

42-1

# The New York Times

SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 2001

## Tracing Anti-Abortion Network To a Slaying Suspect in France

### Communications With Old Allies Offered Clues

By DAN BARRY

He was calling himself Clyde Swenson at the time. He was living in Jersey City and working in construction, occasionally flashing hints of his keen intelligence and religious fervor. Most mornings he attended 7 o'clock Mass before lugging an ammunition box filled with carpentry tools to the job site.

Then late one night in October 1998, in a suburb of Buffalo about 400 miles away, a bullet fired from a high-powered rifle pierced a kitchen window to kill Dr. Barnett A. Slepian, an obstetrician who performed abortions. Soon afterward, the man called Swenson vanished from Jersey City, leaving behind little more in his apartment than some trash from a Taco Bell and a calendar from a funeral home.

Federal agents spent the next two and a half years searching the world for him, convinced that he had pulled the trigger. To find him, about all they had to go on were his real name, James C. Kopp, and his ties to the country's loose-knit group of violent anti-abortion activists.

Several weeks ago, the agents learned that he was in Ireland, living under another alias and working sporadically as a clerk — for a time at a Dublin hospital where he adorned his desk with religious statuettes. But by the time the Irish authorities pinpointed his whereabouts, he had vanished again.

Then, on Thursday, French police officers descended upon a post office in Dinan, a town in Brittany, to arrest a gaunt, hollow-eyed man in a frayed sport shirt who had just picked up a package from New York that contained \$300. The man was Mr. Kopp.

"He did not look good," Christian Guillot, a manager at the post office, said, adding: "He would start out in French, then there would be a word of English, then Spanish. He was nice, but it was pretty hard to help him. We couldn't figure out what he was talking about."

The arrest of Mr. Kopp, 46, was made possible in large part by the communication he kept with those from his past: two anti-abortion activists in Brooklyn who were charged on Thursday with plotting to help Mr. Kopp slip back into the United States.

One is Dennis John Malvasi, 51, who was convicted in 1987 of bombing an abortion clinic in Manhattan and trying to bomb a second clinic in Queens. The other is Loretta Claire

Continued on Page B4

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, Dec. 26 — The National Cancer Institute, which used to say on its Web site that the best studies showed “no association between abortion and breast cancer,” now says the evidence is inconclusive.

A Web page of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention used to say studies showed that education about condom use did not lead to earlier or increased sexual activity. That statement, which contradicts the view of “abstinence only” advocates, is omitted from a revised version of the page.

Critics say those changes, far below the political radar screen, illustrate how the Bush administration can satisfy conservative constituents with relatively little exposure to the kind of attack that a legislative proposal or a White House statement would invite.

Bill Pierce, spokesman for the Department of Health and Human Services, scoffed at the idea that there was anything political about the changes, saying that they reflected only scientific judgments and that department headquarters had had nothing to do with them. “We simply looked at them, and they put them up,” he said of the agencies involved.

The new statements were posted in the last month, after news reports that the government had removed their predecessors from the Web. Those reports quoted administration officials as saying the earlier material had been removed so that it could be rewritten with newer scientific information. The latest statements are the revisions.

Those statements have drawn some criticism, as did the removal, though like the issue itself it has gone largely unnoticed. Fourteen House Democrats, including Henry A. Waxman of California, senior minority member of the House Government Reform Committee, have written to Tommy G. Thompson, secretary of health and human services, charging that the new versions “distort and suppress scientific information for ideological purposes.”

Gloria Feldt, president of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, said the new statement on abortion and breast cancer “simply doesn’t track the best available science.”

“Scientific and medical misinformation jeopardizes peoples’ lives,” Ms. Feldt said, adding that any suggestion of a connection between

---

## In this administration, critics say, politics trumps science.

---

abortion and cancer was “bogus.”

The earlier statement, which the National Cancer Institute removed from the Web in June after anti-abortion congressmen objected to it, noted that many studies had reached varying conclusions about a relation between abortion and breast cancer, but said “recent large studies” showed no connection. In particular, it approvingly cited a study of 1.5 million Danish women that was published in *The New England Journal of Medicine* in 1997. That study, the cancer institute said, found that “induced abortions have no overall effect on the risk of breast cancer.”

The Danish research, praised by the American Cancer Society as “the largest, and probably the most reliable, study of this topic,” is not mentioned in the government’s recent posting, which says the cancer institute will hold a conference next year to plan further research.

Dorie Hightower, a press officer at the cancer institute, attributed the revision to the institute’s periodic review of fact sheets “for accuracy and scientific relevance.” Asked whether the institute now thought that the Danish study failed on either count, Ms. Hightower said no. But she said there was no scientist available to explain the change.

As for the disease control centers’ fact sheet on condoms, the old version focused on the advantages of using them, while the new version puts more emphasis on the risk that such use may not prevent sexually transmitted diseases, and on the advantages of abstinence.

Posted on Dec. 2, the new version begins, in boldface: “The surest way to avoid transmission of sexually transmitted diseases is to abstain from sexual intercourse, or to be in a long-term mutually monogamous relationship with a partner who has been tested and you know is uninfected. For persons whose sexual behaviors place them at risk for S.T.D.’s, correct and consistent use of the male latex condom can reduce the risk of S.T.D. transmission. However, no protective method is 100 percent

THE NEW YORK TIMES NATIONAL FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 2002

U.S. Revises Sex Information, and a Fight Goes On

effective, and condom use cannot guarantee absolute protection against any S.T.D.”

A different Web page maintained by the centers, referring to studies of uninfected people at risk of H.I.V. because of sexual relationships with infected people, does say on the other hand, “The studies found that even with repeated sexual contact, 98-100 percent of those people who used latex condoms correctly and consistently did not become infected.”

But the recently revised page warns that evidence on condom use and other sexually transmitted diseases is inconclusive, though it says the uncertainty demonstrates that “more research is needed — not that latex condoms do not work.”

The new version also omits a passage on sex education and condom use that appeared in the earlier document. “Studies of specific sex education programs,” the earlier version said, “have shown that H.I.V. education and sex education that included condom information either had no effect upon the initiation of intercourse or resulted in delayed onset of intercourse.”

In an interview, Dr. David Flem-

ing, the disease control centers’ deputy director for science, defended the new version. “We try as hard as possible,” Dr. Fleming said, “to state objectively what is known about condom efficacy without nuancing language beyond what is supported by the science.”

He said that the document reflected consensus of the centers, the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health, and that none of its conclusions had been influenced by those agencies’ parent, the Department of Health and Human Services.

The letter to Secretary Thompson from House Democrats said that by alteration and deletion, the disease control agency “is now censoring the scientific information about condoms it makes available to the public” in order to suit abstinence-only advocates. And it said the breast cancer document amounted to nothing more than “the political creation of scientific uncertainty.”

“Information that used to be based on science,” the lawmakers said, “is being systematically removed from the public when it conflicts with the administration’s political agenda.”