

The letter writers of *“Recent DI Advertising Supplement Strikingly Inaccurate”* defend their statement “an abortion does not increase the risk of breast cancer” by citing an American Cancer Society (ACS) page where the U.S. National Cancer Institute’s (NCI) 2003 workshop and three studies (Danish, Harvard, and California Teachers) all claim to refute the abortion-breast cancer (ABC) link.

If they’d viewed the NCI’s online [Videocast](#) they would see that workshop leaders didn’t permit an examination of 26 studies supporting an ABC link. They only considered a handful of studies against it. See [Commentary on NCI 2003 Workshop](#). If they’d read the (NCI) workshop statement, they’d realize the NCI acknowledged one of three ways abortion raises risk - by delaying first full term pregnancy (FFTP). The scientific community widely accepts the conclusions of World Health Organization research that an FFTP at age 35 triples breast cancer risk compared to an FFTP at age 17. Every one year delay of FFTP increases risk 3.5%. Therefore the NCI’s conclusion denying an ABC link is contradictory.

Recent stem cell research has shown that breast cells are not cancer-resistant until they lactate. The *Linacre Quarterly*, reported this (9/09) in the article, **Normal Breast Physiology**, further explaining that between puberty and FFTP nearly all breast lobules are Type 1 and 2 which is where at least 95% of all breast cancers originate. Only FFTP matures 85% of lobules into cancer-resistant lobules. I should mention here that the ACS was asked in September of this year if their medical advisors would review this article for inaccuracies concerning the physiology presented. Curiously, they declined.

The studies cited on the ACS page are three of at least 10 studies repeatedly cited as proof of no ABC link. The ACS does not reveal, however, that these studies excluded the effect of delayed FFTP and only examined a second risk - whether abortion leaves breasts with more places for cancers to start (estrogen related breast growth). Furthermore, experts have identified astonishing methodological flaws invalidating the conclusions in these studies. Dr. Joel Brind’s critique of these studies is available in the following medical journals: *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, 12/05 and 6/07; *International Journal of Cancer*, 2/08; *Contraception*, 3/09. No scientist has refuted Brind’s conclusions. Some examples of these flaws include:

Danish study:

- Misclassified 60,000 women as having NOT had abortions when records indicated they did.
- Used 1973 instead of 1939 as the year abortion was legalized in Denmark.
- Scientists violated the rule of temporality, tracking abortions from a different point in time than the tracking of breast cancer cases.

Harvard study:

- Researchers did not allow sufficient follow-up time between exposure to abortion and development of breast cancer.

- Excluded cases of in situ breast cancer, which show up sooner than do cases of invasive breast cancer.
- Did not adjust for miscarriages, having the effect of lowering risk, statistically.

California Teachers study

- Nearly one in five women with breast cancer in the study were counted as not having breast cancer.
- Did not compare pregnant women who aborted to pregnant women who carried pregnancies to term. Because of the permanent changes in the breast from pregnancy, pregnant women who abort should be compared to pregnant women who give birth after a full term pregnancy.

The American Cancer Society is part of a larger community of breast cancer researchers/fundraisers that mislead, deceive, or ignore evidence regarding the ABC link. Therefore, to understand the whole story one must look further than the ACS or the NCI for information on the ABC link. A good place to start would be the **Coalition on Abortion/Breast Cancer**.

Rebecca Curtis
Desert Hills, Arizona