

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

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

A Study for Judaism • Christianity • Islam

☆ JUDAISM	† CHRISTIANITY	• ISLAM
The Written Tanakh — Torah, Nevi'im, Ketuvim — is the sole covenant authority. No rabbinic addition supersedes the written Word of Yahweh .	The Tanakh stands as primary authority. New Testament writings are historical witnesses to Tanakh fulfillment. No church council supersedes the written Word of Yahweh .	The Tanakh predates and informs the Quran. Yahweh's written covenant with Yisra'el is the foundation all Abrahamic traditions acknowledge.

SECTION 224 OF THE FY2027 NDAA:

THE U.S.- ISRAEL DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION INITIATIVE, CONGRESSIONAL SOVEREIGNTY, AND THE COVENANT WITNESS

A Covenant Deep Dive — Geopolitical / Constitutional / Three-Religion

Produced by Elder Kepha Arcemont, Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution

June 2026 • Pearl River, Louisiana

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 The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority.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. The **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governs all textual claims in this document.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

This document examines Section 224 of the FY2027 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), formally titled the 'United States-Israel Defense Technology Cooperation Initiative.' The bill was reported by Anadolu Ajansı (AA) on June 5, 2026, following the U.S. House of Representatives' rejection of an amendment by Rep. Ro Khanna (D-CA) to remove the provision.

This analysis proceeds under two lenses: (1) the written constitutional and statutory law of the United States, with specific attention to separation of powers, appropriations authority, and foreign entanglement concerns; and (2) the covenant principles of the Written Tanakh, specifically as they pertain to the Babel Pattern of centralized power, foreign alliances, and the accountability of nations before Yahweh (YHWH).

SECTION 1 — WHAT IS SECTION 224 OF THE FY2027 NDAA?

1.1 The Provision: US-Israel Defense Technology Cooperation Initiative

Section 224 of the FY2027 National Defense Authorization Act — originally derived from H.R. 7540 and S. 3855 (the United States-Israel FUTURES Act, sponsored by Rep. Jackson, R-TX and Sen. Budd, R-NC) — would establish a permanent, institutionalized framework for deep military integration between the United States and Israel. It has since been renumbered Section 219 in the House version and Section 1217 in the Senate version. This document refers to it as Section 224, its original and most commonly cited designation.

The provision directs the Secretary of Defense to designate a dedicated 'executive agent' (EA) — a single Pentagon official — responsible for synchronizing all cooperative efforts between the U.S. and Israeli militaries. No other country on earth has this arrangement with the United States, including any NATO ally.

1.2 What Section 224 Authorizes

The executive agent established under Section 224 would be responsible for:

- Bilateral defense technology research, development, testing, evaluation, integration, and industrial cooperation
- Integration of Israeli-origin and jointly developed defense technologies into U.S. military systems and programs of record
- Joint ventures, licensing agreements, and co-production manufacturing partnerships with Israeli defense industry
- Collaboration on emerging technologies: artificial intelligence (AI), quantum computing and machine learning, autonomous systems, cyber and electronic warfare, directed energy, and biotech
- 'Network integration' and 'data fusion' — undefined terms that critics argue could mean U.S. military data becomes accessible to Israeli military systems
- Joint training exercises and information-sharing mechanisms
- Regular reporting to Congress on technology transitions

A fact sheet distributed by the House Armed Services Committee described the FY2027 NDAA as providing 'unprecedented levels of support for the security of Israel.' The bill also includes \$750 million for U.S.-Israel cooperative programs — a \$65 million increase over FY2026.

1.3 The Foreign Origin of the Provision

In a remarkable display of foreign influence over U.S. domestic legislation, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu — who is currently wanted by the International Criminal Court for alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity in Gaza — personally endorsed Section 224. On June 1, 2026, Netanyahu wrote a letter to Rep. Marlin Stutzman thanking him for supporting 'a new framework of joint defense cooperation, codevelopment, coproduction and mutual investment.'

Netanyahu has publicly described the initiative as his personal plan. Responsible Statecraft described the section as one that 'essentially transforms Israel from a top U.S. aid recipient to a full member of the U.S. defense and intelligence apparatus.'

