

Cancer industry total fraud exposed: Nearly all 'scientific' studies fail to be replicated

Recent article from NaturalNews.com

By, by Jonathan Benson, staff writer - Link [here](#) for original post.

(NaturalNews) The vast majority of so-called scientific studies focused on cancer research are inaccurate and potentially fraudulent, suggests a new review published in the journal *Nature*. A shocking 88 percent of 53 "landmark" studies on cancer that have been published in reputable journals over the years cannot be reproduced, according to the review, which means that their conclusions are patently false.

C. Glenn Begley, a former head of global cancer research at drug giant Amgen and author of the review, was unable to replicate the findings of 47 of the 53 studies he examined. It appears as though researchers are simply **fabricating findings** that will garner attention and headlines rather than publishing what they actually discover, which helps them to maintain a steady stream of grant funding but deceives the public.

"These are the studies the pharmaceutical industry relies on to identify new targets for drug development," said Begley about the false studies. "But if you're going to place a \$1 million or \$2 million or \$5 million bet on an observation, you need to be sure it's true. As we tried to reproduce these papers we became convinced you can't take anything at face value."

Begley says he cannot publish the names of the studies whose findings are false. But since it is now apparent that the vast majority of them are invalid, it only follows that the vast majority of modern approaches to cancer treatment are also invalid.

Back in 2009, researchers from the *University of Michigan's Comprehensive Cancer Center* also published an analysis that revealed many popular cancer [studies](#) to be false. As can be expected, one of the primary causes of false results was determined to be conflicts of interest that tended to favor "findings" that worked out best for drug companies rather than for the people (http://www.naturalnews.com/026314_cancer_research_studies.html).

Published research for other conditions also found to be invalid

The *Nature* study also confirms what was previously uncovered by Dr. George Robertson from *Dalhousie University*, who found the same inconsistencies in published research studies on Parkinson's disease and other neurodegenerative disorders. Just like with [cancer](#), it appears that the foundation upon which drugs for these conditions have been developed is fallacious as a result of phony research.

And scientists working for drug giant *Bayer* have run into similar problems in other areas as well, which they outlined in a 2011 paper entitled *Believe it or not*. According to their findings, much of the published data with which they were expected to develop new drugs could not be reproduced, either.

"The scientific community assumes that the claims in a preclinical study can be taken at face value," add Begley and his colleague Dr. Lee Ellis in their review. This published [research](#) also assumes that "the main message of [papers] can be relied on [...]" Unfortunately, this is not always the case."

Ironically, the only thing all these scientists have been able to successfully reproduce over the years is research showing that much of modern science is unsound. Whether it is funded by drug companies or by agenda-driven federal grants, the so-called "gold standard" of science has been debunked as a greed-driven myth.