

undertaking exercises in the presence of the King.<sup>3</sup> A crowd of the general public was also watching. A firearm was discharged on the group of soldiers, and a Mr. Ongley of Chelsea, standing five or six yards from the King, was struck. No individual was identified, as the perpetrator fled. The reports concluded that the matter was accidental and was the consequence of the unintended discharge of the firearm.

The report, however, includes an account that when the King saw what had happened, he immediately rode up and ordered every assistance to be given to Mr. Ongley and to arrange for his wounds to be dressed and for him to be taken home.

We consider that the interest in this long-forgotten event from over 200 years ago is the insight that it provides into the relationship that the monarch enjoyed with his people and the responses of the public and the King to untoward events. The uncomplicated innocence of everything that happened shines through.

Finally, we can but speculate how major events of today and all that goes with them will be viewed in 2200.

Abraham L. Halpern, MD  
Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry  
New York Medical College  
Valhalla, NY

John A. Baird, MD  
Consultant Forensic Psychiatrist  
Leverndale Hospital  
Glasgow, Scotland, UK

## References

1. James DV, Mullen PE, Pathé MT, *et al*: Attacks on the British Royal Family: the role of psychotic illness. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 36:59–67, 2008
2. Glancy GD: Commentary: attacks on royalty—the more we know, the more we can classify. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 36: 68–73, 2008
3. Darby Mercury, May 22, 1800, p 1
4. Moran R: The origin of insanity as a special verdict: the trial for treason of James Hadfield (1800). *Law Soc Rev* 19:487–519, 1985
5. Anonymous: *Sketches in Bedlam*. London: Sherwood, Jones, & Co., 1823
6. Bethlem Royal Hospital Archives, Subcommittee Minutes, April 3, 1802; June 15, 1826. Case Book, December 1816
7. See, for example, Exeter Flying Post, May 22, 1800; Caledonian Mercury, May 22, 1800
8. Gazette of the United States, July 8, 1800, p 1
9. London Times, May 16, 1800, pp 1–2

Editor:

Should the second Amendment be interpreted by the Supreme Court as the free right to bear arms by all in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* (76 U.S.L.W. 4631 (2008)), this lenient gun legislation will have profound effects on mortality and morbidity. Stricter gun law legislation is associated with reduced rates of both suicides and homicides in Canada, Australia, and Austria.<sup>1–3</sup> Loftin *et al.*<sup>4</sup> showed that restrictions in gun access has led to declines in homicides and suicides, while Rosengart *et al.*<sup>5</sup> found that eliminating restrictions on carrying a concealed weapon has been associated with increased firearm homicide rates in the United States. Handgun purchase has been shown to be associated with increased risk of mortality for several years.<sup>6</sup>

Those with mental illness may be more adversely affected by relaxed gun law legislation. Suicide and homicide have low base rates of occurrence<sup>7</sup> compared with the prevalence of mental illness.<sup>8</sup> Individuals with mental disorders are as likely as those without to have access to carry or store a gun in an unsafe manner.<sup>9</sup> Threats made with guns and other weapons increase with the presence of mental illness.<sup>10</sup> At the same time, the rate of violent victimization has been found to outweigh the perpetration of violence.<sup>11</sup> The mentally ill will be negatively impacted by relaxed gun law legislation. Policymakers should be well informed of the wide-reaching implications of such changes.

Hygiea Casiano, BSc, MD  
Jitender Sareen, BSc, MD  
Department of Psychiatry  
University of Manitoba,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

## References

1. Bridges FS: Gun control law (Bill C-17), suicide, and homicide in Canada. *Psychol Rep* 94:819–26, 2004
2. Chapman S, Alpers P, Agho K, *et al*: Australia's 1996 gun law reforms: faster falls in firearm deaths, firearm suicides, and a decade without mass shootings. *Inj Prev* 12:365–72, 2006
3. Kapusta ND, Etzersdorfer E, Krall C, *et al*: Firearm legislation reform in the European Union: impact on firearm availability, firearm suicide and homicide rates in Austria. *Br J Psychiatry* 191:253–7, 2007
4. Loftin C, McDowall D, Wiersema B, *et al*: Effects of restrictive licensing of handguns on homicide and suicide in the District of Columbia. *N Engl J Med* 325:1615–20, 1991
5. Rosengart M, Cummings P, Nathens A, *et al*: An evaluation of state firearm regulations and homicide and suicide death rates. *Inj Prev* 11:77–83, 2005

