



Mission

To restore and defend the right to keep and bear arms through on-target strategy, and to hold accountable all those who surrender that right through compromise.



WGO releases bold new "Tactical" decal. Put one on your vehicle. Scare liberals. And neo-cons.

It does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority keen to set brush fires in people's minds.

— Samuel Adams

Inside

- CCW: Another Sell-Out?
- WI Politicians Anti-Gun
- Open Carry Arrest
- Knox on Concealed Carry
- UN's Gun Ban Timeline
- CCW: Case Study Iowa

WI Concealed Carry: Is a Sell-Out in the Works?

Milwaukee bureaucrats propose gun control wishlist in exchange for a bad carry law

Milwaukee, Wis. — A recent editorial appearing in the Wisconsin Journal Sentinel (It's time to reconsider concealed carry law) ought to alarm gun owners. That's because it underscores a push to create tougher gun laws by using concealed carry as a carrot to lure in and dupe activists into complacency and surrender, say leaders of Wisconsin Gun Owners (WGO).

Continued Page 2



WGO ramps up pressure to introduce freedom-friendly concealed carry.

Wisconsin Politicians Admit to War on Gun Ownership

Both democrats and republicans race toward the same goal: To become rulers and regulators of your firearm freedom

Madison, Wis. — In a recent story appearing in Madison's Capital Times (*Ready, Set, Fire! Pols take on NRA*), State Senator Spencer Coggs (D-Milwaukee), revealed his true agenda when he admitted recent gun control bills introduced in the state are only the beginning.

But Coggs's statements revealed something even more chilling: State democrats don't believe gun owners can or will defend themselves against gun control advances, and more anti-gun legislation has been planned.

Continued Page 3



WGO staff members prepare concealed carry petitions — which flooded the office from all corners of the state — for deployment to Wisconsin legislators.

Concealed Carry

Continued from Page 1

“We’ve been warning gun owners to prepare for a tough fight on concealed carry, and to expect marginal state republicans to cave in to pressure from anti-gun bureaucrats,” said Corey Graff, executive director of WGO. “If liberals suddenly claim to support concealed carry in exchange for tougher gun laws you can bet gun owners stand more to lose than we do to gain. You know something’s amiss.”

Say No To Felony CCW

One of the bargaining chips up for grabs is to make carrying a concealed weapon a felony in Wisconsin, in exchange for passage of a permit bill. It is currently a misdemeanor.

Milwaukee District Attorney John Chisholm and Milwaukee Chief of Police Ed Flynn (Flynn no friend of the Second Amendment, someone who recently told his “troops” to throw gun owners found to be open carrying to the ground and ‘then decide what rights they have’) are proposing a comprehensive gun control package.

“We all should be willing to live

with concealed carry if it is part of comprehensive firearm reform and if prosecutors are given the ability to severely punish those illegally carrying guns,” opined the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. “In other words, the trade-off is worthy if also included are tools that, as Flynn describes it, make it just as dangerous for folks to carry illegal guns as they think it is to go without them.

“And getting caught with a concealed gun but without a permit should carry significant penalties.”

In other words: Those caught exercising their right to bear arms should face significant penalties, WGO pointed out.

WGO warned activists that such a package would be a step back not only in the proposed gun control package (including closing the so-called “gun show loophole”) but also on concealed carry.

“We want to move in the direction of more freedom for gun owners, not less,” said Graff. “Carrying concealed weapons in Wisconsin should not be a misdemeanor as it currently is, but it sure should not be upgraded to a felony.

“We should not allow unelected bureaucrats to herd us into a gun

control scheme. There is a right way and a wrong way to fight for concealed carry, and giving up more ground than you gain is most definitely the wrong way,” Graff said.

WGO also warned gun activists that preemptively surrendering is not a good way to negotiate and leaves them vulnerable to accept a restrictive piece of CCW legislation — such as forcing gun owners into a criminal database monitored by law enforcement.

“...[I]f concealed-carry legislation is crafted, it should be done with reasonable access for law enforcement to the database so they can know who’s carrying,” the Sentinel concluded.

