“A wise man… [accustoms himself to changing times], as water shapes itself to the vessel that contains it”. Stagnation in any field is predominantly decried because it hampers change; which fundamentally fuels progress and advancement. The writer of this prompt asserts that in any profession— may it be business, education or governmental affairs—authoritarians should resign after five years. To some extent, I can substantiate what the author maintains; however, there are instances that I abnegate the notion. Change is required for revitalizing any business structure and prevent corruption, but that does not always apply in fields that require more experience or already have a qualified leader. Three reasons that will be advanced in support of my claim.

In the modern-day society, conditions are rapidly changing; which gives rise to the need for agile adaptation. The advancement of technology, introduction of new management methods –or the improvement of pre-existing ones—require professions such as businesses to satisfy the demands. Thus, it is pragmatic that in a business setting, the one in power should be replaced with someone who is more familiar with these advancements.

Similarly, in governmental affairs, the person in charge must be denounced after a period of time in order to prevent protracted authority of the governor- which is most likely to abet corruption. The reason for such claim underlies in the fact that after a few years of being empowered, it is highly likely that the individual would act in a way to assure their permanence and personal gain; hence, a period of five years would wane their acrimonious intentions by limiting the time they can be in control of power.

On the other hand, there are fields such as education and science, which rely heavily on the experience of their leader. That is why in academia, most of the people who are in charge, or who are revered, are higher on the age spectrum. Regarding these professions, empowering people who are good at what they do, and constantly impugn their abilities and hone their skills, will engender true masters of their craft. Mastery in any of these fields require time and effort which is not accumulated easily or over-night. In many cases, scientific research could span well over a decade; if we were to change the person who was in charge, it would be detrimental to the process and progress of the experiment- or research- because there will be a lag time due to the adaptation to new protocols or management; hence, if the person in charge is qualified and flexible, there is no reason to change them.

In addition, the fruition of some goals are only feasible if enough time is elapsed and the process cannot be rushed. If the leader of a movement is changed, the initial aspiration of that movement could be nullified; However, it is essential to circumvent common authoritative issues, such as lust of totalitarian power, negation of required change and lack of compassion towards the supporters of the cause.

In sum, based on the above-mentioned advancements, I concur that 5 years could be enough time for specific professions’ leaders to prosper; however, that is not always the case. Some professions rely more on the experience on the individual in charge, which is only attainable through being in the position of power for a longer time. It must be taken into consideration that this is a not a “one-size fits all” scenario and the verdict depends on the circumstances in which the situation presents itself.