

You don't have to be Jewish to fight by our side. You just have to love liberty.



The Dark Mirror

Charlie Kirk, a staunch defender of free speech and the right to keep and bear arms, and founder of Turning Point USA, was brutally murdered for the high crime of exercising his natural right to free speech. You read that correctly, dear reader. He was murdered for merely speaking. Even daring to have discussions with those who disagreed with him, he opened conversation up to anyone who was willing to talk with him. He toured college campuses across America, having open mic conversations with students from every walk of life, religion, and political persuasion. He promoted conversation between those who disagree, knowing that if we stop talking to each other, violence would be the next course of action. Furthermore, he understood the fundamental principle that the everyday, common American had much more in common with another such person with whom he disagreed than with a snobbish, protected, wealthy, elitist who holds more sway over all our lives than we'd like to admit. He championed openness, honesty, and intellectual integrity in debate and was a firm believer that each and every one of us



had something valuable to contribute to society and that we begin that contribution with honesty and with the willingness to hold ourselves to a high intellectual and spiritual standard.

The person

twisted justification for murder. The irony of murdering someone for speaking their mind while calling them a fascist was apparently lost on this deranged criminal. Those who hate liberty cannot bear those who love it. It is the darkest instinct in human nature, that desire to violently silence those with whom we disagree. We, at JPFO, have written on this subject before. That we are all imbued with, among other things, the spirit of tyranny. We each have a choice whether to aspire to be a citizen or a tyrant. We choose to tolerate those with whom we disagree, or to plot against them for it. The murderer of Charlie Kirk chose to be the tyrant, chose to justify evil with false righteousness. This feeble attempt is, of course, a mere facade, covering the darkness of the heart with the thin veil of sophistry. The person who did this does not love liberty but despises

Continued on page 2

Business Ethics

Many of us have been compelled to sit through the tedious and lengthy meetings at our places of work regarding business ethics. A stuffy suit or generic video drones on and on about the various rules and protocols of that business and how they make us all more ethical. We're subjected to monotonous lectures about the intricacies of the mechanisms that drive the business's ethical machinery and how we fit into their idea of what is ethical.

Continued on page 5

who murdered Charlie was possessed by dark ideologies. Stating that "Some hatred cannot be negotiated with," the villain conflated and confused a fundamental human right with "hatred." The killer's perverted view held that disagreement was hate. That discussion was violence. That, if someone thought differently than them, they should be killed without mercy. Branding Charlie Kirk as a fascist granted the killer the obscene,

freedom, and cannot abide those who love it. The murderer is not heroic, not brave; merely a coward, weak, and afraid to live in a world where ideas not in alignment with theirs, are permitted to endure.

The villain murdered Charlie using a firearm, perched atop a nearby roof while Charlie engaged a crowd of college students on campus. From the moment the shot rang out and the news followed, fellow haters of liberty in the political sphere flocked to the cameras to condemn the firearm and all but ignore—and sometimes defend—the murderer. No sooner had the attack on Charlie’s freedom of speech and his life started buzzing across the wires and screens, than those hellbent on the destruction of those liberties for the rest of Americans immediately seized the opportunity to beset the right to keep and bear arms. They claimed that this hideous act was a “gun problem”, failing to account for the hundreds of millions of other guns that were not used to commit unlawful violence against peaceable citizens that day. They stood before the cameras, with misdirected concern, while carrying on the work of tyranny, by vilifying the very freedom that defends the rest of our liberties. But tyrants are almost always poorly masked, and many of the pro 2A groups saw right through this trickery. While many people refused to condemn the political violence used against Charlie Kirk, they openly blamed the implement



used to murder him, but not the murderer, and not the action. In moments like these, tyranny lights up like a flare for all to see. We see its true colors, its real goals, and we see clearly those who use safety as a mask to hide their treachery. Another disturbing twist, besides many people—often holding left-leaning ideologies—refusing to condemn the evil act, was

that many not only excused it but celebrated it. A dark face of humanity looked up, and spoke through the voices of the possessed. Thousands of people openly rejoiced in the murder, not truly understanding what they were promoting and worshiping. One cannot help but feel not just anger but pity looking at those poor souls, basking in the evil that was done. They stand at the edge of chaos, beckoning their own destruction. They cheer for the death of someone they hated, likely not knowing why, and for the means by which it was done. Not knowing, they could be the next hated person with whom others disagree, the next target in the world they so carelessly wish to bring into being. We cannot wish evil on those around us, bring an evil world into being, and not expect that evil to devour us as well. It is not the nature of evil to restrain itself; its purpose is to consume us all. It’s a terrifying thing to watch thousands mindlessly welcoming a

society that trivializes life, justifies murder, and casts out those who are thought by some to be dissidents.

