

Patriotism is supporting your country all the time and your government when it deserve it

Outlines:

You have misinterpreted the topic

Patriotism is supporting the country

Patriotism is not about supporting the govt all the time

① Introduction

② Patriotism is unconditional servitude to state

① State is source of unity and provides identity

② Permanent and sovereign

③ State interests always post priority

④ Support during crisis, war and peace

③ Government response is conditional

① Representation of state

② Government is changeable and accountable

③ Government enacts laws and execute policies

④ Maintain law and order and socio-economic welfare of people

4. State and Government support differ

① Crisis, wars, and disaster unite people but government actions can be opposed

case in point: Flood in Pakistan

US in Iraq

② Existential threat to state is uncompromising governments can be changed

case in point: Chinese resistance to Japan

and internal struggle for power

③ Government exists within states; draws legitimacy from state

case in point: Transition in Afghan government and Bangladesh; legitimacy differs

④ Protection of states' interests by government

case in point: Russia-Ukraine war

⑤ Conclusion

Introduction

Patriotism thrives on loyalty; government endures by competence. Government enacts and executes laws; so, people often evaluate its policies and actions. The ability to protect national interests and public interests gives governments effective support. However, failure to such commitment results in weakening support of the people. Meanwhile, people render unconditional support to the state, thereby transcending any kind of reasoning. In addition to unconditional sumitude, people consider state as permanent and sovereign entity. Government draws its legitimacy from state while people gain their identity. Hence, people reaffirm their identity by supporting their state during war, peace, crises, and disasters; however, government's policies and actions are tested everytime so as to ~~creep maximum~~ benefits.

The one who uses force is afraid of reasoning

Outlines:

- ① Introduction
- ② Belief in mental superiority leads to dissenting voices.
 - ① Fear of dominance of dissenting voices
 - ② Lack of negotiating and diplomatic skills pushes towards aggression
 - ③ Accountability, question of legitimacy, and disclosure of flaws in policy weaken status quo
- ③ Enacts laws to legitimize the use of force
 - ① Suppress freedom of speech and press
 - ② Construction of national vocabulary
 - ③ Rewriting history and indoctrination
- ④ Blocking reasoning brings socio-economic impacts
 - ① Blocks creativity, awareness, and progress and opens door to social evils
 - ② Narrow decision-making circle weakens national unity and sovereignty
 - ③ National prestige impacts foreign investment
- ⑤ Symbolic and dictating leadership poses threats to national security
 - ① Foreign powers exploits social grievances
 - ② Disrupted social order creates instability
 - ③ Weakened national unity reduces states ability to defend in times of war
- ⑥ Conclusion

Introduction

Standing on the edifice of sand, force shields the weak argument by suppressing dissenting voices. Distorting the dissenting voices becomes the top priority of leadership. By constructing national vocabulary and by manufacturing truth, reason is denied to weaken the status quo. This manifests the fear of dominance of reasoning. Hence, frustration with reasoning leads them to use force. Meanwhile, they enact laws to curtail freedom of speech and press. The underlying reason behind such moves is that it prevents raising questions on the use of force, thus, providing legal cover to their actions and legitimizing the use of force. However, such systematic suppression of intellect brings grave socio-economic consequences such as class inequality, authoritarianism, and weakened democratic norms. As a result of narrow decision-making circle, social deprivation and grievances are often exploited by foreign powers. Thus, weak national image and symbolic leadership with fewer negotiating skills resorts to aggression to counter reason, which muffles but never extinguishes.