What's the best way to lift people out of poverty? — 中英對照學習本

TED-Ed（編劇：Jolene Tan）· 5 分 36 秒

中英對照學習本 · 每段約 100 字 · 段落開頭時間碼可點擊跳轉影片

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_gTgloPR0Aw

掃碼開啟影片

▶ 00:00:07 117 words 1 / 6

In 2018, a non-profit gave every adult in western Kenya's Ahenyo village $500. Most of their families had lived in extreme poverty for generations, and this sum was roughly equivalent to most recipients' annual salaries. Despite all this, the money came with no strings attached outside a commitment to speak with researchers after two years. They hoped this influx of cash would lift the villagers out of poverty. But they also knew this could easily be the latest in a long line of failed philanthropic interventions. In the 1960s, charitable organizations began ramping up their philanthropic efforts, spending billions funding education, job training, agricultural development, infrastructure projects, and health care programs in attempts to help poor countries.

> 2018 年，一家非營利機構向肯亞（Kenya）西部 Ahenyo 村的每位成年人發放 500 美元。村裡多數家庭世代身處極端貧困，這筆錢大約相當於受助者一整年的收入。條件優厚歸優厚，這筆錢除了答應兩年後跟研究人員談談，幾乎沒有任何附加限制。他們指望這筆現金流入能把村民拉出貧困，但他們也清楚，這很可能只是漫長的失敗慈善行動清單上最新的一筆。1960 年代起，慈善組織不斷加大投入，花費數十億美元資助教育、職業培訓、農業發展、基建工程與醫療保健項目，試圖幫助那些貧窮的國家。

(n.) **extreme poverty**
極度貧困

(adj.) **roughly equivalent**
大致相當的

(phr.) **no strings attached**
沒有任何附帶條件

(n.) **commitment**
承諾

(n.) **influx**
（資金、人員的）大量流入

(n.) **philanthropic interventions**
慈善性質的介入行動

(phr. v.) **ramping up**
加碼、加大力度

(n.) **infrastructure**
基礎設施

▶ 00:01:02 104 words 2 / 6

These programs hoped to create a springboard of knowledge and capital that would foster financial independence and bolster struggling economies. But when economists started studying this kind of aid in the late 90s and early 2000s, they made some surprising discoveries. After running various randomized control trials, where one group received education or job training and another group did not, the researchers found this kind of aid often had minimal impact. School supplies failed to improve education. Job training didn't always raise incomes. And the benefits of nutrition education varied dramatically from group to group. These disappointing results even extended to newer philanthropic models.

> 這些計畫希望打造一座知識與資本的跳板，讓受助者取得財務自主，同時撐起陷入困境的經濟。但當經濟學家在 90 年代末、2000 年代初開始檢視這類援助時，他們發現了一些令人意外的事情。他們進行了各種隨機對照試驗：一組接受教育或職業培訓，另一組什麼都沒有。結果發現，這類援助往往成效甚微。學校物資沒有改善教育質素，職業培訓不一定能提高收入，營養教育的成效在不同群體之間更是差距巨大。這些令人失望的結果，連較新的慈善模式也未能倖免。

(n.) **springboard**
跳板、起點

(v.) **foster**
培育、促進

(n.) **financial independence**
財務自主

(v.) **bolster**
支撐、鞏固

(n.) **randomized control trials**
隨機對照試驗

(n.) **minimal impact**
極有限的作用

(n.) **nutrition education**
營養教育

(phr. v.) **varied dramatically**
變化極大、差距巨大

▶ 00:01:52 100 words 3 / 6

At this time, many theorists advocated heavily for microfinance, a model that offered small loans to aspiring entrepreneurs in weak economies. But while microfinance recipients consistently repaid their loans with interest, the programs failed to meaningfully raise their incomes. All these failures led researchers to consider a strategy many considered ridiculous: direct cash giving. Most philanthropists saw this approach as the worst kind of shortsighted philanthropy. They assumed recipients would quickly spend the cash and then end up back where they started. But when researchers returned to Ahenyo two years later, the results were astonishing. Business revenues were up 65%.

> 同一時期，不少學者大力推介微型金融，一種向經濟薄弱地區有志創業的人提供小額貸款的模式。然而，微型金融的受貸者雖然一直準時還清本息，這些計畫卻沒有真正拉高他們的收入。一連串的失敗，讓研究人員轉而考慮一個當時許多人覺得荒謬的做法：直接發放現金。多數慈善家認為這種做法是最典型的短視慈善，他們假定受助者會很快把錢花光，然後回到原點。但兩年後，當研究人員重返 Ahenyo 村時，結果令人吃驚：商家的營業收入上升了 65%。

