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

The writer of the issue states that leadership in any profession should change every five years. With consideration to the advantages of this approach in some specific professions, I totally disagree with this policy for two main reasons.

First of all, the management of many institutes, such as educational or commercial corporations, needs sustainability. In fact, frequent changes in the leadership of these companies lead to inconsistency. That is, in a big company, strategies adopted by a manager need adequate time to wrap up and make the company successful. For example, in, Microsoft company, one of the most successful companies all over the world, Bill Gates, the manager of the company, had been the leader of the company for about twenty years and could accomplish his ideas in the sufficient time while enjoying stability and this policy leads to succeed. Hence, while a manager is efficient and successful in leading an institute, alternation in the leadership not only isn't necessary but also leads to instability.

The second reason that I want to mention is that when someone undertakes the management of a company, he or she gains valuable experiences during the management period. These experiences can be crucial for managing the company under challenging situations or in economic and managerial crises. High-experienced managers have fantastic mental skills in decision-making and adopting strategies in various conditions. They acquired many of these skills during their management period. Combining these skills with sufficient knowledge can help managers overcome crises.

However, we should consider that in some professions, changes in leadership are essential for perfectly leading the complex. In my opinion, these changes are necessary for professions that are related to politics, especially for managers who adopt strategies for society administration. In this case, Management changing is a beneficial instrument for society members who want to monitor and control the politician's acts. This policy also prevents self-centeredness. Because when a manager changes after five years, the strategies, programs, and approaches also change. Though, these changes must base on the vote of the majority of the society. Thus, the leadership must be responsible to the community. Therefore, if people are satisfied with the leaders' approaches, they will select a leader with similar approaches. But, if the manager doesn't consider social tendencies, society will select a person with other thoughts and programs.

In sum, I believe that leadership-changing isn't a beneficial policy in a wide-ranging group of professions. Stability and utilizing the valuable experiences of the managers are two important reasons why I entirely disagree with this policy. However, this policy can be useful in some professions, especially those related to politics.