Be ready: With bureaucrats leaking their intent to shove a fistful of new anti-gun regulations down our throats, and the institutional gun lobby proving itself willing to concede the concealed carry fight before it begins, gun activists need to be ready to demand both a good concealed carry package — and fight like hell to oppose more oppressive gun control as well. 

Yes! You CAN Get a Permit to Carry!

Earn a Utah CCW Permit Good for 30 States

A Note from Paul Horvick, Concealed Carry Instructor

The two most-often honored non-resident concealed carry permits are from Florida and Utah. And once you complete my 4-hour class, you can apply for a permit to carry a concealed handgun that is valid in 30 States.

Since Utah has no range requirement, the classes can be held anywhere there is space to meet. I do many classes in the Midwest and would love to come to your town! I am seeking “hosts” to help organize a class at your gun club or any place in your community.

Call me at 218-234-6001 today. Or e-mail paul@shootingsafely.com

TAKE ACTION: shootingsafely.com

Politicians War on Guns

Continued from Page 1

“When you look at the fact we are taking on the NRA and other pro-gun groups during a re-election year, we’re bucking the trend,” said Coggs, a sponsor of several gun control bills before the Wisconsin legislature. “I used to be surprised by the power of the pro-gun opposition, but not anymore.”

Wisconsin Gun Owners, Inc. (WGO) has been warning gun owners all session that two bills by Coggs — one a scheme to ban the private sales of handguns in the state, the other a ploy to impose “microstamp” technology on handgun makers — were only steps toward more draconian gun control.

According to the story, “...loopholes in the law, along with a surge in gun violence across the state, have prompted Milwaukee-based Democratic lawmakers and others across the state to take action.”

State Republicans Holding Hands with Democrats to Push Gun Control

The story continues, saying, “Coggs may not have that tough of a fight.

Rep. Scott Gunderson, R-Waterford, has already introduced a similar bill in the Assembly. Gunderson has sought to make straw purchasing a state felony for the past 10 years but with no luck.”

In their rush to fashion the chains that bind us, state republicans Alberta Darling and Scott “Gundy” Gunderson aren’t stopping there: They continue to push (in defiance of the wishes of gun owners) AB 70 and SB 44, two bills to expand the scope of the state-run National Instant Check System (NICS) by rolling in mental health data.

“No one wants the mentally-ill to buy guns,” said Corey Graff, Executive Director of Wisconsin Gun Owners (WGO). “The problem we have with expanding Sarah Brady’s background check system is that it will now be fueled with a database supplied by psychiatrists and psychologists and will act outside of any due process afforded to the accused. If an anti-gun psychiatrist says you’re mentally ill, you lose your guns.”

Gunderson’s trusty sidekick Mike Bruhn praised his boss’s anti-gun bills, saying, “He wants to make sure law-abiding citizens have the



State Rep. Scott Gunderson (R-Waterford) and NRA lobbyist Darren LaSorte snicker at gun owners during a public hearing on concealed carry. Photo by WGO.

opportunity for self-protection, but he also wants to make sure criminals cannot get their hands on guns.”

That sounds like the same message from anti-gunners, Graff pointed out.

Gun owners are urged to contact Gunderson at 608-266-3363 and tell him that his efforts to turn gun owners into a whole new class of criminals aren’t appreciated.

To check the status of AB 70 and SB 44, check out WGO’s Bill Watch page, and sign up for WGO’s e-mail newsletter for late-breaking gun rights alerts, by visiting wisconsin-gunowners.org.

Wisconsin Man Sues After Arrest for Open Carry

RACINE, Wis. — A Racine man arrested while openly carrying a holstered gun on his porch is suing the city and two police officers.

The Journal Times in Racine says Frank Hannan-Rock and a gun-rights group filed the federal lawsuit Friday.

The suit challenges Wisconsin’s Gun Free School Zone Act, which restricts gun possession within 1,000 feet of a school. The plaintiffs say the act covers so much territory that it’s too restrictive for gun owners.

He says police told him they have probable cause to arrest him in his home when he has a gun and refuses to identify himself because he lives within 1,000 feet of a school.

Source: ChicagoTribune.com



Watch online video (wisconsin-gunowners.org) of Sussex police confronting an open carry advocate eating in a restaurant. Full story spring 2010.