(n.) **microfinance**
微型金融

(n.) **aspiring entrepreneurs**
有志創業的人

(n.) **weak economies**
經濟薄弱的國家

(adv.) **consistently**
一貫地、持續不斷地

(adv.) **meaningfully**
實質上、有意義地

(adj.) **ridiculous**
荒謬的、可笑的

(n.) **shortsighted philanthropy**
短視的慈善做法

(adj.) **astonishing**
令人驚訝的

Families saved more and ate more. Kids were doing better in school. There was less alcoholism, depression, domestic violence, and inequality between families. And these impacts weren't unique to Ahenyo. Since this study, direct cash giving has become one of the most researched poverty interventions, and it's consistently shown impacts that often exceed traditional aid programs. In fact, a subsequent study spanning hundreds of Kenyan villages found the surrounding economy grew by more than twice what was given out just a year after the cash transfers. However, direct cash giving isn't a silver bullet. Poverty is a generational issue that requires long-term changes to solve; and since this intervention is relatively new, we still don't fully understand the effects of cash giving on extended timelines.

> 家庭存下更多錢，也吃得好一點；孩子在學校的表現更好；酗酒、抑鬱、家庭暴力，以及家庭之間的差距都少了。這些影響也不只在 Ahenyo 村出現。自從這項研究之後，直接發放現金成為受研究最密集的脫貧介入方式之一，效果往往勝過傳統援助計畫。事實上，一項後續研究覆蓋數百個肯亞村落，發現現金發放僅一年後，周邊經濟的增長額便達到發放金額的兩倍以上。不過，直接發放現金並非萬靈藥。貧困是跨世代的問題，需要長期的改變才能解決；加上這套做法相對新穎，我們對現金援助在更長時間跨度上的影響，仍然未能完全掌握。

(n.) **domestic violence**
家庭暴力

(n.) **inequality**
不平等、差距

(n.) **poverty interventions**
脫貧介入措施

(v.) **exceed**
超越、超過

(adj.) **subsequent**
後來的

(v.) **spanning**
涵蓋、橫跨

(n.) **silver bullet**
萬靈藥

(adj.) **generational**
跨世代的

▶ 00:03:43 115 words 5 / 6

For example, a Ugandan study beginning in 2008 found that while a cash transfer improved some families' earnings over the first four years, the positive effect disappeared after the next five years. Then it returned again under the pressure of the COVID-19 pandemic. Clearly, we still have a lot to learn about how cash giving unfolds over time. But regardless of what we learn in the future, the theory for why direct cash giving works can help change how we think about poverty today. Where traditional aid programs assume that philanthropists have the best knowledge of a community's needs, cash giving programs believe the people experiencing poverty best understand what they need to escape it.

> 例如，一項 2008 年在烏干達（Uganda）展開的研究發現，現金轉移在頭四年確實提升了部分家庭的收入，但再過五年，正面效應卻消失了；到了新冠疫情（COVID-19）席捲而來的時候，效應又重新出現。顯然，現金援助如何隨時間推移而變化，我們還有太多要學。不過，未來無論再發現什麼，直接發放現金之所以有效的道理，本身就能改變我們今日看待貧困的方式：傳統援助計畫假設慈善家最了解社區需要什麼，而現金援助計畫相信，身處其中、最清楚自己需要什麼才能擺脫貧困的人，才是真正了解的人。

(n.) **positive effect**
正面效應

(phr. v.) **unfolds over time**
隨時間推移而展開

(phr.) **regardless of**
不論、無論如何

(n.) **theory**
道理、理論

(v.) **assume**
假定、認為

(n.) **best knowledge**
最了解、最有認識

▶ 00:04:32 100 words 6 / 6

For example, perhaps for one person, repairing their home is more important to long-term success than starting a new business. And for another, ensuring their child can finish school might allow them to bring in more money in the future. Fortunately, we can afford this kind of help. Today, wealthy countries spend $200 billion a year in international aid, and philanthropists have a trillion and a half more sitting in private foundations. We already have the means to eliminate extreme poverty. But doing so will require these institutions to trust the expertise of the people actually living in these conditions.

> 舉例來說，對某個人來說，修好自家的房子，可能比起開創一份新事業更有利於長遠的成功；對另一個人來說，讓孩子讀完書，日後反而可能帶來更多收入。所幸，我們負擔得起這種幫助。今天，富裕國家每年花費 2,000 億美元於國際援助，而慈善家的私人基金會裡還躺著 1.5 萬億美元。我們早已有消除極端貧困的財力，只是要真正做到，就必須讓這些機構信任一件事：最了解自身處境、最知道要靠什麼擺脫貧困的，其實是那些真正生活在這種境況裡的人。

(n.) **long-term success**
長遠的成功

(v.) **ensuring**
確保

(n./v.) **afford**
負擔得起

(n.) **international aid**
國際援助

(n.) **private foundations**
私人基金會

(v.) **eliminate**
消除、杜絕

(n.) **institutions**
機構

(n.) **expertise**
專業知識與判斷