The message of liberty, of open conversation and discussion, did not die with Charlie Kirk as the murderer had hoped. We cannot expect someone so possessed by hatred and cowardice to understand that his plan backfired. The villain did not end the movement, but set it aflame, sparking a backlash against hate, and against political violence. Whatever doubt may have been in the movement before has been eradicated. It has been replaced by resolve. We who love freedom are not cowed, we will not be silent, we will not hide. We will speak louder, more boldly. We, at JPFO, honor Charlie Kirk and thank him for his years of work supporting liberty. We wish the best for his family and friends, honoring their loss, and we continue to carry out our work in the same spirit as Charlie Kirk—a man who loved liberty and gave his life defending it.



Bill of Rights Sentinel

Publisher: Alan Gottlieb
 Editor: James Jones
 Editor Emeritus: Alan Korwin
 Rabbi Emeritus: Rabbi Dovid Bendory

Contributors: Kjartan “Karno” Arnorsson, Felicity Bower, Craig Cantoni, Dr. Julius Decker, Charles Heller, William Barclay Masterson, J.D. “Duke” Schechter, Grant Schmidt, Richard Stevens, Barrett Tillman, Dean Weingarten, JPFO Staff

The Bill of Rights Sentinel is published by Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership 12500 N.E.Tenth Place Bellevue, WA 98005 800-869-1884 Copyright 2025 JPFO

Address Change: Include new address, city, state and zip code. Send to *The Bill of Rights Sentinel* at 12500 N.E.Tenth Place, Bellevue, WA 98005 or email to info@jpfo.org. Please allow up to four weeks for changes.

JPFO’s Mission Statement: 1. Destroy “gun control” (code words for disarming innocent people)*. 2. Expose the misguided notions that lead people to seek out “gun control.” 3. Encourage Americans to understand and defend all of the Bill of Rights for all citizens. The Second Amendment is the “Guardian” of the Bill of Rights.

*So-called gun control is not a credible policy position: it does not control guns nor does it control criminal behavior. What it does is disarm the innocent, leaving them helpless in the face of petty criminals, tyrannical governments and genocide.

JPFO Welcomes Bruce Linker

By Alan Korwin

Concerned about renewed attacks on the right to keep and bear arms, and already active in state politics, Mr. Linker developed a heightened awareness and deep concern about growing Jew hatred, broadly nicknamed anti-Semitism by mainstream sources.



The word “Semite” however describes much of the Middle Eastern Arab human population—but the “anti” prefix relates only to Jews. This leads to inaccuracy and a lack of clarity. Like the body of JPFO members, he and we are highly focused on the ability for armed defense of ourselves and our communities from attacks based on that pernicious hatred. Motivated by the need to preserve the right to keep and bear arms, along with deep training in the judicious use of force, he joins our ranks as our newest Ambassador.

JPFO Ambassador Bruce Linker grew up in Elmont, on Long Island, N.Y. At 16 he would go to the local

high school’s indoor shooting range with his father. “At first he taught me shooting from the prone position. We shot his Mossberg 144 single-shot bolt action 22LR. Later, my father, a WWII USMC veteran, taught me to shoot from a sitting and kneeling position, too. That was fun. He also moved me up to a Savage 22 LR.

“When I was 18, my sister and brother-in-law returned from California driving the old Route 66. They bought a Winchester 30-30 Lever Action Carbine in Flagstaff. They later stopped in Albuquerque, N.M. There they traded the ‘plain’ Winchester for a model that had some scroll work on the breech and gold-toned saddle ring and cover for the tube-feed magazine.

