

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority
A Study for Judaism • Christianity • Islam

DOCUMENT 168

ATLANTIS, THE ANNUNAKI, AND THE WRITTEN COVENANT

A COVENANT RESPONSE TO JOHN HAMER'S THE FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY

Where Does an Extraterrestrial-Origins, Anti-Religion Conspiracy Theory Fit Within Yahweh's Covenant Plan for This Generation? — A Three-Religion Covenant Witness

June 2026

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

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

PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452

☆ JUDAISM	† CHRISTIANITY	☪ ISLAM
Bereishit (Genesis) presents creation, the flood, and the table of nations as the acts of Yahweh alone, not as a record requiring extraterrestrial collaborators. The <i>nephilim</i> of Bereishit 6:4 are examined here on the Tanakh's own terms, against the 'Annunaki' reading Hamer imports from Sitchin.	Christianity inherits the Tanakh's creation account and its rejection of rival origin-stories. Yochanan (John) 1:1–3 is cited as historical reference only — the New Testament's own witness affirms, rather than displaces, the Genesis record Hamer's thesis sets aside.	The Qur'an's account of Adam's creation (Surah 15:26–29) and its category of <i>shirk</i> stand in direct tension with a thesis that assigns humanity's genetic origin to beings other than the Creator.

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, 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 The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur’an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority. Miqdash Bethel uses the Written Tanakh as its sole source for four reasons: it is the only text Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all recognize as originally given by **Yahweh**; it predates and underlies the Talmud, New Testament, and Qur’an, so testing those traditions against it follows the evidentiary direction of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** — the earlier witness governs the later commentary; every later tradition that departs from the Tanakh does so by addition or reinterpretation, never by overturning the text itself, so the text remains the fixed standard; and **Yahweh**’s own words declare the covenant unchanging (**Malachi 3:6; Tehillim (Psalms) 119:89**), making the written covenant — not evolving institutional interpretation — the only stable ground for doctrine. All three great covenant traditions — Judaism, Christianity, and Islam — are addressed simultaneously and equally in every Miqdash Bethel document, because **Yahweh**’s covenant belongs to every nation that will receive it.

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. Hebrew transliterations appear in ***bold italic*** with English meaning in parentheses at every occurrence. Scripture references are bold. Three audiences are addressed simultaneously: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Rabbinic commentary, New Testament texts, and the Qur’an are cited as historical and comparative reference — not as binding authority. The work under review — John Hamer’s *The Falsification of History: Our Distorted Reality* (2012, 894 pages) — is examined on its own stated terms: a sweeping claim that recorded history, the origin of the human species, and present world events are the product of a single coordinated deception maintained by a small ruling Elite. This response addresses the structure and the stated theology of that claim, including Hamer’s own treatment of “mainstream religion” and his proposed replacement of the Genesis creation account, because the structure and the theology are where the claim either submits to or breaks against the written covenant.

TANAKH BOOKS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

DIVISION	BOOKS CITED	PURPOSE IN THIS STUDY
Torah	Bereishit (Genesis), Devarim (Deuteronomy)	Creation account, the nephilim, the test of a

		prophet, and the evidentiary standard
Nevi'im (Prophets)	Yeshayahu (Isaiah), Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah), Yechezkel (Ezekiel)	Prophetic witness against idolatry, false comfort, and self-originated revelation
Ketuvim (Writings)	Tehillim (Psalms), Mishlei (Proverbs), Kohelet (Ecclesiastes), Daniel	Wisdom literature on the unreliable heart, and the covenant's own pattern of empires and end-time discernment

