

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT ASSEMBLY

Pearl River, Louisiana • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 985-250-9060

miqdashbethel.org • PO Box 762, Pearl River, LA 70452

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly is not associated with the House of Yahweh out of Clyde/Abilene, Texas.

TO: Tucker Carlson

FROM: Kepha Arcemont, Elder & Founder

RE: Covenant Witness — Tucker Carlson Interview with Father Chad Ripperger, April 3, 2026

DATE: April 6, 2026

Tucker,

We watched your April 3, 2026 interview with Father Chad Ripperger with great care, and we write to you now not as critics but as witnesses — witnesses to truths that Father Ripperger reached for, some of which he found, and some of which require the corrective lens of the covenant of **Yahweh** as established in the Tanakh. We commend you both for the seriousness with which you engaged this subject. The spiritual war is real. The adversary is documented throughout the covenant. The problem before you, Tucker, is the same one you pressed Ripperger on without fully realizing it: *the framework through which you interpret the battle matters enormously.*

We write because you deserve the full witness, not just the partial one.

PART ONE

I. What Father Ripperger Got Right — And Where the Covenant Confirms It

Father Ripperger affirmed that the casting out of unclean spirits is *central* to the mission of Yeshua, not peripheral. This is correct. The covenant record through the Nevi'im and Ketuvim establishes that **Yahweh** has absolute sovereignty over all created beings — both the *malakim* (messengers) of righteousness and those who rebelled.

Iyov (Job) 1:6–12 is the foundational witness: the adversary — *ha-satan* (הַשָּׂטָן), the accuser, the one who opposes — stands before **Yahweh** and *cannot act upon Iyov without explicit permission*. Every boundary Ripperger described — demons unable to act without divine authorization, Christ metering what they can and cannot do — is rooted not in Scholastic Catholic theology but in the covenant testimony of **Yahweh** Himself. The Catholic framing gives it a Latin name. The covenant gave it first.

Ripperger's identification of five "generals" operating against this nation — Baal, Asmodeus, Lilith, Leviathan, and Moloch/Baphomet — is not foreign to the Tanakh. These names appear

throughout the covenant record as the principalities behind the nations that **Yahweh** condemned Israel for serving. **Baal** is named hundreds of times. **Moloch** is specifically named in the Torah:

Vayikra (Leviticus) 18:21 — "You shall not give any of your offspring to offer them to Molech, and so profane the name of your Elohim: I am Yahweh."

Vayikra (Leviticus) 20:2–5 — "Any man from the sons of Israel or from the strangers sojourning in Israel who gives any of his offspring to Molech, shall surely be put to death... I will set My face against that man and will cut him off from among his people, because he has given of his seed to Molech."

When Ripperger said that the legalization of abortion ceded territory to Moloch, he spoke more accurately than even he perhaps knew — because **Yahweh** warned Israel in **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 18:10** that causing children to pass through the fire was among the abominations that brought covenant judgment upon the nations. This is not metaphor. This is Torah law.

Leviathan appears in **Iyov 41** and **Tehillim (Psalms) 104:26** as a created being fully under **Yahweh's** authority. **Baal** and its cult are documented throughout Melachim and the Nevi'im as the central covenant violation that brought Israel's judgments. Ripperger is standing on real ground — he simply does not know how deep the roots go.

PART TWO

II. The Structural Problem — Where the Witness Must Go Further

Tucker, you asked the right question when you pressed Ripperger about *how the modern church de-emphasized this*. Ripperger blamed psychology and the 1950s–60s shift. That is a surface answer. The deeper answer, which the covenant compels us to speak plainly, is this:

The Church that Ripperger represents departed from the covenant foundation of the Tanakh centuries before psychology was invented.

The Nicaean Council of 325 CE — which we document in our covenant witness record — restructured the faith away from its Hebraic, Torah-grounded foundation. The divine name **Yahweh** (יהוה) was displaced. The calendar of **Yahweh** established in **Vayikra 23** was abolished. The dietary covenant of **Vayikra 11** was declared void. The covenant structure **Yahweh** gave to Yisra'el as the governance framework for all nations was replaced with Roman imperial ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Ripperger is a trained, sincere, and evidently experienced man. But he operates from within a system that carries layer upon layer of Hellenistic and Roman overlay on what was originally a Hebrew covenant reality. His reference to Pseudo-Dionysius, Thomas Aquinas, and the nine choirs of angels is not Hebrew — it is medieval Scholastic theology grafted onto a Hebrew root.

