

TRANSKRYPCJA NAGRAŃ

Task 1

Speaker A

There is no doubt that hosting the Olympics boosts civic pride. When the attention of two-thirds of the world's population is focused on a host city, the event becomes an advertising phenomenon. This has some evident short-term benefits for tourism, real estate values and businesses. However, pride in a city aroused by holding such an event is fleeting and in the long run the buildings erected for the occasion, such as stadiums and sporting venues, become little more than reminders of the past. Even if tourists continue to visit out of curiosity, admission fees are not enough. Without major events going on at former Olympic venues, over the years, the majority of them become 'white elephants' whose owners have to pay enormous maintenance bills, which usually far exceed the revenue gained from renting the properties out. Obviously, there are a few exceptions when efficiently managed facilities bring considerable profits, but more often than not the Olympic venues face rather grim prospects.

adapted from <https://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com>

Speaker B

The International Olympic Committee is enthusiastic about bids that will have a lasting impact. That's why they've always looked favourably on cities that locate Olympic Villages in impoverished areas. For example, the Barcelona Olympics were used as a means to completely overhaul the port and coast of the city, by creating an artificial beach and waterside cultural area that became a major tourist attraction. Olympic Villages release office and retail premises after the event, and accommodation built for athletes can be designated as low-budget housing. And while many large-scale developments would eventually be completed without the Olympics, the need to provide roads and transport, etc. by a set deadline means that there is far more pressure to get the projects done. More financial resources are also available as city councils get extra money in order to complete everything on schedule. So, the way I see it, hosting the Olympics promotes overall quality of life in a host city.

adapted from <https://uk.idebate.org>; <https://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com>

Speaker C

When the idea of hosting the Olympic Games is promoted, we often hear that the event will attract tens of thousands of spectators to the host city, and if things go according to plan, the influx of visitors will continue into the indefinite future. But the picture isn't necessarily so rosy. In fact, it turns out that the Olympics often tend to drive people away. Many potential tourists decide to avoid former Olympic host cities for a few years as they anticipate large crowds and high hotel rates. In fact, many economists believe that local organizers routinely exaggerate the benefits and underestimate the costs of organizing the Olympic Games. Hosting the event is often presented as a straightforward road to riches and economic success. This is rarely the case, however, and while it's true that hotels and restaurants are usually packed during the Games, department stores and cultural venues with no direct connection to the event tend to lose customers and can suffer significant losses.

adapted from <https://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com>

Task 2

Text 1

Today more than half of the human population lives in urban areas. The dramatic demographic shift of recent decades comes with inevitable consequences – some predictable, like the need to build new houses, and some less so, like the rise in the urban honeybee population. With growing interest in honeybee sustainability and more cases of diseases fatally affecting honeybee colonies in the countryside, changes to promote beekeeping in cities have recently been made in legislation. For example, most cities in the USA at one time prohibited the keeping of bees, but in recent years, beekeepers have succeeded in overturning these bans. In some states, beekeepers even get grants for the purpose of increasing the city bee population. In the UK, beekeeping in cities is strictly regulated but at the same time strongly encouraged. Dramatic colony losses a decade ago prompted a national campaign urging people to keep bees and some cities started to run free courses teaching people about keeping bees on rooftops and balconies. As a result, the soothing sound of bees buzzing around green roof gardens has lately become much more common. Thus, in some small way, bees are contributing to the creation of environmentally friendly buildings.

Interestingly, some buildings can also benefit more directly from bees. It turns out that bees can act as security guards. Some time ago, journalists were talking about the recurring theft of lead from the roofs of some buildings and a unique counter-measure taken by their owners. Their roofs are now home to bees, which are a powerful deterrent to anyone intent on removing the lead. The very thought of being stung has the power to put thieves off. Regrettably, however, this doesn't restrain the theft of rooftop beehives. Due to colony disease, honeybees have become so valuable that hive theft is on the rise. There are also cases of pest controllers who kill urban honeybees in abandoned houses after mistaking them for wasps.

In an original response to the idea of keeping bees in cities, a group of architecture students at the University of Buffalo designed an extraordinary construction for urban bees. It's a steel tower, 22ft tall, called Elevator B, which can be placed on the roofs of buildings. On the outside, the tower is covered with hexagonal panels inspired by the natural honeycomb structure of beehives. Bees don't occupy the full height of Elevator B, just a glass-bottomed box suspended near the top, a suitable new home for a thriving bee colony. People can enter the tower through an opening at its base and look up to see the industrious insects at work. And when beekeepers want to collect honey, they lower the glass bottomed box. It works like an elevator. This feature is also of value to school groups that visit the site of the prototype, as the children can get a close-up view.