I. WHAT JOHN HAMER ACTUALLY CLAIMS

I-A. THE AUTHOR AND THE BOOK

John Hamer is a British geopolitical researcher and self-published author from West Yorkshire, England, writing since approximately 2012 following what he describes as his own ‘awakening’ to alternative history and conspiracy research after the events of September 11, 2001. *The Falsification of History: Our Distorted Reality* (2012) is an 894-page compendium covering ancient origins, secret societies, both World Wars, the modern banking system, 9/11, weather-control technology, vaccines and modern medicine, and what he calls ‘Religion and Spirituality.’ Hamer has subsequently published a substantial and still-growing body of related work: *RMS Olympic and Titanic’s Last Secret* (2013–2014, arguing the Titanic and Olympic were secretly switched for insurance fraud), *Behind the Curtain* (2016, a 600,000-word study of the global banking system), *JFK — A Very British Coup* (2019), *The Falsification of Science* (2021, a sister volume applying the same framework to medicine and physics), *Welcome to the Masquerade: Prelude to the Coming Reset* (2022, co-authored with Shannon Rowan, applying the framework to COVID-era public health policy), and most recently *Sixty Degrees South: Beyond the Ice Wall* (2025, co-authored with Andy Ross, a novel built on flat-earth and hollow-earth premises concerning Antarctica). The throughline across this entire body of work, by Hamer’s own framing, is a single claim: that a tiny hereditary Elite, in possession of suppressed knowledge about humanity’s true origins and the true shape of history, has constructed and maintained a comprehensive false reality across every domain — historical, scientific, medical, religious, and political — in order to control the rest of the human race.

I-B. THE CENTRAL THESIS, IN HAMER’S OWN FRAMING

Hamer states his thesis directly in the book’s introduction: that “the ongoing, deliberate, systematic falsification of both ancient and modern history” is being carried out by a ruling Elite, and that “almost everything you think you know about history and the present-day is wrong.” He is careful, to his credit, to qualify this at the outset — he does not claim the whole of recorded history is false, only that its framework is “certainly distorted and manipulated.” This qualification deserves to be named before any critique proceeds, in the same spirit this Institution has applied to other systems under review: **a claim should be tested as its author actually states it, not as a caricature of it.**

From this thesis Hamer builds outward across four ‘parts’: a prologue proposing an extraterrestrial origin for the human species and the lost continent of Atlantis as civilization’s true cradle; a middle section reinterpreting the last thousand years of Western history (secret societies, the World Wars, the moon landings) as the Elite’s ongoing operation; a third section applying the same lens to the present day (9/11, weather modification, vaccines, the entertainment industry); and an epilogue explaining why he, personally, has devoted years of his life to this project. The section most directly relevant to this Institution’s mandate is titled *Religion and Spirituality*, in which Hamer states his actual view of every world religion, including the Tanakh’s own covenant: that mainstream religion is “a substantial part of the control mechanism” used by the same ruling Elite, that the Genesis creation account is one possibility he personally rejects outright, and that the true origin of the human species is genetic engineering performed by extraterrestrial visitors he identifies, following the author Zecharia Sitchin, as the *Annunaki*.

I-C. WHAT HAMER SAYS ABOUT THE TANAKH SPECIFICALLY

Hamer’s treatment of the Tanakh’s creation account is explicit and direct, not merely implied. He writes that he will “exclude” the “biblical story of creation by a supreme being” from serious consideration, on the stated grounds that “the absurdity of the entire proposition should be very apparent” to any reader who already knows the Bereishit (Genesis) account. He then proposes that the Sumerian creation tablets translated by Sitchin describe the actual event behind the Bereishit (Genesis) narrative: that the Annunaki bioengineered a slave species from their own genetic material combined with an existing hominid population roughly 200,000–400,000 years ago, and that this event is the historical core later mythologized as the creation of *Adam* from the dust and *Chavah* from Adam’s rib. He extends the same reading to *Eden* itself, proposing the Sumerian **E.DIN** (‘abode of the righteous ones’) as its historical referent. On organized religion broadly, Hamer writes that its “main function... is to destroy spirituality and to prevent people from making the connection to the consciousness of who we are,” and that all major religions descend from ancient solar-zodiacal worship, citing the December 25 birthdates attributed to Horus, Mithra, and other pre-Christian deities as evidence that the Christian nativity narrative is a repackaged pagan myth formalized at the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE for purposes of social control.

II. THE COVENANT TEST FOR A REPLACEMENT ORIGINS NARRATIVE

II-A. BEREISHIT (GENESIS) DOES NOT COMPETE ON HAMER’S TERMS — IT IS THE STANDARD HAMER’S TERMS ARE MEASURED AGAINST

Hamer dismisses the Genesis account by asserting its “absurdity,” then proposes in its place a narrative in which an alien species, the Annunaki, traveled here from a planet called Nibiru roughly 400,000 years ago to mine gold, encountered labor unrest among their own workforce, and genetically spliced their DNA with that of an existing terrestrial hominid to manufacture a more compliant slave race — modern *Homo sapiens*. This Institution does not need to argue Hamer’s alternative into absurdity; it is sufficient to apply the same evidentiary standard this Institution holds every claim to, including its own.

