

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

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

A Personal Covenant Letter — Not a Numbered Library Document

AN OPEN LETTER TO NATHAN APFFEL

You Found the Disease. The Covenant Has the Cure.

On The Religion Business, Broken Shepherds, and the Tucker Carlson Interviews of April 7 and June 19, 2026

June 20, 2026

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

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

PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452

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 The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and theological comparison only.

HOW TO READ THIS LETTER

This is not a courtroom filing against you, Nathan. It is a letter from one man who has spent decades inside an institution he eventually had to leave — the House of Yahweh, twenty-three years as an ordained Elder and Judge — to another man who has spent years inside an institution he is now

exposing from within. We recognize each other. You are doing, with a camera and a balance sheet, what this Assembly does with the Hebrew text: holding the American church to a standard it claims to follow but does not keep. Everywhere this letter says **Yahweh** or **Elohim**, it preserves the covenant Name rather than the titles “God” or “LORD” that later translation traditions substituted. Hebrew terms carry their English meaning in parentheses at every occurrence. Every claim made about you, your work, or your words is drawn from your own public statements — your website, your docuseries, and your two appearances with Tucker Carlson — and is offered for your correction if any of it has been misread.

Nathan,

My name is Kephah Arcemont. I am a retired New Orleans firefighter, a former volunteer fire chief, and the founder of a small covenant institution in Pearl River, Louisiana — Miqdash Bethel — built on one rule: the Written Tanakh alone, with nothing added and nothing taken away. My father, SFC Terry Arcemont, died on the Imjin River in Korea in 1967. I spent twenty-three years as an ordained Elder and Judge inside a high-control religious organization in Texas before I had to walk out of it in 2008, and I have spent the years since trying to hold every religious claim — including my own — to the same plumb line: ***does the Written Word actually say this, or did a man build an institution on top of it and call the institution the Word?***

I watched both of your conversations with Tucker Carlson — April 7 and June 19, 2026. I have read what you and Chris Ayoub have built with *The Religion Business* and *Broken Shepherds*. I want to tell you plainly: you are asking the right questions. You are one of the very few public voices in American Christianity right now willing to follow the money into the sanctuary and name what it finds there. That takes a kind of courage most pastors, most donors, and most Christians who benefit from looking away will never have.

But I also watched you reach the edge of your own framework — the place where you said the Old Covenant is “*fulfilled and done... put on the shelf*”, where you said the Christian is now “*your own priest*” answerable to no fixed law, where you said tithing is whatever “*your heart tells you*” rather than a

commanded amount — and I want to show you something. **The very tools you need to finish what you started are sitting in the book you already hold as authoritative. You just have not been shown how to use the older half of it.**

PART ONE — WHAT YOU GOT RIGHT, AND WHY IT MATTERS

Before any correction, the record. You said, on the FARA documents alone: a foreign government — the State of Israel, through its Ministry of Foreign Affairs — funded a geofencing campaign against American churches, calling it, in its own paperwork, “*the largest geofencing and Christian targeting campaign in U.S. history.*” You said pastors are being flown overseas, shown the land, and returned home as unpaid spokesmen for a government’s military policy. You said a church bought a \$13 million property while forgiving its own PPP debt onto the American taxpayer. You said Greg Laurie’s organization knew about abuse in its own overseas orphanages and stayed silent because the program was a revenue generator. You said an organization is buying life-insurance policies from elderly widows for pennies on the dollar and calling it ministry.

Every one of those is a covenant violation by the plain text of the Tanakh, not merely a public-relations problem.

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2, 4 — “Woe to the shepherds of Israel who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the sheep?... The diseased you have not strengthened, nor have you healed the sick, nor bound up the broken, nor brought back what was driven away, nor sought what was lost; but with force and cruelty you have ruled them.”

This is the oldest indictment in the Hebrew prophetic tradition, and it is your indictment too, even if you have never opened the book to find it stated in those terms. A shepherd who profits from the flock while the flock starves is named, judged, and sentenced in **Yahweh’s** own court, three thousand years before Form 990 existed.

Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:13 — “You shall not defraud your neighbor, nor rob him.”

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:17 — “You shall not pervert the justice due the stranger or the fatherless, nor take the widow's garment as a pledge.”

The widow whose life-insurance policy is bought for pennies is the same widow named in Devarim. The covenant does not need a documentary crew to discover this is wrong — it has been written for thirty-three centuries. What your documentary crew did was find the modern address where the ancient crime is still being committed.

So before one word of correction: thank you! You are doing *mishpat* (justice, H4941) work — the work the prophets of Israel did when they walked into the courts of kings they could not control and said the thing no one paid them to say. That is rare. That is worth saying plainly before anything else.

PART TWO — THE CONTRACT THAT WAS NEVER A CONTRACT

On June 19, you gave Tucker an analogy you clearly thought through carefully. You said you are a laborer. Tucker hires you to mow the lawn, cut the trees, and clean the pool. You do the work, he pays you, the contract is fulfilled — done. If you showed up the next day and mowed the lawn again, expecting a second payment for a contract already closed, you said, that would be absurd. You said this is what the church does with the Old Covenant: it keeps showing up to a job that was already finished and paid in full at the cross, and you said that is why tithing, Torah observance, and the whole “old contract” can be set aside in favor of an unconditional new one, where a believer is “*your own priest*” who simply gives “what your heart tells you.”

Here is the problem, Nathan, and it is worth sitting with: a covenant between Yahweh and a people is not a day-labor contract between two strangers.

A day-labor contract ends when the work is done because the relationship was never the point — the lawn was the point. A marriage covenant does not end when the wedding day is over, because the

relationship *was* the point. The Hebrew word for covenant, ***brit*** (H1285), is never used in the Tanakh for a one-time transactional exchange. It is the word used for **Yahweh's** promise to Noah (Noah) never to flood the earth again (Bereishit/Genesis 9:11), for His promise of land and descendants to Avraham (Genesis 17:7) — ***“I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations, for an everlasting covenant”*** — and for the covenant given at Sinai. Every time the word is used, it describes an ongoing relationship with standing obligations on both sides, not a wage paid for a finished task.

Bereishit (Genesis) 17:7 — “And I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and your descendants after you.”

Olam (H5769) — **everlasting, perpetual, without end. Not a contract for one day's labor. A covenant for all generations.**

WHAT “IT IS FINISHED” ACTUALLY FINISHED

You referenced ***tetelestai*** — **“it is finished”** — as the moment the Old Covenant contract was closed out. The Greek word is real and it is significant, but it is a priestly declaration about a specific atoning sacrifice, not a repeal notice for the Torah. A ***kohen gadol*** (high priest, H3548 + H1419) examining a sacrifice and declaring it **tamim** — without blemish, complete, sufficient — is not declaring the entire law that defined what a blemish even was to be obsolete. He is declaring that *this offering* satisfied *that requirement*. The requirement itself — the standard by which the offering was judged sufficient — still stands, or there is nothing left for the offering to have fulfilled.

Yeshua (Jesus) himself, read in his own Hebrew context rather than through nineteen centuries of Greek philosophical overlay, said the opposite of what dispensational theology built on top of his words:

Mattityahu (Matthew) 5:17–18 — “Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. For assuredly, I say to you, till

heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled.”

Plerosai — to fulfill — is not the same Greek word as *kataluo* — to destroy, abolish, throw down. Yeshua specifically denies the second and affirms the first. The text you are citing to retire the Torah is, on its own terms, a text in which the speaker explicitly refuses to retire the Torah.

THE LAND WAS ALREADY KEPT — SO WHAT ELSE WAS ALREADY KEPT?

There is a hinge text in the Tanakh that, once read, changes how every later promise has to be understood:

Yehoshua (Joshua) 21:43–45 — “So Yahweh gave Israel all the land which He had sworn to give to their fathers, and they possessed it and lived in it... Not one of the good promises which Yahweh had made to the house of Israel failed; all came to pass.”

