

## 2. HELP's World Bank Agendas for Parents and Children

- **Data Collection**
- **Tax-funded Advocacy and Lobbying**
- **Parents as Employees and Consumers**

### Child development becoming industrialized

In a 2005 speech to the World Bank, Coffey praises Mustard and sets out the World Bank agenda:

... early child development is gradually becoming an industry worthy of investment [....] investments in child care as an industry that produces jobs and stimulates the economy.

**"In essence, early child development is gradually becoming an industry worthy of investment and important to economic growth.** 'It has fostered new relationships with business, government and economic development experts. It has the potential to spawn new approaches to data collection, planning, professional development, management, finance, government policy, and advocacy.'"

"Some of you may be familiar with the "trillium flower with three petals, that's used by Cornell University's Linking Economic Development and Child Care Project to reflect the three ways the research community has demonstrated the economic importance of early care and education. Together the three petals capture the short and long-term economic contributions made by early childhood services. One petal represents Children and the investments in human development and education. Another represents the Regional Economy, **investments in child care as an industry that produces jobs and stimulates the economy. The third petal represents Parents and the economic contributions they make to the economy, as employees and consumers.**"

[emph. added]

See Coffey's speech at World Bank:

<http://www1.worldbank.org/hdnetwork/External/cy/ccoffey.htm>

### Newly-“spawned” approaches to data collection

In his World Bank speech Coffey says “**spawn[ing] new approaches to data collection**” is part of the “**business imperative**” of the “industry” of early child development.

In Hertzman's re-built village it's not that irritating fact of life in small communities, that every one knows everything about everyone else—it's that Big Brother knows everything about everybody.

Mustard's statement that “**17% of parents are godawful**” is another example of this imaginative use of numbers in child policy propaganda.

HELP is leading the Bank's “new approach” data collection—or data mining—in Canada. HELP's supposedly academic research acts as a cover for its ideology-based policy agenda. Numbers must be generated to give an air of credibility. Referring to HELP's data collection efforts in BC, Mustard told a Senate committee, “**Remember: No data, no problem, no policy.**”

[http://www.parl.gc.ca/39/2/parlbus/commbus/senate/Com-e/soci-e/45189-e.htm?Language=E&Parl=39&Ses=2&comm\\_id=47](http://www.parl.gc.ca/39/2/parlbus/commbus/senate/Com-e/soci-e/45189-e.htm?Language=E&Parl=39&Ses=2&comm_id=47)

The World Bank's Hertzman heads the evaluation and data collection for BC's Strong Start fledgling in-school pre-school system. World Bank writer, Judith Evans, is also on the “research team” (see above). Strong Start is a drop-in for children ages 0-5 with their parents located in “under-utilized school space.”

[http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early\\_learning/strongstart\\_bc/guidelines.htm](http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early_learning/strongstart_bc/guidelines.htm)

### New legislation makes pre-school a data mining opportunity

In BC, Strong Start is a new parent-child in-school drop-in program for ages 0-5 filling “underutilized school space.” Though it is a casual drop-in program, children must register and be assigned a Personal Education Number [PEN] to participate. Registration requires giving a personal medical number, address, documentation, etc.

[http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early\\_learning/pdfs/registration\\_form\\_pen.pdf](http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early_learning/pdfs/registration_form_pen.pdf)

PEN legislation was altered in July 2007 to allow assigning PENs to children under age 5. The government website says, “this personal education number forms the basis of the student’s educational record, from kindergarten to graduation, and on to post secondary programs.” “With the new legislation, **information may now be collected about children participating in StrongStart BC centres.**”

[http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early\\_learning/strongstart\\_bc/qa\\_pen\\_reporting.htm](http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/early_learning/strongstart_bc/qa_pen_reporting.htm)

### Sperm to worm Personal data-linking underway

In HELP’s data collection mega-project, databases with the personal records “**for all children in British Columbia**” “from conception to high school leaving” and even “**from pre-conception to young adulthood**” and beyond are “linked.”

