

I семестр

Синхронний переклад

North Atlantic Council at the NATO Summit in The Hague, NL - opening remarks, 25 JUN 2025

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EfLmlrXqSwo>

NATO Secretary General: So good morning. Good morning to you all, and welcome to this Leaders' Session of the North Atlantic Council. We meet at a dangerous moment for our one billion citizens. Russia's war against Ukraine rages on. An assertive grouping of adversaries seeks to divide and challenge us. There is war in the Middle East. Terrorism poses a persistent threat. And new technologies bring opportunities but also many serious security challenges. In the face of this, we stand together, united in NATO. The most powerful defensive Alliance in world history. History has shown that North America and Europe working together is a winning combination. Our adversaries know this. Our enduring commitment to Article 5 – that an attack on one, is an attack on all – sends a powerful message. In this meeting, we will take historic, transformational decisions. To make our people safer through a stronger, fairer, and more lethal NATO. To make NATO stronger, we have a concrete plan for all Allies to spend 5% of GDP on defence. It will go towards core defence, as well as defence- and security-related investments. This decision is deeply rooted in our core mission, and is required to resource our plans and readiness. This will also make NATO fairer. To ensure anyone and everyone contributes their fair share for our security. For too long, one Ally, the United States, carried too much of the burden of that commitment. And that changes today. President Trump, dear Donald, you made this change possible. Your leadership on this has already produced one trillion dollars in extra spending from European Allies since 2016. And the decisions today will produce trillions more for our common defence, to make us stronger and fairer by equalising spending between America and America's Allies. Allies will also agree to further increase defence production, so that our armed forces have everything they need. That means a huge expansion of our defence industrial base, on both sides of the Atlantic. That's good for our security, it's good for our economies, and good for our jobs. Our decisions include continuing our support to Ukraine, while also pushing for a just and lasting peace. We all want the bloodshed to stop. We call on Russia to end its aggression against Ukraine. Let me now turn to Prime Minister of the Netherlands, Dick Schoof, whose government and people are graciously hosting us here. Thank you to the media for joining us, we will continue our discussions in just a moment, but first and with the media here, please, Dick Schoof, your introductory remarks.

Послідовний переклад

Why is Argentina's economy such a mess?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=18RTtDVghfw>

Rampant inflation, a booming black market for US dollars and crippling debt - welcome to Argentina, one of the world's most dysfunctional economies. How did it end up like this?

[00:00](#) - Argentina's economy is in crisis

[01:21](#) - What is happening now?

[04:16](#) - Why is this happening?

[05:52](#) – Overspending

[07:00](#) - Printing money

[08:03](#) - Borrowing money

[08:51](#) - Trade controls

[11:06](#) - What are the solutions?

2 семестр

Синхронний переклад

The problem with plastics - and how they're changing the environment

https://www.ted.com/talks/patricia_villarrubia_gomez_the_problem_with_plastics_and_how_they_re_changing_the_environment

00:03

So plastics.

Plastics come in all shapes, forms and colors.

They are everywhere.

They are in our makeup,

it packages our food

and insulates our homes.

They are in airplanes and our favorite electronic devices.

They are truly a remarkable material.

00:24

But so are its troubles.

And we produce and consume plastics in staggering quantities.

Since it's been mass-produced,

the world has created over 10 billion metric tons of it.

Half of them just in the past 20 years.

00:42

I have been investigating plastic pollution [for] about a decade,

and I try to align my personal choices as a consumer

with the aspirations of my research.

And you may think, "Oh, that's easy, you know how to do it."

But actually it's not.

Sometimes it's impossible to avoid single-use plastics.

The system is built that way.

01:06

The dominant narrative about plastics tell us that this is a consumer's
and a waste management problem.

Who of us here have not heard

about the tales of gigantic plastic islands

floating in the middle of the ocean?

Which, by the way, it's not true.

And that low-income countries are to blame

for most of the plastic waste entering our oceans.

But this narrative is a misleading oversimplification
of a much bigger and complex story.

01:39

Plastics and their chemical additives

are really a climate problem.

01:46

Now, we need to think of plastics from a systemic perspective.

So let me take you through the journey of plastics.

