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Abstract

In this article, I have argued that the right to secede as a right to territory is multilateral, also the writer has suggested heterogeneous nationalism to avoidance of secession. Moreover, the writer has presented the Martyr Argument against the primary rights of secession and has related it to relevant topics.
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Multilateralism and Heterogeneous Nationalism

The first note of this section is on secession and territorial debates that claim the right to secede is the right to secede as a right to territory multilaterally since there is a relation that secessionists, remainders, and a state comprise the segments of the relation. Imagine a territory without a state that straddles the borders between the

1 Ph.D. Student of Philosophy of Religion at IHCS (Tehran–Iran): lotfiyazdi@gmail.com

2 The writer's footnote: I (hereafter: the writer) finished this work in 2019 and uploaded it somewhere, and then the writer continually has been updating references of this work. In addition, the writer would like to thank some activists who have been providing critiques of the writer's thoughts during these years. Likewise, the writer is indebted to philosophers, social and political scientists, and legal scholars who directly sent their works to the writer. Also, the writer has to thank some notes to the writer. Lastly, this article is dedicated to the people of the writer's country.

3 The writer's footnote: This article allows only four types of sentences and paragraphs: 1. The writer's innovative ideas, 2. Quotations, 3. Interpretations, and 4. Footnotes: 4.1. The writer's footnote (footnotes of mine), 4.2. Literature's footnote of philosophy of secession (only empirical footnotes: 10th & 11th). The writer named this methodology "Microscopic Analyticity".


The writer's footnote: The writer is an anti-secessionist and the writer's theory (hereafter: the theory) is anti-model of secession.


6 For Institutional multilateral secession see: (Perez-Lozano, 2022, pp. 13-4).

7 For secession and other political concepts see: A. Secession and/or intervention (Roth, 2015), (Fabry, 2013, pp. 94-100), B. And/or revolution (Buchanan, 1991a, pp. 326-7), (Buchanan, 1991b, p. 10),
lands institutionally,\(^8\) individuals who inhabit the territory ought to contribute to the territory as a whole, and every particular citizen of the country possesses the same right as the other citizens of the country where each centimeter does not belong to private ownership,\(^9\) the state does not permit to exchange those public places to the private one as they belong to all citizens of the country, therefore, territory as equity sharing is a public right.

In addition, there is another note that is related to national debates of secession, it is claimed that we have to pursue these policies to avoid secession: 1. Recognizing differential countries and recognizing their differential challenges not as global

---


---

\(^9\) For secession and privatizing of territory see: (Rothbard, 1998, p. 84).
struggles,\textsuperscript{10} 2. Recognizing heterogeneous nationalism\textsuperscript{11} since it is a tremendous description of some nationalities and their people, and we have to discern this non-hegemonic policy to this type of nationalism due to the fact that the heterogeneous is meticulously much more parallel with the human values esp. an unplanned heterogeneous one.

The Martyr Argument

First groups of the theories of secession are the Primary Right theories\textsuperscript{12} infringes reminders’ rights that have two types:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ascriptivist Right Theories\textsuperscript{13} i.e.:
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{10} For secession and the similar empirical claim see: (Chandhoke, 2014b, p. 51).

The writer’s footnote: The writer’s country is an exceptionally suitable example to know how a country has been devastated by all of the permanent secessionist temptations of some countries.


The Distributive Justice


For the Communitarian Right Theories as the Ascriptivist Right Theories see: (Pavkovic, 2003, pp. 79-80), (Gilbert, 1998).

Nonetheless, there are some objections against all of the Primary Right Theories i.e. Martyr Argument\textsuperscript{19}.


\textsuperscript{16} For the Republican Right Theories as the Plebiscitarian Right Theories see: (Pérez Lozano, 2021), (Pérez, 2017), (Perez-Lozano, 2022).

\textsuperscript{17} For the Libertarian Right Theories as the Plebiscitarian Right Theories see: (Kreptul, 2003), (Rothbard, 1998), (McGee, 1994).

\textsuperscript{18} For the Realist Right Theories as the Plebiscitarian Right Theories see: (Sanjaume-Calvet, 2020).


