**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。

2. 然而，这个因果推论(causal inference)具有巨大的漏洞(numerous flaws): ://\*\*领导人修路，10年，但是只能5年，受人民否定，坚持，最后人民获利

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 ‘new trend’ oriented and the ‘comprehensive consideration’ 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 need to be recommend to resign after five years since different fields have divergent plan. Both sides justify themselves with sound reasons. From my perspective, in most cases, I would prefer the latter rather than the former.因为前者太绝对了

The ‘new trend’ supporters might argue that with the long management of one leader, an enterprise might tend to be conservative. A good case in hand is the experience of my internship at Baidu, a multination technology company who dominate many fields such as deep learning, big data, cloud computing, etc., in China. Our team focus on exert machine learning, a computational model, to solve the computer vision problem. Although Our boss already put great amount of time researching on it, he was a little bit conservative and refuse to use the new model because he alleged it 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.

Nevertheless, the ‘comprehensive consideration’ believers might also the serious drawbacks of changing leader. Some field, like education, might not have to select a new leadership. Here is an example, Fei-Fei Li, one president of Tsinghua university, the best university of China, once want to establish a new educational approach. This approach involves in teachers’ salary and undergraduates’ study plan. It’s too complicated and can’t to be achieved within five years. Some teachers didn’t support her since there are conflicts of interest. If she had to be step down after five years and the new president didn’t consist the approach, Tsinghua university won’t have so many talents and resources to establish the world class university. Moreover, on one can guarantee that new leader would be ‘intelligent’ enough to do the right decision. The situation of the enterprise might become worse as the result of the imprudence of the new leadership. In short, not all fields need to change the leadership.

Furthermore, there's an inherent tradeoff between leadership and enterprise’s success. In some fields and circumstance, it might be essential to step down the in power after five years. For example, the president of government need to be force to elect again to forestall the corruption of power; whereas the president of a university or business might not be demand to leave it might be better since current leader has better experience in his or her position. The essence of the claim is to maximize benefits and minimize the hazards not thwart the career of leadership. Hence, if the present leader is eager to absorb new ideas and doesn’t drug the development of the enterprise, he or she doesn’t need to be stand down.

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