U.S. Agrees to Timetable for UN Gun Ban

WGO Joins National Association for Gun Rights in Nationwide Effort to Stop International Gun Confiscation Scheme

source: nationalgunrights.org



To sign the online petition against the UN Gun Ban "Small Arms Treaty," visit www.nationalgunrights.org

The United Nations and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton are moving forward with their plan to confiscate guns, say leaders with the National Association for Gun Rights (NAGR).

The United States joined 152 other countries in support of the Arms Trade Treaty Resolution, which establishes the dates for the 2012 UN conference intended to attack American sovereignty by stripping Americans of the right to keep and bear arms.

"...there's no doubt that the real agenda here is domestic firearms control."

— **Former United Nations Ambassador John Bolton**

Working groups of anti-gun countries will begin scripting language for the conference this year, creating a blueprint for other countries when they meet at the full conference.

The stakes couldn't be higher, NAGR said.

Former United Nations ambassador John Bolton has cautioned gun owners about the Arms Trade

Treaty and says the UN "is trying to act as though this is really just a treaty about international arms trade between nation states, but there's no doubt that the real agenda here is domestic firearms control."

Establishing the dates for the Arms Trade Treaty Conference is just the first step toward their plans for total gun confiscation.

Hillary Clinton is the key mover and shaker, expected to round up congressional support for the ban.

Once the UN Gun Ban is passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations it must be ratified by each nation, including the United States.

As an arch enemy of gun owners, Clinton has pledged to push the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty. She will push for passage of this outrageous treaty designed to register, ban and confiscate firearms owned by private citizens.

NAGR is urging gun owners to sign the online petition at nationalgunrights.org demanding U.S. Senators vote against ratification of the UN's "Small Arms Treaty."

So far, the gun-grabbers have successfully kept the exact wording of their new scheme under wraps.

But looking at similar schemes hatched in the past, gun owners get a good idea of what's likely in the works.

Don't let any of the "experts" lull you to sleep by saying "Oh, we have it handled" or "Until you know exactly what's in the treaty you can't fight against it."

Judging by Ambassador



Bolton's comments — who certainly knows what to expect from the American-freedom-hating international crowd that infests the U.N. — we are certain the treaty will seek to undermine the private ownership of firearms. 

Editor's Note: WGO members are urged to contact Wisconsin Senators Herb Kohl (202-224-5653) and Russ Feingold (202-224-5323), urging them to OPPOSE ratification of the UN Small Arms Treaty.

NRA Pushing Bad Bill in Iowa By Jeff Knox

It's been a long time since we have had serious issues with NRA actions, but their proposed concealed carry legislation for Iowa is simply bad and we're taking exception.



**** Update: A revised proposal from NRA has surfaced which is somewhat better than the proposal discussed in this article, but which still has some serious flaws. Changes will be noted parenthetically within the article at the applicable sections. ****

Last year two state organizations, Iowa Carry and Iowa Gun Owners, banged heads with competing legislation and competing strategies. Iowa Carry was backing a “shall issue” bill which included mandatory training requirements and several other concessions. Iowa Gun Owners was pushing an Alaska-style bill which removed restrictions on concealed carry and offered an optional permit system for the sake of reciprocity.

The Alaska bill had 25 cosponsors among the 100 members of the Iowa House and failed to pass by just one vote ending in a 49 – 49 tie in the final minutes of the legislative session. (Note: This was not a straight up or down vote, but a procedural vote on whether to suspend the rules to allow the Alaska-style bill language to be amended onto a must-pass bill. It

still demonstrates a surprising level of support.)

After such an impressive showing, one would expect advocates to unite around the Alaska-style bill for this legislative session with an eye towards either passing a very good bill, or forcing a clear record vote on such a bill and using that vote against opponents in the next General Election. Instead, after ignoring the state for decades, NRA has decided to ride their white horse into Iowa to save the day by amending the already weak Iowa Carry bill to make it not only weaker, but to actually include some provisions which are worse than existing law — snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

Under the NRA proposal, not only would anyone ever convicted of a felony or a violent misdemeanor be barred from concealed carry, anyone ever arrested on such a charge would be barred. The proposal also bars anyone with “a written finding by any agency of a state or the United States sustaining an allegation of abuse against another person,” leaving the door open for a ban on concealed carry for a parent who spansks their child or a person victimized by false accusations from a former spouse or intimate.