Plastics contribute to climate change from before the moment they are produced to long beyond the moment they are disposed or landfill or drift into the ocean.

And it will remain in the environment for centuries, degrading ecological processes.

02:15

For 99 percent of all plastics the starting point is fossil fuel hydrocarbons.

Oil, gas and coal are extracted and refined to produce plastic and other synthetic chemicals.

And those processes generate greenhouse gases such as CO₂ and methane.

Studies indicate that if nothing is done, the production of single-use plastic alone will contribute to more than 10 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

02:49

And the thing is that our use of plastic last often just a few minutes or a few hours,

then we throw them away, and that generates further emissions.

And we know that our recycling system doesn't work.

It's broken everywhere.

And recycling plastics is hard and not cost-competitive.

Most of the waste that has not been landfilled or incinerated domestically

is shipped across the planet,

and it reaches low-income countries where they are expected to be recycled.

But this is one of those hypocrisies of globalization where rich countries outsource their problems to low-income countries.

And we know that these countries do not have the capacity nor the technology to deal with them in a soundly manner.

And so huge amounts of plastics are illegally incinerated, informally dumped or get lost at sea.

And as a result, millions of tons of plastic every year get into our environment.

But even plastics that are soundly managed emit greenhouse gases.

04:05

Once plastics enter the environment, landfill, are dispersed in soil or water, they start a process of breaking down into micro and nanoparticles.

I will just call them microplastic for the sake of the conversation today.

And this process of breaking down emits powerful gases such as methane, ethylene and CO₂.

And that's true for both traditional and biodegradable plastics.

On the surface of microplastics, new microbial communities can grow.

We call them the plastisphere.

And their biological activity also releases additional CO₂ and nitrous oxide into the environment, creating the possibility of further magnifying the climate problem.

It means that microplastic can also impair the growth and the photosynthesis capacity of phytoplankton, which are the microorganisms producing much of the oxygen we breathe.

But also microplastics can have toxic effects on zooplankton, and the health of these organisms

[is] essential for the functioning of all aquatic food webs.

05:23

And unfortunately, the problems run even deeper. Microplastics bind with the so-called marine snow, which are made out of the clumps of bacteria, plankton and other organic material that sinks down into the ocean depth, acting like a biological carbon pump. But microplastics risk affecting this marine snow and potentially decreasing the capacity of the ocean to absorb and sequester carbon from the atmosphere. And microplastics can be decreasing the reflective properties of snow and ice, potentially accelerating the melting of glaciers and polar ice.

06:05

So we have early enough indications that plastic pollution is starting to change the processes that allow the Earth's climate system to work. And this pollution is not a localized phenomenon. Microplastics are everywhere, from the mountaintops of Everest to the deepest sediment in the Mariana Trench. They are in the air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat. They are now found in our bloodstream and our lungs. And personally, the most terrifying, in the placenta of our unborn children.

06:45

Now, of course, plastic is a great material, it's versatile and durable, and in many ways it has allowed modern civilization to develop in the way it has. But it also comes with a lot of problems and the outlook is worrying. Today, the total mass of plastic is twice the total mass of all living organisms on the planet. But still, fossil fuel companies see hydrocarbon as their primary growth sector projecting a 30 percent increase of virgin plastic for single-use plastic just in the next five years. We already see an accelerating pace in producing and releasing new chemicals because there are many, many kinds of plastic. Each one the result of a different chemical formula. And we know that this is incompatible with staying within the safe operating space for humanity. And given how plastics impact the climate and the world's social ecological system, this would spell a catastrophe.

07:55

By the way, I'm not saying that we are completely doomed yet. There are solutions. And it's that worldwide, entrepreneurs and companies are creating new designs and material that can substitute traditional single-use plastic. And social movements are consolidating and educating people to reduce their plastic footprint and pressuring local and world policy makers to enact strong policies.

And scientists are collaborating more than ever,
communicating the urgency to limit not only the volume,
but the chemical diversity of plastics.
And earlier this year,
representatives from over 170 nations at the UN Environment Assembly
adopted an initiative to end plastic pollution,
committing all these countries to participate in creating, by 2024,
a legally binding agreement
that addresses the full life cycle of plastics,
from production to design
to disposal.