The writer's footnote: First of all, the thought of the Martyr Argument came to the writer's mind in a discussion more than ten years ago, and the writer had to present a pure ethical argument without referring to culture, history, and heritage. In addition, the writer has studied Hirschman's definition very recently and the writer thinks that Hirschman would claim that there is a similarity between martyrdom and secession and both of them are remorseless. Although, the writer believes that secession is based on the Marty Argument morally.
The second group of theories of secession is the Remedial Right Theories\(^{20}\) that are considered the well-settled theories somehow as a standard theory.\(^{21}\)

The writer has presented Martyr Argument as a noninstitutional deontological argument, since, it is a mere fact that one cannot compensate for the grievous harms of reminders and the infringement’s basic rights of them, then, there could not be utilities and consequences of those immoral acts, but they are about ignoring the transgression of reminder’s moral properties. As a result, the right to secede as a right is based on moral property which is a remedial cure for remedial situations of unilateral or consensual cases, as a Kantian term it is about the mere ends of human beings and their respectful personhood and so, consequentialist argument on the right to secede is not cogent. Martyr Argument which is the pivotal part of the theory is constructed as follows: One cannot redress for the value of a young martyr who was murdered while defending a non-colonizer country. Imagine a person who lived in a village located on the borderline that was assailed by another country. He passed away not only for defending his village and its people in an unjust war but also for defending the whole of the country, his blood has made the boundaries morally valuable and each inch of the country is painted by the blood of this innocent martyr owing to this fact that the innocent martyr died for moral values and a non-colonizer country’s defending, he did not die for immoral purposes and attacking in favor of a colonizer country. As a result, unilateral secession is considered a transgressor of other people’s rights. The important points of this argument are mentioned below:

A is a non-colonizer country that is forced to enter an unjust war started by B,

---


\(^{21}\) For secession and similar claim see: (Wellman, 2006), (Norman, 2003, p. 198).
B represents an offensive country, 

X is an innocent young person who lives in A, and his village is near the borderline where the war takes place.

Z is a secessionist part of A.

- B attacks A,
- X passed away while defending A that including Z,
- After his death, Z would secede from A,
- But X passed away as a result of defending A,
- Defending A as a whole territory is contrary to withdrawing of a part of that territory,
- Because unilateral withdrawing of Z from A is destroying A as a whole country where defended by X,
- The above-mentioned destroying is come from defending a non-colonizer country by an innocent martyr that is moral contrary to incentives of Z to be an independent territory,
- Then, how Z could compensate and solve this contrary?
- It is undeniably true that it is morally impossible. Owing to the fact that there is nothing one can do about compensating for the life of an innocent martyr as it is about the moral property of the martyrdom and transgressing of martyr's blood,
- Then, it is not morally possible to redress the life of that martyr,
- As a consequence, unilateral secession is morally unpermitted, except as the theory.

Martyr Argument shows only remedial cure for remedial situations of unilateral or consensual cases of secession (hereafter: RCRSUCCS) is permissible. Hence, imagine A as the richest and democratic country that democratically joins B as the poorest and undemocratic country, and B welcomes A, although, Martyr Argument is morally sufficient to avert A's secession from B, since, we have to acknowledge B as a present-day country that secession of every part of B is permitted only as these two ways:

- The remedial cure for remedial situations of unilateral cases (hereafter: RCRSUC): 1. Self-defense: There are persistent serious and horrendous injustices and/or grave violations of basic human rights such as genocide against huge numbers of people that could not be rectified by other political or legal solutions and escaping ways for those people are unfeasible and unreasonable. 2. Unjust seizure: The unjust seizure of a sovereign territory i.e. usurpation by foreigners and colonization, annexation, and occupation.
- The remedial cure for remedial situations of consensual cases (hereafter: RCRSCC) is a multilateral, negotiated, conservative and democratic procedure with a supermajority vote of all citizens.

---

22 For secession and similar claim see: (Buchanan & Golove, 2004, p. 910).
The writer thinks legalization of secession remains a futile striving since it is not only true that barbaric states do not obey the moral norms and they breach the law as RCRSUC, but also, it requires to codify numerous provisions in constitutional and/or international law as RCRSUCCS and it may lead to arbitrary legal interpretation in favor of some countries. Altogether, we only require a supreme international court to obey the extreme moral codes and has generated those codes through well-entrenched provisions in exceptional cases when we shall hold the court and shall declare and impose them as RCRSUC.