If **Yahweh** keeps every promise He makes — and that text says, in unambiguous Hebrew narrative, that He already did — then the covenant was never a contract that could lapse or expire for lack of performance on His side. The only side capable of breaking faith with the covenant was Israel's. That is the consistent witness of the Tanakh from Sinai through the exile: **Yahweh does not abandon His own covenant; people abandon theirs and are called back to it, generation after generation, by the prophets you have not yet had reason to read closely.**

This is the part of your own analysis you have not yet finished, Nathan, and I say that with respect, not condescension: you correctly diagnosed that something has been weaponized and double-dipped — cherry-picking convenient pieces of an “old” system to prop up a modern institution while discarding the parts that would discipline that institution. You are right that this is happening. But the fix is not to discard the whole law as a finished contract. **The fix is to stop letting institutions pick which parts of Yahweh's covenant to keep and which to discard — and that requires the covenant to still be standing, in full, as the standard by which the institution is judged.** A finished contract has no power to convict anyone of anything. Only a standing law can do that. You need the very thing you said was retired in order to finish the indictment you have already started writing.

PART THREE — THE TITHE: YOUR OWN MISSION NEEDS THE LAW YOU SET ASIDE

This is the part of your framework I most want you to look at again, because it is not academic for you — it is the exact terrain of Broken Shepherds. Your entire platform exists to answer one question: *is this church handling donor money the way it should?* But on Tucker's show you said the New Covenant has no fixed giving standard — not 10%, not any percentage — only “what your heart tells you.”

Nathan, that answer cannot do the job you need it to do. A standard that is whatever each person's heart tells them is not a standard at all — it cannot convict anyone of anything, because no one can be wrong. If the giving requirement is purely subjective, then the pastor who tells his congregation “give sacrificially” while buying a private jet has not violated any fixed rule; he has simply interpreted his own heart differently than you interpret yours. Your platform's entire moral force depends on there being an actual, objective standard for what faithful giving and faithful stewardship look like. The Torah already wrote that standard. It is exact, it is specific, and it already indicts exactly the abuses you are exposing.

WHAT THE TORAH TITHE ACTUALLY REQUIRED

The Tanakh does not describe one vague tithe. It describes a structured, three-part system with a built-in welfare mandate — the very accountability mechanism your platform is trying to invent from scratch:

PROVISION	WHAT IT REQUIRED
The Levite's Tithe	Bemidbar (Numbers) 18:21 — support for those who served the covenant full-time, with no land inheritance of their own. This is the only tithe with any analogy to clergy support, and it was tied to actual covenant service, not a building fund.
The Festival Tithe	Devarim 14:22–27 — brought to the place of worship and eaten there in covenant celebration, before Yahweh.

<p>The Welfare Tithe</p>	<p>Devarim 14:28–29 — every third year, set aside specifically for “the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within your gates and be satisfied.” This is a direct, commanded, auditable transfer to the vulnerable — not discretionary.</p>
<p>Withholding It Is Theft</p>	<p>Malakhi (Malachi) 3:8–9 — “Will a man rob God? Yet you have robbed Me... You are cursed with a curse, for you have robbed Me, even this whole nation.” Theft is named in both directions: withholding the tithe is robbery against Yahweh, and (by the same standard) diverting it from its commanded purpose is robbery against the poor it was commanded for.</p>

Notice what this system does that “give what your heart tells you” cannot do: **it specifies the amount, it specifies the recipients, and it specifies the consequence for diversion.** A pastor who builds a \$13 million property while his congregation’s welfare tithe goes unfulfilled to the widow and the fatherless is not merely failing an abstract Christlikeness test — he is in direct, namable violation of Devarim (Deuteronomy) 14:28–29 and stands under the Malakhi 3:9 curse. That is a covenant case with a verdict. “Give what your heart tells you” produces no verdict at all, because there is no fixed law to have broken.