“For the next few years I went big game hunting in the New York State mountains for bear and deer. I was

successful in shooting several white tail deer, the largest a 4 pointer, dressed out at 147 lbs. It was fun getting outdoors with fellow hunters. We had a group—my brother-in-law Harry, cousin Ralph with his Ruger semi-automatic, my father with a Marlin 30-30 lever action, and Sal, a friend who was an awesome shot. We had to awaken in the dark and it was cold and sometimes snowy. We were in the woods, several miles deep by sunrise. That was a great time.

“I moved to Arizona in 1996. My wife Paula and I obtained concealed carry licenses, in 1997. Back then the state required a shooting proficiency test. I bought a Ruger P89 9MM and a Ruger Mark II .22LR. We both passed the written and shooting parts of the CCW process, though now, as a Constitutional Carry state, state-mandated classes are no longer required,

Continued on page 4



SEVEN MORE WAYS TO SUPPORT THE IMPORTANT WORK OF JEWS FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

- For a donation of \$36 or more (twice “Chai,” it’s Hebrew for *Life*), you get an insightful JPFO book.
 - Make a monthly tax-deductible donation *automatically!* JPFO handles all the details for you. \$10 \$18 \$20 \$36 \$72
Give any donation amount in multiples of 10 or 18.
 - Give a gift membership to a member of the tribe, or anyone you choose. “You don’t have to be Jewish to support JPFO, you just have to love Liberty”
 - Sign up a friend or relative for our free eblast announcements. It’s double opt-in, JPFO just offers a chance to join, which must be confirmed by your referral. Turn on someone you know to the inside scoops you’ve been getting. Lists are welcomed!
 - Increase your membership for another year right now, whether it’s due or not. It helps JPFO, supports the cause, and you want your membership to stay active, right? Do it. You’ll do it later anyway.
 - Walk our safety brochure into your local Rabbi and have a chat. Increasingly, religious leaders are now becoming aware of a need for enhanced security, and that starts with personal safety. Every shul in America needs to know about JPFO. Call or write for a few free copies. We’re glad to send you a batch! Just ask. Wise Rabbis like armed congregants.
 - Become an Ambassador or a volunteer. Belong to something serious. Ask for info or a Volunteer Menu.
 - Just donate a few bucks because you can, and you know it’s a good cause. Write the check. Fill in the blank.
- Stop wishing for a better world, make it so. Please remember to remember JPFO in your will.

a modest increase in freedom.

“Learning and practicing the shooting sports has been quite rewarding for me. It was fun going to a few Saturday night events shooting at bowling pins. You had to knock over the pins to score. Most recently (July 2025), I added to my ongoing training, attending Gunsite Academy’s week-long 250 Defensive Pistol Training.”

Bruce was introduced to Arizona politics as a Precinct Committeeman in 2005. He is active generally in Arizona’s CD1 (Congressional District 1) and LD4 (Legislative District 4).

Bruce’s recently deceased wife Paula was very active in Arizona congressional and local campaigns as far back as 1996, soon after they moved to Arizona. Bruce assisted Paula while he worked full-time at American Express. With her, he worked on successful campaigns for Congressmen J.D. Hayworth and David Schweikert, among others. The two organized writing campaigns for multiple programs and many candidates.

Bruce participates in local party politics, as well as the Jewish Women’s Conservative Forum, and the Palo Verde Republican Women’s Club, which his wife introduced him to more than two decades ago. Both clubs have welcomed Bruce into the fold, where he holds various positions. Bruce is also a regular at the JPFO Political Salons in Scottsdale, the free-wheeling discussions held on the 4th Tuesday each month.

**Visit the
JPFO Store!**
store.jpfo.org

Support JPFO By Reading!



store.jpfo.org

Postal Review

Under 39 C.F.R. § 232.1(l)—implemented in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970—and 18 U.S.C. § 930(a), citizens are forbidden from carrying firearms onto postal grounds or in Post Offices. As you may guess, this is all for our “safety.” Anyone choosing to violate these edicts and opt for being prepared and able to defend their lives with a firearm while in a Post Office is subject to fine and imprisonment. The wisdom of our government has dictated that our lives are apparently not worth defending within postal facilities.