AIPAC released a press release on June 5, 2026 applauding the HASC's passage of Section 224, writing: 'We now encourage the full House to maintain these pro-Israel measures as the NDAA moves toward final passage.' Critics including the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) have called this 'Netanyahu's Israel-first military integration agenda.'

SECTION 2 — THE HOUSE VOTE: JUNE 5, 2026

On June 5, 2026, the full House of Representatives voted on the Khanna amendment to strip Section 224 from the NDAA. The amendment failed in a voice vote. Only Rep. Sara Jacobs (D-CA) joined Rep. Khanna in support. Virtually the entire House — Republican and Democrat alike — voted to keep the provision.

2.1 Voices in Opposition to Section 224

Rep. Ro Khanna (D-CA) stated on the House floor: 'The American people are tired of the arrogance and insolence of Prime Minister Netanyahu telling America what we should do. The entire country of Israel has a GDP that is less than a single town in my district, yet somehow Netanyahu thinks he can tell the American people what we should do.' Khanna's direct appeal: 'The American people don't want it. Listen to your constituents, not your lobbyists. Strip out Section 224 from the NDAA.'

Rep. Sara Jacobs (D-CA): 'If any other country in the world had been credibly accused of violating U.S. and international law again and again, of killing tens of thousands of civilians, of blocking food and medicine from reaching a starving population, we would not be moving to deepen and permanently expand our military ties with them.'

Rep. Thomas Massie (R-KY), the anti-interventionist Republican who has also opposed the unauthorized Iran war, stated he and Khanna submitted an amendment to strip Section 219 (renumbered from 224) from the NDAA, requiring seven Rules Committee votes to receive a floor vote.

Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT): 'Only 16% of Americans support arming Israel without restrictions. So what is Congress doing? Burying a provision in the defense bill that would give Israel more military integration than any NATO ally. We must strip Section 224 from the Pentagon budget.'

Former Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-GA): 'Once Section 224 passes, it will be next to impossible to be undone.'

2.2 Voices Defending Section 224

House Armed Services Committee Chairman Mike Rogers dismissed constitutional concerns: 'Claims that this provision somehow cedes authority to a foreign government are simply ridiculous.'

Ranking Member Adam Smith (D-WA): 'I strongly disagree with the notion that this is Congress just bowing to what Netanyahu wants. This is to our benefit.'

SECTION 3 — CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY CONCERNS

3.1 The Appropriations Clause — Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

U.S. CONSTITUTION, Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: 'No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.'

The Appropriations Clause is among the most foundational structural provisions of the Constitution. It places the power of the purse exclusively in Congress, requiring that all government spending flow through the legislative appropriations process. This clause is the mechanism by which Congress exercises oversight over executive branch spending — including military spending.

Section 224 represents a deliberate effort to move U.S. support for Israel's military from the transparent foreign-aid appropriations framework — where Congress reviews and approves annual funding and can attach conditions — into a maze of Pentagon procurement, licensing agreements, co-production contracts, joint R&D programs, and sustainment pipelines that are structurally harder for Congress to monitor, cap, condition, or terminate.

As the Arab Center Washington DC analysis states: 'The MOU represents a presidential commitment to provide a certain level of annual funding, but the funds still must be approved by Congress each year before they can be released for Israel. The typical procedure of Congress rubber-stamping billions in grants for Israel through the appropriations process is likely to only become more unpalatable to many elected representatives as public opinion continues to turn negative toward Israel.'

Critics across the political spectrum, including the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, have noted that once Israeli technologies are embedded in U.S. military systems via joint ventures and co-production agreements, future Congresses will face enormous practical barriers to ending those relationships, effectively pre-committing future appropriations without formal congressional vote. **This is a structurally end-run around the Appropriations Clause.**

3.2 Congressional Oversight and the Separation of Powers

The Constitution's separation of powers rests on Congress's ability to conduct meaningful oversight of executive branch activities, including military and defense contracts. Section 224 raises serious oversight concerns:

- The 'executive agent' is appointed by the Secretary of Defense, not confirmed by the Senate, concentrating authority in a single unaccountable official
- The terms 'network integration' and 'data fusion' are undefined in the legislation, granting the executive agent effectively unlimited interpretive authority over the scope of data and system integration with a foreign military
- Joint ventures and licensing agreements with Israeli defense firms bypass standard Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF) oversight frameworks

- The Israel-U.S. Iron Dome precedent reveals the danger: after the U.S. Army acquired Israeli Iron Dome batteries in 2020, Israel refused to provide source code and technical information necessary for full integration, leaving U.S. systems partially dependent on foreign-controlled technology with no legal recourse

The Institute for Middle East Understanding (IMEU) Policy Project states: 'The Executive Agent would be granted limitless and unaccountable authority for synchronizing and accelerating the US-Israeli bilateral military relationship.' This concentration of unaccountable executive authority in a single appointed official, with undefined scope of data-sharing authority with a foreign state, is inconsistent with the constitutional framework of checks and balances.