I feel that when this modern type of beehive is successfully introduced to skyscrapers, they will then become high-rise luxury towers for bees, not only for people. It should be mentioned that the bees in Elevator B were forcibly relocated from their colony in a boarded-up window of an abandoned building and may well have been happier there. But such is progress.

adapted from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com>

Text 2

Interviewer: At first blush, it sounds like the talk of a conspiracy theorist: a company implanting microchips under their employees' skin. But for some companies it's neither a theory nor a conspiracy. Today my guest is Sam Bengtson, a software engineer in a technology company called *Three Square Market*. Welcome.

Sam Bengtson: Good evening.

Interviewer: What do you think about the idea of employees having chips implanted?

Sam Bengtson: Once you have a chip the size of a grain of rice injected between your thumb and index finger, any task involving Radio Frequency Identification technology, like swiping into the office building, paying for food in the cafeteria or logging onto your computer, can be accomplished with a wave of your hand. And it won't need frequent updating or replacing like the devices we have now. When I was asked whether we should consider implementing the technology, I wanted to jump on the bandwagon as quickly as possible and not pussyfoot around for years, as other companies are likely to do. I arranged a meeting with my co-workers to see if this was something we wanted. I was astonished to find that an overwhelming majority were willing to give their consent to being microchipped. I was prepared for some criticism, particularly from the older staff members, who tend to be more distrustful of technological innovations, but in fact just a few of my colleagues opposed the idea. And even those who did were thrilled about the technology itself, but wary of having the device implanted in their body. They agreed to wear a ring with a chip instead.

Interviewer: Don't you have any doubts about the idea of microchipping people? Surely it raises a variety of questions...

Sam Bengtson: Certainly, it does, like anything which is new.

Producers assure us that the chips are secure and encrypted, but still many people voice their concerns about it. They claim that "encrypted" is a pretty vague term, which could include anything from an actually secure product to something that is easily hackable. I personally think that this threat is blown out of proportion and transparent and robust regulation should be enough to allay these concerns. Another fear is that technology designed for one purpose, like getting access to a building, could later be used in more invasive ways, for instance, to track the length of an employee's bathroom or lunch break without their consent or even without their knowledge. Well, I can't vouch for all other devices, but a Radio Frequency Identification chip reader has very limited capabilities. It can't be harnessed to work as a GPS tracking device. In fact, a standard cell phone reports 100 times more data than the chip is able to provide.

As for concerns about health, at this stage they are difficult to assess. Since 2004, when the Food and Drug Administration approved microchips for medical use, there have been some rare cases of the implantation site becoming infected. However, since the device is removable, I would not worry too much about it. In any event, I'm certain that within the next 10 years such devices are going to be introduced in many places, and companies like ours really must be at the forefront. After all, we're a technology company.

adapted from <https://www.nytimes.com>

Task 3

Do millennials know how to cook? A new survey shows that 60 percent of millennials don't know how to make salad dressing. More than 20 percent judged themselves incapable of preparing a cake from a boxed mix and when shown a picture of a butter knife, only 33 percent of millennials knew what it was. While these statistics provide plenty of fodder for all those who share the commonly held notion that millennials are just spoiled and immature, there's much more to it than that. According to these statistics, 70 percent of boomers, that is people born between 1946 and 1964, can carve a turkey, but for millennials the percentage drops to 40. That's arguably because boomers have hosted way more Thanksgiving dinners. I think it would be interesting to see the results of a study which asked boomers what kitchen skills they had when they were in the age range that millennials currently are. This would seem to be fairer and less biased towards older respondents. It's also worth noting that the survey didn't measure a person's actual skill, so some respondents may be downplaying or overestimating their skills in the kitchen.

Perhaps part of the reason for millennials' lower expertise in the kitchen is their familiarity with technology. According to the survey, millennials were more likely to get their recipes from the Internet than boomers, and they also reported watching online cooking videos far more than older generations. This might have made it harder for them to learn how to cook. Blame it on "cognitive offloading", which means relying on search drives like Google rather than committing a recipe to memory. The survey showed that millennials' searches are usually incredibly basic, like "How to make the best baked potatoes" and while cooking they do not experiment, alter the recipes to suit their preferences or make use of the ingredients they have available, at least a great majority of them don't.

The survey has also revealed that millennials are anxious about their lack of skills. This low confidence leads them to repeat rote, uninspiring meals and rely on a handful of dishes they know well. If you are one of those millennials, we've got some recipes for you on our website voraciously.com. They're not intimidating, we promise. And if you don't know what a butter knife looks like, we won't judge.

adapted from <https://www.sfgate.com>