

READ THE CLAIM

by Sample



Read the Claim

Four stories and a lesson in careful English

by Sample

Attribution and rights

Based on “Learning English Podcast September 11, 2023”
by VOA Learning English.

Original source:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4tCXW2pnqy8>

This independent reading companion adapts the supplied transcript. It is not an official VOA publication. Brief dialogue excerpts are attributed to the original program. Names and unclear automatic captions need an audio check before public release.

News figures, intentions and forecasts describe statements made in September 2023. They are not presented as current status. Text of this companion © 2026 Sample, subject to verification of source-use rights before publication.

Contents

Introduction: Listen for the Claim

1. What the Betting Money Pays For

2. A Proposed City and Its Neighbors

3. Landing Where You Choose

4. The Little Words That Change a Conversation

Conclusion: Keep the Verb

Action Plan

Introduction: Listen for the Claim

One news report says a state will direct some betting revenue toward help for people with gambling problems. Another describes a proposed city and the people who doubt it. A third follows a spacecraft whose most important test has not yet happened. Each sounds complete when spoken aloud. On the page, each leaves questions you can see.

This book is for English learners who want to read an accessible news story and use its language with confidence. Its source is a September 2023 episode of VOA Learning English. The episode also contains a short lesson on the little expressions people use when they hesitate, apologize, notice a mistake, or end a conversation. The reports are snapshots from that date. A forecast in one of them is not a report of what later happened.

You will learn a simple reading habit: identify who made a statement, when it was made, and whether it describes a fact, a plan, a concern, or a prediction. Then you can practice the spoken phrases from the lesson without confusing polished news language with everyday conversation. This is a reading companion, not an update on the three stories, an investigation of their claims, or a complete English course.

Start with the question that puts the first report into focus: when an activity earns money for a state, how much help does that state provide to people harmed by it?

1. What the Betting Money Pays For

Problem. A reader can hear a large revenue number and assume it measures help for people with gambling problems. It measures something different.

In the September 2023 report, Kentucky was about to allow legal sports betting for the first time that month. Some of the resulting money was to help pay for the state's first program for people with gambling problems. The report places that decision against a wider shift: it says the U.S. Supreme Court had cleared the way for legalized sports betting five years earlier and that almost three fourths of states had since permitted it.

Permission to bet, tax revenue, and treatment capacity are three separate subjects. The episode reports \$3 billion in state and local tax receipts from legal sports betting over the preceding five years. It does not say that \$3 billion went to gambling services. Its examples show an uneven response: Massachusetts budgeted \$10 million for problem gambling services in 2022, while nine other states were said to have spent nothing. The named services include telephone helplines, counseling, and public awareness campaigns. The report says the federal government provided nothing specifically for gambling problems, despite spending heavily on substance abuse prevention and treatment. These are claims made in the 2023 episode; the transcript does not provide the budgets or research needed to verify or update them.

Kentucky was projected to spend about \$575,000 in its first year on gambling problems. Michael R Stone, identified as director of the nonprofit Kentucky Council on Problem Gambling, called that a good start but described a staffing limit. The state had five certified gambling counselors at the time, he said, and would probably need five times that many. A new funding rule could begin a service without making help immediately available at the scale he expected.

The report also distinguishes legal requirements from spending totals. It says that, a year before its account, 15 states and the District of Columbia required some sports betting revenue to go toward problem gambling services, while another 15 states did not. Since then, seven more states had launched sports betting or passed laws enabling it. According to University of Massachusetts Amherst researcher Rachel Forberg, all seven required a share of sports betting money for those services. The episode does not name the states or supply the amounts in their laws.

Worked example. Imagine reading the two Kentucky sentences on the same page: approximately \$575,000 in projected first-year spending and five certified counselors already in the state. The situation is a new source of funding and a limited number of specialists. The useful action is to write two notes: “planned spending” beside the first figure and “current staffing, according to Stone” beside the second. The result is a more careful question: how many additional counselors can the program train or support? The mistake would be to describe \$575,000 as proof that the need has been met. The report provides no such outcome.

The technology detail matters, too. The episode says smartphone apps make betting available 24 hours a day in many states. It cites research suggesting younger, higher educated men are among the groups most likely to bet on sports, but does not identify that research. A reader can retain the point while leaving the unsupported study attribution open for checking.

Common mistake. Treat every figure in a report as if it refers to the same population, year, and measure. Instead, attach a short label to each: what it counts, where it applies, its date, and who supplied it. You can now distinguish money collected from help planned and help actually available. Next, that same habit helps separate a developer's promises from residents' responses.

2. A Proposed City and Its Neighbors

Problem. An attractive drawing can make a proposed place feel settled and real. The people already living near it may see unanswered questions instead.

