ANGOL MADÁCH-KUPA 2016/2017 - SZÓBELI FORDULÓ

Időpont: 2016. február 13. (hétfő) 15:00, helyszín: angol terem

Kedves Diákok!

A következőkben információkat találtok az angol Madách-kupa szóbeli fordulójáról. Kérünk Benneteket, a verseny előtt **olvassátok el** ezeket, hogy a vetélkedő minél zökkenőmentesebben és gördülékenyebben folyhasson.

A forduló mindkét feladatát (újságcikk tartalmára való reagálás, illetve képleírás) egy társatokkal együtt kell megoldanotok. Az, hogy ki lesz a partneretek, a helyszínen derül ki. A pontozás természetesen, ahogy eddig is, egyénenként történik, így **a partnered teljesítménye nem befolyásolja a te teljesítményed értékelését**.

A szóbeli verseny ismertetése:

A szóbeli fordulóban **két feladat**ot kell megoldani, erre feladatonként max. 10-10 perc áll rendelkezésre. A verseny **két bizottság** előtt zajlik.

1. feladat**: Kiselőadás (10 perc/pár)**
   A tájékoztató végén található **5 újságcikk közül kell egyet kihúzni**, és az abban olvasottak alapján elmondani a véleményeteket az adott témáról. A versenyen a szövegek nem használhatók, azokból előzetesen kell felkészülni. Fontos tudni, hogy elsősorban **nem a cikk tartalmát kell visszamondani**, hanem az abban szereplő gondolatokra támaszkodva kell a témát kifejteni a te nézőpontodból. Erre **3-4 perc** áll rendelkezésre. Miután befejezted a kiselőadást, a partnered feladata az lesz, hogy egy **rövid kérdés** segítségével (pl: What could you add to what your partner has said?/Do you agree with what your partner has said?/Do you think most people would agree with what your partner has said?/Would you have liked to talk about your partner's article? Why (not)? / Which was the most interesting part for you in your partner's talk, etc.) reagáljon az általad elmondottakra. Miután ez megtörtént, a partnered beszél az általa húzott újságcikk témájáról, a te feladatod pedig az lesz, hogy a kiselőadás közben figyelj, hisz most neked kell egy rövid kérdés alapján reagálnod az elhangzottakra. A kiselőadásokra való **reagálásra 1-1 perc** áll rendelkezésre.

2. feladat: **Képleírás (10 perc/pár)**
   Ebben a feladatban **három,** valamilyen szempontból egy adott témához kapcsolódó **kép közül kell kettőt kiválasztanod**, és azokat **összehasonlítanod** a képek mellett található két **segítő kérdés**re támaszkodva. Erre 3-4 perc áll rendelkezésre. Fontos, hogy nem a képen szereplő dolgokról kell beszélni, hanem a képek által megjelenített témákról. Miután elmondtál minden olyan gondolatot, ami eszedbe jutott a képek által reprezentált témáról, a **partnerednek egy** rövid, a témához/képekhez kapcsolódó **kérdést kell megválaszolnia**. Ezután a partnered kap három képet, amely közül kettőt kell összehasonlítania az azokon szereplő téma szempontjából, és ennek végeztével neked kell megválaszolni egy rövid kérdést a képekkel kapcsolatban. Erre 1-1 perc áll rendelkezésre.

Mindkét feladat esetén törekedjetek arra, hogy minél **változatosabb szókincs**et használjatok!

Ha további kérdéseitek lennének, forduljatok bátran a szaktanárokhoz!

A felkészüléshez és a vetélkedéshez sok sikert kívánunk!

Angol munkaközösség

The power of advertising

Where would modern society be without advertising? Individual advertisers might think they are just trying to sell a particular product but advertising as a whole sells us an entire lifestyle. If it weren't for advertising the whole of society would be quite different. The economy, for instance, would be plunged into a crisis without the adverts and all the publicity that fuel our desire for limitless consumption.

As John Berger observed in his book "Ways of Seeing", all advertising conveys the same simple message: my life will be richer, more fulfilling once I make the next crucial purchase. Adverts persuade us with their images of others who have apparently been transformed and are, as a result, enviable. The purpose is to make me marginally dissatisfied with my life - not with the life of society, just with my individual life. I am supposed to imagine myself transformed after the purchase into an object of envy for others - an envy which will then give me back my love of myself.

