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

The author of the issue makes an unqualified assertion requiring the people in power in any profession to resign after five years. As far as I am concerned, there are a number of negative consequences that should be carefully heeded before it is applied. The ensuing paragraphs will elaborate on the most salient reasons underlying my perspective.

To begin with, the experiences acquired by authorities are so valuable that they can utilize for years and remain in their position for a long period of time. As a matter of fact, experience is not a thing that can be achieved in an immediate and facile way. Rather, it takes new comers a long time to become knowledgeable. According to a recent survey conducted among high-ranked educational managers in my country, Iran, the results show that the factor of experience is a key determinant of their being successful, which is obtained after quite a few years of responsibility. This obviously demonstrates how the durability of managers in their posts brings them experience which is of paramount importance.

Another noteworthy detrimental consequence of officials' giving up their posts has to do with the harm their organizations might suffer in the first years after officials' resignation. From a professional viewpoint, the more people work together in an organization, the better they know each other's moral characteristics, resulting in improved efficiency. With this in mind, introducing new boss, generally accompanied by subsequent changes in subordinates, can lead to the absence of harmony in the context of people who had sufficient recognition of each other before such changes. Therefore, the replacement of bosses might cause some damages to their organization and prevent them from prosperity.

Nevertheless, there might be some professions that require replacing officials after a while. Without any shadow of doubt, in the area of politics and government, the probability of corruption is more than that in the area of education and business on the grounds that the magnitude of officials' power in such areas is extremely enticing. In other words, cronyism, nepotism, and favoritism are sadly rampant among political officials. As a case in point, consider a governmental authority supposed to govern a society. Were he or she to be at his or her post in the long run, the probability he or she would be involved in corruption would increase. Thus, professional misconduct in the world of politics can be hampered to some extent through altering those in governmental power after several years.

In summation, with all this taken into account, I do believe that enforcing officials to leave their post after five years is not a rational action on the grounds that the lack of experience of new arrivals and the detrimental influence on their organization accompanied by such a measure cannot be compensated in the short term. On the other hand, it should be mentioned that replacing authorities after a period in some professions can contribute to corruption-free atmosphere there. Hence, it is highly recommended that decision-makers not take the veteran officials for granted.