

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority

A Study for Judaism • Christianity • Islam

DOCUMENT 165

Empire of the Offering Plate: A Covenant Response to the JD Hall–Tucker Carlson Interview

A Covenant Deep Dive into Dispensationalism, the Scofield Bible, the Right of Return, and the Tanakh's Own Verdict on Christian Zionism

Examining the June 23, 2026 Interview at the Plumb Line of the Written Tanakh

June 2026

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 402-218-9530

PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452

| ✧ JUDAISM | † CHRISTIANITY | ☪ ISLAM |
|---|---|--|
| The covenant tithe, the conditional Land, and the prophets' indictment of false shepherds belong first to Yisra'el's own Torah — examined here on its own terms before any Christian movement borrows them. | Dispensationalism, the Scofield Bible, and the modern alliance between American evangelicalism and the secular Israeli state are entirely Christian inventions, tested here against the Written Tanakh the Church claims as its foundation. | The Qur'anic record of Muslim governance over Christian holy sites, and the Islamic affirmation of 'Isa (عيسى) as a true prophet sent from Elohim, are weighed here against the competing claim that Judaism and Christianity share a natural alliance against Islam. |

DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY — STANDING RULE OF MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

The sole binding authority of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution is the *Tanakh* — the written covenant of **Yahweh**. No Talmudic tractate, Church council decree, papal encyclical, hadith collection, dispensationalist study-Bible marginal note, or extra-biblical tradition carries doctrinal weight equal to or greater than the written Torah. Where any tradition conflicts with the written covenant, the written covenant governs without exception. The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and theological comparison only. The **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governs all textual and historical claims in this document.

This document does not exist because Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution requires the New Testament's authority to settle a Christian internal dispute. It exists because a widely circulated interview between two Christian commentators — Tucker Carlson and JD Hall, recorded and released June 23, 2026 — made claims about the Hebrew Tanakh, the Abrahamic covenant, the modern state of Israel, and the nature of Yahweh's covenant people that this Institution is positioned to test directly against the Written Text both parties claim to honor. Where the interview's covenant-theology critique of dispensationalism agrees with the plain sense of the Tanakh, this document says so plainly. Where the interview imports its own Christian theological assumptions — chiefly that the Church has replaced or inherited Israel's covenant promises by faith in a divine mediator — this document holds that claim to the same plumb line and finds it wanting on the same grounds.

Why the Tanakh and not the New Testament, the Talmud, or the Qur'an as final authority? Because the written Tanakh is the only text of the three Abrahamic traditions whose authorship, transmission, and canonization is attested across all three — Jew, Christian, and Muslim alike acknowledge that **Mosheh (Moses), Dawid (David), and the Nevi'im (Prophets)** received and spoke the word of **Yahweh**. No competing tradition can claim that same universal acknowledgment for its own additions. A covenant claim that cannot be sustained from the Written Tanakh itself — Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim — is a claim resting on sand, regardless of which religion built the sandcastle.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

This document applies the sole authority of the written *Tanakh*. **Yahweh (יהוה)** and **Elohim (אלהים)** appear in bold throughout. Hebrew book names are given with English in parentheses, both bold, at

every occurrence. Hebrew transliterations appear in ***bold italic*** with English meaning in parentheses at every occurrence. Scripture references, prophet names, and Strong’s numbers are bold. Three audiences are addressed simultaneously: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The JD Hall–Tucker Carlson interview transcript is treated as a primary source under examination — its theological and historical claims are quoted, evaluated, and where appropriate either upheld or corrected against the Written Tanakh and independently verified historical record. Rabbinic commentary, New Testament texts, and the Qur’an are cited as historical and comparative reference — not as binding authority. The Written Tanakh governs all conclusions.

TANAKH BOOKS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

| DIVISION | BOOKS CITED | PURPOSE IN THIS STUDY |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Torah | Bereishit (Genesis), Shemot (Exodus), Bemidbar (Numbers), Devarim (Deuteronomy) | Covenant of Avraham; the seed promise; the ger and the nations; the two-or-three-witness standard |
| Nevi'im (Prophets) | Yeshayahu (Isaiah), Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah), Yechezkel (Ezekiel), Mikhah (Micah), Malakhi | Prophetic indictment of false shepherds and the tithe trade; the Eved Yahweh; covenant conditionality of the Land |
| Ketuvim (Writings) | Tehillim (Psalms), Iyov (Job) | The nations' inheritance; the limits of covenant identity by ethnicity alone |

I. WHAT THE INTERVIEW GOT RIGHT — THE COVENANT AGREES

On June 23, 2026, Tucker Carlson interviewed pastor and Substack writer J.D. Hall on the subject of Christian Zionism and dispensationalism. Before this document examines where the interview’s claims fail under the Written Tanakh, covenant honesty requires stating plainly where Hall’s critique of dispensationalism is correct on the historical record and where it converges, whether he intended it or

not, with positions this Institution has documented across Doc 150 (Scofield Deception) and Doc 162 (The Religion Business on Trial).