The prevalence of this social envy is a necessary condition if advertising is to have any hold on us whatsoever. Only if we have got into the habit of comparing ourselves with others and finding ourselves lacking, will we fall prey to the power of advertising.

While fanning the flames of our envy advertising keeps us preoccupied with ourselves, our houses, our cars, our holidays and the endless line of new electronic gadgets that suddenly seem indispensable. Tensions in society and problems in the rest of the world, if attended to at all, quickly fade into the background. They are certainly nothing to get particularly worked up about. After all, there can't be any winners without losers. That's life.

Furthermore, together with the holy rituals of shopping (people get dressed up now to go shopping in the way that they only used to get dressed up when they went to church) advertising is one of the ways in which we are quietly persuaded that our society is the best of all possible worlds (or at least so good that it is not worth campaigning for any fundamental changes). Adverts implicitly tell us to get off our fat arses and do some shopping, and the idea that the shelves of the shops are full of the latest products is indeed one of the most effective ways in which contemporary society gets its legitimation.

People like John Berger are also not entirely over the moon about the impact that advertising and shopping have on the value of political freedom. Freedom is supposed to be the highest value in our societies, but in the age of the consumer that freedom is all too readily identified with the freedom to choose between Pepsi and Coke, McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chicken, Toyota and Ford, and people lose interest in the various political freedoms and our ability to participate in the process of exercising democratic control. There are lots of criticisms that could be made of modern democracies, but no one is going to pay much attention to them if they are more interested in becoming happy shoppers.

In all these ways advertising helps to keep the whole socio-economic show on the road. We are rarely aware of this because we are too busy working to earn the money to pay for the objects of our dreams - dreams that play on the screen of our mind like the little clips of film we see in the commercial breaks.

http://fullspate.digitalcounterrevolution.co.uk/archive/advertising.html

Will jobs exist in 2050?

Sophisticated machines are fast outpacing jobs. What does this mean for the future of work? And if there are no jobs, what we will do with our time?

There's no question that technology is drastically changing the way we work, but what will the job market look like by 2050? Will 40% of roles have been lost to automation – as predicted by Oxford university economists Dr Carl Frey and Dr Michael Osborne – or will there still be jobs even if the nature of work is exceptionally different from today? To address these issues, the Guardian hosted a roundtable discussion, in association with professional services firm Deloitte, which brought together academics, authors and IT business experts.

The future of work will soon become "the survival of the most adaptable", says Paul Mason, emerging technologies director for Innovate UK. As new technologies fundamentally change the way we work, the jobs that remain will be multifaceted and changeable.

"Workers of the future will need to be highly adaptable and juggle three or more different roles at a time," says Anand Chopra-McGowan, head of enterprise new markets for General Assembly. So ongoing education will play a key role in helping people develop new skills.

It may be the case that people need to consistently retrain to keep up-to-date with the latest technological advances, as jobs are increasingly automated and made redundant. The idea of a "job for life" will be well and truly passé. "There will be constant new areas of work people will need to stay on top of. In 2050 people will continually need to update their skills for jobs of the moment, but I have an optimistic view that there will continue to be employment if these skills are honed," adds Chopra-McGowan.

However, Mark Spelman, co-head of future of the internet interactive, member of the executive committee for the World Economic Forum, says there will be winners and losers in this new world. "The idea of continuous training is optimistic – I imagine there will be one-day training blitzes where people learn new skills quickly, and then are employed for a month while they're needed."

This means the workforce is more likely to shift towards more part-time, freelance-based work, says Julia Lindsay, chief executive of iOpener Institute. "Employers won't think in terms of employees – they'll think in terms of specialisms. Who do I need? And for how long? Future work may also be focused around making complex decisions – using creativity, leadership and high degrees of self management."

For businesses, this means keeping on top of the latest technological advances. "It comes back to how we use technology to inform young people about jobs. Data plays an important role – how can we engage children at school in technology, and give them more support early on in their career? It's important that there is a cycle drive to foster a better digital environment," says Mervin Chew, digital attraction manager for Deloitte.

The problem with needing highly specialised roles is that it will isolate parts of the population who are unable to continuously adapt and retrain. "We can't all be knowledge workers," says Dan Collier, chief executive of Elevate. "So there will be a lot of unemployment – and perhaps no impetus to help these people. There will end up being a division between the few jobs that need humans, and those that can be automated."