Malakhi (Malachi) 3:8–10 — “Will a man rob God? Yet you have robbed Me. But you say, ‘In what way have we robbed You?’ In tithes and offerings. You are cursed with a curse, for you have robbed Me, even this whole nation. Bring all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be food in My house, and try Me now in this, says Yahweh of hosts, if I will not open for you the windows of heaven and pour out for you such blessing that there will not be room enough to receive it.”

This text alone answers the exact question your platform is built to answer: where should the money actually go, and how do we know if it didn’t? The Torah’s tithe law is the original transparency mechanism — the original *auditing* standard, applied to a covenant people three millennia before anyone built an app to do the same job.

PART FOUR — ISRAEL: YOU ASKED THE RIGHT QUESTION AND STOPPED ONE STEP SHORT

On June 19 you said something that took real nerve to say on a major platform: that the modern nation-state of Israel *“is not the ethnic tribe that’s described in the Torah,”* and that this has become a card American religious and political institutions weaponize — “if you don’t back the nation-state, you clearly don’t believe this book.” You called yourself an auditor and said you wanted to audit the nation-state scripturally. I want to finish that audit with you, because the Tanakh itself — not later commentary, the actual text — gives you the standard to do it.

THE LAND PROMISE WAS CONDITIONAL ON COVENANT OBEDIENCE, NOT ETHNICITY ALONE

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 28:1–2, 15 — “Now it shall come to pass, if you diligently obey the voice of Yahweh your God, to observe carefully all His commandments... all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you... But it shall come to pass, if you do not obey the voice of Yahweh your God, to observe carefully all His commandments and His statutes which I command you today, that all these curses will come upon you and overtake you.”

The Torah’s own land theology is covenantal, not merely genealogical: possession of the land was always conditioned on covenant faithfulness, and dispossession — exile — was the Torah’s own stated consequence for covenant breach (Vayikra/Leviticus 26:33; Devarim 28:64). The prophets do not treat the modern political entity occupying the land as automatically synonymous with covenant Israel; they treat covenant faithfulness as the actual criterion **Yahweh** judges by. A government’s actions — toward the stranger, the widow, the fatherless, the poor, and toward other nations — are squarely within the territory the prophets claimed authority to judge, regardless of what flag flies over the land.

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 22:3 — “Execute judgment and righteousness, and deliver the plundered out of the hand of the oppressor. Do no wrong and do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, or the widow, nor shed innocent blood in this place.”

This is spoken to the throne in Yerushalayim (Jerusalem) itself — to the covenant nation, by its own prophet, in its own capital. The Tanakh’s standard for judging the conduct of the land’s government has never been “does a Jewish state exist here,” it has always been *“does this government’s conduct*

meet the covenant standard of justice Yahweh required of it.” That standard applies the same way in 2026 that it applied in 600 BCE. You do not need to import a modern political controversy to make this case — the prophets already made it, against their own government, in their own land, using the Name **Yahweh** rather than a flag.

NAMING THE WEAPONIZATION WITHOUT LOSING THE STANDARD

You documented something real with the FARA filings: a foreign government's ministry funding a domestic religious targeting campaign, training pastors abroad, and supplying messaging templates to American pulpits. That is *shochad* (H7810, **bribery/inducement**) operating at institutional scale — the same category of corruption Yeshayahu (Isaiah) names directly:

Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 1:23 — “Your princes are rebellious, and companions of thieves; everyone loves bribes, and follows after rewards. They do not defend the fatherless, nor does the cause of the widow come before them.”

Notice the prophet pairs bribery directly with neglect of the fatherless and the widow — the exact welfare-tithe obligation from Part Three. The corruption you found is not a free-floating modern phenomenon; it is the same covenant crime named in the eighth century BCE, in the same order, with the same victims. You are not seeing something new. You are seeing the oldest pattern in the prophetic record, now running through a FARA filing instead of a royal court.

And the standard by which a pastor who takes that money is judged is not “did he support or oppose a particular government's foreign policy.” It is **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 18:20–22** — the test for whether a man is speaking for **Yahweh** or speaking for the hand that pays him:

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 18:20 — “But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in My name, which I have not commanded him to speak... that prophet shall die.”