The ninefold angelic hierarchy Ripperger referenced — Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones; Dominions, Virtues, Powers; Principalities, Archangels, Angels — comes from Pseudo-Dionysius's *De Coelesti Hierarchia* (c. 5th century CE). It has no foundation in the

Tanakh. The Hebrew word *malak* (מַלְאָךְ), Strong's **H4397**, is a *functional* designation — it means *one who is sent*, a messenger, a deputy. It covers prophets, priests, human ambassadors, and heavenly beings alike — BDB, HALOT, Gesenius, and Davidson's Analytical Lexicon confirm this uniformly. The English word "angel" is not a translation of a Hebrew concept of a winged supernatural being; it is a transliteration of the Greek *angelos*, which was chosen to render *malak* in the Septuagint, and the Greek overlay built up from there.

We do not say this to condemn Ripperger. We say this as covenant witnesses: **the battle he is fighting is real, but the full armor described in the Tanakh has not been fully put on.**

PART THREE

III. On the Nature of Ha-Satan — The Single Most Important Correction

A. The Lexical Foundation

Tucker, when Ripperger described Satan, Lucifer, and Beelzebub as a "trifurcated personality" — an unholy trinity — he was working from Catholic theological tradition. The covenant requires precision here.

The Hebrew word *ha-satan* (הַשָּׂטָן), Strong's **H7854**, is a *title*, not a personal name. In Hebrew grammar, proper names do not take the definite article *ha-* (הַ). Yet in Iyov 1–2 and Zekhariah 3, the Hebrew consistently reads *ha-satan* — "*the adversary*" — not "Satan" as a proper name. Gesenius confirms this expressly: the definite article indicates a specific adversarial *function* or role, not a personal identity.

The Hebrew root *satan* (שָׂטָן, H7853) is a primitive *verb* meaning to attack, to oppose, to accuse, to be an adversary. It describes what someone *does*, not what they *are*. This is the covenant anchor for this entire discussion.

B. The Decisive Text Ripperger Does Not Have: Bemidbar 22:22

Perhaps the most important single verse in the entire ha-satan discussion, and the one most absent from Ripperger's framework, is found in **Bemidbar (Numbers) 22:22**:

Bemidbar (Numbers) 22:22 — "But Elohim was angry because he was going, and the malak Yahweh took his stand in the road l'satan lo — as an adversary to him (Balaam)."

The *malak Yahweh* — the Messenger of **Yahweh** — occupies the role of *satan* in this passage. He stands in Balaam's path *l'satan lo* — to be an adversary to him — under **Yahweh's** direct commission. This single verse is decisive: the adversarial function can be — and was — occupied by the very Messenger who bears **Yahweh's** own Name (Shemot 23:21: "*My name is in him.*"). The adversarial role is not inherently demonic. It is a covenant function under **Yahweh's** sovereign authority.

C. The Iyov Witness — Ha-Satan in the Divine Council

Iyov (Job) 1:6–7 — "Now there was a day when the sons of Elohim came to present themselves before Yahweh, and ha-satan also came among them. Yahweh said to ha-satan: 'From where have you come?' Then ha-satan answered Yahweh and said, 'From roaming about on the earth, and walking around on it.'"

Five observations the Tanakh text itself establishes:

- Ha-satan enters the divine council among the sons of **Elohim**. He is not excluded, not in rebellion, not imprisoned. He is present at the divine assembly.
- **Yahweh** initiates the conversation — the posture of a sovereign addressing a servant, not the posture of a deity at war with a rebel.
- Ha-satan acts only within **Yahweh's** explicit permission: *"all that he has is in your power; only do not put forth your hand on him."* (Iyov 1:12) He cannot exceed the boundary.
- Ha-satan's role is to test and accuse — to function as prosecuting attorney within **Yahweh's** covenant court.
- Ha-satan is *never* said to have fallen in Iyov. He departs and returns. No rebellion, no fall, no prior glorious condition is described.

D. The 1 Chronicles / 2 Samuel Parallel — The Sovereignty Proof

One of the most decisive covenant witnesses on this question is the comparison of two accounts of the same event:

Divrei HaYamim Aleph (1 Chronicles) 21:1 — "Then satan stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel."

Shmuel Bet (2 Samuel) 24:1 — "Now again the anger of Yahweh burned against Israel, and it incited David against them to say, 'Go, number Israel and Judah.'"