We're essentially heading towards a two-tier society, agrees Dave Coplin, chief envisioning officer for Microsoft UK. This feeling was echoed by all of our panel, who saw a potential divide between high-level, leadership roles and then less highly-specialised jobs that can be automated.

"This is either going to be very good or very bad – and either way there's not going to be much in the way of work," says Richard Newton, author of The End of Nice: How to be human in a world run by robots. The defining factor to whether there will be a two-tier society of mass unemployment, or a society of leisure, will be what society places value on. "The social contract of work has been ripped up, and people will be left with nothing for as long as businesses and corporations value productivity," adds Newton.

The cheapest and most productive thing to do will be to automate the workforce, so if productivity is what shareholders place value on, there will be mass unemployment. "But if you use technology to reduce accidents, produce food for people and save time – that provides a great societal value," says Spelman. It doesn't fit with today's idea of maximising profits, but these are important things we will need from society. "So in future we need to put societal and shareholder value together," adds Spelman.

The idea of productivity was forged in the industrial revolution, so it's no surprise that this may soon become an outdated way of viewing work. "There's no shortage of work in society – there's loads of jobs like caring, looking after children and volunteer work, for which we do not assign a value," says Magdalena Bak-Maier, founder and managing director of Make Time Count.

However, we need to move away from this idea of working for a pay packet. "There also needs to be a shift away from the stereotype of men working and women staying at home," adds Clare Ludlow, director of Timewise Foundation.

Coplin agrees that even if we can automate all the services we need (and thus eliminate most jobs) we will continue to have huge societal problems that need attention. "We are on a burning platform – a key issue of the future will be: how will we feed everyone?" So there's an idea that as we continue to evolve and find new boundaries, work will be confined to working on the next human step. "First we need to tackle food and healthcare and transport issues, then we need to make the way we treat the earth more sustainably – and finally we will even look at reaching other planets," Coplin says.

It may seem that some of these conversations are premature, as we are decades away from creating a working artificial intelligence. "There's a huge potential for robotics, but you must remember that making a robot is hard," says Dr Sabine Hauert, lecturer in robotics for the University of Bristol. "For example, if you wanted to create a robot and ask it to fetch you some water, that is amazingly complex. First, the robot needs to understand the home environment, then see the glass, and then locate you. These challenges are extremely hard to solve one by one, and at the moment they're almost impossible to solve altogether."

However, Hauert warns that we will see robots and algorithms programmed to do highly specific tasks. "Robots can be programmed to do specific tasks, rather than doing everything."

One thing we need to remember is that the defining factor for what computers will be designed and created to do, is what humans want. "The change will come from what we want to happen. People make the planet work, so new advances will respond to how people want technology to change," explains Mason.

But we have to be wary of creating things superior to us, warns Mark Eltringham, workplace expert and consultant for Insight Publishing. "The descent of man under machines is something to be wary and fearful of – it has the potential to be damaging in ways we haven't thought of before."

In the past we have used technology to replicate old ways of working – as a way to simply make old practices quicker and cheaper, but now we are about to enter a third computational wave where machines can learn and adapt. "This will have a huge economic impact –

businesses will think: should I take the saving that automating the workforce will make, and run? Or should I take the saving and then work with it to create new jobs?" says Coplin.

"I used to think that creative skills would provide a 'safe space' as a refuge – but as technology continues to develop, I'm not so sure," adds Newton. Indeed there is evidence that computers will eventually be able to replicate creative tasks, and even learn to create music, art and write novels.

But Newton is optimistic that this won't devalue human accomplishments. "I think increasingly we will start to value the journey a human has been on, their personal struggle for achieving something great, even if a robot can do it better. For example, with a musician, we will value how long it took him to learn to produce such amazing music. It's that human journey and struggle which will become important."

Though the future of work is unclear, the panel agreed that one thing is for certain: "The nature of work is going to change – the jobs of tomorrow won't be the same as jobs of today."

https://www.theguardian.com/careers/2016/oct/13/will-jobs-exist-in-2050

The homelessness crisis – An ever growing problem

Even as the numbers sleeping rough rise, so does public spending on temporary accommodation.