6. Wintemute GJ, Parham CA, Beaumont JJ, *et al*: Mortality among recent purchasers of handguns. *N Engl J Med* 341:1583–9, 1999
7. Kessler RC, Chiu WT, Demler O, *et al*: Prevalence, severity, and comorbidity of 12-month DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 62:617–27, 2005
8. Borges G, Angst J, Nock MK, *et al*: A risk index for 12-month suicide attempts in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *Psychol Med* 36:1747–57, 2006
9. Ilgen MA, Zivin K, McCammon RJ, *et al*: Mental illness, previous suicidality, and access to guns in the United States. *Psychiatr Serv* 59:198–200, 2008
10. Casiano H, Belik SL, Cox BJ, *et al*: Mental disorder and threats made by noninstitutionalized people with weapons in the national comorbidity survey replication. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 96:437–45, 2008
11. Choe JY, Teplin LA, Abram KM: Perpetration of violence, violent victimization, and severe mental illness: balancing public health concerns. *Psychiatr Serv* 59:153–64, 2008

2. Weisleder P: Inconsistency among American states on the age at which minors can consent to substance abuse treatment. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 35:317–22, 2007

Editor:

In the last issue of the *Journal*, Dr. Victoria Dreisbach and I had the opportunity to advise readers of the use of the term “mental defective” by Congress and in the U.S. Code to refer to individuals who have experienced one of several mental health adjudications and are thereafter considered “denied persons” for the purpose of sale and possession of guns.<sup>1</sup> We noted that states are now required to submit data on such individuals to the National Instance Criminal Background Check System (NICS) managed by the FBI. We also noted that the FBI had expressed its willingness to cooperate with states to avoid the use of offensive language when referring to people with mental illness.

I write now to inform readers that the FBI has indeed followed through with that cooperation. The FBI intends to rewrite their coding manuals so that the code that states must use to enter data about individuals who have experienced the relevant mental health adjudications will no longer use the term “mental defective” as a descriptor, but will instead simply refer to “denied persons pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 922(d)(4)” or similar neutral language. Such a term will also be used by the FBI to make its mandated reports to the Attorney General and Congress.

What remains to be accomplished is for Congress to repeal the use of the offensive language in U.S. Code and the Code of Federal Regulations. Readers are encouraged to contact their Congressional representatives to express their opinions about this use of language. (Please see the previous letter to the editor for suggested changes.<sup>1</sup>)

American history has regrettably illustrated the common usage of many derogatory terms to refer to various groups of people in our country. Fortunately, such language is no longer tolerated in public discourse and certainly not in official acts and laws of our government. Most Americans would cringe at the sight or mention of such words in social exchange; such language is unimaginable in official government enactments and publications. It is time for “mental defective” to go the way of such words; our Congress should be ashamed of its

Editor:

With much interest, I read Mr. Sullivan’s enlightening and witty editorial<sup>1</sup> regarding my article published in the *Journal* last year.<sup>2</sup> His comments provide an authoritative insider’s appreciation of the crafting of legislation and help advance the discourse in this area of the law. Mr. Sullivan’s points are well taken: politics are messy, and they engender odd bedfellows. We have a lesser government than we deserve, and we ought to seize the opportunity to express our opinion. There is, however, one point I need to clarify. Mr. Sullivan indicated that in the article I stated that I was “surprised and not happily” about the way substance abuse treatment laws for adolescents have been crafted (Ref. 1, p 11). While learning details about the fashioning of said laws was eye-opening, I did not include in the paper the phrase Mr. Sullivan ascribes to me. Furthermore, I was neither amazed nor distressed by the data I obtained. As the number 1 cliché for 2004, according to *USA Today*, states: it is what it is! My findings simply provide further support to the quote attributed by some to Otto von Bismarck: Laws are like sausages—it is best not to see them being made.

Pedro Weisleder, MD, PhD  
 Nationwide Children’s Hospital and  
 The Ohio State University  
 Columbus, OH  
 pedro.weisleder@nationwidechildrens.org

#### References

1. Sullivan KB: A public policymaker’s response: Weisleder and Meyer on legislator decision-making. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 36:10–12, 2008