The NRA says that a “paper trail” demonstrating a history of violence or abuse is enough. A judge and jury — due process — are just superfluous. This portion is supposed to improve on the current law’s provision that bars a permit from anyone with a “history of violence.” The language about violent misdemeanors addresses this, but even that raises questions. Many people have been cited at some point for involvement in a fist-fight or some such petty up-scuttle. Is it reasonable to bar anyone so cited from the ability to defend themselves? (Note: This

provision was retained unchanged in the newer version of the proposal.)

NRA’s bill also makes going “armed with a firearm while under the influence of alcohol” an aggravated misdemeanor punishable by up to two years in prison. If legislators subsequently added just one day to the punishment guidelines for an aggravated misdemeanor, anyone convicted under this law would not only lose their right to carry, they would lose all of their gun rights for the rest of their lives. NRA claims that this provision fixes a problem with the existing law which bars “alcoholics” from receiving a permit to carry. Since the clinical definition of an alcoholic can include “recovering alcoholics” who haven’t had a drink in decades, simply barring alcoholics is a problem, but NRA’s solution creates a much worse problem. Anyone who enjoys an occasional beer and who regularly carries understands the catch-22 such a law can create — especially when “under the influence is left undefined.

The NRA “fix” also recreates the exact same problem it’s fixing by creating a blanket prohibition for anyone addicted to a controlled substance. Just as with alcohol, there are many people who no longer use drugs, but who stand up every week and say “Hi, I’m Dave and I’m an addict.” Some of these folks are police officers who would lose their jobs if such language was enforced. (Note: These provisions were tweaked in the newer proposal, downgrading the “possession under the influence” charge to a simple misdemeanor and making some exceptions for someone on their own property, but it remains a trip-wire for anyone who ever consumes alcohol. The issue of recovering addicts was not addressed.)

Continued Page 6

Iowa Bad Bill

Continued from Page 5

Rather than creating new regulations which could be used to harass and persecute gun owners, NRA should be looking for ways to make it easier and safer for responsible citizens to exercise their right to arms. The fact is that criminals and the dangerously irresponsible will carry and misuse guns regardless of what the law says so the first priority must always be protecting the rights of the responsible and law-abiding.

In what they claim is an effort to bring the Iowa Code into alignment with federal law and definitions, the NRA includes a long list of disqualifiers which echoes the federal “prohibited persons” language. If NRA wants harmony with federal law, why not simply state that no one prohibited from firearms possession under federal law may be issued a concealed weapons permit? That way, if federal law improves, Iowa law would be similarly improved. Restating federal law — and expanding upon its restrictions — is not in the best interest of Iowans. *(Note: Retained in the newer proposal.)*

Even though decades of data prove that mandatory training does nothing to reduce accidents, mistakes, or criminal activity among permit holders, the NRA bill retains the current Iowa training requirements with only minor modifications expanding the options for individuals and agencies offering the training. While professional training is absolutely a good idea,

government mandated training is an unwarranted attempt to legislate personal responsibility and should always be opposed. *(Note: This section was extensively rewritten in the newer proposal and now reflects a much less onerous training requirement. While we remain opposed to mandatory training, the newer language is an improvement.)*

“After such an impressive showing, one would expect advocates to unite around the Alaska-style bill for this legislative session with an eye towards either passing a very good bill, or forcing a clear record vote on such a bill and using that vote against opponents in the next General Election. Instead, after ignoring the state for decades, NRA has decided to ride their white horse into Iowa to save the day by amending the already weak Iowa Carry bill to make it not only weaker, but to actually include some provisions which are worse than existing law — snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.”

