

Re: Sun exposure = skin cancer? Not likely.

Re: Sun exposure = skin cancer? Not likely.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2007-07/msg00061.html>

- *From:* TC <tunderbar@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 10 Jul 2007 14:08:03 -0000
-

On Jul 9, 6:55 pm, Tim <T...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mon, 09 Jul 2007 11:44:41 -0700, TC <tunder...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

3) If sun exposure causes the damage that leads to skin cancer, why are skin cancers not predominantly on the face, the neck and/or the hands and forearms where one tends to get a lot of sun exposure whether you want it or not? Skin cancers are predominantly on the upper torso, on the back and on the chest, beneath where a typical short sleeve shirt would cover, where one would have to explicitly uncover oneself to get excessive sun exposure.

Sunburn is a bigger concern than simply tanning. Tanning at least gives the body the ability to adapt and protect itself. The upper torso is more likely to be burned as many have rarely ever seen sunlight.

What is the difference between sunburn and suntan? Not much. One is a slower "damage", one is a little faster "damage". Do either cause skin cancer? Doubt it.