

TO THE HOUSE OF YISRAEL
(Israel)

TO THE HOUSE OF
CHRISTIANITY

TO THE HOUSE OF ISLAM

DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY: Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution (MBCI) operates under the sole authority of the Written *Tanakh* (Hebrew Scriptures). All doctrinal and legal claims herein are adjudicated by the two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15**. No claim is advanced without documentary, testimonial, or textual witness meeting this threshold.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT: Bold text marks the Name **Yahweh** and **Elohim** at every occurrence. ***Bold italic*** marks Hebrew transliterations, each followed immediately by their English meaning in parentheses. Scripture quotations appear in **bold**. Prophet names are **bold**. Strong's numbers are **bold**.

ABBREVIATION	FULL TITLE	LANGUAGE	SOURCE	DATE
MOU	US-Iran Memorandum of Understanding	English	White House / CNN / CBS / Time	June 2026
FARA	Foreign Agents Registration Act (22 U.S.C. § 611)	English	U.S. Department of Justice	1938/amended
Tanakh	Hebrew Scriptures (Written Torah, Nevi'im, Ketuvim)	Hebrew	Masoretic Text	Ancient

THE US-IRAN 14-POINT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

A Covenant Witness Analysis of the Agreement, the Opposition, and the American Interest

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution (MBCI) | Pearl River, Louisiana | June 2026

I. BACKGROUND: HOW THE WAR BEGAN

On February 28, 2026, the United States, in military coordination with Israel, launched offensive operations against the Islamic Republic of Iran. The war — which preceded the Memorandum of Understanding now under review — resulted in weeks of Iranian ballistic missile and drone counterattacks, massive energy price disruptions worldwide, imminent food shortage warnings, and a humanitarian catastrophe across Iran and Lebanon. The Strait of Hormuz was closed to commercial shipping, threatening the global oil supply.

The war was initiated at Israel's strategic direction, with Prime Minister **Benjamin Netanyahu** playing a central role in persuading the Trump administration to act. It is now documented that Israel was subsequently **excluded entirely** from the ceasefire negotiations that produced the MOU, and that Netanyahu admitted publicly he had not yet seen the deal's text at the time he held a press conference about it.

Former Prime Minister **Ehud Barak** publicly stated: "Iran emerged stronger; Israel emerged weaker. That is Netanyahu's strategic responsibility. He failed."

II. THE 14-POINT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING — FULL BREAKDOWN

The following table presents each of the 14 points as read aloud by senior US officials on June 17, 2026, and confirmed by CNN, CBS News, Time, and ABC News. The agreement was formally signed in Switzerland on June 20, 2026.

PT.	PROVISION	KEY TEXT / SIGNIFICANCE
1	Immediate & Permanent Ceasefire	Declares the immediate and permanent termination of military operations on all fronts, including in Lebanon, ensuring Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty. The final deal will confirm this termination.
2	Mutual Non-Aggression	Both nations commit to respecting each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and to refraining from interfering in each other's internal affairs.
3	60-Day Final Deal Window	Both parties commit to negotiating and achieving a final deal within a maximum of 60 days, extendable with mutual consent. Trump warned: 'If it doesn't get done in 60 days, that's all right. We go back to bombing.'

4	Naval Blockade Removal	The US begins removing its naval blockade immediately upon signing, fully ending it within 30 days. US forces are to be withdrawn from the proximity of Iran within 30 days of the final deal.
5	Strait of Hormuz Reopening	Iran will arrange safe passage of commercial vessels at no charge for 60 days, with full commercial traffic restored within 30 days as demining proceeds. Future administration of the Strait to be determined by Iran, Oman, and Gulf states.
6	Lebanon / Hezbollah Clause	The ceasefire explicitly covers Lebanon, requiring Israel to terminate military operations there. Israel's Defense Minister has publicly defied this provision.
7	Final Deal Framework	The final deal will include provisions for full sanctions termination, nuclear issues, and reconstruction. UN endorsement is contemplated.
8	Reconstruction Fund (\$300B)	The US and regional partners commit to developing a reconstruction and economic development fund of at least \$300 billion for Iran. Trump stated the US would not contribute but could not stop other nations.
9	Status Quo — Nuclear Freeze	Pending the final deal, Iran maintains the current status quo of its nuclear program. The US will impose no new sanctions and deploy no additional forces.
10	Iranian Oil Sanctions Waivers	Immediately upon signing, the US Treasury will issue waivers for the export of Iranian crude oil, petroleum products, and all associated services including banking transactions.
11	Frozen Assets Release	The US undertakes to make fully available all frozen or restricted funds and assets of Iran — estimated at approximately \$100 billion — upon implementation of the MOU.
12	Nuclear Non-Proliferation	Iran affirms it 'shall not procure or develop nuclear weapons.' The disposition of stockpiled enriched material will be 'adequately addressed in the final deal.' Iran has made this commitment for 50 years.
13	Hostages / Citizens	Provisions for addressing detained citizens of both nations — details to be negotiated in the final deal window.
14	UN Endorsement	The final deal will be submitted to the UN Security Council for endorsement and international recognition.