On another point NRA doesn’t just support the status quo, their bill takes

three steps backward. Current Iowa law states that any otherwise qualified person who has attained the age of 18 years is eligible for a concealed weapons permit, but NRA wants to exclude 18, 19, and 20-year olds and move the minimum age up to 21. No reason is given for this change, but it is likely to be a matter of reciprocity. Since many other states have a 21-year minimum standard, raising Iowa’s requirement to 21 increases the likelihood of other states recognizing Iowa permits. If the additional reciprocity is really that important, 18 to 21-year olds could be offered a “restricted permit” which was only valid in Iowa or other states which choose to recognize it. Simply cutting this group out of the process for no other demonstrable reason is just wrong. *(Note: This provision was retained in the newer proposal.)*

On the subject of reciprocity, the NRA bill sums it up in a single paragraph which limits the possibility of reciprocity to only those states whose restrictions “meet or exceed” the Iowa regulations. It goes on to give the Secretary of State full discretion on whether to then grant reciprocity to these states. While the NRA bill shifts Iowa’s permitting process from “may issue” to “shall issue,” when it comes to reciprocity, NRA says the Secretary of State “may” enter into such agreements. *(Note: This language was retained in the newer proposal.)*

Continued Next Page

WISCONSIN OPEN CARRY
ONLINE PETITION
 wisconsin-gunowners.org



Iowa Bad Bill

Continued from Page 6

Along with the “may issue” problem that this bill is supposed to fix, Iowa has a much larger problem which this bill completely ignores. Iowa law currently requires anyone wishing to acquire a handgun to first get an annual permit. The “Permit to Acquire a Revolver or Pistol” requires that applicants meet basically the same standards as those for a permit to carry a weapon and NRA makes most of the same tweaks to those definitions without making any effort to mitigate or repeal the permit to purchase provision. *(Note: This language, as well as the language pertaining to the NICS Improvement Act, remain unchanged in the newer proposal.)*

On top of everything else, the NRA bill adds a bunch of new language to bring Iowa into compliance with last year’s controversial “NICS Improvement Act.”

All in all, what the NRA is doing with this bill is taking Iowa’s complicated, convoluted, and misguided laws regarding the acquisition and carry of weapons, changing the word “may” to the word “shall” and making other tweaks and modifications, which, in the big picture, makes the laws more restrictive, intrusive, and unconstitutional than they already were

—and they’re doing so in total disregard for the desires of Iowa gun owners, the principles of the Second Amendment, and the proven safety records of many other states. They are also bringing this seriously flawed bill forward at a time when the Iowa legislature is primed to pass good, responsible, rights protecting legislation. By offering this bill, NRA is setting the bar so low that even their most ardent opponents can support it while their most ardent supporters are left wondering just what the hell is going on.

It is incomprehensible that Iowa’s atrocious laws were completely ignored by NRA while a prominent Iowa political figure, Kayne Robinson, served for years on the NRA Board of Directors including an unprecedented five years as First Vice-President and then two years as President of the NRA. That Iowa’s laws continued to be ignored even when a member of the legislature, Clel Baudler, was serving multiple terms as a member of the NRA board of directors and Robinson moved into the position of Executive Director of General Operations at NRA. Only now, after the grass roots of Iowa have finally awakened and started making effective strides toward reform of their laws, does NRA decide to put their formidable clout into the fight — not in support of the local grassroots, but in place of them. While NRA is working

with Iowa Carry in this effort, they are doing so as the lead dog, dictating terms and telling the locals what to do. The arrogance of this belated rescue effort might be excused if NRA were jumping in with a solid, principled bill, but there is simply no excuse for them swooping in with such a load of horse manure.

If this is the best NRA and their Legislative Liaison for Iowa, Chris Rager, can come up with, the Gun Voters of Iowa would do well to bluntly tell them to go rescue someone else.

(Note: Kayne Robinson has been on the opposite side of several internal NRA up scuttles with the Knoxes, but there is no personal animosity against him. I have met Clel Baudler and like him. Serving in the legislature is not easy and the job comes with a “Kick Me” sign. I’m sure Clel appreciates my position. Again, nothing personal. I don’t know Chris Rager, but I imagine we would have much in common. I think he’s off base in this case and I hope he will work with me or other “fundamentalists” to keep improving his proposal until it is something we can all get behind and support. — JK) 

Editor’s Note: This article reprinted with permission. For more information about Jeff Knox and the Firearms Coalition, visit www.firearmscoalition.com.