HELP is gathering and linking highly personal “person specific” data including records from: schools, medical insurance, drug prescriptions, hospitals, census, birth, death, and mental health. The EDI (see below) kindergarten questionnaire is also “linked”:

[http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/CYDTRU/developmental\\_research.htm](http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/CYDTRU/developmental_research.htm)

[http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/HELP\\_Crosswalk\\_Update\\_07-26-04.doc](http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/HELP_Crosswalk_Update_07-26-04.doc)

### Who needs informed consent?

All this is done without the knowledge or informed consent of the public or of the individual children and parents, or even the kindergarten teachers involved.

Hertzman and two other HELP people write in a Statistics Canada report **they want tax records included in the data “linkages.”**

<http://www.statcan.ca/english/research/11F0019MIE/11F0019MIE2006284.pdf>

p.19What’s next – banking, credit cards, internet records? Does the public want this?

### The EDI = a propaganda instrument

### Non peer-reviewed data to support wobbly contentions

In HELP’s data collection mega-project, databases for “all BC children from conception to high school leaving” and beyond are “linked.”

HELP creates volumes of elaborately colour-coded, non-peer-reviewed data to support its agendas. For example, the oft-cited meaningless factoid that 25% of children are “vulnerable” or “at risk” in kindergarten is HELP’s creation based on the Early Development Instrument (EDI).

<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/30891.html>

The EDI is a policy propaganda tool and not the rigorous scientific measurement “instrument” it is promoted as. Statements about children’s development based on the EDI lack any objective meaning: the EDI’s creators simply “**recommend that percent of children deemed as ‘not ready to learn’ is the percent of children who score in the lowest 10<sup>th</sup> percentile on one or more scales.**”

<http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/guidelines.html>

The questions do not even ask teachers if a child is “**not ready to learn**” – a bizarre concept especially given the developers’ statement, “**We know that children are born ready to learn.**”

[http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI\\_factsheet.html](http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI_factsheet.html)

Just being late or absent or sick “more than once” lowers a child’s score.

[http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI\\_viewonly.html](http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI_viewonly.html)

And it is not clear how questions about attending Sunday school, Hebrew school or licensed daycare are factored in.

[http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/files/2005.EDI.ENG.Guide.pdf\\_p15](http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/files/2005.EDI.ENG.Guide.pdf_p15)

It is also a large leap of logic to conclude that more school would fix the “problem” if it did exist. It is also a large leap of logic to conclude that more school would fix the subtle “readiness” “problem” if it does exist. The EDI lacks diagnostic validity: the developers state that, “one cannot use the EDI questionnaire to indicate that a child has a learning disability.” The “Validation of the EDI” website is empty.

[http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI\\_validation.html](http://www.offordcentre.com/readiness/EDI_validation.html)

Yet despite the lack of validity, Mustard is using this propaganda instrument to claim that, “Mexican children in poorer areas of Monterrey are further ahead in kindergarten than the average

It is also a large leap of logic to conclude that more school would fix the “problem” if it did exist.

Canadian kid” (*Toronto Star*, July 29, 2008,. pg. A-4) in order to coerce us into major policy changes here.

Charles Coffey’s World Bank speech stated that early child development would **“spawn new approaches to... government policy, and advocacy.”**

These new approaches to changing government policy eschew old-style voting, volunteering, public debate, door-knocking, bake-sale fundraisers, peer-reviewed academic journals, church basements, posters, street demonstrations, etc.

Instead, the nouveau advocates enjoy well-paid tax-funded jobs pushing their agendas and promoting each other. It’s not called “lobbying,” it’s called KT: “Knowledge Translation.”

Health research money from the federal government’s Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) helped Hertzman establish and maintain HELP. Hertzman is on the Advisory Board of the CIHR. Hertzman and other HELP personnel receive CIHR grants.

<http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/ClydeHertzman.htm>

### **Taxpayer funded free drinks and appies at “community mobilizing” events**

HELP does lobbying and KT by presenting complicated-looking PowerPoint® “mappings” of its colour-coded kindergarten questionnaire and other findings at events around BC, often at hotels and usually involving a free meal (or at least with “Host bar and hot and cold canapés”), drumming up support for HELP’s agendas. It calls this “community mobilizing.”