III. THE OPPOSITION: WHO IS UPSET AND WHY

The reaction from America's neoconservative and pro-Israel media and political establishment has been swift and visceral. The pattern of criticism reveals not a concern for American national security, but rather a disappointment that the war did not continue until Iran's regime was eliminated — a goal that served Israeli strategic interests, not American ones.

MARK LEVIN — FOX NEWS HOST

Mark Levin, who spent months vilifying anti-war voices including Tucker Carlson and Megyn Kelly, posted publicly: "I sure as hell hope I am misreading and mishearing things." He earlier demanded: "Why can't we, the people, see the damn MOU? Not through people briefed by an anonymous person. Honestly, I've never seen anything like this." He also argued the MOU should be treated as a treaty requiring two-thirds Senate ratification — a legal maneuver aimed at killing the deal.

BEN SHAPIRO — DAILY WIRE

Ben Shapiro, who had praised Trump's Iran airstrikes as "the single bravest foreign-policy move of my lifetime," called the deal a "**disaster**" in a Fox News interview on June 17, 2026. He described any signing ceremony with Iran's parliamentary leader as "a horrible idea" — "the idea of deploying the Vice President of the United States to do a handshake with an actual terror leader." Earlier he called the deal "mediocre" and complained publicly that the text had not been released.

SEN. LINDSEY GRAHAM (R-SC)

Senator Lindsey Graham — a consistent advocate for military escalation — called on "the architect of the deal, Vice President Vance," to come before Congress to defend it. He said he had concerns even while expressing limited pleasure at the ceasefire.

SEN. BILL CASSIDY (R-LA)

Senator Bill Cassidy (Louisiana) called the MOU "the worst foreign policy blunder in decades."

SEN. TED CRUZ (R-TX)

Senator Ted Cruz warned that "giving billions of dollars to lunatics in Iran is not a good idea."

NIKKI HALEY — FORMER UN AMBASSADOR

Nikki Haley wrote that the Iranians will use any funds received to "further their nuclear ambitions and on terrorist proxies against us."

ERICK ERICKSON — CONSERVATIVE COMMENTATOR

Erick Erickson wrote on social media that the accord was "an American surrender."

MARC THIESSEN — FOX NEWS CONTRIBUTOR

Marc Thiessen, who reportedly advised Trump on the war, objected to ending the conflict at all, arguing that "the Iranian regime, thanks to all those military strikes, is on its back and a deal, even a good deal, helps them get up." He compared the White House to recycling Obama-era talking points.

NATIONAL REVIEW / ANDREW MCCARTHY

National Review's **Andrew McCarthy** berated the White House for not releasing the MOU text and compared Trump to Neville Chamberlain.

FOUNDATION FOR DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACIES — MARK DUBOWITZ

Mark Dubowitz, CEO of the FDD — a neoconservative think tank with deep ties to Israeli security networks — called for Trump to restart the war and said the administration is "recycling Obama-era talking points."

IV. THE NETANYAHU DIMENSION: ISRAEL CUT OUT OF ITS OWN WAR

The most politically significant development surrounding the MOU is the confirmation that **Israel was excluded from the negotiations entirely**. An Israeli government official confirmed to NBC News that Israel had not been shown the MOU text, even after Trump stated publicly that he had given them a copy — a claim the Israeli source denied.

Netanyahu admitted at a press conference — his first in three months — that he did not yet know what was written in the deal at the time he spoke about it. Critics across the Israeli political spectrum used this moment to expose his strategic miscalculation.

Former Israeli Prime Minister **Yair Lapid** wrote that the deal was "one of the most shocking failures of Israel's foreign and security policy... entirely registered in Netanyahu's name." Former Defense Minister **Avigdor Liberman** called it "a catastrophe from Israel's perspective."

The MOU explicitly requires Israel to end its military operations in Lebanon as part of the broader ceasefire. Israel's Defense Minister **Israel Katz** publicly defied this requirement, stating that the IDF would not withdraw from southern Lebanon. This places Israel in direct tension with the terms of the agreement.

Trump has publicly criticized Netanyahu during this period, calling him "a very difficult guy" in an interview with The New York Times. The rift between Washington and Jerusalem — once thought unthinkable in American political discourse — is now documented in the public record.

V. COVENANT WITNESS ANALYSIS: THE PROPHETIC STANDARD

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution applies the Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 two-or-three-witness standard to all claims. The following analysis is based exclusively on the Written *Tanakh* (Hebrew Scriptures) as the sole doctrinal authority.

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17:14-20 — the law of the king — establishes that any ruler over the nation must not: multiply horses (foreign military entanglements), return the people to a foreign power, multiply wives (political alliances that corrupt his heart), or multiply silver and gold (financial corruption). The principle is exclusive covenant loyalty to **Yahweh** and the welfare of the people.