Two accounts. One event. In Divrei HaYamim, *satan* incites David. In Shmuel, **Yahweh's** anger incites David. **Whatever ha-satan does operates fully within and under the sovereignty of Yahweh.** The adversarial instrument is the vehicle of **Yahweh's** own judicial purpose. Ripperger's picture of a near-equal cosmic battle between God and Satan has no foundation in this text.

E. Yahweh Is the Author of All Outcomes, Including Adversity

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 45:7 — "I form light and create darkness; I make peace (shalom) and I create evil (ra); I am Yahweh who does all these things."

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 32:39 — "See now that I, I am He, and there is no Elohim besides Me; it is I who put to death and give life. I have wounded and it is I who heal, and there is no one who can deliver from My hand."

Amos 3:6 — "If a shofar is blown in a city, will not the people tremble? If a calamity occurs in a city, has not Yahweh done it?"

Tucker, this is the bedrock the Tanakh lays down. Yahweh does not describe Himself as engaged in a cosmic war He might lose. He does not present a rival sovereign who generates evil independently. The Tanakh's theology is not dualistic. Adversity, calamity, darkness — all fall under Yahweh's direct governance. Ripperger's framework of Christ "metering" how much Satan can do reflects the Iyov witness correctly as far as it goes — but the fuller picture is **Yeshayahu 45:7: Yahweh** does not merely regulate evil. He governs it as a sovereign governs all within his domain.

PART FOUR

IV. The Three "Proof Texts" for the Fallen Angel Doctrine — What They Actually Say

A. Yeshayahu 14 — "Lucifer" Is a Latin Mistranslation

Ripperger identified Lucifer as one of the three "personalities" of Satan. The problem is that the word *Lucifer* does not exist in the Hebrew text.

Yeshayahu 13:1 opens: *"The oracle concerning Babylon which Yeshayahu the son of Amoz saw."* Yeshayahu 14:4 identifies the subject: *"You will take up this taunt against the king of Babylon."* The taunt is against an earthly monarch. The Hebrew text calls him **helel ben shachar** (הֵלֵל בֶּן-שָׁחַר, H1966) — "shining one, son of the dawn" — a poetic reference to the morning star (Venus). Jerome's Latin Vulgate (c. 382–405 CE) translated **helel** as *Lucifer* — Latin for "light-bearer," the Roman name for Venus. That Latin word entered English Bible tradition, and a planet's name became a cosmic rebel's name.

The text itself closes the debate:

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 14:16–17 — "Those who see you will gaze at you, they will ponder over you, saying: 'Is this the man (ha-ish — הַאִישׁ) who made the earth tremble, who shook kingdoms... who did not allow his prisoners to go home?'"

The word **ha-ish** — "the man" — appears in the Tanakh's own text. This is the death of a mortal king whose body is covered by worms (v. 11). The word **satan** appears *nowhere* in this passage.

B. Yechezkel 28 — The King of Tyre Is Called a Man

Yechezkel 28 opens with **Yahweh's** own declaration about its subject:

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 28:1–2 — "The word of Yahweh came to me saying: 'Son of man (ben adam), say to the prince of Tyre: Thus says the Lord Yahweh: Because your heart is lifted up... yet you are a man (adam) and not Elohim.'"

The oracle calls him **adam** — a man — explicitly. The "Eden" language is royal poetry: in Yechezkel 31:8–9, Pharaoh king of Egypt is compared to trees in "the garden of **Elohim**" — and no one argues Pharaoh was literally in Eden. The word **tamim** (H8549, "perfect") used of this king is also used of Noach in Bereishit 6:9 — "Noach was a righteous man, **tamim** in his

generations." No one identifies Noah as an angel. The word *satan* appears *nowhere* in Yechezkel 28.

C. Where the Fallen Angel Narrative Actually Came From

The "Lucifer / fallen angel" doctrine was not assembled from the Tanakh. It was assembled from:

- **Origen** (c. 184–254 CE) — among the first to read Yeshayahu 14 as referring to Satan's fall, applying Luke 10:18 backward onto the Hebrew text.
- **Jerome's Latin Vulgate** (c. 382–405 CE) — the translation of *helel* as *Lucifer* that cemented the identification.
- **The Book of Enoch** (extra-biblical, c. 3rd–1st century BCE) — the primary source for elaborate fallen angel narratives. Never accepted as canonical by mainstream Judaism or any Tanakh-grounded tradition.
- **Zoroastrian dualism** — encountered during the Babylonian exile (6th century BCE), introducing the concept of a cosmic evil being opposing a god of goodness. Jewish angelology in the Second Temple period was significantly shaped by these Persian concepts.
- **Dante's *Inferno* and Milton's *Paradise Lost*** — these literary works shaped the popular Western portrait of Satan as a magnificent fallen prince far more than any scripture. The image of Satan reigning in hell is Dante and Milton — not Moshe and the prophets.