However, a District Court judge in Texas, Reed O’Conner, has seen through the facade of pretend safety and ruled that banning guns in Post Offices and on postal grounds is unconstitutional. While the government tried desperately to defend their position, the judge was unconvinced. Since the Postal Service in one form or another has been

around since a time before the Founding and firearms were not banned then, there is no historical precedent for upholding the current law.

The judge noted that concern for postal employees was present even at the time of the Founding, stating, “..the Founders were acutely aware of threats to post offices and postal employees, yet chose to criminalize the offending behavior rather than banning firearms outright...”

While the government attempted to argue that the Founders could not have foreseen similar issues arising within postal buildings since none were established at the time of the Founding, the judge replied that “even though Congress and the Founders were aware of the ‘general societal problem’ of violence towards the postal service, the prohibition against firearms in post offices or on postal property did not appear until nearly 200

Continued on Page 7

While there are a few legitimate aspects, most of the content has very little to do with actual ethics and more to do with ensuring each individual conforms to the company standards and detailed instructions on how to report people who step outside the line.

Ironically, the vast majority of the companies pontificating about their employees' behavior and trying desperately to make morally relevant the

addressing ethics and safety without ever talking about self-defense. Without pause, they patronize employees with pretenses of caring for their safety while completely ignoring the need for employees to defend themselves. They appear very serious when they imply that being weaponless is ethical and that being armed is not. Not having the burden of self-reflection within the corporate guidelines, officers of ethics are not troubled by the obvious logical

After all, from an amoral perspective, employees can be replaced; good public optics cannot. And, while the zeitgeist is in opposition to self-defense, expedience demands compliance in order to produce optimal marketing and maximize profits.

The legal issues that could potentially arise from armed employees are enough to scare any wily corporate lackey. The CEOs, CFOs, and every other over-paid, belettered position is stuffed with cagey people often unwilling to risk the bottom line for trivial things like the lives of lowly employees. Moral accountability is a distant contender to things like optics, profit,

Continued on Page 8



minutiae of daily life as a corporate cog, are lacking basic introspection. While they preach to their workers at regularly scheduled intervals, trying to get them to adopt their carefully-tailored, specialized, truncated brand of morality, they are blatantly violating the fundamental ethical principle of human existence. The primary purpose of these rather oblique sessions is to ensure that the customer/client-facing aspect of the business is marketable and palatable and to ensure that employees aren't putting the company in legal jeopardy by committing actionable *faux pas*.

Somehow with a straight face, wardens of company ethics blather about the dangers of employees carrying weapons in the workplace, as if criminals in the workplace are somehow more manageable or will simply take care of themselves. They deftly evade the logical error of

conflicts nor the rather blatant and awkward collision of business ethics and actual ethics.

By refusing to address self-defense and its importance to life, companies shine a light on their lack of concern for employee safety and their complete disregard for morality. Their silence on the matter is, as they say, deafening and quite damning. In actual, real life, before all other concerns, comes that of basic life preservation. One cannot even contemplate the issue without first ensuring one is alive long enough to contemplate it. Defense of life is both fundamental and paramount, leading this writer to believe that a company's willful disdain of the matter through disarmament and then, largely, silence, is a good sign that the company cares more for its bottom line than the life of its employees.

Join
JPFO
Now!

www.jpfo.org
800-869-1884

Visit the
JPFO Store!
store.jpfo.org





The Million Shekel Quiz

There are no right answers, except of course there are

A state that claims fundamental rights end at their borders is...

- A. Correct
- B. Misreading the Constitution
- C. Trying to protect themselves
- D. Afraid of tigers

A right delayed is a right...

- A. Retained
- B. Denied
- C. Earned
- D. Rewarded

Legal bloat helps strengthen what?

- A. Citizens' rights
- B. State rights
- C. Count Dracula
- D. National Rights

Why is the government not able grant citizens rights?