If a group of people secede from a country or join another country as an irredentist without these two permissible political models of secession, those political acts violate the other populace's rights atrociously. However, Martyr Argument produces some notes that fundamentally restrict these two models of secession:

1. Institutional Democratic Right Note: The writer has to reply to the Institutional Democratic Right Argument of the Remedial Right Theories. Some argue in favor of the right to secede in the case of lack of democracy and human rights in a government, and so, they argue in the other cases of secessionist incentives have to be banned incentives in the movements,23 or have to regain the territory in the case of illegitimate secession.24 The writer's reply has three parts: First of all, there is no doubt that democracy is the most high-quality political system among current political systems, even though, lack of democracy and human rights does not contain inherently a permission to withdraw a territory unilaterally, it means that we have to strive for a democratic state that includes human rights. Needless to say, there is a connection between the right to secede as a right to territory and a right to democracy, because a right to secede includes a right to territory and a right to a new independent democratic or non-democratic state, and conversely, there is a -partial- overlapping between a right to secede and a right to democracy. For instance, imagine that A is a territory that includes three parts: J, K, and L, and the political system of A is a dictatorship which infringes human rights. Every act of people of K who are fascinated by the undeniable democratic values to overthrow the dictator state and replace A with a democratic system means their striving that A becomes a democratic state and this does not mean an independent state and does not equal having a right to A’s territory and this violates the J and L’s moral rights. Moreover, the second part is that imagine A is an ancient country with primary democratic values in the past or now, this situation never means that K is allowed to secede, since, it is unfair to abandon those past or present strivings or become hopeless to endeavor for democratic values or as mentioned in the first part of the reply. The Last part is that the Institutional Democratic Right Argument could be in favor of democratic countries and be in disfavor of nondemocratic counties arbitrarily, and so, it could not be nominated candidate as an argument to right to secede. Altogether, this reply is against both Remedial Right and Primary Right arguments that desire to create a right to secede upon democratic values.

23 For secession and similar claim see: (Buchanan, 1998a, pp. 29-30).

24 For secession and similar claim see: (Margalit & Raz, 1990, p. 442).
2. Ancient Countries Note: In the disfavor of RCRS, the writer would insist that the heterogeneous ancient countries as antiquity are normatively heritages of humankind, and encouraging the citizens of those countries to stay together is a criterion, and we have to preventing secession in those countries. There are past and future generations that get involved with the timeless ancient countries, and so, next generations who will live in the hypothetical secessionist region will prefer antiquity to the newly-established country, also the remainders of the former territory will suffer from the political acts of their descendants. Moreover, those who lived in the past had spent their lives in the country in different ways before we could reach their success, thus we have to retain their accomplishments culturally and morally.

3. Past Borders Note: There are many borders and countries which have been forcibly involved in wars, those have been changed during hundreds or thousands of years, those have not been as same as in the past. As a result, it seems the writer has put the Martyr Argument on ice until it could be replaced with other arguments. Nevertheless, the writer thinks that this note reinforces Martyr Argument and does not undermine it, because one has to distinguish between legitimacy and illegitimacy of those cases to apply Martyr Argument e.g. the question that whether they are non-colonizer countries or not.

4. Regaining Note: Martyr Argument and the theory of it –RCRSUCCS- bans violence and permit states and remainders to regain their lost territories legally and morally in the condition of immoral secession or irredentism, however, first of all, we have to avoid adding more transgression of basic human rights and violence, moreover, we ought to start a morally justifiable negotiation on the regaining of the lost territories with those colonizers or secessionists, also we need to present all-things-considered arguments and evidence that could prove our claim, it is also necessary to involve a supreme international court to assess the process.