08:59

We need to stop thinking of plastic just as a waste problem,
one that can be solved by changing consumers's habits alone
and stopping using plastic bags.
We need to think of plastics as a climate problem,
as a product that creates damage along all its journey,
from the drilling up of hydrocarbons to the spread of microplastics.
And that can only be addressed in a systemic way.

Послідовний переклад

How common threats can make common (political) ground

https://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan_haidt_how_common_threats_can_make_common_political_ground/transcript

So if you've been following the news,
you've heard that there's a pack of giant asteroids
headed for the United States,
all scheduled to strike within the next 50 years.
Now I don't mean actual asteroids made of rock and metal.
That actually wouldn't be such a problem,
because if we were really all going to die,
we would put aside our differences, we'd spend whatever it took,
and we'd find a way to deflect them.

I'm talking instead about threats that are headed our way,
but they're wrapped in a special energy field
that polarizes us, and therefore paralyzes us.

00:34

Last March, I went to the TED conference,
and I saw Jim Hansen speak, the NASA scientist
who first raised the alarm about global warming in the 1980s,
and it seems that the predictions he made back then
are coming true.

This is where we're headed in terms of global temperature rises,
and if we keep on going the way we're going,
we get a four- or five-degree-Centigrade temperature rise
by the end of this century.

Hansen says we can expect about a five-meter rise in sea levels.

This is what a five-meter rise in sea levels would look like.
Low-lying cities all around the world will disappear
within the lifetime of children born today.

Hansen closed his talk by saying,
"Imagine a giant asteroid on a collision course with Earth.
That is the equivalent of what we face now.
Yet we dither, taking no action to deflect the asteroid,
even though the longer we wait,
the more difficult and expensive it becomes."
Of course, the left wants to take action,
but the right denies that there's any problem.

01:32

All right, so I go back from TED,
and then the following week, I'm invited to a dinner party
in Washington, D.C., where I know that I'll be meeting
a number of conservative intellectuals, including Yuval Levin,
and to prepare for the meeting, I read this article by Levin
in National Affairs called "Beyond the Welfare State."

Levin writes that all over the world,
nations are coming to terms with the fact
that the social democratic welfare state
is turning out to be untenable and unaffordable,
dependent upon dubious economics
and the demographic model of a bygone era.

02:06

All right, now this might not sound as scary as an asteroid,
but look at these graphs that Levin showed.
This graph shows the national debt
as a percentage of America's GDP, and as you see,
if you go all the way back to the founding,
we borrowed a lot of money to fight the Revolutionary War.
Wars are expensive. But then we'd pay it off, pay it off, pay it off,
and then, oh, what's this? The Civil War. Even more expensive.
Borrow a lot of money, pay it off, pay it off, pay it off,
get down to near zero, and bang! -- World War I.
Once again, the same process repeats.

Now then we get the Great Depression and World War II.
We rise to an astronomical level, around 118 percent of GDP,
really unsustainable, really dangerous.

But we pay it off, pay it off, pay it off, and then, what's this?
Why has it been rising since the '70s?

It's partly due to tax cuts that were unfunded,
but it's due primarily to the rise of entitlement spending,
especially Medicare.

We're approaching the levels of indebtedness we had at World War II,
and the baby boomers haven't even retired yet,
and when they do, this is what will happen.

This is data from the Congressional Budget Office
showing its most realistic forecast of what would happen
if current situations and expectations and trends are extended.

03:18

All right, now what you might notice is that these two graphs
are actually identical, not in terms of the x- and y-axes,
or in terms of the data they present,
but in terms of their moral and political implications, they say the same thing.
Let me translate for you.

03:33

"We are doomed unless we start acting now.
What's wrong with you people on the other side in the other party?
Can't you see reality? If you won't help, then get the hell out of the way."

03:44

We can deflect both of these asteroids.
These problems are both technically solvable.
Our problem and our tragedy is that in these hyper-partisan times,
the mere fact that one side says, "Look, there's an asteroid,"
means that the other side's going to say, "Huh? What?"
No, I'm not even going to look up. No."