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 establishes that ‘*al-pi shenayim edim*’ or three a matter is established; a single witness does not establish a matter, however confidently asserted. Hamer’s entire genetic-engineering thesis rests on one primary witness: the translation work of one researcher, Zecharia Sitchin, reading Sumerian and Akkadian cuneiform tablets in a manner not accepted by the field of Assyriology as a whole — a discipline whose specialists, working from the same primary tablets Sitchin claims to translate, do not find in them any account of extraterrestrial visitation, a twelfth planet, or genetic engineering of a slave species. Hamer compounds the problem by stacking inference upon inference without independent corroboration at any stage: from one disputed translation, to an inferred planet (‘Nibiru’) whose existence is asserted from the translation itself and from a single 1983 newspaper report about an unidentified infrared signal that was never confirmed as a planetary body, to an inferred genetic-engineering event, to an inferred motive (gold mining), to an inferred identification of that species with the biblical *nephilim*. Each link in this chain is a single, undisputed witness asked to bear the evidentiary weight of two or three.

II-B. THE NEPHILIM OF BEREISHIT (GENESIS) 6:1–4 DO NOT SAY WHAT HAMER NEEDS THEM TO SAY

Hamer’s strongest textual hook into the Tanakh is the figure of the *nephilim*, whom he and his cited sources identify outright with the Annunaki. The Hebrew text of **Bereishit (Genesis) 6:4** reads:

“The *nephilim* were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the *b’nei ha-Elohim* came to the daughters of men, who bore children to them.”

This Institution does not need to settle the long-disputed identity of the *b’nei ha-Elohim* — whether divine beings, fallen angelic figures, or, as some Jewish and early Christian interpreters have held, the line of powerful human rulers — to observe what the text does *not* say. It does not say these beings traveled from another planet. It does not say they performed genetic engineering, mined gold, or

manufactured a slave species. It says they had children with human women, and that the offspring were called *nephilim*, glossed in the same verse as *gibborim* of renown. The text’s own concern, established in the very next verses, is moral rather than biological or technological: **Bereishit (Genesis) 6:5** immediately pivots to declare that **“the wickedness of man was great in the earth,”** which becomes the stated reason for the flood judgment that follows. Hamer’s reading imports a science-fiction framework the text never raises and ignores the moral framework the text explicitly raises in the same breath.

II-C. THE COVENANT’S OWN TEST FOR A NEW ACCOUNT OF ORIGINS — DEVARIM (DEUTERONOMY) 13

The written covenant anticipated the precise category of claim Hamer is making — a confidently presented account that asks the reader to set aside Yahweh’s own revealed word in favor of a hidden, more complete truth.

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 13:1–3 states:

“If a prophet or a dreamer of dreams arises among you and gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder comes to pass, and he says, ‘Let us go after other gods... and let us serve them’ — you shall not listen to the words of that prophet.”

Note precisely what this standard does and does not ask. It does not ask whether the dreamer is sincere — Hamer’s sincerity, evident throughout his text and his decade-plus of continued research and publication on this exact theme, is not in dispute here. It does not ask whether the dreamer’s account is internally coherent or rhetorically persuasive. **It asks only one thing:** does the claim, however earnestly presented, pull the hearer away from the covenant Yahweh has already given and toward a rival account of ultimate origins and ultimate authority? Hamer’s thesis fails this test by its own stated structure — he does not propose the Annunaki account as compatible with, subordinate to, or a deeper reading of Bereishit (Genesis); he proposes it as the truth Bereishit (Genesis) obscures, and he states plainly that the Genesis account itself should be dismissed as absurd on its face.