California Forever, a group of technology investors, released plans in 2023 for a new community in Solano County, between San Francisco and Sacramento. The episode says the group had purchased about \$800 million in land, amounting to 202 square kilometers bought since 2018. It describes a county of about 450,000 people, small cities, farms, and a military base. The area is given as about 100 kilometers from San Francisco and 50 kilometers from Sacramento.

The proposal appeared amid a housing concern. A mid-level Solano County home cost around \$600,000 according to the report; homes closer to San Francisco could cost two or three times as much. Schoolteachers, nurses, and police officers were among the workers described as unable to live near their jobs. California Forever's announcement spoke of a new community, good-paying local jobs, solar farms, and open space. Its website included drawings of homes, farms, solar fields, boats, fishing, and meals in a central city area. These drawings show what the group wanted people to imagine, not what had been built.

The investors bought land under the name Flannery Associates LLC. The group said it kept identities secret until it had enough land. Representative Mike Thompson said the secrecy caused problems, time, and expense, and that federal agencies had worked to discover who was behind the purchases. The episode names Laurene Powell Jobs, Mark Andresen, and Reid Hoffman among the investors, although some proper names in the automatic transcript require checking against the audio. It also says California Forever reported that 97% of its investors were American. That percentage is the group's claim, not an independent finding established by the supplied transcript.

After revealing the project, the group surveyed homeowners. Residents named lower living costs, good jobs, better schools, and safety from crime as priorities. Princess Washington, identified in the captions as acting mayor of “Susan City” in central Solano, questioned the plan. She said many people wanted land near Travis Air Force Base kept open and worried that the proposed low-cost homes might instead form a city for wealthy residents. She asked why the investors did not work with the cities already there. The city name in the captions needs an audio check before publication.

The report also describes a court case Flannery opened against landowners it accused of coordinating to sell at high prices. A later survey mentioned a large development with tens of thousands of homes. These details help explain why a request for community input could be met with suspicion. The developers said they would protect the military base and farmers wishing to continue farming. That is a stated commitment; the episode supplies no completed design or result by which to judge it. Thompson's assessment at the time was blunt: the group did not yet have a plan ready.

Worked example. Put the proposal for solar farms and open space next to Washington's concern about land near Travis Air Force Base. The situation is one tract of land viewed by investors and neighbors with different priorities. The action is to attribute both statements: "California Forever proposed" and "Washington objected." The result is a fair account of disagreement without pretending the drawing resolves it. What would go wrong is writing, "The new city will preserve open land." The report records a promise and a dispute, not that outcome.

Common mistake. Turn a plan into a future fact by changing "aims to" into "will." Preserve the source's verbs and attribute disputed claims. You can now read a development announcement beside local objections without declaring either one proven. The next report makes the difference between mission goals and results even sharper.

3. Landing Where You Choose

Problem. A successful launch is easy to picture as a successful mission. For a spacecraft designed to test landing precision, the decisive test comes later.

The September 2023 episode reports an H-2A rocket launching from a Japanese space center on September 7. It carried the Smart Lander for Investigating Moon, called SLIM, and an X-ray astronomy satellite. Japan's space agency, JAXA, said it received signals indicating that SLIM was operating normally after launch. The episode expected a landing process by February of the following year. That is a forecast made in 2023, not an account of a later landing.

SLIM's central target was specific: Japanese space officials said it aimed to land within 100 meters of a selected place on the lunar surface. JAXA president Hiroshi Yama Kawa, as rendered in the captions, framed the test as a shift from landing only where a spacecraft can to landing where scientists want it. The proposed landing area had solidified lava plains and mineral-rich rocks that might offer clues to the Moon's development. The place name in the automatic captions is unclear and should be checked before printing it as a geographic fact.

The lander was described as weighing a little more than 700 kilograms and costing about \$102 million to develop. The episode says it used chemical propulsion and small electronic control devices. JAXA hoped lighter spacecraft would help reduce launch costs and allow more missions. That hope is distinct from a demonstrated saving. The episode says SLIM was not carrying a lunar explorer; its described purpose was to land precisely and examine rocks.

The launch followed other attempts. The report says India's successful landing had occurred the previous month, Russia had failed in an attempt shortly before it, and a private Japanese company's spacecraft had crashed during an April landing attempt. It described Japan as a potential fifth nation to land a spacecraft on the Moon if SLIM succeeded. The condition belongs in any retelling. A 2023 prediction must not be converted into a present-day ranking without checking what happened next.

The rocket's other payload had a different scientific purpose. The transcript calls it "Crisp," a name that needs checking against the audio. It describes a joint project involving JAXA, NASA, and the European Space Agency to observe X-rays of different wavelengths and study hot matter. Ground stations in Hawaii and Japan reportedly received its signals after launch. The stated hope was to help scientists understand how stars and galaxies developed. The two spacecraft shared a rocket, not a research question.

