MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT ASSEMBLY

Pearl River, Louisiana | miqdashbethel@gmail.com

A NEW WORLD ORDER, THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AND THE COVENANT OF YAHWEH

What the Nations Are Searching For — What the Law Forbids — What Only the Covenant Provides

A Covenant Study in Direct Response to the Tucker Carlson Interview with Professor Jiang Xueqin, March 20, 2026

Prepared by Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly — March 22, 2026

When Tucker Carlson asked Professor Jiang Xueqin what he would do if he were Commander in Chief of the United States, the Professor gave what Tucker called the wisest possible advice — and then added that one country stands in the way of it. What followed was among the most candid exchanges in recent public discourse: two serious men acknowledging that the world's problems require a framework none of its current governments possess.

This study takes that exchange seriously. It examines the Professor's proposal for a New World Order against the supreme law of the United States — the Constitution itself. It examines whether America can legally constrain Israel. It documents Russia's strategic benefit from this war. It then presents what **Yahweh (יהוה)** has declared on all of these matters in the Tanakh — not as religious opinion, but as covenant instruction that predates every geopolitical framework now in use by more than two thousand years. And it takes the final question Tucker and Professor Jiang raised — the role of Orthodox rabbis declaring that nuclear apocalypse is good because it will bring the Messiah — and submits it to **Yahweh's** own standard of judgment.

SECTION I: THE PHRASE THAT HAUNTED AMERICAN POLITICS FOR A CENTURY

"A New World Order" — What Six Presidents Said, and What They Actually Meant

Professor Jiang proposed something specific: sit everyone down — Russia, China, Iran, America — as partners, end American hegemony, and build a new economic order where everyone is respected, not just the powerful few. Tucker Carlson called it the wisest possible advice and the only path that preserves civilization.

Six American presidents have used similar language. But they did not mean what Professor Jiang means. Understanding the difference is critical to evaluating whether his proposal is achievable under existing American law.

Woodrow Wilson (1918–1921) — Wilson's vision, embedded in his Fourteen Points and the League of Nations, proposed collective security enforced through an international body. The Senate rejected it. His New International Order presumed American moral leadership at the center of global governance — not partnership, but American-defined international law.

George H.W. Bush (September 11, 1990) — In the landmark speech to Congress that gave the phrase its modern definition, Bush described a world where the rule of force gives way to the rule of law, with the United Nations as the enforcement mechanism. His vision was explicitly one of *American-led* multilateralism — not the partnership of equals Jiang describes. America would lead the world body.

Richard Nixon (1972) — Used the term to describe a new balance of power following his opening of China and detente with the Soviet Union. Transactional, not idealistic — a great-power concert managed by America.

Jimmy Carter (1977) — Called for bold initiatives to build a more just and equitable international system. The closest to Jiang's vision, yet still framed within American-led international institutions.

Barack Obama (2009) — Outlined global governance principles centered on non-proliferation, disarmament, and economic opportunity — again, American-led multilateralism through existing institutions.

Joe Biden (March 2022) — Declared at a business roundtable: "There's going to be a new world order out there, and we've got to lead it." The most explicit assertion of American hegemony in the new order — the precise opposite of what Jiang is proposing.

The pattern is unmistakable. Every American president who has used this language envisions American leadership at the center of the new order. Professor Jiang envisions the *removal* of American hegemony from the center. These are not the same proposal. And as we will now demonstrate, what Jiang actually proposes faces a formidable legal obstacle: **the Constitution of the United States itself.**

SECTION II: IS A GENUINE NEW WORLD ORDER CONSTITUTIONAL?

The Supreme Law of the Land Examined Directly

The Constitution of the United States (1787) is the foundational governing document of the American republic. It establishes three branches of government, distributes powers carefully among them, and constructs specific barriers against the concentration of authority — including authority exercised through foreign entanglements. We examine the relevant provisions directly.

Article II, Section 2 — The Treaty Clause

> **U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2:** *He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur.*

Any binding international agreement that would constitute the framework of a genuine New World Order — one that governs the conduct of the United States, limits its military options, requires financial contributions to a world body, or adjudicates disputes involving American citizens — **must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate**. This is a structural barrier that has defeated major international agreements throughout American history. The Senate rejected the League of Nations in 1919–1920 with a majority — but not a two-thirds supermajority — of votes. Getting 67 of 100 senators to ratify a genuine partnership-based world order framework, including with Iran, Russia, and China, is constitutionally required and politically impossible in the current American political climate.