III. ATLANTIS, THE FLOOD, AND THE TANAKH’S OWN ACCOUNT OF JUDGMENT BY WATER

III-A. HAMER’S ATLANTIS THESIS

Hamer devotes an entire chapter to defending the historical reality of Atlantis as “the cradle of our civilisation,” drawn from Plato’s account in the *Timaeus* and *Critias*, supplemented by Edgar Cayce’s psychic readings and the Bimini Road rock formation near the Bahamas. He proposes that Atlantis was destroyed by a cataclysm around 9600 BCE — in some versions of his sourcing tied to the close approach of the same ‘Nibiru’ invoked for the Annunaki narrative — and that surviving Atlantians

seeded the later civilizations of Egypt, Sumer, and the Americas with advanced knowledge, including pyramid construction. This Institution takes no binding doctrinal position on the existence or non-existence of Atlantis as a historical landmass; the Written Tanakh does not mention it, and a claim the Tanakh is silent on is not, for that reason alone, a claim the Tanakh’s authority forbids. What this Institution does hold under the **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** standard is that Hamer’s case again rests on a single primary witness — Plato’s account, written roughly nine thousand years after the event it describes, by Plato’s own admission relayed to him from Egyptian priests through Solon — supplemented by a psychic’s trance readings and a natural rock formation whose man-made origin remains disputed among geologists. None of these constitute independent, corroborating witnesses to one another in the sense the covenant’s evidentiary standard requires.

III-B. THE TANAKH’S OWN GLOBAL JUDGMENT-BY-WATER NARRATIVE — NOACH

Where the comparison becomes covenantally significant is this: the Tanakh itself records a global cataclysm by water, judgment poured out on a civilization that had become corrupt, and a small remnant preserved to re-found the human race afterward — the flood of **Bereishit (Genesis) 6–9**. This is worth naming plainly, because it means this Institution is not asking Hamer’s readers to choose between ‘a worldview with a great lost civilization destroyed by catastrophe’ and ‘a worldview with none.’ The Tanakh already contains exactly that structural shape — a high civilization, divine judgment by water, a remnant, and a re-founding. The covenant question is not whether ancient peoples preserve memory of catastrophic flooding; flood traditions are nearly universal across ancient Near Eastern, and indeed world, literature, and this Institution’s own research standard (corroborated across Mesopotamian, Mediterranean, and other ancient flood accounts) treats that universality as suggestive of a shared historical kernel rather than embarrassing to the Tanakh’s account. The covenant question is *why* the judgment came. Bereishit (Genesis) gives a moral answer:

“Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth” (Bereishit (Genesis) 6:5).

Hamer’s Atlantis, in the alternative-history tradition he draws on, falls to natural or technological catastrophe — a tectonic event, a close planetary pass, an unspecified ‘un-natural’ cause — with no covenant cause attached. The Tanakh’s flood narrative is not merely a parallel data point alongside Hamer’s Atlantis; it is a competing *explanation* for the same category of inherited human memory, and the covenant’s explanation carries a moral accountability Hamer’s account, by its own design, does not.

IV. “ALL RELIGION IS SUN WORSHIP” — TESTING THE SOLAR-MYTH THESIS AGAINST THE TANAKH’S OWN POLEMIC

IV-A. WHAT HAMER CLAIMS ABOUT CHRISTMAS, NICAEA, AND THE ORIGIN OF WORSHIP

Hamer’s religion chapter argues that all major world religions, including the figure of *Yeshua* within Christianity, derive from an ancient solar-zodiacal cult, citing a list of pagan deities allegedly sharing a December 25 birthdate (Horus, Mithra, Dionysus, and others), and arguing that the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE formalized this repackaged solar mythology as orthodox Christianity for purposes of social control. This Institution’s standing position, consistent across its library, is that the historical record of the December 25 nativity date is itself a fourth-century Roman ecclesiastical calculation with no claim to first-century Judean origin, and that the convergence of much later church practice with pre-existing winter solstice festivals (Saturnalia, Sol Invictus) is a documented feature of how the Roman world absorbed and recalibrated its calendar — a separate question from what the Written Tanakh itself teaches about its own covenant origin. This Institution takes no position defending the historicity of a December 25 birth, because the Written Tanakh contains no birth-date claim for any covenant figure to defend in the first place; Hamer’s solar-syncretism critique, where it targets fourth-century church calendar practice, is in this narrow respect not in conflict with anything the Tanakh itself asserts.