A pastor who takes foreign government messaging and presents it from the pulpit as the voice of **Yahweh** has not committed a political offense in the Torah's eyes. He has committed the gravest covenant offense the Torah names: speaking presumptuously in Yahweh's name what Yahweh never commanded. That verdict does not depend on which side of a geopolitical argument you land on — it depends entirely on whether the speech was actually **Yahweh's**, or a paid substitute for it.

PART FIVE — “YOU ARE YOUR OWN PRIEST NOW”: THE CLAIM THAT MATTERS MOST

Of everything you said to Tucker, this is the line I want to sit with you on longest, because I think it is the real engine underneath everything else you said: *“You are your own priest now... there's no mediator between the Holy of Holies and the outer courts... you have to lead, you have to take responsibility... you don't need the institution anymore.”*

I understand exactly why you landed there. You have watched institutions fail, exploit, and hide behind sacred language while doing none of the things sacred language requires of them. The natural conclusion, watching that for years, is: *the institution is the problem, so remove the institution and the mediating structure, and what is left — me and Yahweh directly — is safe.* I do not think you are wrong that institutions have failed you. I think you are wrong about what the fix is, and the Tanakh explains why, in a place I do not think you have had reason to look yet.

THE TANAKH NEVER PROMISES AN UNMEDIATED, LAWLESS RELATIONSHIP

Every covenant in the Tanakh between **Yahweh** and His people comes **with structure**, not instead of it. Sinai itself is the moment Israel is given law, priesthood, and ongoing instruction — not the moment those things are declared unnecessary. The prophet Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) speaks of a New Covenant centuries before the Second Temple even fell, and it is worth reading exactly what he says it is, because it is not what “no institution, no mediator, just my own heart” describes:

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 31:33 — “But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says Yahweh: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.”

Read that again, slowly. The New Covenant Yirmeyahu describes **is not the abolition of Yahweh's law — it is the internalization of Yahweh's law.** The Hebrew word is *Torah* (H8451), the same word used for the instruction given at Sinai. The promise is that the *same* law moves from stone tablets into the human heart — not that the law is replaced by the absence of law. “Give what your heart tells

you” is the opposite of what this verse promises. This verse promises that **Yahweh's** actual, specific, written instruction — the same instruction that includes the tithe law in Part Three and the justice law in Part Four — would be written onto the heart, so that the heart and the law would finally agree, not so the heart would be left to invent its own standard.

ON MEDIATION: WHAT THE TANAKH ACTUALLY SAYS ABOUT THE PRIESTHOOD

You said there is now no mediator between the Holy of Holies and the outer courts — that each believer walks straight through. I want to point you to what the Tanakh itself says happens when a man tries to perform priestly mediation for himself, outside the structure **Yahweh** actually established:

Bemidbar (Numbers) 16:39–40 — “And Eleazar the priest took the bronze censers... as a memorial to the children of Israel, that no outsider, who is not a descendant of Aaron, should come near to offer incense before Yahweh, that he might not become like Korah and his companions.”

This is not a passage about cruelty or arbitrary exclusion. It is a passage about the danger of self-appointed mediation — a man deciding for himself that he can stand in the place that **Yahweh** structured, without **Yahweh's** structure. Korah's error was not humility before **Yahweh**; it was the belief that personal sincerity was sufficient to bypass the form **Yahweh** had actually commanded. The Tanakh's consistent witness is that approach to **Yahweh** matters — not because **Yahweh** is distant or unreachable, but because He has always specified *how* He is to be approached, and “my own sincerity” has never, in the text, been treated as automatically equivalent to **Yahweh's** own appointed way.