04:00

To understand why this is happening to us,
and what we can do about it, we need to learn more about moral psychology.
So I'm a social psychologist, and I study morality,
and one of the most important principles of morality
is that morality binds and blinds.
It binds us into teams that circle around sacred values
but thereby makes us go blind to objective reality.

04:22

Think of it like this.
Large-scale cooperation is extremely rare on this planet.
There are only a few species that can do it.
That's a beehive. That's a termite mound, a giant termite mound.
And when you find this in other animals, it's always the same story.
They're always all siblings who are children of a single queen,
so they're all in the same boat.
They rise or fall, they live or die, as one.
There's only one species on the planet that can do this
without kinship, and that, of course, is us.
This is a reconstruction of ancient Babylon,
and this is Tenochtitlan.

04:55

Now how did we do this? How did we go
from being hunter-gatherers 10,000 years ago
to building these gigantic cities in just a few thousand years?
It's miraculous, and part of the explanation
is this ability to circle around sacred values.
As you see, temples and gods play a big role in all ancient civilizations.
This is an image of Muslims circling the Kaaba in Mecca.
It's a sacred rock, and when people circle something together,
they unite, they can trust each other, they become one.
It's as though you're moving an electrical wire
through a magnetic field that generates current.
When people circle together, they generate a current.
We love to circle around things.
We circle around flags, and then we can trust each other.
We can fight as a team, as a unit.
But even as morality binds people together into a unit,
into a team, the circling blinds them.
It causes them to distort reality.
We begin separating everything into good versus evil.
Now that process feels great. It feels really satisfying.
But it is a gross distortion of reality.

06:03

You can see the moral electromagnet operating in the U.S. Congress.

This is a graph that shows the degree to which voting in Congress falls strictly along the left-right axis, so that if you know how liberal or conservative someone is, you know exactly how they voted on all the major issues. And what you can see is that, in the decades after the Civil War, Congress was extraordinarily polarized, as you would expect, about as high as can be. But then, after World War I, things dropped, and we get this historically low level of polarization. This was a golden age of bipartisanship, at least in terms of the parties' ability to work together and solve grand national problems. But in the 1980s and '90s, the electromagnetic turns back on. Polarization rises. It used to be that conservatives and moderates and liberals could all work together in Congress. They could rearrange themselves, form bipartisan committees, but as the moral electromagnetic got cranked up, the force field increased, Democrats and Republicans were pulled apart. It became much harder for them to socialize, much harder for them to cooperate. Retiring members nowadays say that it's become like gang warfare. Did anybody notice that in two of the three debates, Obama wore a blue tie and Romney wore a red tie? Do you know why they do this? It's so that the Bloods and the Crips will know which side to vote for. (Laughter)

07:25

The polarization is strongest among our political elites. Nobody doubts that this is happening in Washington. But for a while, there was some doubt as to whether it was happening among the people. Well, in the last 12 years it's become much more apparent that it is. So look at this data. This is from the American National Elections Survey. And what they do on that survey is they ask what's called a feeling thermometer rating. So, how warm or cold do you feel about, you know, Native Americans, or the military, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, all sorts of groups in American life. The blue line shows how warmly Democrats feel about Democrats, and they like them. You know, ratings in the 70s on a 100-point scale. Republicans like Republicans. That's not a surprise. But when you look at cross-party ratings, you find, well, that it's lower, but actually, when I first saw this data, I was surprised. That's actually not so bad. If you go back to the Carter and even Reagan administrations, they were rating the other party 43, 45. It's not terrible. It drifts downwards very slightly, but now look what happens under George W. Bush and Obama. It plummets. Something is going on here. The moral electromagnetic is turning back on, and nowadays, just very recently, Democrats really dislike Republicans. Republicans really dislike the Democrats. We're changing.

It's as though the moral electromagnet is affecting us too.
It's like put out in the two oceans and it's pulling the whole country apart,
pulling left and right into their own territories
like the Bloods and the Crips.

08:53

Now, there are many reasons why this is happening to us,
and many of them we cannot reverse.
We will never again have a political class
that was forged by the experience of fighting together
in World War II against a common enemy.
We will never again have just three television networks,
all of which are relatively centrist.
And we will never again have a large group of conservative southern Democrats
and liberal northern Republicans making it easy,
making there be a lot of overlap for bipartisan cooperation.
So for a lot of reasons, those decades after the Second World War
were an historically anomalous time.
We will never get back to those low levels of polarization, I believe.