Article I, Section 8 — The War Power

> **U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8:** *The Congress shall have Power... To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water; To raise and support Armies... To provide and maintain a Navy.*

The power to commit the United States to war belongs exclusively to Congress. Any New World Order framework that would allow a multinational body to authorize the use of American military force without a Congressional declaration of war would violate this provision on its face. The War Powers Resolution (**50 U.S.C. § 1541**) reinforces this:

> **50 U.S.C. § 1541(c) — War Powers Resolution (1973):** *The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities... are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.*

A genuine partnership-based world governance structure in which collective security decisions could bind American military action would require either a constitutional amendment or a fundamental restructuring that the existing separation of powers is specifically designed to prevent. Presidents from Nixon to Obama to Biden have *already* violated the spirit of the War Powers Resolution by conducting hostilities without formal Congressional declarations — yet they did so under national executive authority, not under a multinational body's direction. Subjecting American force to a world body's command would be a constitutional transformation, not a treaty.

Article VI, Clause 2 — The Supremacy Clause and Its Limits

> **U.S. Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2:** *This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land.*

Treaties are supreme law of the land — but the Supreme Court established in **Reid v. Covert (1957)** that no treaty can override the Constitution's individual rights protections. Justice Black wrote for the plurality: *No agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress, or on any other branch of Government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution.* A world governance framework that superseded the First Amendment's speech protections, the Fifth Amendment's due process rights, or the Sixth Amendment's trial guarantees would be struck down by American courts regardless of how many nations ratified it.

Article I, Section 9 — No Foreign Emoluments; No Titles of Nobility

> **U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 9:** *No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.*

A world governance body with binding authority over American officials — even an executive secretariat of a new international partnership — would require that American representatives be subject to directives from a body that is not the Congress, the President, or the American judiciary. The structural logic of Article I, Section 9 is explicitly anti-imperial: no American official holds loyalty to a foreign power without Congressional consent.

The Tenth Amendment — Reserved Powers

> **U.S. Constitution, Amendment X (1791):** *The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.*

Any transfer of sovereign authority from the American people and their state governments to a multinational body — even a voluntary partnership — constitutes a transfer of powers that are currently reserved under the Tenth Amendment. Such a transfer would require a Constitutional amendment ratified by two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the states — 38 of 50 state legislatures. This is the highest bar in American law.

George Washington's Farewell Address (1796) — The Founders' Own Warning

Washington's Farewell Address — which is read aloud in the Senate every year on his birthday — explicitly warned against exactly what Professor Jiang is proposing. Washington wrote: ***It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.*** Hamilton reinforced this principle in Federalist No. 75, explaining that the two-thirds Senate supermajority requirement for treaties was

designed to prevent *foreign entanglements* — the precise danger Professor Jiang's world partnership would require America to embrace.

Conclusion on Constitutionality: A genuine New World Order of the kind Professor Jiang describes — one that removes American hegemony and builds a true partnership of equals with binding governance authority — is not achievable under the current Constitution without either a treaty ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, or a series of Constitutional amendments requiring three-fourths of the states. This is not an argument against the idea's wisdom. It is a legal statement of the obstacles. Tucker Carlson called it the only path that preserves civilization. If he is right, then preserving civilization requires a transformation of American law that has no political constituency to accomplish it — yet.

SECTION III: CAN AMERICA CONTROL ISRAEL? THE LEGAL AND POLITICAL TRUTH

Tucker Carlson identified the critical obstacle: Tucker said 'the one country standing in the way of that is Israel.' He then asked the precise constitutional question: Does the American president have the authority to control his client state? The answer requires separating legal capacity from political will.

The Legal Framework: What American Law Actually Says

The Leahy Law — 22 U.S.C. § 2378d (Foreign Assistance Act, Section 620M):

> **22 U.S.C. § 2378d(a):** *No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter or the Arms Export Control Act to any unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of State has credible information that such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.*

The Leahy Law is permanent federal law. It defines gross violations of human rights to include torture, extrajudicial killing, enforced disappearance, and rape under color of law — as confirmed by the State Department's own Fact Sheet. Multiple human rights organizations, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the United Nations Special Rapporteur, have documented credible evidence of such violations by specific Israeli Defense Forces units in Gaza. **The legal mechanism to restrict American military assistance to those specific units already exists in federal law**. The Secretary of State has the authority and the legal obligation to invoke it. As of March 2026, no Secretary of State has done so. This is a political choice, not a legal impossibility.

