

Sunday, Jun 06 2010

Perhaps Derrick Bird's deadly rampages aren't so 'inexplicable' after all

By [Peter Hitchens](#)

Last updated at 9:13 PM on 5th June 2010

Yet another gun massacre is followed by yet another typhoon of psychobabble, sentiment and bogus declarations that 'this must never happen again', when everyone knows that it will.

It's difficult to argue for tighter gun laws, since they're already so tight, though I'm sure the authorities will think of something suitably irrelevant and futile, as they did after Hungerford and Dunblane.

They are determined to make sure nobody in this country is armed, apart from criminals and terrorists, the invariable effect of 'tough' gun laws that trouble only the law-abiding and have no impact on illegally held weapons at all.



Massacre: Now police need to establish if Derrick Bird was on anti-depressants

The truth is that until 1920, Britain's gun laws were so relaxed they made Texas look effeminate, but we had virtually no gun crime. That only really began to increase here after we abolished hanging.

But that truth doesn't fit the Leftist dogma which has everyone, including the Tories, the media and the police, in its grip, so the facts will be ignored.

What can we learn from the Cumberland murders? Well, first of all that the police are no use to anyone once a crime has been committed. They never were and they never will be, except if they can do first aid.

It's such a pity they've forgotten their job is to prevent crime rather than hold verbose Press conferences afterwards and festoon the countryside with silly scene-of-crime tape copied from American TV shows.

It's possible an old-fashioned village constable, on the spot, might have done something to halt Derrick Bird, or have realised something bad was going to happen before it did.

It's certain that the modern fire-brigade approach to policing with its sirens, helicopters, computers and flash cars was no use.

But I'd also like to urge another line of investigation.

Was Bird taking the anti-depressant pills that are now prescribed so readily by NHS doctors to so many people whose lives – like Bird's – have gone down the drain?

Look carefully at the reports of many of the big US shootings – for example Eric Harris at Columbine in 1999 – and you will find that the shooter is described as having been 'depressed' and 'on medication'.

Here is a partial list of other incidents (there are several more, including some where it is likely, but not proven, anti-depressants were involved) which must surely suggest that this possible link badly needs investigating.

Patrick Purdy, culprit of the 1989 Cleveland School massacre in Stockton, California, had been on anti-depressants. Jeff Weise, perpetrator of the March 2005 Red Lake High School massacre, was on anti-depressants.

Anti-depressants were found in the cabin of the 'Unabomber' Ted Kaczynski. Michael McDermott, culprit of the 2000 'Wakefield massacre' in Massachusetts, was on anti-depressants.

Kip Kinkel, culprit of a 1998 murder spree in Oregon, was on anti-depressants.
John Hinckley, who tried to kill Ronald Reagan in 1981, was on anti-depressants.

It is both interesting and worrying that, with so many such unhinged and otherwise inexplicable killings perpetrated by people taking legal medication, the official world has been so slow to look into the matter.

It's so much easier to pass a pointless, populist gun ban.