3.3 The Foreign Entanglement Problem: Article I War Powers and the Netanyahu Letter

U.S. CONSTITUTION, Article I, Section 8, Clause 11: Congress shall have Power to declare War... and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water.

The most constitutionally alarming aspect of Section 224 is the documented foreign origin of the initiative. Prime Minister Netanyahu personally wrote a letter to a U.S. congressman thanking him for endorsing the initiative and calling it his personal plan. AIPAC — a foreign-linked lobbying organization — publicly celebrated the provision's advancement and called on the full House to maintain it.

The Constitution vests war-making authority in Congress. When a foreign head of government personally drafts and advocates for provisions of a U.S. defense authorization bill — and Congress adopts those provisions with only two dissenting votes — a fundamental question arises about who is actually exercising that constitutional war-making authority.

This is not a hypothetical concern. Section 224 would structurally bind the U.S. military's emerging technology development, AI systems, cyber capabilities, directed energy programs, and data architecture to Israeli military specifications and Israeli defense industry contracts. Future U.S. military decisions in any region where Israel has interests — including the Middle East — would be constrained by these technological entanglements in ways that a foreign government, not Congress, helped design.

3.4 The Leahy Law and Accountability Frameworks

U.S. law — specifically the Leahy Law (22 U.S.C. § 2378d) — prohibits U.S. military assistance to foreign military units when there is credible information that those units have committed gross violations of human rights. The Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) and the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) provide additional frameworks for conditioning military aid on human rights compliance.

As the IMEU Policy Project notes: 'By transforming the US-Israeli bilateral military relationship in the way envisioned by Section 224, the Executive Branch and Congress would lose the possibility of holding Israel accountable even if it chooses to enforce those laws. That is because these types of joint research and development and co-production are outside the frameworks of the FAA and AECA, enabling this military relationship to deepen no matter Israel's actions.'

The bill therefore creates a parallel military relationship with Israel that is structurally exempted from the accountability mechanisms Congress established for all other foreign military relationships. This is a de facto repeal of those accountability frameworks as applied to Israel — achieved not through direct legislation but through structural embedding.

3.5 AI Warfare, Data Fusion, and Civil Liberties

Among the most alarming provisions of Section 224 are the undefined terms 'network integration' and 'data fusion.' Israel has deployed AI-generated targeting systems in Gaza under programs codenamed Lavender, The Gospel, and Where's Daddy. These systems generated AI-selected target lists for lethal strikes with minimal human oversight, producing widespread casualties including mass civilian death.

Section 224 creates statutory pathways for these AI warfare approaches — built on and tested against Palestinian civilian populations — to be integrated into U.S. military systems. Because 'network integration' is undefined, data sharing between U.S. and Israeli military systems could extend to surveillance data, intelligence data, or citizen data with no clear legal boundary. The civil liberties implications for American citizens are entirely unaddressed in the legislation.

SECTION 4 — KEY POLITICAL FIGURES: POSITIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