The Foreign Assistance Act — 22 U.S.C. § 2151 et seq.:

The Foreign Assistance Act gives Congress the authority to condition, reduce, or eliminate military and economic assistance to any foreign nation. Congressional majorities have the statutory power to attach conditions to any appropriation for Israel — requiring specific conduct, access for humanitarian organizations, or compliance with international law as conditions of continued funding. This has been done to other

nations. Congress has invoked foreign assistance conditionality against Egypt, Pakistan, Honduras, and others. The legal precedent exists. The political will to apply it to Israel does not.

The Arms Export Control Act — 22 U.S.C. § 2751 et seq.:

The Arms Export Control Act requires that American arms sold or transferred to foreign governments be used only for legitimate self-defense and internal security purposes. Section 4 of the Act (**22 U.S.C. § 2754**) provides that if the President determines that a foreign government is using American-supplied equipment in ways contrary to the purposes of the Act, the President may terminate future sales and demand the return of equipment. This authority exists by statute. It has not been exercised with respect to Israel.

Why America Does Not Control Israel: The Political Architecture

Professor Jiang correctly identified the structural reason: Christian Zionism as a political force. John Hagee's Christians United for Israel claims seven million members and operates as one of the most effective lobbying organizations in Washington. The alignment between evangelical eschatological expectation — Israel must control its prophesied territory for Jesus to return — and Israeli strategic objectives has produced a bipartisan political wall around American-Israeli relations that no president since Eisenhower has successfully challenged.

Eisenhower's 1956 confrontation with Israel during the Suez Crisis — when he forced Israel to withdraw from the Sinai by threatening to terminate financial support — remains the last example of an American president successfully constraining Israel through the exercise of legal authority. The political cost to Eisenhower was significant. No president since has been willing to pay it.

The legal tools to constrain Israel exist. The political will does not. This is the honest answer to Tucker's question. America can control Israel — legally, financially, and militarily — if its elected leadership chooses to exercise existing statutory authority. The barrier is not law. The barrier is the convergence of eschatological theology, campaign finance, and generational political alignment that Professor Jiang accurately identified as Christian Zionism.

SECTION IV: RUSSIA AS BENEFICIARY — GEOPOLITICAL FACTS AND COVENANT WARNING

Tucker and Professor Jiang both identify Russia as a beneficiary of this war. The facts support this. Russia's energy revenue has recovered through Iranian oil corridor arrangements that bypass Western sanctions. Russian drone and weapons technology — particularly the Shahed series adapted by Iran — has been tested and refined in this conflict. Most significantly, as the United States extends itself militarily and financially in the Middle East, its capacity to sustain Ukraine support diminishes, accelerating the trajectory toward a Russian strategic victory in Eastern Europe that frees Russia's western flank and restores its claim to regional dominance.

But the Tanakh's warning about a northern power that positions itself to benefit from Middle Eastern chaos is not a minor footnote. **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 38:1–6, 10–12** describes a northern confederacy — Gog of the land of Magog — that watches the nations of the region weakened and then moves against a land of unwalled villages, taking plunder:

> **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 38:10–12 — *"Thus says Yahweh Elohim: On that day, thoughts will come into your mind, and you will devise an evil scheme and say, 'I will go up against the land of unwalled villages. I will fall upon the quiet people who dwell securely... to seize spoil and carry off plunder, to turn your hand against the waste places now inhabited, and the people who were gathered from the nations...'"***

We cite this not as date-setting. The Tanakh does not authorize human beings to use prophetic texts to identify current geopolitical actors with certainty. What the Tanakh does establish is a **structural warning**: a northern power that calculates its advantage while others fight, then moves against the weakened region, is described in the prophetic record. Whether or not Russia is that power, the structural dynamic the Tanakh warns about is precisely what Professor Jiang and Tucker Carlson are describing. **The covenant wisdom is:** when a northern power begins to calculate its advantage from others' wars, the path to peace requires **Yahweh's** governance framework — not the absence of it.

SECTION V: IS A COVENANT-BASED WORLD ORDER COMPATIBLE WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION?