09:35

But there's a lot that we can do. There are dozens
and dozens of reforms we can do that will make things better,
because a lot of our dysfunction can be traced directly
to things that Congress did to itself in the 1990s
that created a much more polarized and dysfunctional institution.
These changes are detailed in many books.
These are two that I strongly recommend,
and they list a whole bunch of reforms.
I'm just going to group them into three broad classes here.

10:02

So if you think about this as the problem of a dysfunctional,
hyper-polarized institution, well, the first step is,
do what you can so that fewer hyper-partisans get elected in the first place,
and when you have closed party primaries,
and only the most committed Republicans and Democrats are voting,
you're nominating and selecting the most extreme hyper-partisans.
So open primaries would make that problem much, much less severe.

10:25

But the problem isn't primarily that we're electing bad people to Congress.
From my experience, and from what I've heard from Congressional insiders,
most of the people going to Congress are good, hard-working,
intelligent people who really want to solve problems,
but once they get there, they find that they are forced
to play a game that rewards hyper-partisanship
and that punishes independent thinking.
You step out of line, you get punished.
So there are a lot of reforms we could do
that will counteract this.

10:52

For example, this "Citizens United" ruling is a disaster,
because it means there's like a money gun aimed at your head,
and if you step out of line, if you try to reach across the aisle,
there's a ton of money waiting to be given to your opponent
to make everybody think that you are a terrible person through negative advertising.

11:08

But the third class of reforms is that we've got to change
the nature of social relationships in Congress.

The politicians I've met are generally very extroverted, friendly, very socially skillful people, and that's the nature of politics. You've got to make relationships, make deals, you've got to cajole, please, flatter, you've got to use your personal skills, and that's the way politics has always worked. But beginning in the 1990s, first the House of Representatives changed its legislative calendar so that all business is basically done in the middle of the week. Nowadays, Congressmen fly in on Tuesday morning, they do battle for two days, then they fly home Thursday afternoon. They don't move their families to the District. They don't meet each other's spouses or children. There's no more relationship there. And trying to run Congress without human relationships is like trying to run a car without motor oil. Should we be surprised when the whole thing freezes up and descends into paralysis and polarization? A simple change to the legislative calendar, such as having business stretch out for three weeks and then they get a week off to go home, that would change the fundamental relationships in Congress.

12:15

So there's a lot we can do, but who's going to push them to do it? There are a number of groups that are working on this. No Labels and Common Cause, I think, have very good ideas for changes we need to do to make our democracy more responsive and our Congress more effective.

12:28

But I'd like to supplement their work with a little psychological trick, and the trick is this. Nothing pulls people together like a common threat or a common attack, especially an attack from a foreign enemy, unless of course that threat hits on our polarized psychology, in which case, as I said before, it can actually pull us apart. Sometimes a single threat can polarize us, as we saw. But what if the situation we face is not a single threat but is actually more like this, where there's just so much stuff coming in, it's just, "Start shooting, come on, everybody, we've got to just work together, just start shooting." Because actually, we do face this situation. This is where we are as a country.

13:08

So here's another asteroid. We've all seen versions of this graph, right, which shows the changes in wealth since 1979, and as you can see, almost all the gains in wealth have gone to the top 20 percent, and especially the top one percent. Rising inequality like this is associated with so many problems for a democracy. Especially, it destroys our ability to trust each other, to feel that we're all in the same boat, because it's obvious we're not. Some of us are sitting there safe and sound in gigantic private yachts. Other people are clinging to a piece of driftwood. We're not all in the same boat, and that means

nobody's willing to sacrifice for the common good.
The left has been screaming about this asteroid for 30 years now,
and the right says, "Huh, what? Hmm? No problem. No problem."

13:54

Now,
why is that happening to us? Why is the inequality rising?
Well, one of the largest causes, after globalization,
is actually this fourth asteroid,
rising non-marital births.
This graph shows the steady rise of out-of-wedlock births
since the 1960s.