Ripperger's experiential knowledge of what he encounters in sessions is real. But his *interpretation* of those encounters is filtered through a theological construct that the Tanakh does not provide. I personally have been involved in exorcisms and understand his experience and what he has dealt with concerning people having an influence in them.

PART FIVE

V. On Baal, Fornication, and the Covenant of the Body

When Ripperger named Baal as the spirit of fornication, he stood on covenant ground. **Bemidbar (Numbers) 25:1–9** records what happened when Yisra'el "played the harlot" with the daughters of Moab and "joined themselves to Baal Peor." Twenty-four thousand died in a single plague. **Yahweh's** response was not a suggestion — it was immediate covenant judgment.

The covenant does not approach fornication as a psychological or sociological problem. It is a covenant violation. **Vayikra 19:29** forbids making your daughter a harlot. **Devarim 23:18** forbids the wages of a harlot being brought into the House of **Yahweh**. When Ripperger traces the cascade from fornication laws being struck down to the domino of homosexual practice — he is tracking, without using the language, precisely what **Yahweh** documents in **Vayikra 18** and confirms as covenant consequence throughout the Nevi'im.

Ripperger also named **Leviathan** as a spirit associated with homosexual practice in women. The Tanakh identifies Leviathan as a created creature fully under **Yahweh's** authority (Iyov 41;

Tehillim 104:26). The covenant's position on covenant sexual practice is established in Vayikra 18:22–23 and 20:13. This is Torah law — not Catholic natural law theory, not Scholastic moral theology, but the direct word of **Yahweh**.

PART SIX

VI. On Molek — The Covenant Names the Charge

Tucker, you both identified what we identify as the central spiritual crisis of this nation: child sacrifice, now called abortion. Ripperger named Moloch/Baphomet. The covenant names Molek directly, not as mythology but as covenant law:

Vayikra (Leviticus) 20:2–5 — "Any man from the sons of Israel or from the strangers who sojourn in Israel who gives any of his seed to Molek, he shall surely be put to death... I will set My face against that man and will cut him off from among his people, because he has given of his seed to Molek, so as to defile My sanctuary and to profane My holy name."

Yahweh did not restrict this judgment to ancient Canaan. The covenant principle is eternal: wherever a people gives its children to the fire — whether literal or legislative — they have entered covenant with Molek and separated themselves from **Yahweh**. The Supreme Court did not invent this dynamic. The people ratified it, and the spiritual consequences Ripperger describes are the predictable covenantal result.

We have produced an extended study on this — *Molek Worship and the Modern Covenant Violation* — available through our document library at miqdashbethel.org and enclosed as an attachment to this letter.

PART SEVEN

VII. On Tucker's Own Observation — The Pattern of Targeted Attack

Tucker, you made an observation that stopped us: *"It's very obvious to me that demonic forces go after Christian leadership."* You then extended it to political leaders — those in authority are disproportionately afflicted and corrupted.

The covenant confirms this from a different angle. **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 1:17** — *"You shall not show partiality in judgment; you shall hear the small and the great alike"* — establishes that those who hold authority in judgment and governance are held to the highest covenant standard, and therefore bear the greatest spiritual vulnerability when they depart from it.

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34 is the entire covenant indictment of shepherds — leaders — who feed themselves and devour the flock. Ripperger described how the wrong people are inspired to seek power because their psychological patterns are compatible with the adversary's use. The

covenant calls this *navi sheker* — a false prophet, a false shepherd. You have been documenting this pattern for years in your public work. The covenant gives you the framework that names why it is not merely political corruption — it is covenant betrayal.

Ripperger also made an observation that connects directly to our witness: that demons present a temptation as a glorious promise, secure the consent, and then take the person down — and he drew the parallel to communism using the same pattern. This is accurate as far as it goes. The covenant calls this the seduction pattern of Baal — documented at length in the Nevi'im: the promise of prosperity and fertility through covenant violation, followed by the collapse that the violation itself produces. **Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 2** is the extended covenant lawsuit on this pattern.

PART EIGHT

VIII. On Fasting, Prayer, and the Covenant Discipline

Ripperger spoke at length about fasting — that he fasts six days a week while conducting sessions, eating only one moderate meal in the evening. He grounded this in the command to "bring your body under subjection" and the Yeshua teaching that certain spirits come out only through prayer and fasting.