This is the most critical section of this study — because it answers the question that no geopolitical analyst and no constitutional scholar has placed before the American people: **is the covenant framework of Yahweh — as recorded in the Tanakh — compatible with republican self-governance under the United States Constitution?**

The answer is yes. And the reason it is yes is that the Founders drew more deeply from the Hebrew covenant tradition than most Americans realize.

The Covenant Principles and Their Constitutional Parallels

1. Impartial Justice — Devarim (Deuteronomy) 1:17:

> **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 1:17 — *"You shall not be partial in judgment. You shall hear the small and the great alike. You shall not be afraid of the face of man, for the judgment is Yahweh's."***

Constitutional parallel: Amendment XIV, Section 1 — No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. The equal protection clause is the constitutional expression of what the Tanakh called impartial justice. The Founders did not invent this principle. They received it — imperfectly and incompletely

— from the Hebrew covenant tradition through English common law and Puritan political theology.

2. Protection of the Stranger — Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33–34:

> **Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33–34 — *"When a stranger sojourns with you in your land, you shall not do him wrong. You shall treat the stranger who sojourns with you as the native among you, and you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt."***

Constitutional parallel: Amendment XIV, Section 1 — All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens. The 14th Amendment's citizenship clause extended covenant-equivalent protection to persons who were strangers to the original constitutional community. The Tanakh anticipated this by three thousand years.

3. Prohibition of Bribery and Corruption — Shemot (Exodus) 23:8:

> **Shemot (Exodus) 23:8 — *"And you shall take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the clear-sighted and subverts the cause of those who are in the right."***

Constitutional parallel: Article II, Section 4 — The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for Bribery or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors. The Constitution's impeachment clause names bribery explicitly as a removal offense — directly paralleling the Tanakh's covenantal prohibition.

4. No Concentration of Military Power in the Executive — Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17:16:

> **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17:16 — *"Only he must not acquire many horses for himself or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to acquire many horses, since Yahweh has said to you, 'You shall never return that way again.'"***

Constitutional parallel: Article I, Section 8 — Congress, not the President, raises and supports armies and provides and maintains a navy. The Constitution's deliberate separation of military power between the executive command function and the legislative funding authority reflects exactly the Tanakh's warning against a king who multiplies military force in his own hands. The War Powers Resolution of 1973 is Congress's attempt — however imperfect — to restore this covenant-parallel balance after Vietnam-era executive overreach.

5. The Yovel (Jubilee) — The Covenant's Answer to Monopoly Capitalism — Vayikra (Leviticus) 25:10:

> **Vayikra (Leviticus) 25:10 — *"You shall consecrate the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants. It shall be a jubilee for you, when each of you shall return to his property and each of you shall return to his clan."***

There is no constitutional equivalent to the ***Yovel***. This is the most significant gap between American law and covenant law. The Constitution protects private property (**Amendment V** — nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation) but contains no structural mechanism for periodic wealth redistribution or debt cancellation. The Founders, drawing on Locke and classical liberalism rather than the full Sinaitic covenant, built an economic framework that protects accumulation without providing the periodic reset that **Yahweh** prescribed. This is precisely why **monopoly capitalism** — which Professor Jiang correctly identifies as driving South Korea's birth rate collapse and which drives inequality across the Western world — is constitutionally protected even as it destroys the social fabric. The ***Yovel*** is the covenant's answer. It has no constitutional home. Building one would require exactly the kind of covenant-informed amendment to American law that the Tanakh's framework calls for.

Conclusion: A covenant-governed world is not a theocracy imposed by force. It is a voluntary alignment with **Yahweh's** instructions for human governance — instructions that the Founders partially received and partially ignored. Where they received them (impartial justice, anti-corruption, separation of military power), the Constitution works. Where they ignored them (***Yovel***, care for the stranger beyond citizenship, prohibition of usury), American governance produces the exact pathologies Professor Jiang and Tucker Carlson are documenting. The covenant is not contrary to the Constitution. The covenant is what the Constitution is trying — imperfectly — to approximate.

SECTION VI: THE RABBIS, THE MESSIAH, AND NUCLEAR WAR

A Deep Covenant Response to the Claim That Apocalyptic War Fulfills Prophecy

Tucker Carlson described what he called 'Jewish Wahhabism' and 'evangelical Christian Wahhabism' — the eschatological extremism that is now openly driving geopolitical decisions. Professor Jiang described rabbis going through Israel declaring that even the destruction of Tel Aviv is good because it will bring the Messiah. This is not a fringe position held by a handful of extremists. It is a theologically developed position with institutional roots in several major streams of Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox Judaism. It requires a precise, thorough, and honest covenant response.

