the wicked by citing process: the process was followed, the vote was held, the incentive package was negotiated — therefore it is legitimate. But **Yahweh's** standard is not procedural legitimacy. It is covenant justice. When the outcome of a formally correct process is the transfer of wealth from the many to the powerful few, the process has been used to produce an abomination in **Yahweh's** sight — regardless of whether the paperwork was filed correctly.

---

## **BREACH 7 — THE REGULATORY COVENANT — THE ESG REVERSAL AND BLACKROCK**

**What Tucker said:** Tucker identified Larry Fink of BlackRock as the architect of ESG — Environmental, Social, and Governance investing standards — which for more than a decade used BlackRock's position as the world's largest asset manager to pressure corporations into carbon neutrality commitments, environmental impact reduction, and the moral framing of fossil fuel use as a civic sin. Tucker noted:

**Tucker Carlson:** *Larry Fink was... the leader of the opposition to Trump... the guy who promulgated anyway the idea of ESG, the idea that you don't just do business, you have to affect political change as you do it. You got to worry about racial equity, too many whites. You got to worry about the climate, CO2. No, you can't have a chainsaw or a wood stove. That's his contribution to the American economy... But now all of a sudden, Larry Fink is a close associate of Trump's and is working in close concert with Trump to bring about this AI.*

**Why this destroys O'Leary's argument:** O'Leary's institutional trust framework requires that the institutions — regulatory bodies, financial oversight, corporate governance standards — operate according to stated principles. The ESG reversal demonstrates that they do not. Larry Fink's ESG framework was not a set of principles BlackRock believed in. It was a **leverage mechanism**: a way to use the threat of capital withdrawal to compel corporate compliance with a political agenda. When that agenda became inconvenient — because AI requires the fossil fuels ESG was supposed to eliminate — the principles were *suspended*. The same week O'Leary is citing the constitutional framework as AI's safeguard, Larry Fink — the man who told the world that carbon was a moral sin — is coordinating with the government he spent years opposing to build fossil-fuel-powered compute infrastructure.

**The regulatory and institutional framework does not constrain power. It is wielded by power and set aside by power as power requires.**

**The mechanism of breach:** BlackRock manages approximately ten trillion dollars in assets. This gives it more leverage over corporate behavior than most national governments have over their domestic corporations. When BlackRock used this leverage to impose ESG standards, it was exercising a form of private regulatory power with no democratic accountability. When BlackRock reversed those standards without public explanation — because AI is now more profitable than carbon neutrality — it demonstrated that **the regulatory function had been captured by private capital and was being exercised in private capital's interest.** The institutions O'Leary trusts to prevent AI abuse are, in the most critical cases, **not government institutions at all.** They are private financial institutions with the leverage of governments and the accountability of none.

**Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 6:13–14** — *"For from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the prophet even unto the priest every one deals falsely. They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace."*

The *Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 6:13–14* indictment names the condition in which **every level of the institutional hierarchy — from least to greatest — has been compromised by the same interest.** The prophets and priests said *Peace, peace* — they gave the people institutional reassurance — when the structural conditions of the covenant had already been violated and judgment was already in motion. O'Leary's *trust the Supreme Court, trust the Constitution, trust the founding fathers*"), t(" *framework is the* "), ti(" *Peace, peace of Yirmeyahu 6:* institutional reassurance offered by someone who either does not know or will not say that the institutions he is citing have already issued the authorizations for the breach he is claiming they will prevent.

---

## SUMMARY — THE SEVEN BREACHES AND THEIR COVENANT VERDICTS

### BREACH 1

Fourth Amendment — Warrantless surveillance of American citizens authorized by bipartisan Congressional vote with presidential endorsement in the same week O'Leary cited the Constitution as AI's