I-A. THE HISTORICAL RECORD ON SCOFIELD AND DARBY

Hall's account that dispensationalism is a 19th-century innovation, not the historic position of the Church, is correct. The system was constructed by **John Nelson Darby**, a 19th-century Anglo-Irish minister of the separatist Plymouth Brethren movement, who divided redemptive history into discrete eras or 'dispensations' and made the future restoration of ethnic Israel to the land the hinge of the entire system. Independent historical sources confirm this lineage without dispute.

The interview's account of how the system spread is also substantially correct: **Cyrus I. Scofield**, an American Bible-study author with a documented record of having abandoned his first wife and children, met with Oxford University Press contacts in England and produced the *Scofield Reference Bible*, first published by Oxford in **1909** — placing Darby's dispensational notes directly in the margins of the King James Version text itself. Because it was the only commentary many under-resourced clergy could access, it became, within a single generation, the de facto seminary education for a large segment of low-church American evangelicalism, and dispensationalism became the majority eschatology among that population by the mid-20th century.

I-B. ONE CORRECTION THE COVENANT REQUIRES: THE ACTUAL SEQUENCE OF SCOFIELD AND BALFOUR

Here the interview's chronology requires a covenant correction, not because the underlying argument is wrong, but because the Two-or-Three-Witness standard of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** forbids this Institution from repeating an unverified timeline simply because it serves an otherwise sound argument. Hall states that the same institution that printed the Scofield Bible published the Balfour Declaration '*within a year*' of one another, implying the 1909 first edition sat just ahead of the 1917 Balfour Declaration. The verified historical record shows a different and, if anything, more striking sequence: the first edition of the Scofield Reference Bible was published by Oxford in 1909 — eight years *before* Balfour. It was Scofield's revised 1917 edition — issued roughly ten months *after* the November 1917 Balfour Declaration — that added explicit notes affirming Israel's restoration to the land, aligning the study Bible's marginalia even more closely with Britain's just-announced policy.

The covenant point stands either way: a theological framework and a geopolitical declaration arrived from the same publishing house, in the same decade, reinforcing one another. But this document will

not let a true conclusion ride on a false date. Where the interview's chronology can be tightened by the documentary record, this Institution tightens it.

II. THE COVENANT TEST OF GENESIS 12:3 — WHO IS BLESSED, AND WHY

II-A. THE VERSE ITSELF

Both Hall and Carlson identify **Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3** as the verse most weaponized by Christian Zionist preachers:

“I will bless those that bless thee and curse those that curse thee.”

This is correctly cited. The Hebrew text reads *va'avarakhab mevarakheikha* (וְאַבְרָכָה מְבָרְכֶיךָ) — ‘**and I will bless those who bless you.**’ The verse is addressed to **Avram (Abram)** personally, in the second-millennium-BCE founding moment of his individual covenant call out of Ur Kasdim (Ur of the Chaldeans). The Tanakh itself never extends this specific verse, by its own internal logic, into a blank-check geopolitical directive binding all future nations to the foreign policy of a 20th-century parliamentary state founded three thousand years later. The text blesses or curses in response to how nations treat **Avraham (Abraham)** and, by extension in later covenant texts, the patriarchal line — not in response to support for any particular government's borders, military budget, or settlement policy.

II-B. THE COVENANT WAS ALREADY CONDITIONAL — DEVARIM 28 AND THE LAND

Where the interview is strongest, and where it stands directly on Tanakh ground rather than New Testament argument, is its insistence that modern Israel's claim to perpetual, unconditional divine favor cannot be sustained from the text. **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 28** and **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 30:15–20** — cited at length in this Institution's own Doc 148 — set the terms in advance: blessing for covenant obedience, curse and exile for covenant breach, with no exception clause for ethnicity alone. **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 33:13** states it without ambiguity:

“If I say to the righteous that he shall surely live, and he trusts in his righteousness and commits iniquity, none of his righteous deeds shall be remembered; for the iniquity that he has committed he shall die.”