Worked example. Suppose an English learner writes: “Japan landed SLIM within 100 meters of its target on September 7.” The situation is a launch report containing both an event and a mission objective. The action is to revise the sentence: “On September 7, Japan launched SLIM, which aimed to land within 100 meters of its target.” The result preserves what had happened and what remained to be tested. The original sentence would have reported an unobserved landing as a completed fact.

Common mistake. Read every mission verb in the past tense because the article itself is old. Instead, underline “launched,” “aims,” “if successful,” and “plans,” then place each on its own timeline. You can now report a launch without inventing its outcome. The final chapter turns from news claims to the small sounds that help people respond to one another.

4. The Little Words That Change a Conversation

Problem. A learner may know every content word in a sentence and still miss what a short sound is doing. Timing and tone can carry the speaker's attitude.

The episode's English lesson draws on lessons eight and nine of *Let's Learn English*. In one scene, Ana visits Jonathan while he is recording his evening show. A studio light is on. Ana asks to see the studio; Jonathan hesitates before saying it might be possible another time because he is busy. The supplied captions mangle the hesitation sound in the explanation, so its exact spelling or pronunciation cannot responsibly be reconstructed here. The teachable function is clear: a brief hesitation can give someone time to think and soften an answer that is likely to disappoint.

An apology follows. Ana tells Jonathan she is sorry about the previous day, and he answers, "No worries." She apologizes to Amelia, who answers, "It's okay." The lesson also mentions "no problem" as a possible response to a small apology. These expressions acknowledge the apology without requiring a long exchange. The episode connects "no worries" with Australian speech but notes its use in American conversation and email as well.

Worked example. At the recording studio, Ana's request comes while Jonathan is occupied. Her situation is a polite request at a poor time. Jonathan pauses, proposes "another time," and states that he is busy. The result is a refusal that still leaves the relationship comfortable. Without the pause or alternative, an abrupt "no" might sound sharper than he intends. The scene illustrates a conversational choice; it is not a promise that one phrase will always be received the same way.

The lesson then follows Ana checking the weather in Washington, D.C. She hears "18 degrees" and assumes the day is cold. The phone specifies Celsius and gives 65 degrees Fahrenheit; Ana says "Oh" as she recognizes the mistake. Earlier, she says a quick "Oh" when she notices she is on camera while reading a book. In the lesson's explanation, a short, lower "oh" can mark a small correction; a longer sound can mark a larger realization. Writing alone cannot carry all of this difference. Listening to the original audio would help a learner hear it.

For a stronger surprise, the teachers demonstrate "Oh, my gosh." One offers a pretend announcement of a recent marriage; the other reacts, then learns it was only an example. They explain that some speakers prefer "gosh" to using "God" as an exclamation because of their religious beliefs. The point is about choosing a phrase suitable for the speaker, not memorizing one compulsory response.

Two final expressions are simpler. “Yep” is presented as an informal “yes.” “Bye bye” closes the exchange. Neither belongs automatically in every formal setting. Their value is that they let a learner hear the shape of ordinary speech: a person thinks, responds, corrects an assumption, and ends the conversation.

Common mistake. Insert a sound such as “oh” everywhere because it appeared in a lesson. Listen for its job first: surprise, correction, or an informal opening. When practicing with a partner, say the same short sentence with a quick “oh” and then a longer one; ask what each version seems to mean. You can now choose a small expression for the moment it serves, while keeping the uncertain hesitation sound marked for an audio check.

Conclusion: Keep the Verb

The reports and lesson reward the same habit of attention. “Collected,” “budgeted,” and “needed” describe different parts of the gambling story. “Proposed,” “questioned,” and “promised” keep the city story open. “Launched,” “aimed,” and “if successful” prevent a mission objective from turning into a completed landing. In conversation, a small “oh” can mark the moment someone's understanding changes.

Carry the exact verb, its speaker, and its date into your own sentence. You will be able to say what you learned without claiming more than the source gave you.

Action Plan

1. Read one chapter and circle every number, named person, and future-tense claim.
2. Next to each, write who supplied it and whether it describes an event, an estimate, an opinion, or a plan.
3. Rewrite one sentence from each news chapter using the original distinction: revenue versus services, proposal versus outcome, launch versus landing.
4. Practice one apology and two responses: "Sorry about yesterday." "No worries." "It's okay."
5. Listen to the original lesson before imitating the unclear hesitation sound or the different lengths of "oh."
6. Before sharing a statement as current news, check what changed after September 2023 in a dated, reliable source.