

How Many Guns Are Too Many?

by Mac Slavo

After responding to a burglary call at a Rockford, Illinois home, police failed to apprehend the thief but found something that is perhaps much more interesting. WTVO reports that upon entering the home of an unnamed 67 year old resident they were surprised to find a weapons cache of over 300 weapons ranging from shotguns to rifles.

The homeowner, a registered firearm owner, was out of town at the time of the burglary. According to police, the weapons were taken for safe-keeping. The guns will be cross-checked against police databases to ensure they have not been used for criminal activity.

While it's probably a good idea to take the weapons for safekeeping, considering that the house was broken into and the homeowner was out of town; what's equally as interesting is the reaction of the neighbors:

"It's just un-real to see this many guns involved a regular residential neighborhood," says concerned resident McArthur Tennin.

Coley Woods lives across the street from the home. He says, "I'm thinking it's an accident or something, but I look over and I see them with all them rifles."

Woods' says, "Even if he's a registered gun owner or not, that just seems like its too many rifles."

This brings to the forefront the question of how many guns are too many?

Three hundred may seem like quite a large number to the average, non-gun collecting American. But the homeowner in this particular case is 67 years old, suggesting he may have been a collector of fine weaponry for several decades. Considering this, it is not out of the question for a retiree to amass a large gun collection.

Hopefully the homeowner will have his guns returned when he gets back to town, but he'll most certainly have a lot of questions to answer at the local police station.

A recent Austin, Texas search warrant executed against a resident who had been involved in digging an underground bunker, yielded a variety of self defense armaments, including large amounts of ammunition and 19 weapons, as well as compressed gas tanks used for welding.

The neighbors in this case, also, responded with fear:

"It's scary to know that he had all that down there. What if something had exploded," Landon said.

Another example of police seizing weapons for "safe keeping," was recently reported in Anatomy of a Police State Setup and Coverup, where police arrived at the home of a San Luis Obispo, California resident, who was legally target shooting on his land. After executing an illegal search warrant, police found a safe containing several weapons and subsequently-seized those weapons for safe keeping. The justification for the search and seizure was that the homeowner negligently-discharged his firearm, something he had done for years without issue.

It seems that anytime law enforcement enters a home, be it legally or illegally, and a weapons cache is found, anything more than perhaps a handgun and a rifle rings the alarm, resulting in a painstaking process for the gun owner if they ever want to retrieve the weapons.

Since the second amendment of the Constitution makes no specific reference to the number of arms an individual can store for personal defense, there should be no question as to how many weapons one can personally-own and keep at home. Has law enforcement and

the citizenry come up with an imaginary and arbitrary number that's safe for everyone? Perhaps one gun per household, or maybe a bit more leniency and we can make it one gun per resident of the home?

Where should we draw the line?

Maybe the best thing to do is to first determine if the individual in question has or had ill intentions with the weapons, before we use the media to spread fear about extremist, right-wing pistol packers.

One thing's for sure, however. Because of failures by our federal policing agencies to stop the flow of illegal aliens through our southern border; namely those related to drug smuggling and violence, ranchers in states like Texas and Arizona should probably be heavily-armed, lest they end up either stabbed to death or have their land taken over by paramilitary drug organizations. If those living in violence prone areas ever need to call upon neighbors or local militia to assist with defending their land against would-be drug smugglers, kidnappers and thieves, it's better that they be armed to the teeth with 300 shotguns and rifles than sling shots and BB guns.

— Editorial Addition —

The preceding article is really nothing new. For the past 5 decades, forward thinking Americans have stood in contrast to the typical "bunny hunter" and the cowardly NRA, who were for "sporting use" of firearms only!

As the availability of legal, semi-auto versions of many military-styled weapons became available, a viable market was found.

Since many of these new weapons were black in color and had high capacity magazines, the news media were

quick to attach the label “assault weapons” to the entire category.

It was now easy to separate the bunny hunters from the “wicked weapon” owners. “Who needs all that firepower to hunt,” was their battle cry! When any of the milk-toast crowd saw a neighbor with “assault weapons” or any large amount of ammunition, all the alarm bells in their peanut brain sounded!

To fully understand their mental processes, one must look at the situation from their point of view. If you grew up in the mid-west as I did, you realized that the typical person had only a few guns, usually a .22 rifle and a shotgun of either .410, 20, 16 or 12 gauge. If you lived where deer were present, then you might own a “deer rifle” of one of the more popular center fire variety — usually .30-.30.

Your ammunition supply consisted of only a box or two of the calibers you owned. Why own more? Buy a box when needed.

Firearms were considered the same as tools to a farmer — no affection for the product it’s self.

If such a person was a visitor in your home and happened to see your “collection” and ammunition stock of several thousand rounds for each weapon, you immediately became some kind of a “gun-nut” in his mind. Conditioned by the liberal media, he probably considered you a member of some right-wing militia or, today, maybe even a terriost group.

There was about a 50-50 chance of being turned in to “authorities” by this well-meaning citizen!

Even 50 years ago, the sage advice was to keep your collection away from prying eyes. Today, it is even more imperative that no one should know of any “collection” you might have that would be considered different than any dumb neighbor or friend.

It goes without saying that your “collection” should be housed in both fireproof and kid-proof storage, such as

well-made gun vault. Again, this vault shouldn’t be in plain sight.

It is interesting to note that in one case, the police removed the weapons from the owners vault and took them for “safe-keeping.” Your chances of getting your entire “legal” collection back from such “police” action is about the same as winning the power ball lottery!

In our present world situation, any large quantity of guns will attract attention. This is in spite of the many reasons for owning such a collection. With our economic condition as it is, having your money invested in guns is certainly better than any conventional bank type commodity, maybe even gold.

In this article, we are focusing only on the mere ownership of a large number of firearms, without addressing the intended purpose for such a collection. In future articles, we hope to address the para-military uses and the weapons of choice.