	safeguard. VERDICT: Constitution already breached at point of citation.
<b>BREACH 2</b>	Social Compact — 55,000 Lake Tahoe residents told their electricity supply is being rerouted to a data center with 18 months' notice. No vote, no compensation, no alternative provided. VERDICT: Public utility obligation inverted. Shemuel 8 pattern confirmed.
<b>BREACH 3</b>	Democratic Consent — A \$15 billion project consuming more electricity than the entire state of Utah approved by three county commissioners in a competitive expedited process designed to prevent deliberation. VERDICT: Form of consent preserved; substance evacuated.
<b>BREACH 4</b>	First Amendment — Citizen opposition reframed as Chinese-backed foreign subversion within hours of the commissioner vote, using private surveillance teams monitoring social media for anomalous IP addresses. VERDICT: Right to dissent technically intact; exercise of it criminalized in practice. Yeshayahu 10 pattern confirmed.
<b>BREACH 5</b>	Equal Protection — Federal criminal penalty structure protects data center property more aggressively than the bodies of children. The institutional hierarchy of protection reflects the hierarchy of whose interests it actually serves. VERDICT: Amos 2:6 confirmed.
<b>BREACH 6</b>	Public Trust — Taxpayer subsidy of a \$15 billion project whose profits accrue entirely to private investors with no equity returned to those who funded the incentive. Normalized as 'how capitalism works.' VERDICT: 200-year breach cited as evidence of institutional integrity. Mishlei 17:15 confirmed.
<b>BREACH 7</b>	Regulatory Covenant — ESG standards used as leverage instrument for a decade, suspended without explanation when AI profitability requires the fossil fuels ESG was supposed to eliminate. BlackRock exercises de facto regulatory power without democratic accountability. VERDICT: Yirmeyahu 6:13 confirmed — peace, peace, when there is no peace.

**THE COVENANT CONCLUSION: WHY O'LEARY'S ARGUMENT FAILS**

Kevin O'Leary is not a dishonest man — or at least, he is not obviously more dishonest than any man whose financial interests are aligned with the position he is defending. His institutional trust argument fails not because he is lying but because he is **trusting institutions that have already demonstrated their priorities in real time**. The priorities they have demonstrated are:

**Capital over community.** Lake Tahoe's electricity goes to the data center.

**Speed over consent.** Three commissioners, not 66,000 residents, made the Utah decision.

**Surveillance over privacy.** Warrantless data collection authorized the same week as the broadcast.

**Compliance over dissent.** Citizens raising questions are reframed as foreign agents.

**Property over persons.** Attacking a data center is a more serious federal crime than assaulting a human being.

**Extraction over accountability.** Taxpayer subsidies without equity return are 200 years of precedent.

**Leverage over principle.** ESG was a tool, not a conviction. It was suspended when inconvenient.

Tucker's framing is correct and covenant-grounded: **you cannot defeat totalitarianism by building totalitarian infrastructure and trusting that different people will use it differently**. The Tanakh's addition to this is: the people you are trusting have **already shown you who they are**. They showed you in Lake Tahoe. They showed you in the warrantless surveillance vote. They showed you in the three-commissioner process. They showed you in the ESG reversal. They showed you in the sentencing asymmetry. **Yahweh's** covenant standard — *Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15*, two or three witnesses — does not require that you predict future behavior. It requires that you **account for the testimony already in evidence**. The testimony is in. Seven times over.

**Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** — *"One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sins: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established."*

The matter is established. Seven witnesses. The institutional framework O'Leary cited as protection against the abuse of AI power is the same framework that produced each of these breaches — and it produced them **before the data centers are even built**. The question is not what the framework *might* allow. The question is what it has *already* allowed — and what it will allow when the compute power to act on that surveillance data at previously impossible scale is operational.

---

**Tehillim (Psalms) 94:20–21** — *"Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with You, which frames mischief by a law? They gather themselves together against the soul of the righteous, and condemn the innocent blood."*

**Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 59:14** — *"And judgment is turned away backward, and justice stands afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter."*

---

**Issued by:** Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution | Louisiana/Texas

**Addendum to:** *The Tower of Silicon — Tucker Carlson Transmission, May 15, 2026*

**Ministry Contact:** miqdashbethel@gmail.com | 985-250-9060 |

**Web:** miqdashbethel.org

**Authority:** The Tanakh — The Word of **Yahweh** (יהוה) Alone

*Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 — Two or Three Witnesses*

---