Be sure to share this story with anyone who wants to pass concealed carry in Wisconsin. And encourage them to join WGO in this fight! Sign up online at wisconsin-gunowners.org



Case Study Iowa: How Real Concealed Carry Almost Was

By Corey Graff, Executive Director

Wisconsin gun activists must learn from Iowa's fight for Real Concealed Carry

Our friends at Iowa Gun Owners (IGO) — our Hawkeye State equivalent — recently proved that change really does come from an irate minority. The fledgling organization did what the establishment said was impossible: They introduced an Alaska-style concealed carry bill ... and pulled off a tie vote in the assembly!

Now comes the clincher: Just as gun owners there were gearing up to pass the freedom-friendly bill through the state assembly, the effort was suddenly de-railed by establishment republicans ... and the institutional gun lobby.

It's true. Even the Knox Report (see page 5-7 this issue) decried the move as "an example of a typically arrogant NRA screw-up." First, let's back up and explain what we mean by "Alaska-style carry."

It's a Right, Not a Privilege

Shall-Issue concealed carry, the most common, typically involves a criminal background check, an application, a fee, a waiting period, training, and sometimes fingerprinting in order to earn one's permit to carry concealed weapons in that state.

The other model is known as Vermont- or Alaska-style concealed carry and simply removes any prohibition on carrying from the books. If you can legally own a gun, you can legally carry it. Since you don't need a permit to attend the church of your choice, or

exercise free speech, you shouldn't be forced to get one in order to bear arms — which is also an inalienable right. Our position has always been to fight for the best possible bill right out of the gate, and that usually means pursuing Vermont-style. Why surrender the fight before it's begun?

The Iowa debacle is of interest to us because we're always told something like, "Sure, we'd all like to see a Vermont-style carry law passed in Wisconsin, but that's not the political reality *here*. So we need to offer a *reasonable* bill."

By reasonable, they mean a well-crafted gun control package. The status quo is working very hard to fashion the chains that bind us; they enter the fight believing they will lose — so they graciously offer our enemies concessions, with the hope that they will be spared. It doesn't work. When sharks smell blood, they go for the kill.

But what we saw in Iowa proved WGO's position: That Alaska-style is not some pie-in-the-sky ideal that cannot be attained. It's the best possible way to negotiate from a position of power!

Iowa Real Carry Hi-Jacked

WGO upset the compromisers last session (and, I'm proud to say the session before that and the session before that), simply because we wanted to fight for concealed carry the smart way: by starting off with the best possible bill. We were told time and again that a Vermont-style bill wasn't within the pale of political reality. We responded by pointing out that if pro-gunners start off with a compromised bill, it will only get worse over time, and eventually nothing will pass. But don't take my word for it.

I asked Jeff Knox, of the Firearms

Coalition, if I could reprint his comments, because what he told me was spot-on. "I'm very frustrated with NRA's actions in this case and they are symptomatic of a much greater problem within the organization," Knox said. "I fully expect the people of Iowa to get no concealed carry reform — or just token reform — and still have no clear enemies upon whom to vent their wrath in the voting booth come November because many of the most anti-gun members of the house and senate will be sporting 'A' ratings from NRA for 'trying' to get NRA's bill passed."

Now, before you fire off an angry letter at me for "NRA bashing" let's get one thing clear: Jeff Knox is no NRA-basher. In fact, he's objective and well-respected in the firearms industry. Bottom line: what the institutional gun lobby did in Iowa — and what they'll do here in Wisconsin if we're not vigilant — was to impose their position of compromise upon a situation that did not warrant it.

"...[T]hey never did waiver in their commitment to do things their way — to hell with everyone else," said Knox. "While the situation has changed since that was written, the lesson remains."

Just a question: Do you suppose Real Carry would have passed the Iowa legislature with room to spare had the NRA lent its support — rather than selfish opposition — to the bill? 

Bullet Points

Published by
Wisconsin Gun Owners, Inc.
PO Box 329
Waupaca, WI 54981
tel 888.202.1645
fax 866.208.1346
www.wisconsin-gunowners.org

Wisconsin Gun Owners, Inc. is a non-profit, 501(c)(4) tax exempt organization and is a registered lobbying principle with the Wisconsin Ethics Board.