EXACTLY 50 years ago, a drama aired on British television that changed the way the general public thought of homeless people. Entitled "Cathy Come Home", it told the story of an ordinary couple who descend by accident into poverty and homelessness, and whose children are then taken into care. The film revealed to 1960s Britain that the social safety net was failing and that such trauma could happen to anyone. It played a big role in mobilising a fight against homelessness. The country's two largest homeless charities, Crisis and Shelter, were set up around the same time, and the film slowly raised the issue's profile within government as well.

In recent years, the problem of homelessness has re-emerged with a vengeance, driven by a toxic combination of welfare cuts and soaring rents. Rough sleeping is at its highest in a decade and has doubled since 2010, with at least 3,500 people on the streets every night in England alone. But that is merely the most visible (and probably underestimated) sign of a much bigger problem. With thousands of families losing their homes because they cannot afford the rent, Shelter says 120,000 children—also the highest figure in a decade—will spend this Christmas in temporary accommodation. In response, a bill is going through Parliament that campaigners hope may improve the situation.

It was 11 years after "Cathy Come Home" when the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act of 1977 set the parameters that broadly exist today. The government has a responsibility to house families with children and vulnerable individuals when they become homeless, but it does not have to house all homeless people. Many adults deemed not to be vulnerable are simply turned away without any assistance. "It's only half a safety net," says Matt Downie of Crisis.

Over the past decade, the shortage of housing and the policy of giving people a right to buy their council houses but not building new ones has led to a breakdown in the affordable rental market. According to Crisis, the number of people made homeless following termination of a private rental contract quadrupled between 2010 and 2015. In London, homelessness after the ending of a private tenancy accounted for 39% of all cases last year.

Cuts in housing benefits exacerbate matters. Nearly 1.5m people claim some kind of housing allowance for private renting (a further 3.1m claim for social housing). Half a million are in work, up from just 175,000 in 2009. Last year George Osborne, the chancellor, froze housing allowances for four years, hoping to encourage landlords to drop rents (they did not). Now housing benefit is static even as rents soar. According to Shelter, by 2020 in four-fifths of all local councils there will be a gap between the rent charged for one of the cheapest homes and the maximum support a family can receive. "What is most needed is to recreate the link between levels of housing benefit and what housing actually costs," says Mr Downie.

While Mr Osborne seemed obsessed with getting people onto the home-owning ladder, his successor as chancellor, Philip Hammond, hinted at a more sympathetic line in his Autumn Statement. He gave an extra £1.4bn for housing in England, which could lead to 40,000 affordable homes being built. He also announced that fees charged, often randomly, by letting agencies would be banned.

Most importantly, a private member's bill is going through Parliament that charities call significant. The homelessness reduction bill will, if passed, force local authorities to step in earlier to try to stop people from becoming homeless in the first place. It would involve

councils negotiating with landlords, helping people to reorganise their finances and finding a way to keep them in their homes long before the bailiffs arrive. The bill's supporters say any extra costs will still be much cheaper than providing temporary accommodation once a family is kicked out.

The government has spent more than £3.5bn on temporary accommodation for homeless families in the past five years, with the annual cost rising by 43% in that time. Almost two-thirds of the total was in London. Homeless placements in temporary accommodation rose by 12% last year. But such housing is often in poor-quality hostels or bed-and-breakfasts, far away from a family's jobs, schools and community. The bill's backers point to Wales, where a similar measure reduced the numbers needing rehousing by 69% in the first year. Annual spending on temporary accommodation there has declined by 26% over the past five years.

New legislation is important, says Mr Downie. But, he adds, its impact will be limited if government policy on housebuilding and welfare is working in the opposite direction.

http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21711052-even-numbers-sleeping-rough-rise-so-does-public-spending-temporary-accommodation

How Japan has almost eradicated gun crime
By Harry Low
BBC World Service
Japan has one of the lowest rates of gun crime in the world. In 2014 there were just six gun deaths, compared to 33,599 in the US. What is the secret?

If you want to buy a gun in Japan you need patience and determination. You have to attend an all-day class, take a written exam and pass a shooting-range test with a mark of at least 95%.

There are also mental health and drugs tests. Your criminal record is checked and police look for links to extremist groups. Then they check your relatives too - and even your work colleagues. And as well as having the power to deny gun licences, police also have sweeping powers to search and seize weapons.

That's not all. Handguns are banned outright. Only shotguns and air rifles are allowed.