The covenant confirms this practice from its own foundation. The discipline of the body and the sanctification of desire run throughout Torah. **Vayikra 16** establishes the Day of Atonement (*Yom Kippur*) as a full fast before **Yahweh** — the covenant day of corporate affliction of the soul. **Yeshayahu 58** describes the true fast: not merely the physical discipline, but the reorientation of the entire person toward **Yahweh's** covenant justice. Ripperger's experiential confirmation that fasting reduces the adversary's access and sharpens spiritual discernment is consistent with the covenant framework, even if he receives it through a Catholic lens.

His observation that pornography has become a primary entry point for adversarial influence — and that the compulsive, driven quality of addiction is itself a signal of something beyond natural habit — aligns with the covenant's testimony about the consequences of covenant sexual violation as described in **Vayikra 18** and **Devarim 28:27–28**.

PART NINE

IX. Our Covenant Witness to You Both

Tucker — you asked at the end: "*Are you hopeful for the country?*" Ripperger said he believes **Yahweh** will correct it, "probably fairly soon," and compared our condition to Sodom and Gomorrah. We do not dispute his assessment of the condition. We offer a different witness on the correction.

Yahweh does not correct nations at random. He corrects them according to the covenant. **Devarim 28** — the blessings and curses of the covenant — is not a Catholic document. It is not a Protestant document. It is the covenant testimony of **Yahweh** Himself, addressed to all people who come under covenant accountability, whether they know His name or not. The curses Ripperger sees manifested in this nation — the confusion, the sexual inversion, the child sacrifice, the corruption of leaders — are documented in **Devarim 28:15–68** as the specific consequences of departing from the covenant of **Yahweh**.

The correction, when it comes, will not be to drive the nation back to Rome. It will not be to drive the nation back to any institutional church. It will be to drive all peoples — Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, which we address simultaneously — back to the covenant of **Yahweh** as established in the Tanakh: the only document with the legal and spiritual authority to adjudicate these matters.

That is the work of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly.

That is why we write to you.

COVENANT SUMMARY: What the Tanakh Establishes That This Interview Could Not

- **Ha-satan** (הַשָּׂטָן) is a *title*, not a proper name. In 26 of 27 occurrences it is either a human adversary, a function-title with the definite article, or a verbal description of adversarial action.
- **The malak Yahweh Himself occupied the satan role** in Bemidbar 22:22 — standing against Balaam *l'satan lo*. The adversarial function is not inherently demonic; it is a covenant function under **Yahweh's** direct commission.
- **The 1 Chronicles / 2 Samuel parallel** proves that whatever ha-satan does operates under **Yahweh's** sovereign authority — the two accounts of the identical event name different agents for the same divine action.
- **Yeshayahu 45:7** — *"I form light and create darkness; I make peace and I create evil; I am Yahweh who does all these things."* No dualism. No rival sovereign. No cosmic war **Yahweh** might lose.
- **"Lucifer" is a Latin mistranslation** of the Hebrew *helel* (הֵילֵל, H1966) — a poetic name for Venus as the morning star, applied in Yeshayahu 14 to the King of Babylon, who is called *ha-ish* — "the man" — in the same passage.
- **The fallen angel narrative** is assembled from Origen, Jerome's Vulgate, the Book of Enoch, Zoroastrian dualism, and Dante and Milton — not from the Tanakh.
- **Molek is Torah law**, not mythology. Vayikra 20:2–5 makes child sacrifice a capital covenant offense. The legalization of abortion is a covenant violation on the terms **Yahweh** Himself established.

- **Devarim 28** is the covenant framework for national correction — what Ripperger sees in the culture is the predictable covenantal consequence of departure from **Yahweh's** law, documented in exact terms before any of these events occurred.
-

In covenant witness,

Kepha Arcemont

Elder & Founder, Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly

Pearl River, Louisiana

miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 985-250-9060 • miqdashbethel.org

This response draws on the following Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly studies available at miqdashbethel.org:

- *Malakim and Ha-Satan: Who Are the Messengers of Yahweh? Who — and What — Is the Adversary? — A Complete Lexical and Covenant Study from the Tanakh*
- *Molek Worship and the Modern Covenant Violation*
- *613 Laws: Dietary Covenant — Clean, Unclean, and the Laws of the Table*
- *The Hebrew Government: A Covenant Framework for Governance*