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Abstract
I (Hereafter: the writer) think that arguing against the LGBTQ+ adoption right is similar to a battle. On the one side, some proponents would recognize opponents' beliefs as a chain of LGBTQ+ rights, on the other side, opponents insist that they have to punish LGBTQ+ because of this right. The writer disagrees with both camps and will propose this claim as the Gay Adoption Disrespect Argument.

Gay Adoption Right?
The LGBTQ+ adoption right (For simple: gay adoption right or GAR), this contention has been promoted as well-entrenched but is an allegation against a child, this leads us to know that on the one hand, this work is on GAR and it targets the LGBTQ+ adoption, and so, this work is neither on same-sex marriage or other types of LGBTQ+

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

2 The writer's footnote: ""He Is My Wife", Veto Adoption: A Moral Rightful Dissent" is an early draft, please do not cite without the writer's permission. Also, the writer will be indebted to you if you invite this paper to your peer-review journal. In addition, the writer has applied the writer's permanent methodology to this work. The writer has written this work as a Ph.D. semester requirement for autumn 2021.

3 The writer's footnote: The first motivating rush of this work was a comment of an activist, he was happy since he was not born in the west because of The LGBTQ+ adoption right. The comment was eye-opening. The writer is thankful to him to push the writer indirectly to think about the debate and eventually write this paper.

4 The writer's footnote: Let the writer begins with a queer author who has written on her personal experience on GAR: ""You are not my REAL mother!"" she screams from behind a locked bathroom door. She is seven. Although, all adoptive mothers anticipate this moment. I am not ready for this yet. What is a real mother? Am I one? ... And how do I defend my status as real without implying that her birth mom is somehow unreal ... Clearly my daughter's current metaphysical schema will not readily permit the notion of multiple mothers. One of us must, according to her, be an impostor ... like Descartes's evil genius"" (Park, 2005, p. 171). Then, she demands that: "My initial response to my elder daughter's insistence that I wasn't her real mother was to try undermine her claim by way of pointing out all the maternal activities I had been engaged in both for and with her. After all, who had fed, diapered, and bathed her as an infant? Who had walked the floors with her each night when she has colic? ... In short, who has lived with her and cared for her since she was three days old?"" (Park, 2008, p. 179). She confesses that "I am tired ... Tired of being unfavorably compared to her "real" mother ... At my request, my daughter's birth mom sends a letter confirming my hypothesis and urging our child to do homework." (Park, 2008, p. 181). The little girl begs her rights from the author ""I don't want to hurt your feelings. Mom, but I really want to live with my real mom"" (Park, 2005, p. 185), the author shares the rest of the experience that "I know you love me too", "I do love you, but you are not my real mom," she explains. I try a different angle. "Am I fictional?" (Park, 2005, p. 186). The writer would argue that yes! This is a prototype of a fictional mother.
Gay Adoption Disrespect Argument

These quotations and similar perspectives are full of paradoxes and inconsistencies and wrongdoings. As a result, the writer insists on the wrongfulness of GAR because GAR is struggling with the Gay Adoption Disrespect Argument (Hereafter: GADA). The argument runs as follows:

1. Partners or parents ought to respect their children.
2. LGBTQ+ – in the case of GAR by LGBTQ+- ought to respect children,
3. Respecting children means valuing and satisfying their physical, psychological, educational, and moral aspects of them,
4. LGBTQ+ could not enroll 3.,
5. If 4., then they could not respect children,
6. If 5., then GAR is wrong,
7. If LGBTQ+ would insist on GAR without 1., then, it seems that they only would satisfy their interests and desires,
8. If 7. is true, it seems that recurrently GADA is true.

Let’s begin with the premises: The first premise: The writer thinks that respect is one of the most fundamental properties of morality and so, no one could deny that adults' behavior toward children ought to be respectful. The second premise is that LGBTQ+ adults ought to respect children without considering whether they are recognized as parents or not. Because as mentioned in the first premise, respecting children is a fundamental moral action. The third and fourth premises: talk about various aspects of a child that all of them have to be considered as aspects of a respectful end as a Kantian term. The writer will insist on this view these ways:

1. Physical: There is a long list that would prove that adults' actions toward children ought to be physically respectful, i.e. it begins by avoiding the children torturing since it is a horrendous evil or escaping children from child's sex objectification or molestation by adults owing to the fact that it is child abuse.


For unilateral requirement of respectful behavior of children to the LGBTQ+ couples see: (Park, 2006, p. 220).

The writer’s footnote: The writer guesses the first version of this work had been omitted from a global philosophical website by the general editors of the website, the writer uses "guesses" because it is very unlikely that the writer deleted or did not upload the work, and magically at the same time European Union declares that all countries of the Union have to recognize same-sex partners as legitimate families.

For dissimilar idea see: (Park, 2006, pp. 211-2).
Also there are other criteria such as preserving breastfeeding a child by his or her mother.9

2. Psychological10: One more time, there are many criteria that adults ought to respect children psychologically. Thus, if they satisfy more criteria for children, they become better adults. Some of those psychological criteria include providing care, sexual properties of different sexes, showing kindness, avoiding cruel behavior, and so many others, for instance, no male couple could intimate and/or understand menopause moods and symptoms of their daughter.