Here is the distinction that matters most for you, Nathan: the corrupt institutions you exposed are corrupt because they replaced Yahweh's actual covenant structure with man-made structure — a board, a 501(c)(3) shell, a tithe re-purposed for jets instead of widows. Their sin was substitution, not structure itself. The answer to a corrupted structure is not *no structure* — it is the *real* structure, recovered, the one that actually came from **Yahweh** rather than from nineteenth-century interpretive tradition or twenty-first-century nonprofit law. Removing all structure does not protect you from corrupted structure. It just removes the only thing capable of naming

corruption as corruption in the first place — which is exactly the tool you have spent years trying to rebuild from scratch with software, when the Tanakh already supplies it without needing an app at all.

PART SIX — WHAT I AM ACTUALLY ASKING OF YOU

I am not asking you to abandon *The Religion Business* or Broken Shepherds. I think Yahweh can use both. I am asking you to consider that the standard you need to finish the audit — the fixed, objective, non-negotiable line that lets you say “*this specific act is a covenant violation, not just a vibe I disagree with*” — is not something you need to invent through technology or personal conviction. It already exists. It is older than the institutions you are exposing, it does not depend on goodwill or transparency software to enforce, and it has already convicted every abuse you have documented, in its own words, thousands of years before your cameras arrived.

You said something on the Shawn Ryan podcast that I think is the truest thing you have said publicly: ***“No one believes something that’s stupid, Nathan.”*** Your friend Dan Bramer said that to you about why people stay loyal to corrupted systems — they are not stupid, they have reasons, even bad ones. I would add one layer to that: people do not abandon something that’s stupid either. If the Old Covenant truly were a finished, retired, irrelevant contract, the prophets would not still be quoted by every Christian, Jewish, and Muslim voice trying to name injustice today — including you, even if you have not always known you were doing it. You reached for Mark 13’s widow-cheating Pharisees on air with Tucker. That text only has the force it has because the standard behind it — Yahweh’s justice, defined long before the Gospels, in the Torah and the Prophets — is still standing, still binding, and still true.

A DIRECT WORD ON ISRAEL, CHRISTIANITY, AND JUDAISM — TOGETHER

This Assembly does not write only to Christians, because the covenant in question was never only for Christians. To the modern State of Israel and to those who invoke it religiously: the land was always conditioned on covenant justice, not ethnicity alone, and the prophets of your own Tanakh — not a Christian filmmaker, your own prophets — hold that government to that standard today exactly as they held Yerushalayim’s throne to it in Yirmeyahu’s own lifetime. To the Muslim reader watching this

exchange from outside both traditions: the corruption Nathan documents — institutional wealth divorced from the poor it claims to serve — is the same corruption the Qur'an itself condemns in its own warnings against those who “devour orphans' property” (Qur'an 4:10) and withhold *zakat* (Qur'an 9:34) — a tithe-structure echo of the very Torah pattern in Part Three, evidence that the underlying moral architecture long predates and outlasts any one tradition's institutional capture of it.

THE INVITATION

Nathan, I am not asking you to join an organization. Miqdash Bethel does not need your name on a roster. I am asking you to do with the Tanakh what you have already shown you are willing to do with a balance sheet: read it directly, follow it where it actually leads rather than where a tradition told you it leads, and let it finish the audit you started. You have already proven you are willing to lose friends, take legal risk, and absorb public anger to follow a financial trail to the truth. I am asking you to extend that same courage one step further — into the text itself, on its own terms, in its own language, before any council, creed, or commentary got to it first.

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 6:16 — “Thus says Yabweh: ‘Stand in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where the good way is, and walk in it; then you will find rest for your souls.’”

You are already standing in the way, Nathan. You are already asking. I am simply pointing at the old paths and telling you they are still there, and they still hold.

In covenant witness,

Elder Kepha Arcemont

Founder, Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution

“Woe to the shepherds of Israel who have been feeding themselves! Should not shepherds feed the sheep?... For thus says

Yahweh Elohim: Behold, I, I Myself will search for My sheep and seek them out.”

Yechezkel (Ezekiel) 34:2, 11 — The Written Covenant of Yahweh

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

A Personal Covenant Letter to Nathan Appfel • 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