Part A: Who Is Teaching This and What Do They Actually Claim?

The theological position that catastrophe hastens the Messiah draws from several streams within Orthodox Judaism:

1. Chabad-Lubavitch Messianism. The late Rebbe Menachem Mendel Schneerson (1902–1994) taught that the era of Geulah (redemption) was imminent and that events of global crisis were signs of its acceleration. After his death in 1994, a significant portion of the Chabad movement declared him the Messiah — a position that remains active within Chabad to this day. The structural belief: tribulation, not peace, is the precondition for Messianic arrival. This has been used to frame military conflict as eschatologically desirable.

2. The Settler Movement Rabbinate. Figures such as Rabbi Yitzhak Ginsburgh, associated with the Od Yosef Chai yeshiva in the West Bank, have published theological works asserting that Jewish lives are categorically superior in covenant value, that the Torah requires full Jewish sovereignty over the biblical land of Israel, and that military force to achieve this is not only permitted but obligatory. His book *Baruch HaGever* — which praised Baruch Goldstein's 1994 massacre of Muslim worshippers at the Cave of Machpelah — was seized by Israeli authorities but reflects a theological current that has not been extinguished.

3. The Gog and Magog Framework Applied to Current War. Multiple Israeli rabbis — including some with mainstream institutional positions — have publicly stated that the current conflict with Iran represents the beginning of the War of Gog and Magog described in **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 38–39**, and that this war's escalation is not to be prevented but embraced, because it precedes the Messianic era. The destruction of Al-Aqsa has been openly discussed in these circles not as a tragedy to be avoided but as a necessary prophetic step.

4. Christian Zionist Alignment. John Hagee's Christians United for Israel (CUFI), with its seven million members, operates from a dispensationalist framework that holds: Israel must control its biblical territory; the Temple must be rebuilt (requiring the removal of Al-Aqsa); the Battle of Armageddon must occur; then Jesus returns to judge Israel and the nations. In this framework, *preventing* war in the Middle East is theologically equivalent to opposing God's plan. This is the electoral and lobbying infrastructure that prevents American political leaders from exercising the legal authority they possess to constrain Israeli military conduct.

Part B: What the Tanakh Actually Says About Hastening the Messiah Through Violence

Yahweh has spoken with precision on every element of this eschatological framework. We examine each claim against the covenant standard.

Claim 1: Catastrophe and War Are the Precondition for the Messiah's Arrival.

> **Micha (Micah) 4:3–4 —** ***"He shall judge between many peoples, and shall decide disputes for strong nations far away; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and no one shall make them afraid, for the mouth of Yahweh of hosts has spoken."***

<u>The Messianic era in the Tanakh is characterized by the end of war, not its escalation</u>. The arrival of the Messianic era — as described in **Micah 4, Yeshayahu 2, Yeshayahu 11** — is marked by nations laying down weapons voluntarily, by universal instruction in **Yahweh's** covenant, and by each family dwelling securely. The idea that nuclear exchange, the destruction of a mosque, or the devastation of Iran is a *precondition* for this outcome contradicts the prophetic description of how the Messianic era arrives: *<u>voluntarily, through instruction, not through manufactured catastrophe</u>*.

Claim 2: When Israel Is Under Maximum Threat, Yahweh Will Intervene.

> **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 1:15–16 —** ***"When you spread out your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; even though you make many prayers, I will not listen; your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your deeds from before my eyes; cease to do evil."***

The Tanakh does not teach that **Yahweh** intervenes in response to national crisis regardless of covenant conduct. The entire prophetic tradition — from **Amos** through **Yeshayahu** through **Yirmeyahu** through **Yechezkel** — is built on the opposite premise: **Yahweh's intervention is inseparable from covenant faithfulness**. A people whose hands are full of blood and who multiply prayer without repentance will not receive divine rescue — they will receive covenant judgment. The rabbis who tell their congregations that Tel Aviv's destruction is acceptable because it will summon divine intervention are teaching the precise doctrine that **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 1:15** directly refutes.

Claim 3: The Day of Yahweh — Desiring Apocalypse Is Faithfulness.

