**Amir Rahimzadeh**

**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.

People who are in charge in high-powered jobs have significant roles in society, and their decisions and performance have major effects on various people; while some individuals believe that those people who are in power should be replaced after five years, in my opinion, that decision can harm society due to two marked reasons.

To begin with, based on different researches, it takes several years, even decades, for a person to achieve his major goals or for an organization or business company to become successful; thus, enough time should be conferred to those who are in charge. For instance, a new president has an agenda for transforming the economy of his country for better. First, it took some time to select the best economists of the country, following that they should develop a general plan based on the circumstances and current situations, and after revising the plan for several times, finally, it is ready to be adopted. Besides, economists unanimously think that it takes at least four to five years for economic factors to show their results, and more importantly it needs persistence in policies and regulations for those alterations to be sustainable. Since many rules, mindsets, and policies can easily alter when a president is gone, all those plans, efforts, and positive trends can be spoiled ,so, in many cases, changing the person who is in charge not only destroys all his plans, but it also can squander a huge amount of money and hard works of a nation.

Moreover, in many situations, the main reason for changing the person who is in power is to boost the performance of that organization. However, from my standpoint, in many cases, that will not necessarily happen because of two reasons. Firstly, being one of the most notable characteristics of a prosperous CEO, president, or dean of a university, experience is an indispensable trait that one who is in charge must have. While people who are novice will inevitably make poor decisions and will have some errors in operating their job, experienced individuals will probably have a better performance regarding their expertise. Furthermore, people who are superseded can have a poor performance in their new job since they are not competent and lack other crucial traits of a favored person in power. For example, many electorates who vote in elections hope that major problems of their country will be solved by changing the president, yet after a short time, they are flabbergasted by the weak performance of the new administration and wish that the former president never would have changed.

On the other hand, many people especially those in power can become complacent after a while and do their mundane routine only for the sake of making money; thus, they will not have any passion or ambition anymore, and they do not seek significant goals diligently, leading to the squandering of time, energy, and aptitudes in a company or institution. Therefore, in these cases that need for a change seems compulsory, and the new person in charge can revive that organization and give novel ideas, it would be beneficial to step down people in power.

To sum up, I adopt the view that people in power should not be replaced only after five years since time is necessary for an idea or an enterprise to boom completely and replacing the person in power can stop that process; secondly, changing will not guarantee positive results. Nevertheless, when an institution is stuck and does not enhance its performance, stepping down the person in charge seems a smart notion.