- A. Rights are too difficult to grant
- B. Granting rights takes too much time
- C. Rights are too expensive to grant
- D. Rights can be granted only by the Creator

AR stand for:

- A. Armalite Rifle
- B. Assault Rifle
- C. Assault Ready
- D. Automatic Rifle

The government can be trusted with:

- A. Rights
- B. The budget
- C. Everything
- D. A stapler

The maximum number of guns anyone should own.

- A. 5
- B. 10
- C. 100
- D. ∞

In a home invasion emergency, what do police do best:

- A. Stop the intruder from harming you and your family
- B. Barricade the doors
- C. Catch the criminal
- D. Show up too late

The State Line Paradox

The Pheasant Lane Mall located in Nashua, New Hampshire, has a parking lot that spans into Tyngsborough, Massachusetts. A person legally carrying a firearm on the New Hampshire side of the lot then moving to the Massachusetts side could suddenly become a felon. This specific scenario highlights the complete absurdity of the claim that rights end at state lines.

New Hampshire and 24 other states have filed a petition to the Supreme Court that can be read here (<https://tinyurl.com/NHSCOTUS>). The petition states that "...an

American citizen is as free to speak openly on matters of public concern in New York as he is in Florida..." and "it should therefore follow that an American citizen is as free to carry a firearm in public for the purpose of self-defense in Massachusetts as he is in New Hampshire, but it does not." They are challenging Massachusetts' requirement for New Hampshire residents regarding the right to carry, claiming it's cumbersome, time-consuming, and expensive and that it prevents a New Hampshire citizen who could otherwise lawfully carry, from doing so unless they meet these extraneous requirements.

Massachusetts is, as part of the fee for the license to carry, requiring New Hampshire residents to "deposit \$50 into that State's general fund and deposit another \$25 to the department of state police." As the petition astutely and properly points out, "There is no historical support for Massachusetts charging \$100 for an application to carry a firearm for self-defense (and then pocketing half of it)." And, as any good citizen understands, the state cannot charge us for exercising a right. Perhaps Massachusetts thinks it can start charging

Continued on Page 7

Bill of Rights Sentinel

years after the founding.”

The government even attempted to sidestep the Constitution entirely stating that “the ‘constitutional dimensions are different here than in the Supreme Court’s recent cases.’ Namely, because the Government ‘owns (or at least leases) the property at issue’ it is insulated from the Second Amendment’s requirements by the Constitution’s Property Clause and Post Office Clause.” The judge was not buying this feeble attempt by the government to not be held accountable, noting that “the Government as a property owner [cannot] bypass parts of the Constitution it deems unfavorable.”

Ruling properly under *Bruen*, he enjoined the application of these laws against the plaintiffs, preventing the government from enforcing those laws

against those plaintiffs (including members of organizations) named in the case.

While this doesn’t affect the entire nation, it does set a precedent for properly ruling under *Bruen* regarding this issue. In time, for there to be a broader effect, a higher court—hopefully the Supreme Court—would need to get involved.

This is but one of many such laws infringing on the rights of citizens to

keep and bear arms. While there are many battles yet to fight, this is a major victory and we at JPFO applaud the Second Amendment Foundation and the Firearms Policy Coalition for taking on this fight. We also applaud the judge for properly applying *Bruen* and ruling in favor of the Constitution.



for the right to breathe next.

With potential waiting periods of up to five months, New Hampshire residents would be essentially denied their fundamental right to self-defense in Massachusetts simply because the State says so. This is obviously unacceptable and blatantly unconstitutional. Massachusetts is openly demonstrating its disdain for the lives of New Hampshire residents in their underhanded attempt to refuse them their right to keep and bear arms.

The petition also claims that Massachusetts is illegally invoking discretion of applications and their content. Massachusetts is essentially deciding, subjectively, who gets to carry and who does not. This regime is in direct violation of the Constitution and of *Bruen*.

Massachusetts, in bad faith, is denying a fundamental right to American citizens simply because they live outside of Massachusetts’ borders. This is un-American, elitist, and simply illegal and Massachusetts may soon be facing a reckoning for it.

The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

JPFO *always* appreciates good submissions and wants to put **your** content into the next edition of the

Bill of Rights Sentinel

If you have something to say related to the right to keep and bear arms, please feel free to submit your content to our editor. We read and consider every submission.

