

## TRANSKRYPCJA NAGRAŃ

### Task 1

#### Speaker A

When you've made the decision to drive to your holiday destination, the next question is: do you take your own vehicle or rent one? Obviously renting a car is going to be a drain on your travel budget, but many road trippers fail to consider such factors as the depreciation of their own vehicle due to the additional mileage, the fuel-efficiency of their private car compared to one they could rent, and the cost of purchasing roadside assistance cover essential to make sure they don't get stuck *en route* to their destination. If you decide that renting a vehicle is a better option for you, make sure you deal with a reputable car rental company. Otherwise, in the event of a breakdown, you might wait ages for the company to arrange assistance, or you could even be left completely stranded in the middle of nowhere.

Adapted from: [www.theoutsideinsider.com](http://www.theoutsideinsider.com)

#### Speaker B

When you're planning a family holiday, car rental can slip down your list of priorities. But, unless you wish to burn a hole in your pocket, you'd better delve deeply into the intricacies of the numerous offers available on the market, and scrutinize the contract you're going to sign thoroughly. Pay attention to every detail and footnote, no matter how unimportant they may seem. It's also worth looking at the extras, such as flood damage and towing insurance, if you plan to drive off-road. And remember that car hire prices will rise the closer you get to your date of departure, so it's better to book a hire car as part of the initial process when arranging your holiday.

Adapted from: [www.autoexpress.co.uk](http://www.autoexpress.co.uk)

#### Speaker C

The car rental industry has a terrible reputation for treating people unfairly. Have you ever wondered why you need to have a credit card to book a hire car? It's all down to liability if something goes wrong. The company will automatically, without any warning, charge you for any damage if they decide you're the guilty party. The money comes off your credit card without you having the right to dispute the charge – and then all you can do is submit an official request for a refund and just wait. You're completely at their mercy. It is ludicrously unfair, but for now, there's nothing to stop them doing this.

Adapted from: [www.mirror.co.uk](http://www.mirror.co.uk)

#### Speaker D

There is no hard-and-fast rule for determining whether it makes more sense to rent a car or use your own vehicle for a vacation. I think that a rental car is far less likely to give you trouble on the road. It can also be an excellent opportunity to test a new model which you have always wanted to drive. Renting is always worth considering when you doubt whether your vehicle is good enough for the trip, or when you want a car that looks cool and is more recent than your own somewhat outdated model. Usually a road trip is a vacation, it's a break from your routine and a time to pamper yourself a bit, and there are many high-end cars to rent at prices lower than you might expect, so why don't you take this opportunity to upgrade your trip?

Adapted from: [www.allianztravelinsurance.com](http://www.allianztravelinsurance.com)

## TASK 2

### Text 1

**Woman:** Our guest today is Ben Williams, an IT expert who specializes in deepfakes. Ben, why has deepfake technology become such a hot issue lately?

**Man:** Many experts have expressed their concerns about deepfake technology because it enables anyone with even amateur-level computing skills to create realistic-looking photos and videos of people saying and doing things that they did not actually say or do. By looking closely, the viewer can often tell that a video is a deepfake, but since the technology is improving at a breathtaking pace, it is predicted that deepfakes will become indistinguishable from genuine images or films before long. Many deepfake clips have gone viral. One of these was a commercial run during the hit documentary series *The Last Dance*. It appeared to show footage from 1998 of a sports analyst making shockingly accurate predictions about the year 2020. However, it turned out that the clip was a deepfake created just days before it aired. Although it was only supposed to be entertainment, it made many viewers realize how easy it is to be taken in by such manipulated footage.

**Woman:** Have the possible consequences of the proliferation of deepfakes been investigated?

**Man:** Yes, we are fortunate to have different media outlets which uncover the workings of the deepfake industry. Academics have also taken an interest in this subject. For example, a recently published report analyzes the range of threats that deepfakes pose. These include escalating social divisions, eroding trust in democratic institutions, and inflicting damage on the reputation of elected officials and candidates for office.

**Woman:** And the last question. Is there any way to counteract the spread of deepfakes?

**Man:** Given that deepfakes are based on artificial intelligence, researchers are looking to AI for an effective means of identifying the use of deepfake technology. They have already developed sophisticated deepfake detection systems which flag images that have been tampered with. Another defensive approach is to add a filter to an image file that makes it impossible to generate a deepfake. But optimists confident that we're in a position to prevent the spread of deepfakes are few and far between and I wouldn't number myself among them. I don't believe that technological solutions will ultimately be able to eradicate deepfakes from public space. I rather imagine that, just like in the case of cybersecurity, the struggle against deepfakes will be an endless cat-and-mouse chase, where breakthroughs in deepfake detection spur further innovation in deepfake generation. Consequently, no single solution will suffice. But an essential first step is to increase public awareness that deepfakes are not benign.