[http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/mapping/mapping\\_commmob.htm](http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/mapping/mapping_commmob.htm)  
[http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/mobilization\\_aug25.pdf](http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/mobilization_aug25.pdf)

This 100% tax-funded KT- lobbying process is a CIHR priority, and has itself been the subject of CIHR tax-funded, supposedly scholarly

“Host bars and hot and cold canapés:

The nouveau advocates enjoy well-paid tax-funded jobs pushing their agendas and promoting each other.

research by a HELP acolyte. She enthusiastically reports to the CIHR:

“There was unanimity on the part of those who attended the community reporting presentations that **the personal presence of Dr. Hertzman had a pivotal effect**. Dr. Hertzman and HELP staff personally visited all regions and most communities in B.C., initially **to persuade** teachers, school administrators and community representatives about the importance of the [EDI] initiative, and then returning to present and explain the project results.”

<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/30742.html>

Hertzman’s biography describes his and Mustard’s key role in the World Bank’s battle for bureaucrats’ ‘hearts and minds’: the redefining, spin and strategy needed to advance the World Bank agenda for children. It states:

“Dr. Hertzman’s early research with [Mustard’s] CIAR has been fundamental to the development of the early child development strategy for Canada. Through his work with CIAR, **Dr. Hertzman played a central role in developing the conceptual framework for the determinants of health as well as elucidating the special role of early childhood development as a determinant of health.**”

<http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/ClydeHertzman.htm>

... public  
‘healthcare’  
dollars have  
supported  
HELP’s  
daycare  
advocacy  
/lobbying  
endeavours.

**Health = child care = use health research tax dollars to promote all-day institutional childcare**

Redefining the social determinants of health to include child care gave Hertzman access to dollars intended for health research. Thus public ‘healthcare’ dollars have supported HELP’s daycare advocacy/lobbying endeavours.

Abandoning any attempt at scholarly standards expected of academics, a HELP staff gushingly praises HELP and the CIHR on the CIHR website regarding a CIHR event featuring HELP's Hertzman:

“The format was excellent - e.g. reception before & time after the meeting - and very conducive to networking and getting to meet others interested in the field. I also wanted to mention that the community stakeholders [usually means daycare lobbyist—ed.], several of whom were there, were very pleased to be invited to this event.

“Clyde [Hertzman] quickly captivated the audience's attention by delivering a highly informative and **motivating presentation**, entitled *'Is the CIHR Paradigm Broad Enough? The Case of Early Child Development as a Determinant of Health.'* He illustrated the issues and challenges associated with making progress on the early life contribution to health across the lifecourse. It showed the need for brand new skill sets... which are expected to challenge even the **broadened paradigm** of the CIHR.”

<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/12229.html>

### Research—but only if it can make money?

CIHR only funds research that has “commercial potential”.

<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/30924.html>

Critics of P3 endeavours say working too closely with business compromises the objectivity of scientific research, restricts research to what corporations can profit from, and acts as a form of ‘corporate welfare’

It does public-private P3 partnerships with pharmaceutical and other corporations.

[http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/decision\\_media/pre2003/200107dop.pdf](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/decision_media/pre2003/200107dop.pdf)

CIHR only  
funds research  
that has  
“commercial  
potential.”

Examples of the corporate connections abound. It has a former Nestlé staff from Kraft on its nutrition advisory board, Richard Black. <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/35152.html>  
Nestle is infamous for paying for false research, and for marketing infant formula in ways that have resulted in the deaths of thousands of infants and in violation of the World Health Organization code.

The CIHR recently published a paper by a Nestlé consultant, Michael Kramer.

<http://content.karger.com/ProdukteDB/produkte.asp?Aktion=ShowPDF&ProduktNr=230420&ArtikelNr=82590&filename=.pdf> p V

supposedly concluding (falsely) that, “Breastfeeding does not protect children against developing asthma or allergies.”