5. Double Remedialism Note: It was claimed that threshold other compatriots and remainders are impeccable and dissatisfied in hard cases due to the fact that multilateral territorial rights of them are contravened by secessionists. However, secessionists may dwell on secession and argue they are entitled to secession, though, it is presumed that humanitarian intervention, nonviolent revolution, civil disobedience, and referendum of constitutional law are superior to secession owing to fact that these solutions do not involve bloodshed of victims or transgression of blameless remainders' rights. This attitude shows RCRSUCCS is a last remedial cure of remedial situations in which other political tools do not work at all. For instance, imagine that a supreme international court condemns states' inhumanity and imposes punishment, there would be the de facto condition of recurring felonies, no other political tools are accessible, and so, secession could be on the table to escape from recurring ferocities.

\[25\text{ For secession and similar claim see: (Margalit & Raz, 1990, p. 442).}\]

\[26\text{ For secession and similar claim see: (Sunstein, 1991, p. 635).}\]
6. Animal Husbandry Note: It has been advised that if a state would triumph over secessionist incentives, it has to immediately transplant or deport minorities nationally, ethnically, or religiously, etc. Let the world become more tribalistic if the state would preserve the state’s sovereignty, territory, and nationhood. By contrast, it is shocking some countries urge and/or compel other countries to apply this political method, the writer avoids creating this tribalistic animal husbandry.

7. Supervenient Note: There is a relation between victims and tyrants into those savageries, if victims are victimized by a state and are not victimized by other compatriots, then it appears that those remainders are profoundly unhappy with cruelties, are powerless to rescue targets from oppression, and are motivationally restrain persecutors from accomplishing persecution. In those atrocities, moral wrongness supervenes upon tyrants and does not upon the remainders, especially in undemocratic states since those states are undemocratic and the citizens are not a part of the state's decisions and acts.

8. Temporary-Permanent Note: As RCRSUCCS, it seems true that temporary secession is an antidote. Although imagine R is a country in which three groups live there as X (has 80% of the territory and population), Y (has 15% of the territory and population), and Z (has 5% of the territory and population), a disagreement strikes, thus Xs attacks Zs unjustifiably, strategically and timely. This turpitude makes Xs commit an infringement of basic human rights of Zs, 88% of Ys approve the strike and only 12% of Ys disagree with the strike. If it is not clear whether the prior political tools e.g. humanitarian intervention is adequate or not, Z ought to secede from R at once permanently. There are no arguments to prohibit this Z's right, since respecting and rescuing Zs as human beings are the first-order obligations.

9. U Minority Note: Another hypothetical case is that imagine G is a country includes M, N, and L that have a supermajority of G, and they would intend to separate from a minority part of G that is identified as U, and it is exactly the same as minority’s secession. In this case, M, N, and L are not permitted to secede from U, unless they are allowed through RCRSUCCS.

10. Self-defeating Note: Imagine L is a country that includes F as an absolute majority of L, M as a minority of L, M unjustifiably and unilaterally would secede from F, it is not as RCRSUCCS, then F Attacks M, but the attack is the outcome of this unjustified secession and it is not because of RCRSUCC, and so, RCRSUCC is self-defeating here. Therefore, the writer bans secession and recommends other political tools.

11. Disgrace Note: If there could be a multilateral, negotiated, conservative and democratic procedure with a supermajority vote of all citizens to secede a part or some parts of a country from the country as RCRSCC, but Martyr Argument brings disgrace to secessionists, reminders and the state since they waste

---

27 For secession and similar claim see: (Chandhoke, 2014a, p. 6).

28 For secession and similar claim see: (Lincoln, 2001, pp. 436-7).
sacrifices of past martyrs as the argument, and RCRSCC could not redress the life of martyrs. Therefore, RCRSCC with the aforementioned notes could be a case of secession legally, though it could not be a case of secession morally and everyone could strive to revise the law to block RCRSCC.

As a result of the Martyr Argument, we ought to persuade everyone and every group to follow the theory: RCRSUCCS, and foil acts of those who do not account for this moral defense.

**Conclusion**

The writer thinks that Multilateralism, Heterogeneous Nationalism, and Martyr Argument and its notes are a panacea for questions, troubles, and debates of secession philosophically. The writer believes no philosophical theory could escape from RCRSUCCS, and it appears that the theory has discovered "what is wrong with secession?" morally.
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