IV-B. WHERE THE CRITIQUE OVERREACHES — THE TANAKH’S OWN SUSTAINED WAR AGAINST SUN WORSHIP

Hamer’s broader claim — that solar worship is the hidden root *of all religion*, including by implication the Tanakh’s own covenant — runs directly into the single most sustained polemic in the entire Written Tanakh: Yahweh’s own war against exactly the practice Hamer describes. **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 4:19** warns Yisra’el (Israel) explicitly against being drawn to worship “the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven.” **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 8:16** records, as one of the gravest abominations Yahweh shows the prophet in a vision of the Temple itself, men bowing toward the sun at the very door of the sanctuary. **Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 19:13** and **2 Melachim (Kings) 23:5, 11** \[NT-adjacent historical record, cited here as the Tanakh’s own narrative text\] describe King Yoshiyahu’s (Josiah’s) reform specifically removing horses and chariots dedicated to sun worship and altars built on rooftops for burning incense to the sun, moon, and constellations. The Tanakh does not need to be told that solar worship existed in the ancient world and infiltrated Israel’s own practice — it documents this at length, in detail, as a recurring covenant violation that provoked Yahweh’s judgment. Hamer’s thesis, intending to expose religion as a control mechanism built on concealed solar mythology, in fact arrives at a conclusion the Tanakh had already reached three thousand years earlier from the opposite direction: solar worship is real, it is ancient, it is a genuine spiritual danger — and Yahweh’s covenant is not an instance of it but its standing prophetic adversary.

IV-C. “RELIGION IS A CONTROL MECHANISM” — A PLACE WHERE HAMER’S CRITIQUE AND YEchezkel’S INDICTMENT OF FALSE SHEPHERDS CONVERGE

Hamer writes that organized religion’s “main function... is to destroy spirituality” and keep “the masses in their places.” This Institution has stated, in its own examination of institutional religious failure (most directly in its study of *Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34*), that a meaningful portion of the suffering and disillusionment people attribute to religion in general is in fact the documented consequence of corrupt religious leadership specifically:

“Woe to the shepherds of Yisra’el who have been feeding themselves! Should not shepherds feed the sheep? You eat the fat, you clothe yourselves with the wool... but you do not feed the sheep” (Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2–3).

This is a genuine point of partial agreement, and this Institution states it plainly rather than minimizing it: institutional religion, across history and into the present, has often been used by the powerful to pacify and exploit the powerless, exactly as Hamer charges. The covenant’s answer to that real failure, however, is not Hamer’s answer. Yahweh’s response to corrupt shepherds is not the dissolution of covenant religion into an undifferentiated ‘spirituality’ answerable to no text and no community — it is:

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:11’s declaration, “I, I Myself will search for My sheep,”

and the restoration of right shepherding under the standard of the written covenant itself. Hamer’s critique of corrupt religious power, where accurate, is a critique the Tanakh’s own prophets had already made with greater precision and an actual remedy attached.

V. THE HEART AS SOLE WITNESS — WHY “I HAVE SEEN THROUGH THE LIE” IS NOT THE SAME AS “I HAVE FOUND THE TRUTH”

V-A. THE EPISTEMOLOGY HAMER ASKS THE READER TO ADOPT

In his epilogue, Hamer writes candidly about the personal cost of his position — ridicule, strained relationships, and the difficulty of “making the metaphorical leap across the yawning precipice to the truth” that he believes most people are unwilling to make. He frames the choice facing the reader as a binary: remain asleep within the Elite-manufactured ‘reality,’ or ‘wake up’ to the truth he and his cited sources have uncovered. He invokes the ‘hundredth monkey syndrome’ — a popularized claim about spontaneous collective awakening that has no support in the actual primatology research it claims to summarize — as the mechanism by which enough individually ‘awakened’ people will tip humanity into liberation. This Institution names the structural feature here without attributing bad faith to

Hamer personally: a framework that defines disagreement as evidence of being ‘still asleep,’ and personal conviction of having ‘seen through’ the deception as the marker of having reached the truth, is constructed in a way that makes external correction structurally difficult to receive, however sincerely it is held.

V-B. YIRMEYAHU (JEREMIAH) 17:9 — THE COVENANT’S OWN DIAGNOSIS OF SELF-CERTIFYING CONVICTION

Tanakh’s anthropology speaks directly to this structure.

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:9 states: **“The heart is *akov* above all things, and desperately sick; who can know it?”**

The verse that follows answers its own question:

“I, Yahweh, search the heart and test the mind” (Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:10).

The covenant does not teach that the conviction of having broken free from deception is, by itself, proof of having reached truth. It teaches the opposite: that the human heart, including the heart of the person who is certain they alone have ‘awakened,’ is precisely the organ least qualified to self-certify. This is not a claim that Hamer’s conviction is false in the sense of insincere — his decade-plus of sustained, detailed research argues for real sincerity. It is a claim that sincerity and intensity of conviction were never, under the covenant’s own terms, the test for whether a claim about ultimate reality is true.