The Covenant standing in the Tanakh is never a permanent, unconditional, ethnically-secured possession. It is a continuously tested relationship. Any theology — Jewish, Christian, or secular-nationalist — that treats modern statehood as automatic, irrevocable proof of divine favor is importing an assumption the Torah itself does not make.

II-C. WHERE THE INTERVIEW OVERCORRECTS: ROMANS 9–11 IS NOT TANAKH AUTHORITY

The interview's strongest claim — that the modern Church has wrongly transferred Israel's promises away from ethnic Jews and onto itself by faith in **Yeshua (Jesus)** as a 'divine seed' fulfilling **Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3** and **Galatians 3:16** — is a New Testament argument, not a Tanakh one, and this Institution's Doctrinal Authority rule requires it be named as such. Hall correctly diagnoses that dispensationalism misreads Genesis 12:3. But his own covenant-theology alternative — that the Church has *inherited* Avraham's promises by faith in a mediator-Messiah, displacing ethnic Israel as covenant heir — rests entirely on a Greek-language epistle's reading of **Galatians 3:16** (“the seed, which is Christ”) and on **Romans 9–11**, neither of which appears anywhere in the Written Tanakh. The Tanakh's own answer to ‘who inherits the promise to Avraham’ is given in **Bereishit (Genesis) 17:7–8**: the covenant is established with Avraham and his seed after him, **le-dorotam** (לְדֹרֹתָם, ‘throughout their generations’) — a promise to a physical lineage, not a transferable spiritual franchise assignable to whichever later religious movement claims faith in a particular figure. Replacing one exclusivist claim (Israel alone) with another exclusivist claim (the Church alone, by faith in a mediator) is not a correction of dispensationalism's error. It is the same category of error wearing different vestments.

III. THE MEDIATOR QUESTION — WHERE THIS INTERVIEW MEETS DOCUMENT 164

This Institution completed Document 164 — *Is There a Mediator Between Man and Yahweh?* — in the same week this interview was released, and the timing exposes the central fault line running underneath this entire conversation. Hall's argument throughout the interview depends on a claim he states directly: “*The new covenant that Jesus installed... Jesus Christ is the means by which God's people are saved.*” Carried to its geopolitical conclusion, Hall says: “*I'm a joint heir with Jesus Christ... Jesus is entitled to all of the Middle East. He owns everything.*” This is the doctrine of the divine-human

mediator — that approach to **Yahweh** now requires a metaphysical go-between whose legal standing as 'Son' transfers inheritance rights to those who believe in him.

As Document 164 establishes at length, the Written Tanakh does not teach this. The Hebrew word most often pressed into mediator service, *mokhiach* (מוֹכִיחַ), appears in **Iyov (Job) 9:33** as Iyov's *lament* that no such arbitrator exists between himself and **Elohim** — “**Neither is there any mokhiach betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both.**” The Tanakh never resolves that lament with the promise of a future cosmic intermediary. Instead, the covenant model throughout Torah is direct address: **Mosheh (Moses)** speaks with **Yahweh** “face to face, as a man speaks with his friend” (**Shemot \[Exodus\] 33:11**), and every Yisra’eli stands personally and individually before **Yahweh** at **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 29:9–15** without an appointed go-between. This matters directly for the interview's geopolitical conclusion: if the entire claim that Christians — rather than the nations broadly, or none exclusively — inherit the Middle East by virtue of joint-heirship with a mediator-Messiah depends on a doctrine the Written Tanakh itself never establishes, then the Christian inheritance claim collapses on the same textual grounds as the dispensationalist claim it was offered to replace. Both rest on a New Testament overlay the Tanakh does not contain.

IV. THE RIGHT OF RETURN AND THE PERSECUTION OF MESSIANIC BELIEVERS — VERIFIED

IV-A. THE LEGAL RECORD

The interview's most serious factual claim — that an ethnically Jewish person who professes faith in **Yeshua (Jesus)** forfeits the right of return to the modern state of Israel under its *Law of Return* — is independently verifiable and accurate. In the 1962 *Brother Daniel* case, Israel's Supreme Court ruled that a person born Jewish who voluntarily converted to another faith — in that case, Catholicism — falls outside the statute's protection because he had “placed himself outside” the covenant community by voluntary religious conversion. In 1989, the same court extended this ruling explicitly to Messianic Judaism, holding that belief in **Yeshua** as Messiah constitutes adherence to “another religion,” disqualifying the applicant under the Law of Return's exclusion clause regardless of ethnic Jewish ancestry. A narrower 2008 ruling permitted entry only for individuals who were never *halakhically* Jewish to begin with (Jewish father, non-Jewish mother) under the law's separate family-member provision — it did not reverse the 1989 precedent for those who are Jewish by the religion's own maternal-line standard.