Adapted from: [www.forbes.com](http://www.forbes.com)

## Text 2

*The King's Speech* is a great film. Colin Firth and Geoffrey Rush give truly impressive performances, the former as King George VI and the latter as Lionel Logue, the King's speech therapist. To portray the King's stammer, Colin Firth watched the available archive footage of King George VI speaking until he could reproduce the monarch's speech convincingly. The film takes us back to the time when the British monarchy began to adopt a more approachable image; when they became "the Royal Family" rather than proud rulers. Although the film's relationship to the historical record seems fairly accurate, there are two exceptions. The first problem is that the part Winston Churchill played in the abdication crisis has been stood on its head. He famously supported King Edward, so why, in the film, is he encouraging George to become King?

The biggest distortion, however, isn't about Churchill but about the speech therapist himself. In the film, as was actually the case, Lionel Logue's consulting room is in Harley Street, a prestigious address in central London. Yet, in the film, the place is depicted as a humble East End terraced house with the front door opening straight onto a dirty pavement, where ragged children play. The point was probably to show that Logue's friendship with the man who became King bridged all kinds of divisions, but it contradicts the facts. The real Lionel Logue lived with his family first in The Boltons, an exclusive neighbourhood in Kensington, and then in a Victorian villa called Beechgrove which had 25 rooms and five acres of garden. Logue had never been poor – he was a prosperous middle-class Australian who emigrated to Britain. He was perfectly loyal to his monarch and proud of having direct access to royalty. However, for obvious dramatic reasons, this wasn't the kind of personality the makers of *The King's Speech* had in mind. That's why, in the film, Lionel Logue became someone more impertinent, an Australian with little respect for royal etiquette who dares to address the King using his familial nickname – Bertie.

In fact, the character of the speech therapist in the original screenplay was drawn even more crudely. But before filming started, Mark Logue, the grandson of the famous speech therapist, unearthed correspondence exchanged between his grandfather and the King. He shared the letters with the director, who decided the screenplay had to be revised in order to soften the character. One of the remnants that survived from the original version is the swearing-to-cure-stammering therapy used to treat the King's stammer. However, Mark Logue doubts if the method was ever used by his grandfather. According to Mark, the contents of the letters prove that although the two had a remarkable friendship, there was a certain etiquette that Lionel abided by, for example addressing George VI unfailingly as "Your Royal Highness".

Adapted from: [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk); [www.insidestory.org.au](http://www.insidestory.org.au)

### **TASK 3**

**Interviewer:** Professor Allen, could you tell our students how they can avoid being misled by unreliable sources of information on the Internet when doing their research?

*Professor Allen:* Well, you don't have to be an Einstein to be a great researcher. You simply need to put in some effort and learn to identify what is a primary source and what is not. A news article, an award-winning book, or even Wikipedia may accurately portray the truth, but if it cites information from another source, then it is a secondary source for that information. Secondary sources typically have much less space to convey the facts so they often leave out important details and, whether intentionally or not, they often filter or paraphrase information or provide an interpretation of the facts. This is why it's so crucial to access primary sources. You should also bear in mind that something can be a primary source for one fact and a secondary source for another.

**Interviewer:** But if the same fact is cited on many websites, then presumably it's true, isn't it?

*Professor Allen:* Not necessarily. Let me give you an example. In July 2008, Dylan Breves, a seventeen-year-old student from New York, went on holiday to Brazil. One day he and his brother spotted some wild animals. Dylan claimed that they were called aardvarks but Dylan's brother insisted that aardvarks don't live in South America. He said they might be called coatis, a species closely related to racoons. They decided to resolve the dispute by consulting Wikipedia. When Dylan checked the aardvark entry, he realized he was wrong, but instead of admitting his mistake, he made a minor edit to the Wikipedia entry on the coati, inserting the claim that they were also called "Brazilian aardvarks". Obviously, he did not cite a source for this alternative name, because he had invented it. Dylan knew that what he had done was reprehensible but assumed that someone would note the absence of citation and flag his edit for removal.

Over time, though, something bizarre happened: although there are no such animals as Brazilian aardvarks, the alternative name caught on. About a year later, not only was Dylan's edit still on Wikipedia, but references to the so-called "Brazilian aardvark" have since appeared in several newspapers and magazines.

**Interviewer:** Are you implying that we need to fact-check all secondary sources?

*Professor Allen:* Well, if you don't want to end up reproducing errors, you should always search for first-hand accounts of a topic provided by people who have had a direct connection with it. So be ready to dig into one source after another until you've finally reached that "pot of gold". When you do, you may be surprised how different it is from the numerous secondary sources that you have relied upon.

Adapted from: [www.newyorker.com](http://www.newyorker.com)