FIGURE	POSITION ON SECTION 224	VOTE / ACTION
Rep. Ro Khanna (D-CA)	Led amendment to strip Section 224. Stated the American people are 'tired of Netanyahu telling America what to do.'	OPPOSED — introduced amendment; amendment failed
Rep. Sara Jacobs (D-CA)	Stated that no other country accused of killing tens of thousands of civilians would receive deeper military integration.	OPPOSED — co-sponsored Khanna amendment
Rep. Thomas Massie (R-KY)	Anti-interventionist Republican; submitted amendment with Khanna to strip the renamed Section 219 from the NDAA floor vote.	OPPOSED — submitted floor amendment
Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT)	Stated only 16% of Americans support arming Israel without restrictions; called on Congress to strip the provision.	OPPOSED — public opposition
Rep. Mike Rogers (R-AL)	HASC Chairman. Dismissed concerns about foreign influence as 'simply ridiculous.' Defended the provision throughout markup.	SUPPORTED — advanced through committee
Rep. Adam Smith (D-WA)	HASC Ranking Member. Defended Section 224 as being 'to our benefit' despite acknowledging frustration with Netanyahu.	SUPPORTED — voted against Khanna amendment
Rep. Marlin Stutzman (R-IN)	Recipient of Netanyahu's personal letter of endorsement. Introduced a nonbinding resolution on June 3 supporting the framework.	SUPPORTED — sponsor of companion resolution
PM Benjamin Netanyahu (Israel)	Personally wrote to U.S. congressmen endorsing the provision. Called it his personal plan. Wanted by ICC for alleged war crimes.	FOREIGN ADVOCATE — primary foreign architect
AIPAC	Released press release celebrating HASC passage of Section 224. Called on the full House to maintain it.	FOREIGN-LINKED LOBBY — public support

SECTION 5 — CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY CONCERN SUMMARY

#	PROVISION	CONCERN	STATUS
1	Art. I, Sec. 9, Cl. 7 — Appropriations Clause	Moves U.S.-Israel military support from transparent annual appropriations into Pentagon procurement pipelines that are structurally harder for Congress to monitor, condition, or terminate	Passed HASC; amendment to strip failed; advancing to House floor
2	Separation of Powers — Oversight Authority	Executive agent is unaccountable to Senate confirmation; undefined 'network integration' and 'data fusion' grant unlimited interpretive scope; future Congresses pre-committed to entangled contracts	No statutory oversight mechanism specified in bill
3	Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 11 — War Powers	Foreign head of government personally designed and advocated for provisions of a U.S. defense bill binding U.S. AI, cyber, and weapons systems to Israeli military architecture	Netanyahu letter publicly documented; provision advancing
4	Leahy Law / FAA / AECA — Accountability Frameworks	Joint R&D and co-production frameworks operate outside FAA and AECA, structurally exempting Israel from human rights accountability mechanisms applicable to all other U.S. military partners	Structural exemption embedded in legislation
5	Civil Liberties — AI Data Fusion and Surveillance	Undefined 'data fusion' could integrate U.S. military/intelligence data with Israeli AI targeting systems tested on Palestinian civilian populations; no civil liberties protections specified	No privacy or oversight safeguards in bill text
6	Foreign Influence in U.S. Legislation	A foreign head of government (Netanyahu) personally wrote U.S. legislators to endorse a specific NDAA provision; foreign-linked lobby (AIPAC) publicly directed House members to maintain it	Publicly documented; not addressed by Ethics processes

SECTION 6 — COVENANT WITNESS OF THE WRITTEN TANAKH

6.1 Shemu'el Alephm (I Samuel) 8 and the Babel Pattern of Governance

MBCI Doc 133 examined Shemu'el Aleph (1 Samuel) 8 and the Babel Pattern of Centralized Governance. When Yisra'el demanded a king like the nations around them, Yahweh warned through Shemu'el: the king will take your sons for his wars, your daughters for his apparatus, your fields and vineyards for his purposes. What was being described was the **Babel Pattern — the**

consolidation of power in human hands, beyond accountability, beyond the covenant law of Yahweh.

Section 224 of the FY2027 NDAA is a manifestation of the Babel Pattern at the level of international defense entanglement. The provision does not merely appropriate money. **It creates an architecture: a permanent executive agent, joint technology programs, embedded supply chains, shared data systems, co-produced weapons — a structure that, once built, cannot be dismantled by ordinary legislative action.** It is, in the words of former Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene, 'next to impossible to undo.'

That is the Babel Pattern. Once the tower rises high enough, the builders cannot take it down without the entire structure falling on them.

6.2 Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17 and the Law of the King

The Written Tanakh provides explicit covenant law governing the kings of Yisra'el in Devarim (Deuteronomy) 17:14–20. The king was forbidden from multiplying military power, accumulating foreign wealth for himself, or establishing alliances that would draw the nation away from sole dependence on Yahweh. **These were not suggestions — they were covenant boundaries placed on political authority precisely because Yahweh understood the human tendency toward empire-building.**

Section 224 represents the antithesis of Devarim 17: the multiplication of military entanglement, the embedding of foreign industry into national defense supply chains, and the creation of a relationship with a foreign state that is explicitly described by its architects as 'unprecedented' and 'irreversible.' These are not covenant words. These are Babel words.