Per the two-or-three-witness standard of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15**, this claim is corroborated by independent legal commentary across multiple sources spanning Messianic advocacy organizations, mainstream legal reference works, and Israeli court record summaries, all describing the same sequence: *Rufeisen v. Minister of Interior* (1962), *Beresford v. Minister of Interior* (1989), and *Kendel v. Minister of Interior* (following shortly after). The claim survives the witness test.

IV-B. THE COVENANT VERDICT ON THIS POLICY

Whatever a sovereign nation's right to set its own immigration statute, the Written Tanakh has direct things to say about excluding a person from covenant community on the basis of belief while admitting atheists, agnostics, and practitioners of unorganized occultism on the basis of bloodline alone — which the interview also documents and which is consistent with the statute's plain text.

Bemidbar (Numbers) 15:15–16 establishes:

“One law and one ordinance shall be for you, and for the ger \[stranger/sojourner\] that sojourns with you.”

The Torah's own standard for inclusion in covenant community was never ethnicity alone — it required covenant faithfulness, available even to the *ger* (גֵר) who attached himself to **Yahweh**. A legal framework that grants automatic standing to a Jewish atheist while permanently excluding a Jewish believer in the **Mashiach (Messiah)** — under any candidate for that title — inverts the Torah's own logic. This is not a Christian grievance. It is a Tanakh grievance, and it stands regardless of one's position on whether **Yeshua** is in fact Messiah.

V. THE TITHE TRADE — YECHEZKEL 34 AND PROJECT 545

V-A. THE VERIFIED FIGURES

The interview's claim regarding an Israeli government-funded influence campaign targeting American religious and political opinion is independently verifiable and, per the two-or-three-witness standard, well corroborated. Filings under the U.S. **Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA)** confirm an Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiative — internally designated **Project 545**, referencing a Knesset allocation of 545 million shekels (approximately \$145 million) for 2025 public diplomacy spending — which contracted the American firm Clock Tower X, run by a former U.S. presidential campaign strategist, to “game algorithms” and influence how generative AI systems frame Israel-related queries, and to integrate “narrative messaging” into American talk-radio and media networks. This figure and

the contracting arrangement are reported consistently across Israeli financial press (Ynetnews), Wikipedia's sourced summary, and independent FARA-filing analysis — satisfying **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** on this specific point.

V-B. THE PROPHETIC CATEGORY THIS FALLS UNDER

Whether or not this specific funding stream reaches American pulpits, the broader pattern the interview describes — institutional pressure on American clergy to treat support for a foreign government's policy as religious obligation, monetized through weekly offerings — falls squarely inside a category the **Nevi'im (Prophets)** addressed directly nearly three thousand years before any modern nation-state existed. **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2–3** — already cited at length in this Institution's Doc 148 — applies without modification:

“Woe to the shepherds of Yisra'el who have been feeding themselves! ... You eat the fat, you clothe yourselves with the wool, you slaughter the fat ones, but you do not feed the sheep.”

Malakhi (Malachi) 3:8–10 likewise frames the tithe as belonging to **Yahweh** for the maintenance of His own house and the relief of the covenant poor — not as a transferable instrument for funding a foreign government's military procurement, regardless of how that government is described theologically to the donor congregation. A shepherd who tells the flock that the flock's money belongs, by divine command, somewhere other than where **Yahweh** Himself designated it is the precise figure **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34** condemns — and this verdict does not depend on whether the shepherd's theology is dispensationalist, covenantal, or any other label.

VI. THE MUSLIM RECORD ON HOLY-SITE STEWARDSHIP — TESTED

The interview raises a historical claim with direct bearing on the three-religion mandate of this Institution: that Ottoman Muslim authorities did not tax Christian churches and physically restored the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on multiple occasions, in contrast to tax and confiscation pressures the interview attributes to the modern Israeli state against Jerusalem church property. This Institution does not take a position on contested current property disputes without direct documentary access to the underlying tax assessments and church financial records, which lie outside the scope of a Tanakh-authority covenant document. What this Institution can affirm from the Qur'anic and historical record on the narrower religious question — the Islamic view of **'Isa (عيسى)**, Jesus — is this:

the Qur'an affirms 'Isa as a true prophet (rasul) sent from **Allah/Elohim**, born of a virgin, a worker of true miracles by divine permission, and one whose return is anticipated — while denying his divinity or sonship in the Trinitarian sense, consistent with *Tawhid*, the absolute oneness of God. This is, on its own terms, structurally closer to the Tanakh's own insistence that **Yahweh** shares His unique nature with no being (**Devarim \[Deuteronomy\] 6:4, Yeshayahu \[Isaiah\] 45:5**) than either Trinitarian Christianity or, in places, rabbinic mysticism's own departures from strict Tanakh monotheism. The claim that Judaism and Christianity share a *natural*, ancient alliance against Islam — as opposed to a recent 20th-century political construct — does not withstand the documented historical record of rabbinic-Christian conflict across the medieval and early modern periods, and this Institution finds the interview's skepticism on that specific point well founded.

VII. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT TABLE

| ELEMENT | JUDAISM | CHRISTIANITY | ISLAM |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Bereishit 12:3 Claim | Addressed personally to Avraham; rabbinic tradition does not extend it as a blank geopolitical mandate binding all nations to any specific modern government's policy. | Dispensationalism universalizes it into unconditional political obligation; covenant theology (Hall's position) instead transfers it to the Church via a mediator-Messiah reading of Galatians 3 — a New Testament move with no Tanakh textual basis. | Recognizes Avraham as patriarch (Ibrahim) and friend (khalil) of Allah, but does not read Genesis 12:3 as conferring perpetual political privilege on any one ethnic descendant nation. |
| Mediator Doctrine | Mokhiach in Iyov 9:33 is Job's lament for an absent arbitrator, never fulfilled in | 1 Timothy 2:5 reads a single mediator back into the text. Hall's joint-heirship claim to | Tawhid affirms no intermediary shares in Allah's nature; human messengers (rusul) |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Tanakh as a person. Direct address to Yahweh is the covenant norm (Shemot 33:11). | 'all of the Middle East' depends entirely on this non-Tanakh doctrine. | carry the word, but do not stand as ontological go-betweens. Closest to Tanakh's own silence on a cosmic mediator. |
| Right of Return | Bemidbar 15:15-16 sets one law for native and ger alike based on covenant faithfulness, not bloodline exclusivity paired with belief-based exclusion. | Messianic Jews are documented as legally excluded from Israeli return rights since 1962/1989 precedent — verified, and in tension with any claim of natural Judeo-Christian religious alliance. | Not directly addressed by this statute; relevant chiefly as evidence against the 'ancient alliance vs. Islam' framing the interview also challenges. |
| Tithe / Influence Funding | Malakhi 3:8-10 designates the tithe for Yahweh's house and the covenant poor — a principle predating and independent of any modern state's foreign-policy needs. | Yechezkel 34's false-shepherd indictment applies to any clergy directing congregational giving toward ends Yahweh did not designate, regardless of the theological label used to justify it. | Not implicated by this funding mechanism specifically, though the broader pattern of state-funded religious narrative-shaping is a caution applicable across all three traditions. |

VIII. SIX COVENANT DECLARATIONS

| # | COVENANT DECLARATION | BASIS |
|------------|---|--|
| I | Bereishit 12:3 blesses or curses nations according to their treatment of Avraham personally and his covenant line — it is not a transferable mandate compelling support for any specific modern government's policy, military budget, or borders. | Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3, 17:7-8 |
| II | The Land covenant is and has always been conditional on covenant faithfulness, not an unconditional ethnic entitlement immune to the consequences set out in advance by the covenant's own terms. | Devarim (Deuteronomy) 28; 30:15-20; Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 33:13 |
| III | The Written Tanakh does not establish a divine-human mediator standing between man and Yahweh. Claims of inherited geopolitical entitlement built on such a mediator's joint-heirship rest on a doctrine outside the Tanakh's own text. | Iyov (Job) 9:33; Shemot (Exodus) 33:11 |
| IV | One law governs the native-born and the covenant-faithful sojourner alike. A statute that admits the irreligious by bloodline while excluding the believing by creed inverts the Torah's own standard for covenant inclusion. | Bemidbar (Numbers) 15:15-16 |
| V | The covenant tithe belongs to Yahweh's house and the relief of the covenant poor. Religious leadership that directs congregational giving toward a foreign government's policy aims, under any doctrinal label, falls under the prophetic indictment of the false shepherd. | Malakhi 3:8-10; Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2-3, 11 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| <p>VI</p> | <p>Correcting a dispensationalist error by substituting a covenant-theology mediator-inheritance claim is not a return to Tanakh authority — it is the substitution of one extra-textual doctrine for another. Only the Written Tanakh, examined on its own terms, settles the question.</p> | <p>Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15; Bereishit (Genesis) 17:7-8</p> |
|------------------|--|---|

