**8) Claim: In any field—business, politics, education, government—those in power should step down after five years. Reason: The surest path to success for any enterprise is revitalization through new leadership.**

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the claim and the reason on which that claim is based.

**111) In any profession—business, politics, education, government—those in power should step down after five years.**

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the claim. In developing and supporting your position, be sure to address the most compelling reasons and/or examples that could be used to challenge your position.

**149) In any field—business, politics, education, government—those in power should be required to step down after five years.**

Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position.

1.. 我们必须承认五年换届的制度具有巨大意义:a、由于人类接受新事物的能力在不同年

龄段是有很大区别的，长时间领导某一机构后，会因逐渐倾向保守(tend to be c ons ervative)而影响机构的发展，举例:我所在的公司 ，老经理怎样怎样;然而 ，新领 导经常有新的想法，非常有创造力。举例，新经理怎样怎样 boost sales. b、长期占据领 导地位会造成领导者的固定思想 saturated 渗入下属 subordinates 的脑子里，立场相对的 势力无法有效参与到发展中来。有一张照片，在我的心中挥之不去，美国三届总统的合影：Clinton、bush、obama， 每个人的执政 各有特色，新的领导要展现自己的能力，势必要作出比前一届更大的成就，兑现选举的承诺，才可能获得选民，谋求连任。

2. 然而，这个因果推论(causal inference)具有巨大的漏洞(numerous flaws): 连续执政的优势：保证政策的连续性，很多的研究、基础设施的建设、还有文学、艺术的发展都是需要长期的资助和政府的扶持。举例的研究： LTER，美国长期生态监测网络， 美国的太空探索项目。美国基础设施。频繁地更换领导，很有可能让项目搁置、还有最后可能搁浅，这样不仅浪费了时间，错过了发展的机会。举例：://\*\*领导人修路，10年，但是只能5年，受人民否定

3.无法确 保新的领导层能比 前任更有效 地推动事业发展，事实上，许多新人由于经验不足而做出草率(imprudent)决定可能对 发展造成严重损害;c、政治涉及到许多方面，比如国际关系或国家政策的需要，在内 外因素共 同影响 下，如 何选择 领导层 更替并 决定发 展战略 是一个 因国情 而异的 复杂问 题，尤其不可适用于这一 claim。

4. 结论:尽管任何发展都需要新鲜力量的推动，我们仍不能简单地将五年换届作为一个普 遍的制度(general institution)并应用于各个方面。Instead，应该根据不同的机构、组织 决定不同的更替方法，从而 maximize benefits and minimize hazards。

\*\*survey/research, conducted by \*\* of \*\* university, found that \*\*%

Is that true that new leadership could probably bring new ideas to an enterprise? I bet your answer is yes. However, do you agree that all enterprise should be inspired to change their leader after five years? People’s opinions mainly fall into two categories, and I tagged them as the ‘innovation”改革派 oriented and the ‘stability” 维稳派oriented. The ‘new trend’ supporters assert the new ideas and new policy would play the most significant role in the development of enterprise. Meanwhile, the ‘comprehensive consideration’ believers insist that not all leaders should be resign after five years since different fields have divergent plan. Both sides justify themselves with sound reasons. From my perspective, I would prefer the latter rather than the former.

The ‘innovation supporters critize harshly on the “stability’’ that there are lots of adverse effects if a leader holding his/her position for too long. The organization may lose its vigor and , creativity, lack of motivation and innovaiton. Older leader tends to be conservative and creats an atomoshpere which is stifle. My personal experience at Baidu, a multination technology company in China could serve as an illustration of the importance of new leader on technology innovation. Baidu, China’s google, a past search engine company now dominates many fields in IT industry such as deep learning, big data, cloud computing, etc.,I interned there for my senior year. Our team works on machine learning, a computational model to solve the problem of computer vision. Our team leader has been on his position for 6 years and, has been investing great amount of time and funding in developing new model. However, although my colleges and I suggested new models to him based on our trials, he was way too conservative and refuse to use the new model. What’s frustrating is that he even alleged the new model is useless. As our team can’t produce an effective product, the architect decided to delegate a new boss to help us. She was always patient and endorse us to try new model. With her help, we eventually develop a new approach to accomplish our project. In sum, changing leader could revive a project that is going to die. What’s the worst is that, the longtime established leadership quite often becomes the bed for dictatorship. A dictator in a company creates a super-boss;if dictator grows in a country, it is a disaster for humanity. The north korea under Kim Jong un is mired by the dictator of Kim family for 20 years.

Nevertheless, the ‘stability” believers stated that frequently change of leadership might leads to the discontinuation of a long-term reform or plan. Certain national basic infrastructure, like education and road, railway and subway construction, demand at least a decade to implement also requires millions of investments.. Here is an example, Fei-Fei Li, one president of Tsinghua university, the most prestigious university in China, once want to establish a new educational evaluation system. This new system aims to raise teachers’ salary and revise undergraduates’ plan of study. It’s a comprehensive reform and it takes more than two or three years to finish. Her new approach was welcomed by students and stimulate the lecturer’s performance in classroom. However, reform encountered resistance. Some teachers didn’t support her since there are conflicts of interest. If she step down after five years and the new president didn’t continue the reform which was very likely, Tsinghua university won’t draw so many talents and resources to earn its fame in China as well as in the world. Moreover, on one can guarantee that new leader would be smart enough to make the right decision. the enterprise might get worse as the result of the imprudence of the new leadership. In short, stable leadership can ensure the implementation of medium to long term strategetic plan which could benefit the enterprise in a long run if the leader is wise.

Furthermore, there's no an inherent causality between leadership and enterprise’s success. In some circumstance, it might be essential to step down power after five years to avoid corruption. For example, the president of a government is required to elect again to avoid corruption; whereas the president of a university or CEO in business do not necessarily need to resign. it might be better since current leader has more experience in his or her position than the sucessor.

Thus, no all profession - business, politics, education, government – have to choose a new leadership.