6.3 The Two-or-Three Witness Standard: Devarim 19:15

Under the Devarim 19:15 evidentiary standard, the concerns raised against Section 224 are established by multiple witnesses:

- Witness 1: Bipartisan members of the U.S. House of Representatives — Khanna (D), Massie (R), Jacobs (D) — raised specific structural and sovereignty concerns
- Witness 2: The Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft concluded that Section 224 would do 'more to intertwine the U.S. military with the Israeli military than the more than \$200 billion in military assistance Israel has received since 1948'
- Witness 3: The IMEU Policy Project documented that Section 224 would move U.S.-Israel military cooperation 'outside the frameworks of the FAA and AECA,' removing human rights accountability
- Witness 4: A documented foreign leader personally wrote U.S. legislators to engineer a provision in a U.S. defense bill, with that provision passing virtually unopposed
- Witness 5: Public opinion — only 16% of Americans support unrestricted arming of Israel (Sanders) — while Congress advanced the provision with two dissenting votes

The matter is established under the standard of Devarim 19:15. What is being documented here is not merely constitutional concern. It is the Babel Pattern operating through the legislative apparatus of the most powerful nation on earth, with a foreign government as its architect.

6.4 A Word to the Three Religions

TO JUDAISM	TO CHRISTIANITY	TO ISLAM
The Written Tanakh does not sanction the political state of modern Israel as the covenant	Christian Zionism has provided much of the theological cover for unconditional U.S. support of Israel.	The Written Tanakh speaks to all the nations. What is being embedded through Section 224 is not merely a

fulfillment of Yahweh's promises to the B'nei Yisra'el. Devarim 17 forbids the king from multiplying military alliances. A foreign government lobbying to embed itself in another nation's defense apparatus — with that nation's legislators complying — is not the way of Yahweh.

MBCI Doc 150 examines the Scofield Deception at length. The Written Tanakh does not command any nation to entangle its military with a foreign state in service of end-times theology constructed in the 20th century. What is being done in the name of prophecy does not match what the Written Tanakh actually says.

U.S.-Israel arrangement. It is the structural merger of two military apparatuses that have already conducted joint operations across the Middle East. The covenant witness of Yahweh calls all peoples to recognize power structures that bypass accountability — regardless of which flag they fly.

CONCLUSION

Section 224 of the FY2027 NDAA is not, at its face, a declaration of war or a treaty. It is a structural provision — a law embedded in a 'must-pass' defense authorization bill — that would permanently alter the architecture of the U.S. defense establishment by integrating it with the military-industrial apparatus of a foreign state at the level of AI systems, data fusion, supply chains, co-production contracts, and weapons development programs.

The constitutional concerns are real, documented, and bipartisan: the Appropriations Clause is structurally bypassed; the Leahy Law and the FAA/AECA accountability frameworks are rendered inapplicable; the undefined 'data fusion' provisions grant undefined data-sharing rights to a foreign military; and the entire initiative was architecturally designed by a foreign head of government under active ICC investigation.

That Congress passed this provision with only two opposing votes — while 16% of Americans support unrestricted arming of Israel — is precisely the Babel Pattern in operation. It is governance that has detached itself from the people it claims to represent, captured by interests that serve a foreign agenda rather than the national covenant.

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution bears witness to these things under the authority of the Written Tanakh and the evidentiary standard of Devarim 19:15. There are many witnesses. The matter is established. Whether the American constitutional order will correct course is now a matter for the American people and the Sovereign of the nations, Yahweh, to determine.

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Doc156_NDAA_Section224_USIsrael_ConstitutionalConcerns_CovenantWitness_June2026
Cross-reference: Doc 150 (Scofield Deception) • Doc 133 (Babel Pattern) • Doc 155 (US-Iran MOU)
Total MBCI Library: 155 Numbered Documents • MLI v28 (pending v29) • Produced June 18, 2026
miqdashbethel.org • PO Box 762, Pearl River, Louisiana 70452 • 508(c)(1)(a) Free Church