IX. CLOSING STATEMENT

This interview did something rare for a widely circulated broadcast: it correctly identified that a major strand of American Christian political theology was manufactured in the 19th century, financed and distributed for reasons that had little to do with careful exegesis, and that it has materially shaped how millions of Christians vote, give, and pray. That diagnosis deserves to be taken seriously, and this document has taken it seriously, agreeing with it wherever the documentary record allows.

But a covenant institution bound to the Written *Tanakh* cannot stop at agreeing with whichever side of a Christian internal argument sounds more sympathetic to **Yisra'el (Israel)** the nation, the land, or the people. Hall's corrective to dispensationalism is itself built on a claim the Tanakh does not make: that a mediator's death and resurrection transferred the patriarchal promises from **Avraham (Abraham)**'s physical line onto a new covenant body defined by faith in that mediator, who as "joint heir" now holds title to "all of the Middle East."

Trade the dispensationalist's Israel-first reading for the covenant theologian's Christ-first reading, and the same error survives in a new shape: a modern political or theological claim dressed in the language of ancient promise, and read back into a text that was never asked the question being put to it.

The Written Tanakh's own verdict does not require either move. It does not need a mediator to settle the question of who may approach **Yahweh** — **Mosheh (Moses)** did so directly, and so did every Yisra'eli standing at the renewal of the covenant in **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 29**.

It does not need a 20th-century parliamentary declaration, a 19th-century sectarian eschatology, or a first-century epistle to determine who is blessed for blessing **Avraham — Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3** **already says what it says, addressed to one man and his seed, without amendment.** And it does not need a Christian mediator's inheritance to condemn a shepherd who fills the offering plate by frightening or flattering the flock — **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34** had already said everything required on that subject some twenty-five centuries before **Project 545** had a budget line.

What this leaves standing is not a third theological system competing with dispensationalism and covenant theology for the same prize. It is the older and narrower claim this Institution exists to make: that the Written Covenant of **Yahweh** judges every later system — Jewish, Christian, Muslim, or

secular-political — by its own text, on its own terms, without needing any of them to adjudicate it first. **Dispensationalism fails that test. So does the mediator doctrine offered in its place. The covenant title, the conditional Land, and the prophetic charge against false shepherds do not belong to whichever side wins a Tucker Carlson interview. They belong, as they always have, to Yahweh alone, and to the flock such shepherds were charged to feed rather than fleece.**

SCRIPTURE INDEX

| REFERENCE | SUBJECT | SECTION |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3 | The blessing/cursing formula addressed to Avraham personally | II-A |
| Bereishit (Genesis) 17:7-8 | Covenant established with Avraham and his seed le-dorotam (throughout generations) | II-C / VIII |
| Shemot (Exodus) 33:11 | Mosheh speaks with Yahweh face to face — direct address, no mediator | III |
| Bemidbar (Numbers) 15:15-16 | One law for the native-born and the ger alike | IV-B / VIII |
| Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 | Two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governing this document | Throughout |
| Devarim (Deuteronomy) 28 | Covenant blessings and curses as conditional outcomes | II-B |
| Devarim (Deuteronomy) 30:15-20 | Choose life — the covenant sets terms in advance | II-B |
| Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 45:5 | Yahweh's unique, non-shared divine nature | VI |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------|
| Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) — comparative | Prophetic indictment tradition continued in Yechezkel | V-B |
| Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 33:13 | Righteousness does not secure unconditional standing | II-B |
| Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2-3, 11 | False shepherds who feed themselves at the flock's expense | V-B / VIII |
| Malakhi 3:8-10 | The tithe belongs to Yahweh's house and the covenant poor | V-B / VIII |
| Iyov (Job) 9:33 | Job's lament for an absent mokhiach (arbitrator) — unresolved in Tanakh | III / VIII |

*“I will bless those that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee:
and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”*

Bereishit (Genesis) 12:3 — The Written Covenant of Yahweh

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Document 165 • Empire of the Offering Plate • June 2026

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • 402-218-9530 • PO Box 762, Pearl River,
Louisiana 70452

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority • Reaching Judaism, Christianity, and Islam