The prophets uniformly condemned leaders who made covenants with foreign powers at the expense of the people. **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 30-31** condemns those who go down to Egypt (foreign military alliance) rather than trusting **Yahweh**: "**Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult Yahweh.**"

The question confronting the American people is not simply whether this particular MOU is a good deal or a bad deal. It is a structural question: **who do American legislators, media figures, and lobbyists serve when they demand the continuation of a war that kills no American enemies but protects Israeli strategic interests at American expense?**

The covenant witness of the Tanakh is clear: a leader who subordinates his own people's welfare to the demands of a foreign nation — whether through bribery, ideological capture, or lobby pressure — has violated the law of his office and his oath to the people. This applies equally in the legal framework of

the American Constitution, where every officeholder swears an oath to the people of the United States, not to any foreign nation or its proxies.

VI. THE AMERICAN INTEREST: WHAT THE DATA SHOWS

Before the war began, the Strait of Hormuz carried approximately 20% of global oil trade. Its closure caused immediate energy price spikes and food shortage warnings worldwide. The war cost the American military enormous resources in sorties, munitions, and logistics to sustain a campaign that served no documentary American national security interest.

Trump stated publicly: "If it doesn't get done in 60 days, that's all right. We go back to bombing." He also acknowledged that the US oil reserves would run out within 4 weeks without the deal — confirming that the economic pressure of the war's consequences on the American people was a driving factor in seeking a resolution.

The MOU delivers the following concrete benefits to the American people and the global economy:

BENEFIT	MECHANISM
Strait of Hormuz Reopened	Commercial shipping immediately restored; global oil and food supply chains resume; energy prices drop.
Naval Blockade Ends	US military resources redeployed; wartime posture in Persian Gulf wound down within 30 days.
Ceasefire — Lebanon Included	Ends fighting that had produced humanitarian catastrophe; tens of thousands of casualties halted.
Iranian Oil on Market	Immediate Treasury waivers restore Iranian crude to global markets; energy inflation reduced.
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Commitment	Iran reaffirms it will not develop nuclear weapons; enriched material disposition to be negotiated with IAEA involvement.
60-Day Final Deal Window	Framework for permanent resolution with UN Security Council endorsement, providing international verification.
\$300B Reconstruction Fund	Regional partners (not US taxpayers) fund Iranian reconstruction; economic normalization reduces geopolitical instability.

VII. CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS: TREATY VS. MOU

Mark Levin raised a legitimate constitutional question when he argued the MOU should be treated as a treaty requiring two-thirds Senate ratification under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution. While this argument is raised in bad faith by those who want to kill the deal rather than constitutionally scrutinize it, the underlying legal question is real.

A Memorandum of Understanding is an executive agreement, not a Senate-ratified treaty. Presidents have used executive agreements throughout American history — the Obama JCPOA was similarly structured. The legal distinction matters:

INSTRUMENT	TREATY	EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT / MOU
Constitutional Authority	Article II, Section 2, Clause 2	President's inherent executive foreign affairs power
Senate Required?	Yes — two-thirds ratification required	No — President acts alone or with congressional notification
Binding Force	Binds successive administrations	Can be withdrawn by executive action
Historical Use	Relatively rare for major agreements	Majority of US international agreements
Example	NATO (ratified 1949)	JCPOA (2015), Camp David Accords (1978)

The American people should be aware that the same voices now demanding Senate treaty ratification were silent when the original authorization for the Iran war itself — an act of war against a sovereign nation — was conducted without a formal Congressional declaration of war as required by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. The constitutional argument, when selectively applied, reveals its political rather than principled character.

VIII. CONCLUSION: THE COVENANT WITNESS OF YAHWEH TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The fury of Mark Levin, Ben Shapiro, Lindsey Graham, and the neoconservative commentariat at this MOU is itself the most revealing document of this entire episode. These are voices that championed a war against Iran, demanded its escalation, and are now appalled that it ended with a negotiated peace rather than regime change. Their anger is not for American soldiers, American oil prices, or American national security. Their anger is that Israel's strategic objectives were not fully achieved.

This is the same pattern identified in MBCI Doc 150 — “The Scofield Deception” — where the Christian Zionist theological infrastructure has successfully reoriented significant portions of the American political class toward serving Israeli geopolitical objectives as if they were divinely mandated. When peace becomes a scandal and war becomes a theological obligation, the people of any nation have been spiritually and politically captured.

The Written *Tanakh* (Hebrew Scriptures) — the sole doctrinal authority of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution — does not endorse eternal war. **Yahweh** spoke through **Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 2:4: “They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore.”**

The American people have a right to a government that serves their interests — their children's lives, their energy costs, their food security, and their constitutional order. Every officeholder who subordinates those interests to a foreign nation's strategic agenda — whether through AIPAC money, Christian Zionist ideology, or direct bribery — has violated the covenant of their office.

The MOU is not a final deal. It is a 60-day window. The American people and their elected representatives must use that window to demand full transparency, constitutional compliance, and a final agreement that serves the United States of America first.

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution (MBCI) | 508(c)(1)(a) Free Church | Pearl River, Louisiana
PO Box 762, Pearl River, LA 70452 | miqdashbethel.org | miqdashbethel@gmail.com | 402-218-9530
“Under sole Written Tanakh authority — addressing Yisrael, Christianity, and Islam simultaneously”