Mishlei (Proverbs) 18:17 states the same principle from the other direction: **“The first to state his case seems right, until the other comes and cross-examines him.”**

An 894-page case, however exhaustively researched and however many sources it marshals, is still subject to this same examination — length and density of citation are not, under the covenant’s evidentiary standard, a substitute for independent corroborating witnesses.

VI. WHERE DOES THIS FIT YAHWEH’S PLAN FOR THIS GENERATION? — THE COVENANT’S OWN PATTERN FOR THIS TYPE OF DECEPTION

VI-A. THE QUESTION RESTATED IN COVENANT TERMS

The question this document was commissioned to answer — if Hamer’s account of a hidden ruling Elite, suppressed history, and concealed origins were true, how would it fit **Yahweh**’s plan for this period of human history — deserves a direct covenant answer rather than only a critique of Hamer’s

evidentiary method. The written covenant does not need Hamer’s specific Annunaki/Atlantis framework to be literally true in order to address the underlying intuition that drives so many readers to it: that the visible world of politics, media, and institutional power is not the whole picture, that real concealment and real corruption operate behind public events, and that ordinary people sense this and are right to sense it. **Tanakh affirms every part of that intuition directly — and gives it a covenant name and a covenant timeline Hamer’s framework does not.**

VI-B. DANIEL’S PATTERN — EMPIRES RISE, HIDDEN THINGS ARE REAL, AND YAHWEH STILL GOVERNS THE SEQUENCE

Tanakh’s own ‘conspiracy literature,’ if that term may be used carefully, is the book of **Daniel**. Daniel records the rise and fall of successive world empires — Babylon, Persia, Greece, and beyond — governed by court intrigue, deception, and the genuine concealment of plans from the common people, exactly the texture of hidden power Hamer’s research catalogs across the last several centuries. The crucial covenant difference is in who is shown to be sovereign over the sequence.

Daniel 2:21 states: **“He (Yahweh) removes kings and sets up kings.”**

Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the four-part statue, and Daniel’s own visions of successive beasts in **Daniel 7**, openly acknowledge that real, often concealed, imperial power structures rise and dominate — and frame this not as evidence that history has slipped outside **Yahweh**’s governance into the hands of an unaccountable Elite, but as evidence that **Yahweh** Himself directs the rise and fall of every such structure toward His own appointed end. This is the covenant’s answer to the legitimate half of Hamer’s intuition: yes, concealed power operates in human history; no, it does not operate outside or instead of **Yahweh**’s sovereignty, and no, the proper response to perceiving it is not despair or an alternative cosmology — it is the posture Daniel himself models throughout the book: covenant faithfulness, plainly spoken truth to power, and confident trust that the final empire belongs to **Yahweh** alone (**Daniel 2:44**).

VI-C. KOHELET (ECCLESIASTES) — OPPRESSION OBSERVED HONESTLY, WITHOUT A REPLACEMENT COSMOLOGY

This Institution’s own library has already established, in its examination of theodicy (**Document 148**), that the Tanakh does not ask the sufferer or the disillusioned observer to manufacture false comfort.

Kohelet (Ecclesiastes) 4:1 observes directly:

“I saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power.”

This is the same observation that animates Hamer’s entire body of work — the powerful exploit the powerless, and the powerless often have no one to speak for them. The covenant does not deny this

observation or soften it. What the covenant refuses to do, that Hamer’s framework does, is convert the real observation of oppression into a wholesale replacement of revealed origins, revealed history, and revealed religion with an alternative system built on a single disputed translator, a psychic’s trance readings, and AI-adjacent ‘awakening’ logic of the kind this Institution has already examined and rejected in *Document 167*.

Kohelet (Ecclesiastes) 12:13–14 gives the covenant’s actual instruction in the face of observed, unresolved injustice:

“Fear Elohim and keep His commandments... for Elohim will bring every deed into judgment.”

The appropriate response to real, documented abuses of power — and this generation has no shortage of documented examples — is sober-eyed covenant faithfulness and patient trust in a certain final accounting, not the adoption of an unfalsifiable counter-history of the species.