The law restricts the number of gun shops. In most of Japan's 40 or so prefectures there can be no more than three, and you can only buy fresh cartridges by returning the spent cartridges you bought on your last visit.

Police must be notified where the gun and the ammunition are stored - and they must be stored separately under lock and key. Police will also inspect guns once a year. And after three years your licence runs out, at which point you have to attend the course and pass the tests again.

This helps explain why mass shootings in Japan are extremely rare. When mass killings occur, the killer most often wields a knife.

The current gun control law was introduced in 1958, but the idea behind the policy dates back centuries.

"Ever since guns entered the country, Japan has always had strict gun laws," says Iain Overton, executive director of Action on Armed Violence and the author of Gun Baby Gun.

"They are the first nation to impose gun laws in the whole world and I think it laid down a bedrock saying that guns really don't play a part in civilian society."

People were being rewarded for giving up firearms as far back as 1685, a policy Overton describes as "perhaps the first ever gun buyback initiative".

The result is a very low level of gun ownership - 0.6 guns per 100 people in 2007, according to the **Small Arms Survey**, compared to 6.2 in England and Wales and 88.8 in the US.

"The moment you have guns in society, you will have gun violence but I think it's about the quantity," says Overton. "If you have very few guns in society, you will almost inevitably have low levels of violence."

Japanese police officers rarely use guns and put much greater emphasis on martial arts - all are expected to become a black belt in judo. They spend more time practising kendo (fighting with bamboo swords) than learning how to use firearms.

"The response to violence is never violence, it's always to de-escalate it. Only six shots were fired by Japanese police nationwide [in 2015]," says journalist Anthony Berteaux. "What most

Japanese police will do is get huge futons and essentially roll up a person who is being violent or drunk into a little burrito and carry them back to the station to calm them down."

Overton contrasts this with the American model, which he says has been "to militarise the police".

"If you have too many police pulling out guns at the first instance of crime, you lead to a miniature arms race between police and criminals," he says.

To underline the taboo attached to inappropriate use of weapons, an officer who used his gun to kill himself was charged posthumously with a criminal offence. He carried out the act while on duty - policemen never carry weapons off-duty, leaving them at the station when they finish their shift.

The care police take with firearms is mirrored in the self-defence forces.

Journalist Jake Adelstein once attended a shooting practice, which ended with the gathering up of the bullet casings - and there was great concern when one turned out to be missing.

"One bullet shell was unaccounted for - one shell had fallen behind one of the targets - and nobody was allowed to leave the facilities until they found the shell," he says.

There is no clamour in Japan for gun regulations to be relaxed, says Berteaux. "A lot of it stems from this post-war sentiment of pacifism that the war was horrible and we can never have that again," he explains.

"People assume that peace is always going to exist and when you have a culture like that you don't really feel the need to arm yourself or have an object that disrupts that peace."

In fact, moves to expand the role of Japan's self-defence forces in foreign peacekeeping operations have caused concern in some quarters.

"It is unknown territory," says political science professor Koichi Nakano. "Maybe the government will try to normalise occasional death in the self-defence force and perhaps even try to glorify the exercise of weapons?"

According to Iain Overton, the "almost taboo level of rejection" of guns in Japan means that the country is "edging towards a perfect place" - though he points out that Iceland also achieves a very low rate of gun crime, despite a much higher level of gun ownership.

Henrietta Moore of the Institute for Global Prosperity at University College London applauds the Japanese for not viewing gun ownership as "a civil liberty", and rejecting the idea of firearms as "something you use to defend your property against others".

But for Japanese gangsters the tight gun control laws are a problem. Yakuza gun crime has sharply declined in the last 15 years, but those who continue to carry firearms have to find ingenious ways of smuggling them into the country.

"The criminals pack the guns inside of a tuna so it looks like a frozen tuna," says retired police officer Tahei Ogawa. "But we have discovered cases where they have actually hidden a gun inside."

source:

The Problem With Millennials

A recent [video](#) has gained significant attention on social media for its statements regarding the "problem" with Millennials. This video has kicked off a back-and-forth between those defending Millennial values, and those pushing against them. This isn't a new video with new comments regarding Millennial values, and it hasn't started a new wave of argument, in fact, what is most upsetting about this back-and-forth is that it is still happening. Everyone is still arguing about the "problem" with Millennials, but there is no "problem" at all.