Most Hispanic and black children are now born to unmarried mothers.
Whites are headed that way too.

Within a decade or two, most American children
will be born into homes with no father.
This means that there's much less money coming into the house.
But it's not just money. It's also stability versus chaos.
As I know from working with street children in Brazil,
Mom's boyfriend is often a really, really dangerous person for kids.

14:37

Now the right has been screaming about this asteroid since the 1960s,
and the left has been saying, "It's not a problem. It's not a problem."

The left has been very reluctant to say
that marriage is actually good for women and for children.
Now let me be clear. I'm not blaming the women here.
I'm actually more critical of the men
who won't take responsibility for their own children
and of an economic system that makes it difficult
for many men to earn enough money to support those children.
But even if you blame nobody, it still is a national problem,
and one side has been more concerned about it than the other.
The New York Times finally noticed this asteroid
with a front-page story last July
showing how the decline of marriage contributes to inequality.

15:18

We are becoming a nation of just two classes.
When Americans go to college and marry each other,
they have very low divorce rates.
They earn a lot of money, they invest that money in their kids,
some of them become tiger mothers,
the kids rise to their full potential,
and the kids go on to become
the top two lines in this graph.
And then there's everybody else:
the children who don't benefit from a stable marriage,
who don't have as much invested in them,
who don't grow up in a stable environment,
and who go on to become the bottom three lines in that graph.

15:54

So once again, we see that these two graphs are actually saying the same thing.
As before, we've got a problem, we've got to start working on this,
we've got to do something,
and what's wrong with you people that you don't see my threat?

16:06

But if everybody could just take off their partisan blinders,
we'd see that these two problems actually

are best addressed together.

Because if you really care about income inequality, you might want to talk to some evangelical Christian groups that are working on ways to promote marriage.

But then you're going to run smack into the problem that women don't generally want to marry someone who doesn't have a job.

So if you really care about strengthening families, you might want to talk to some liberal groups who are working on promoting educational equality, who are working on raising the minimum wage, who are working on finding ways to stop so many men from being sucked into the criminal justice system and taken out of the marriage market for their whole lives.

16:46

So to conclude, there are at least four asteroids headed our way.

How many of you can see all four?

Please raise your hand right now if you're willing to admit that all four of these are national problems.

Please raise your hands.

Okay, almost all of you.

17:04

Well, congratulations, you guys are the inaugural members of the Asteroids Club, which is a club for all Americans who are willing to admit that the other side actually might have a point. In the Asteroids Club, we don't start by looking for common ground. Common ground is often very hard to find. No, we start by looking for common threats because common threats make common ground.

17:27

Now, am I being naive? Is it naive to think that people could ever lay down their swords, and left and right could actually work together?

I don't think so, because it happens, not all that often, but there are a variety of examples that point the way.

This is something we can do.

Because Americans on both sides care about the decline in civility, and they've formed dozens of organizations, at the national level, such as this one,

down to many local organizations, such as To The Village Square in Tallahassee, Florida, which tries to bring state leaders together to help facilitate that sort of working together human relationship that's necessary to solve Florida's problems.

Americans on both sides care about global poverty and AIDS, and on so many humanitarian issues, liberals and evangelicals are actually natural allies, and at times they really have worked together to solve these problems.

And most surprisingly to me, they sometimes can even see eye to eye on criminal justice.

For example, the incarceration rate, the prison population in this country has quadrupled since 1980.

Now this is a social disaster, and liberals are very concerned about this.

The Southern Poverty Law Center is often fighting the prison-industrial complex, fighting to prevent a system that's just sucking in more and more poor young men.

But are conservatives happy about this?

Well, Grover Norquist isn't, because this system costs an unbelievable amount of money.

And so, because the prison-industrial complex is bankrupting our states and corroding our souls,

groups of fiscal conservatives and Christian conservatives have come together to form a group called Right on Crime.

And at times they have worked with the Southern Poverty Law Center to oppose the building of new prisons and to work for reforms that will make the justice system more efficient and more humane.

19:18

So this is possible. We can do it.

Let us therefore go to battle stations, not to fight each other,

but to begin deflecting these incoming asteroids.

And let our first mission be to press Congress to reform itself, before it's too late for our nation.