VI-D. THIS GENERATION’S ACTUAL COVENANT ASSIGNMENT

Where, then, does a work like *The Falsification of History* fit within **Yahweh**’s plan for this period of mankind on earth? It fits as a sign of something the Tanakh predicts will intensify, not as a revelation of something the Tanakh has concealed.

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:5 pronounces:

“Cursed is the man that trusts in man, and makes flesh his arm, and whose heart departs from Yahweh.”

A generation increasingly aware — correctly — that its political, financial, and media institutions have lied to it repeatedly and provably, and that genuinely conceals real information from the public, faces a covenant choice at exactly the moment of that disillusionment: replace one set of unaccountable human authorities (governments, churches, media) with another equally unaccountable human authority (a self-published alternative-history framework, a channeled medium, a single disputed translator), or return to the one authority the covenant identifies as genuinely answerable to nothing but itself and genuinely unchanging —

“I, Yahweh, do not change” (Malachi 3:6).

This Institution’s answer to Hamer’s readers is not ‘trust the institutions Hamer distrusts’ — this Institution’s entire library exists because it does not extend uncritical trust to corrupted religious or political institutions either. **The answer is that the corrective to deception is not a competing, equally unaccountable deception; it is the written covenant of Yahweh, tested by its own stated two-or-three-witness standard, which is the standard this document has applied to Hamer’s work throughout.**

VII. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT — HOW EACH TRADITION WEIGHS HAMER’S THESIS

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
Primary Question	Does an extraterrestrial-engineering account of Adam displace the Torah’s own creation narrative?	Does Hamer’s solar-myth genealogy for “all religion” include <i>Yeshua</i> as merely one more recycled solar deity?	Does assigning humanity’s genetic origin to a created species (the Annunaki) constitute <i>shirk</i> ?
Covenant Strength of the Critique	Correctly identifies that single-witness translation claims (Sitchin) cannot establish doctrine under Devarim 19:15 .	Correctly flags that the December 25 nativity date is a post-apostolic ecclesiastical calculation, not a first-century claim the Tanakh or earliest record makes.	The Qur’an’s own insistence (Surah 4:171) that Allah is utterly above having partners or offspring resonates with the Tanakh’s rejection of rival origin-claims.
Covenant Departure	Treats one disputed cuneiform translation as sufficient to overturn the creation account every stream of Judaism receives as foundational.	Extends a valid critique of fourth-century calendar syncretism into the unsupported claim that the Person and resurrection of <i>Yeshua</i> are themselves solar mythology.	Ironically, Hamer’s own genetic-engineering thesis re-creates a hierarchy of created beings standing between Creator and man — the very structure Islamic monotheism is most vigilant against.
Covenant Witness	The covenant answer to ‘there is more going on than the official story’ is not a new origins myth	Strip the syncretism critique to its valid core (test every claimed date and tradition against its	Where Islam and the Tanakh converge: ultimate origin belongs to the Creator alone,

	— it is Daniel 's own witness that Yahweh, not any Elite, governs the sequence of empires.	actual historical attestation) and it strengthens, rather than undermines, careful covenant scholarship.	and no intermediate created species — angelic, jinn, or 'Annunaki' — may be substituted for that authorship.
--	---	--	--

VIII. SEVEN COVENANT DECLARATIONS ON THE FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
I	A claim resting on a single disputed witness — however lengthy the derivation built upon it — cannot, under the Tanakh's own evidentiary standard, displace a covenant account received and transmitted across three thousand years by an entire covenant community.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15
II	The nephilim of Bereishit (Genesis) 6:4 are named in the text for a moral purpose — to set up the flood judgment on human wickedness — not as evidence of extraterrestrial genetic engineering; reading a science-fiction framework into the verse displaces the text's own stated concern.	Bereishit (Genesis) 6:1–5
III	A confidently presented alternative account of origins that asks the hearer to set aside Yahweh's revealed word in favor of a hidden, more complete truth fails the covenant's test of a prophet, regardless of the sincerity or research effort behind it.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 13:1–3
IV	Yahweh's covenant is not an instance of ancient solar worship; it is that worship's most sustained and explicit prophetic adversary, documented at every period of Israel's history from Devarim through the exile.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 4:19; Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 8:16