> **Amos (Amos) 5:18–20 —** ***"Woe to you who desire the Day of Yahweh! Why would you have the Day of Yahweh? It is darkness, and not light. As if a man fled from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house and leaned his hand against the wall, and a serpent bit him. Is not the Day of Yahweh darkness, and not light, even very dark with no brightness in it?"***

This is **Yahweh's** own verdict on the eschatological fever Professor Jiang and Tucker Carlson are describing. The prophet **Amos** spoke this directly to those who longed for the Day of **Yahweh** as a moment of divine vindication and national triumph. **Yahweh's** answer: you do not understand what you are asking for. Those who desire the Day of **Yahweh** as a geopolitical weapon — as a means to justify military conquest, architectural demolition, and nuclear exchange — are precisely the people this text warns.

Claim 4: Manufacturing the Conditions for Prophecy Is Faithfulness to Torah.

> **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 18:20–22 —** ***"But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in my name that I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die. And if you say in your heart, 'How may we know the word that Yahweh has not spoken?' — when a prophet speaks in the name of Yahweh, if the word does not come to pass or come true, that is a word that Yahweh has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptuously."***

The Tanakh's standard for prophetic authority is outcome. Decades of specific prophetic timelines — dates set for the Messiah's arrival, predictions about which conflicts would trigger the end — have not materialized as proclaimed. By the Tanakh's own standard in **Devarim 18:22**, these predictions must be evaluated honestly. The track record of

eschatological date-setting, in both Jewish and Christian Zionist traditions, is a record of failure by this standard. This does not disprove the Tanakh's prophetic vision. It does disqualify specific human interpreters who have claimed authority to set timelines for **Yahweh's** actions.

Claim 5: Nuclear War as the 'Fire' That Purifies Before the Messianic Age.

> **Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 33:11 —** ***"Say to them, As I live, declares Yahweh Elohim, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn back, turn back from your evil ways, for why will you die, O house of Israel?"***
>
> **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 11:6–9 —** ***"The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the young goat... They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea."***

The Messianic age in the Tanakh is not a post-nuclear world of survivors. It is a world of **fullness** — abundance, knowledge of **Yahweh**, healing, and reconciliation between predator and prey. The image of **Yeshayahu 11** — wolf and lamb, leopard and goat, lion and calf dwelling together — is the opposite of a radioactive wasteland. **Yahweh** takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked. He calls for repentance — *turn back, turn back from your evil ways*. A theology that welcomes nuclear exchange because it hastens the Messianic age is a theology that attributes to **Yahweh** a pleasure in mass death that His own word explicitly denies.

Part C: The Sin of Presumption — Testing Yahweh

> **Shemot (Exodus) 17:2–7 —** ***"The people quarreled with Moshe and said, 'Give us water to drink.' And Moshe said to them, 'Why do you quarrel with me? Why do you test Yahweh?'... He called the name of the place Massah and Meribah, because of the quarreling of the people of Israel, and because they tested Yahweh by saying, 'Is Yahweh among us or not?'"***

The sin at Massah was **presumption** — the demand that **Yahweh** demonstrate His presence by producing a crisis and then rescuing from it. This is exactly the theological structure of the eschatological extremism Tucker and Professor Jiang describe: manufacture maximum crisis — support military escalation, welcome the destruction of holy sites, embrace the prospect of nuclear exchange — and thereby force **Yahweh's** hand to intervene. The Tanakh gives this sin a name: ***testing Yahweh***. It was the sin of Massah. It is condemned in **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 6:16**: *You shall not put Yahweh your Elohim to the test.* Manufacturing apocalypse to summon divine intervention is not faith — it is presumption. **Yahweh** condemned it at Massah. He has not changed His verdict.

Part D: What Yahweh Actually Calls All Parties to Do

> **Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 29:7 —** ***"But seek the shalom of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to Yahweh on its behalf, for in its shalom you will find your shalom."***

This text — written by **Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah)** to the exiles in Babylon — is **Yahweh's** prescription for a covenant people living under a foreign power in a hostile world. Seek its shalom. Pray for it. Your own shalom is inseparable from the shalom of the city around you. This text applies with equal force to Jewish communities in Israel, to Christian communities in America, and to Muslim communities in Iran. **Yahweh** does not call His covenant people to engineer the destruction of the cities they inhabit in order to hasten His intervention. He calls them to **seek shalom** — and to trust that His purposes will be fulfilled in His own timing, not through human manufacture of catastrophe.