So what is the perceived "problem" with Millennials that sets them apart from the previous generations? Mainly, this generation's values; what is perceived as laziness, instant gratification, and a lack of responsibility. Many people who complain about Millennials see the Millennial values as significantly different, and in that way, significantly "worse" than the values of previous generations. Values tend to stem from the events of society and the world around us. Because of this, Millennial values are different from the values of the generations before us. We cannot say, though, that their values are any better or worse than any other generation; they simply follow the way the world is at the time, and that is neither good nor bad.

If we compare Millennials to the three generations* before us, and their worldly and societal influences, we can understand how their respective value systems emerged. Beginning with the Traditionalists born between 1900 and 1945, this generation was alive during WWII, The Great Depression, The Korean War. Raised with strictness, structure and frugality through these hardships, the Traditionalists followed their parents rules all the way into prosperity with New Deal and The Space Age. Because of their humble beginnings and rise to the top as they grew with the structure of their families, they saw, and learned to associate discipline and patience with success. Because of this, this generation values their families, patriotism, rules and civic duty.

From the Traditionalists to the Baby Boomers born between 1946 and 1964, this generation shifted its values towards fighting the things that caused their parents to suffer. The Traditionalists taught the Baby Boomers the concept of "The American Dream", and that if they work towards what they want, they can have anything. Because of this, this generation was wildly ambitious. This generation saw the Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War, and the Sexual Revolution. They were born Post War, and saw all of the damage war created for their parents, and sought to put an end to it. Their values centered around anti-violence, community, optimism and equality.

Thanks in part to the Baby Boomers high divorce rates, and non-traditional values, the next generation, Generation X born between 1965 and 1980 had a different set of values. This generation lived through the Energy Crisis, Duel Incomes, and single parents, shaping their values around seeking self-sufficiency, independence and balance.

Generation X saw their divorced parents, and as a result, put emphasis on their own children; The Millennials. The Millennials were pampered and sheltered children because of their parents desire to raise them as the "best" they can be paving their values for achievement, competition and success. Thanks to growing up in the world of Digital Media though, Millennials were "shocked" out of their sheltered childhoods and able to witness happenings beyond their own small communities thanks to the popularity of media, making them privy to problems around the globe, and enhancing their desire to question the world. Because of this, Millennials value education, civic duty, and achievement.

What we can see from every generation's value system is that it is a direct effect of society and the changing world. So how is it that the values of the Millennials can be a "problem" if they are only a product of their world? Well, they aren't.

How we "work" is often a topic of criticism, for example. People believe Millennials have "lost" good work ethic, but the truth is the work ethic is still good, it's just different. Previous generations have valued labor jobs, loyalty to a company, and appreciation for the position one is in. This generation, though, through technology, The Digital Age, and a generation of informed and educated people, doesn't need the same work ethic.

Labor jobs are replaced with technology, The Digital Age allows Millennials to see problems and want to fix them, and our parents emphasis on going to college has made us value education more than work. Because of this, Millennials value upward mobility, expanding knowledge, change, and success; and none of this is a "problem" because, inevitably, as society changes, people and their values do too.

Those who take problem in the Millennial's values are often trapped in dangerous regression based thinking. They believe that the past was better, and want to return. This is a common issue, as people don't like change, but it is not rooted in reality (everything changes), it is rooted in fear. People that think regressively are afraid of the future; the unknown.

They want comfort in what they know, and it upsets them to see a world taking a "risk" by uprooting previously placed systems with the hope that positive change will come from it. The fact is, though, we cannot "go back". Life only moves forwards, and despite our fears we have to take risks and move forward hopefully, positively. Without risk and mobility towards the future, nothing gets done, and even the possibility of improvement goes away. Without change, nothing can better.

What society needs to do instead of thinking regressively, trying to halt change, and wishing Millennials had the same values as previous generations, is be thankful that they don't. Be thankful that Millennials have adapted to the inevitably changing world, and are seeking knowledge and coming up with new ways to improve the world. Trust that there is no "bad" generation, and that each one's values are vital to improving the world. Instead of fighting Millennials and dividing the world, unite and invest in them; show them that they are valuable and that you appreciate, and have hope in, what they have to offer. They are going to lead the world soon, and it is important that they do not waste their skills fighting intolerance against them, when they could be using their skills to improve life for us all.

https://www.theodysseyonline.com/the-problem-with-millennials