V	Genuine institutional religious corruption, which Hamer correctly identifies as real and historically documented, is itself indicted most precisely by Yahweh’s own prophets — and the covenant’s remedy is restored faithful shepherding under the written Word, not the abandonment of revealed religion altogether.	Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2–3, 11
VI	Personal conviction of having ‘awakened’ to a hidden truth is not, by the covenant’s own anthropology, evidence that the truth has actually been reached; the human heart is explicitly named as an unreliable sole witness to itself.	Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:9–10
VII	The covenant does not deny that concealed power, deception, and oppression operate in human history; it affirms this directly through Daniel and Kohelet, while insisting that Yahweh — not any human Elite, and not any alternative cosmology — governs the rise and fall of every empire toward His own appointed end.	Daniel 2:21, 44; Kohelet (Ecclesiastes) 4:1, 12:13–14

IX. WHAT THIS INSTITUTION OFFERS IN PLACE OF AN UNFALSIFIABLE COUNTER-HISTORY

The covenant alternative to Hamer’s framework is not naive trust in the institutions he distrusts — this Institution’s own library, including its examinations of the Scofield Reference Bible (Document 150), the House of Yahweh (Document 154), and corrupted religious leadership generally (Document 148, Part VII), demonstrates a sustained willingness to name institutional religious failure plainly.

The covenant alternative is a written, historically transmitted, multiply-attested standard that is not built from a single disputed translator’s reading of clay tablets, a psychic’s trance sessions, or the felt conviction of having ‘awakened.’

Tehillim (Psalms) 119:105 states: **“Your word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path.”**

A self-constructed alternative history, however exhaustively researched, is a lamp the researcher holds for himself, illuminating only where his own prior convictions already pointed him. **The written covenant performs the opposite function — it corrects the reader’s own settled convictions from outside them, which is precisely the corrective capacity an unfalsifiable, self-confirming framework cannot perform for itself by its own design.**

This is not offered as a dismissal of the real grievance underneath Hamer’s decade of research.

Mishlei (Proverbs) 27:6 states: **“Faithful are the wounds of a friend.”**

The covenant response to *The Falsification of History* is to test it the way the work itself implicitly asks to be tested — rigorously, against its own stated evidentiary chain, and against a standard considerably older and more thoroughly tested than Sumerology, channeled trance material, or any researcher’s personal awakening: the Written Tanakh, given to Yisra’el at Sinai, transmitted across every generation since, and as unchanging today as when **Yahweh** Himself declared it so.

SCRIPTURE INDEX

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Bereishit (Genesis) 1:1, 1:26–27, 2:7, 3:20	Hamer’s proposed Annunaki alternative to the Genesis creation account	I-C / II
Bereishit (Genesis) 6:1–4	The nephilim and b’nei ha-Elohim, weighed against the Annunaki/Nibiru reading	III-A
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15	Two-or-three-witness standard applied to the Sitchin/Annunaki evidentiary chain	II-A
Bereishit (Genesis) 6:1–5	Nephilim and b’nei ha-Elohim; the text’s own moral framing of the episode	II-B
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 13:1–3	Test of a prophet — a sign or wonder does not establish authority to supersede covenant	II-C
Bereishit (Genesis) 6:5–9:17	The flood narrative as the Tanakh’s own judgment-by-water account, with stated moral cause	III-B
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 4:19	Yahweh’s explicit warning against sun, moon, and star worship	IV-B
Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 8:16	Sun worship at the door of the Temple itself — a documented abomination	IV-B

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2–3, 11	False shepherds indictment — partial convergence with Hamer’s institutional critique, and the covenant’s actual remedy	IV-C
Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:9–10	The heart as deceitful and unreliable as sole self-certifying witness	V-B
Mishlei (Proverbs) 18:17	The first to state a case seems right until cross-examined	V-B
Daniel 2:21, 2:44, 7	Yahweh’s sovereignty over the rise and fall of concealed imperial power	VI-B
Kohelet (Ecclesiastes) 4:1; 12:13–14	Oppression observed honestly without a replacement cosmology; the covenant’s actual instruction	VI-C
Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:5	Cursed is the man who trusts in man — the covenant choice facing a disillusioned generation	VI-D
Malachi 3:6	Yahweh does not change — the one unaccountable-to-nothing-but-itself authority	VI-D

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick; who can know it?

I, Yahweh, search the heart and test the mind.”

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 17:9–10 — The Written Covenant of Yahweh

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Document 168 • Atlantis, the Annunaki, and the Written Covenant • 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