SECTION VII: WHAT YAHWEH PRESCRIBES — THE FULL COVENANT ANSWER

Tucker Carlson said that what Professor Jiang proposed was the only path that preserves civilization. We agree with the diagnosis. We disagree that Professor Jiang's secular framework is the full solution — because it has no moral anchor. A partnership world order without covenant accountability simply rearranges the power structure without changing the character of the powers involved.

The Tanakh presents a world governance vision that is not a man-made new world order. It is a **covenant-ordered world** — one in which all nations come voluntarily to **Yahweh's** instruction and find their disputes adjudicated by covenant principle:

> **Micha (Micah) 4:1–4 —** ***"It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of Yahweh shall be established as the highest of the mountains... and peoples shall flow to it, and many nations shall come, and say: 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh, to the house of the Elohim of Yaakov, that He may teach us His ways and that we may walk in His paths.' For out of Tzion shall go forth instruction, and the word of Yahweh from Yerushalayim. He shall judge between many peoples, and shall decide disputes for strong nations far away; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and no one shall make them afraid, for the mouth of Yahweh of hosts has spoken."***

Every element of this vision directly addresses what Tucker and Professor Jiang are describing as the world's most urgent need: a mechanism for resolving disputes between strong nations that does not depend on military dominance; an economic order in which every family has security; a world in which nations are not afraid. The difference between this vision and Professor Jiang's proposal is that this vision has **Yahweh** as the arbiter — **not a committee of great powers** — and it comes about through voluntary instruction, not through American withdrawal and multilateral negotiation.

The call goes to every nation simultaneously. **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 45:22** makes this explicit:

> **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 45:22 — *"Turn to Me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am Elohim, and there is no other."***

This is not a call to religious conversion in the institutional sense. It is a call to **covenant alignment** — every nation, every people, every governing structure brought into conformity with **Yahweh's** standard of justice, truth, and care for the vulnerable. Tucker Carlson is right that something like this is the only path that preserves civilization. **What he and Professor Jiang do not yet see is that the path has already been charted — and that it does not begin with a great-power summit. It begins with the covenant**.

CLOSING STATEMENT: TO TUCKER CARLSON, TO PROFESSOR JIANG, AND TO ALL WHO ARE LISTENING

You are both serious men. You are asking the right questions. The world you are describing — locked in war, collapsing economically, driven by eschatological fever, watching its institutions demolished — is real. The analysis is largely accurate. The proposed solution — a partnership world order where all parties sit as equals — is genuinely the closest secular geopolitics has come to the covenant vision.

But secular geopolitics cannot deliver it, for the reasons this study has documented: American constitutional law makes it legally formidable; Christian Zionist political architecture makes it politically impossible without a transformation of American civic life; and the eschatological extremism driving the conflict has no answer in secular analysis — only in the covenant word of **Yahweh** Himself.

The rabbis who welcome Tel Aviv's destruction to hasten the Messiah are not following **Yahweh's** instruction. They are following human presumption condemned at Massah. The evangelical preachers who tell their seven million members that preventing this war is opposing God's plan are not following the Tanakh. They are following dispensationalist theology invented in the 19th century by John Nelson Darby — theology with no Tanakh foundation.

The covenant of Yahweh is available to every nation. Its governance principles are compatible with republican self-government. Its economic prescriptions address the monopoly capitalism that Professor Jiang correctly identifies as destroying birth rates and social cohesion. Its standard of impartial justice — the same standard that prohibits the Secretary of State from ignoring the Leahy Law — applies to every actor in this conflict: American, Israeli, Iranian, Russian, and beyond.

The covenant is still open. The invitation has never been revoked. This is Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly's declaration to the nations, in the name of Yahweh (יהוה), Elohim (אֱלֹהִים) of all flesh, whose word stands forever.

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 40:8

"The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our Elohim will stand forever."

Issued by Miqdash Bethel Covenant Assembly — Pearl River, Louisiana

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

miqdashbethel@gmail.com

March 22, 2026

All citations drawn exclusively from the Tanakh — Yahweh's covenant word to all nations.

U.S. Constitutional citations: National Constitution Center PDF (official text).

U.S. Code citations: 22 U.S.C. § 2378d (Leahy Law); 50 U.S.C. § 1541 (War Powers Resolution); U.S. Const. Art. I § 8; Art. II § 2; Art. VI Cl. 2; Amend. X; XIV.