See Details Here→

WRITE FOR

The Bill of Rights Sentinel

Do you have something to say?

If you’re ready to shout at your TV, or tell paper pundits what you think and your thoughts make sense and you can back them up with real meaning—

The Sentinel can be your platform!

JPFO’s Guarantee: We listen. • Our Rules: Ask for our Writer’s Guidelines.

Your task: Do a good job. • Opportunity is knocking, answer the door.

editor@jpfo.org

marketing, projections, management bonuses, and other such important items.

But perhaps we've been too quick to judge. After all, most of you would have seen an "Active Shooter" video, training you how to deal with a crazed maniac with a firearm entering the workplace with murderous intent. Surely they must address self-defense at least in this situation. The absurdity of the scenarios they show are obvious to people who keep and bear arms but perhaps those making the videos hope to sell them as legitimate, as practical to those who don't know any better and who have already been brainwashed into thinking they should depend on others for their safety and well-being. In an effort to pass the buck, train you to pass the buck, and get you to depend on emergency response services, they demonstrate how to fend off the lunatic by showing several steps you can take. First, they say, try to leave the area. This is good advice. Next they say, if you can't leave, go into a confined space with no exit and turn off the lights and barricade yourself inside. This is part of the "hopefully method." Hopefully, a dark room will deter the criminal

from entering. Hopefully, a chair in front of the door will prevent the maniac from gaining access. But wait, they do address self-defense! They say, if you can't leave, can't hide, and can't keep the would-be murder out, then fight. Most of you reading this have likely already asked the very important question; fight with what? That's a valid question. Don't worry though, the suits thought of that too. They even thoughtfully demonstrate how you can fend off the person who has a semi-auto or automatic rifle with a chair or a book. And there it is. Their contempt for your lives is in plain view. They say fine, you can defend yourself in this situation but only if you're outmatched and only if you've lost at hide-and-seek. You're valuable to them, just not in the way you might think. You're valuable until bringing to work what you would need to defend your life becomes inconvenient, then you're expendable.

True company ethics begins with companies hiring people they trust. People with good character. Those they would trust to carry a firearm in the workplace responsibly. If a company cannot trust a person to be responsible with the tools to defend

their own life, then they shouldn't trust them at all. Ironically, they trust people with 40-ton missiles that go 60 mph on the freeway. They trust them with things like power tools, chemicals, electricity, explosives, medical instruments, heavy machinery and so on. All these things can be deadly and used for evil in the hands of someone willing. The difference between these things and firearms for self-defense is primarily optics and legality though there are still legal problems that arise for a company when one of their employees misuses the things listed. So, the real issue comes down to companies simply being unwilling to permit you to defend your own life because it would hurt the bottom line. Simply put, we're numbers on an actuary table—nothing more—and yet they have the audacity to lecture us on ethics.

"Gun Free Zones" have thus become hunting preserves for psychopathic murderers."

~ Massad Ayoob, Straight Talk on Armed Defense: What the Experts Want You to Know



JEWES FOR THE PRESERVATION OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

12500 N.E. Tenth Place • Bellevue, WA 98005 • jpfo.org • (800)869-1884 • info@jpfo.org

- Yes, I agree that Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership deserves the support of freedom-loving Americans who cherish their constitutional right to keep and bear arms. Enclosed is my check or credit-card contribution.
- Join or** **\$25 Annual** **\$40 Two Year** **\$55 Three Year** **\$500 Life**
- Renew** **\$30 1-Year Friend of JPFO** **\$360 Senior Life (over 65 years old)**
- I want to make automatic contributions of \$_____ per** **Month** **Quarter**
- Donate** **\$25** **\$50** **\$100** **\$250** **\$500** **\$_____ other**

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

JPFO is a 501(c)3 organization and donations are 100% deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes. See our website for merchandise and promo you get automatically when you join up with us!

Donate Online at jpfo.org

"We make other groups look like moderates."



Please be as generous as your means will allow.

Card Number _____ CVC code _____

Expiration Date _____ Phone Number _____

Name on Credit Card _____

Email Address _____

Cardholder's Signature _____

"You don't have to be Jewish to fight by our side. You just have to love liberty."