<http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/82219.php>

Through the power of KT, within six months of publication this false finding was reported by community nurses to BC mums of newborns (including this writer), thus undermining support for breastfeeding.

The CIHR’s “commercialization” agenda is in line with the “business imperative” of the World Bank and in line with the interests of the private sector Hertzman wants in partnership with the public sector. Hertzman sits on the CIHR Advisory Board. He and other HELP people receive CIHR funding.

Under this ever-expanding notion of ‘health,’ the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research is also concerned with commercial potential and is largely funded by the BC government. It funds HELP, including its data collection project (above).

<http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/CYDTRU/index.html>

### Parents as employees and consumers

In his World Bank speech (link above), Coffey emphasizes the role of **parents as “employees and consumers”** rather than as child-rearers.

HELP  
vigorously  
opposes funding  
going to parents  
directly.

HELP advances this agenda by emphasizing cheap daycare as necessary for the participation of parents - especially mothers - in the labour force.

This explains why HELP vigorously opposes funding going to parents directly: financing parents directly would reduce pressure on parents to spend time as employees at jobs away from their children.

For example, HELP's Hillel Goelman writes, "**Funding parents directly does nothing to create a space for every child who needs one in an early childhood setting.**" (Article in the *Vancouver Sun*, Sept., 2007).

<http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/documents/2007/HG%20Van%20Sun%20PreK%20Proposal%20Sep%k2007%20final.pdf>

Similarly, HELP's Hertzman "**scoffs, 'you could make the argument we could give everybody a huge tax cut and when they get sick they could go buy their own hospital. It's ridiculous, right?'**" (Article in *The Province* June 9, 2000).

Hertzman's comparing financial support for raising children to medical insurance for getting sick exemplifies a serious case of false logic.

### **Sex roles: HELP technocrats want Big Bro to keep Mum and Dad in line**

HELP's research includes "gender equity," the new term for what once was called "women's liberation."

HELP's gender equity specialist is Paul Kershaw. He has been emphatic in redefining equality for women. For Kershaw, being able to be an employee is the core of women's equality. His overriding goal is "**successful labour force participation**".

For Kershaw,  
being able to be  
an employee is the  
core of women's  
equality

Being treated equally when we choose to care for our own children is not an accepted route to equality. He laments the fact that men don't share "care giving" equally, and that women do most of the unpaid care work (though he avoids calling this work 'work'). However he does not accept the idea of solving this problem by financing the unpaid work.

He ignores the fact that men do not breastfeed. He wants the state to "promote gender equality by challenging the traditional division of labour between women and men," regardless of what our personal decisions may be. These he seems to think are mindless choices that "sweep the couple along a sea of traditional cultural attitudes and gender work force realities."

<http://www.irpp.org/choices/archive/vol13no2.pdf> pp 6, 24

Dollars for daycare—not money for parents to use as they freely choose—is assumed to be necessary to achieve the "gender equity" that is HELP promotes.

<http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/PaulKershaw.htm#presentations>

### Corporate Right Wolves in Lefty Sheep's Clothing

Notably absent from HELP's new approach to child development is any mention at all of breastfeeding or of parent-child attachment. These have no "commercial potential" and are outside of the World Bank agenda.

Nor is there any criticism of the massive cuts to welfare for families. In fact Hertzman and other HELP writers apparently support such right wing draconian McJobs-for-mums "welfare reform." Writing for Statistics Canada they report:

"Subsidization of childcare increases employment participation and increases the use of child care [i.e. non-parental child care]. These simulations suggest that **welfare reforms combined with assistance for child care can act as incentives for encouraging young mothers to participate in the labour market.**"

<http://www.statcan.ca/english/research/11F0019MIE/11F0019MIE2006284.pdf> p16

**Data-mining and daycare for kids, McJobs and shopping for mums and dads, fat paycheques for policy advisors**

The Human Early Learning Partnership's partnership with the World Bank is about HELPing corporate interests, not parents and children.

