The writer of the issue states that those in power should step down after a brief tenure of five years as he believes that revitalization through new leadership is essential. Although new leadership can bring new ideas and new horizons in the path of reaching an organization's goals; however, I believe that there are some negative aspects along with this policy, which might outweigh the benefits mentioned above.

First, bringing new leadership may result in loss of useful experience that the predecessor has achieved through five years working, and learning every aspect of the work. At the end of the tenure, the person may have a high level of experience and performance, so the removal will result in losing a valuable leader, which, in some cases, cannot be compensated any more. On the other hand, a new leader might be lacking the necessary experience to run the organization which can result in hampering the progress of the organization. For example, Microsoft whose successes are attributable to Bill Gates business savvy would not have been such a successful organization, If he had been forced out of the power after a brief period of five years.

Another negative aspect of hiring new leadership instead of holding an experienced one is that it may cause some interruptions in the ongoing procedures which are central to the organization's success. It is well known that taking time is inevitable in the process of being aware enough of the procedures with which a new one would confront as a new leader. Therefore, it can cause some suspensions in reaching the organization's accomplishments which may not be achieved during five years, causing decreased motivational level and commitment to the organization. This would certainly impede the progress of the organization.

However, some may argue that long tenure may cause leaders to become dramatically autocratic in such a way that they misuse their othurities, but such problems can be overcome with establishing some  rules and accountability committees. For example, in some countries, there is a congress to impeach even the sitting president in order to correct the decisions made by him or her. Therefore, the benefit of revitalization can also be achieved by other measures than the leadership switch, for instance, by appointing new consultants, while using the experienced leaders.

To draw the conclusion based on the above-mentioned statements, I believe that changing the leadership in a short period of five years can not only cause losing the competent and experienced leaders, but it also postpone the organization's achievements, which lowering the motivational level of the employees. Moreover, the policy of new leader might pave a detrimental way for the organization, especially, if not in concord with the predecessor. Therefore, it is recommended the leader in any endeavor must be allowed to continue for a longer period than five year; however, effective legal systems must be in place to make them accountable for their decisions.