3. Educational: To bring up children respectfully is the only option on the table,11 and this means that a sheltered upbringing would be a good candidate for this aspect of the debate, and so, this upbringing reasonably need to be fulfilled by GAR. The writer is doubtful that LGBTQ+ could exercise this respectful aspect for children. The main problem with the educational aspect of GAR is that LGBTQ+ couples could not treat and bring a child up as they deserve this upbringing. Educational behavior of LGBTQ+ could not be as an opposite sex couple. For instance, a lesbian partner who recognizes herself as a husband could not enroll in her educational role as a male father. Another example would be that she could not raise a son who wants to know how could behave towards his male sex organ from his father. Also, the young have this right to be autonomous and it is possible the young become fully separated from their family if the young could reach maturity and puberty, though

4. Moral: Last but not least, GAR is not only on the consequences of the adoption of children by LGBTQ+, but it is on moral duties of LGBTQ+ toward children. For the latter, we have to treat them as ends and not as means. If we consider children ends and not means, then it requires that we ought to not tell a lie on their real parents or drag children into unreal LGBTQ+ parents and their arbitrary interests and desires. Besides that, this approach does not rewrite the hetero-prefix to LGBTQ+ one like homo-prefix, but it argues the only legitimate candidate of the adoption right of children - donated gametes or other types of adoption- are a heterosexual couple since one more time GAR could not respect an adoptee, GAR treats adoptee as means, and they are means in the case of GAR because it comes from a significant untrue familial position of GAR and an essential unreal parental position of GAR. Altogether, if one collects these significant untruthiness epistemically and essential unreality metaphysically of GAR, one will recognize GAR in not legitimate morally. Proponents of GAR could not purport this thought experiment: in a possible world like X, K as female and L as a male could be a biological parents of R as their biological child

---


10 For similar idea see: (Almond, 2006, p. 110), opposite view (Park, 2006, pp. 206-7).

that in an actual world they are adopted parents via donated gamete or other types, if, in the possible world, they have heterosexual orientation to the opposite sex to reproduce of R and be healthy and R is their child, but it could not be true vis-à-vis for GAR.

GADA promotes a picture to show that GAR is not a right-holder of LGBTQ+, but it is a right's abuse of children.\textsuperscript{12}

The fifth premise to the eighth premise: If the fourth premise is true, then LGBTQ+ could not respect children, and then, the next premise is also true, hence, it seems that GAR is wrong, and so, it seems that if LGBTQ+ insists on GAR they would only satisfy their desires arbitrarily, and GADA has to be a plea rightfully.

Some opponents may prepare some objections against GADA:\textsuperscript{13}

The Fake Well-being Childhood Objection: First of all, they would think of GAR as a case of well-being in which it is the only concern of GAR and the children adoption which means the target of the physical, psychological, educational, and moral aspects of them is exclusively well-being,\textsuperscript{14} and so, providing an argument similar GADA is not more than nothing.

- The writer seriously avoids tracking this idea that well-being or happiness is the only purpose of the children's lives, though, primarily children have another fundamental aspect that is a moral one, this approach enforces putting the moral aspect as the first and fundamental aspect of children. This respectful approach toward children has placed them as mere ends and not as mere means.

- Next, the problem is that all of the happiness and well-being of GAR is based on a big lie and deception which means their parents in the case of the GAR are their parents, but there is no doubt that they are not their parents.

- Third of all, it is not possible to know GAR's future consequences for children, unless one would imagine a possible world in which a child who has been adopted by an LGBTQ+ partner and then, the one compares that GAR with opposite-sex adoption. The writer would argue that GADA produces some consequences that their disadvantages outweigh advantages seriously in that possible world.


\textsuperscript{14} For similar idea see: (Park, 2013, p. 6).
The We the Amoral Partners Objection: Another objection would be that the writer’s GADA is absurd because the writer has rambled superfluous details and words. They may add that GAR could simply be admired as a natural relationship between two partners from a biological and/or societal and/or psychological aspect. The sexual tendency is only a natural phenomenon and so, no one could deny the rights of their bearers i.e. GAR and partners are amoral in the case of GAR.

- The writer’s reply is that if it is natural as opponents’ claims of GADA, they have to confirm that it is a common argument that naturally they could not reproduce a child, and generally this ability belongs to opposite-sex marriages. Why are they so inconsistent to apply the term natural? Why do they not value unless on their last shelter: the nature?

- Another writer’s reply would be that the writer has separated one’s adoption right who has involved gender dysphoria (i.e. Transgender or Intersex) from GAR, in the former case, one is unsatisfied with his/her sexual properties, and so, it is possible that they want hormone therapy or sex reassignment surgery and then, they become as male or female with an opposite-sex orientation. In this case, they are not involved GADA. The writer coins GADA to recognize GAR’s wrongness that is excluded gender dysphoria.

- The last reply is that this objection has serious trouble that this objection covers up the naturalistic fallacy, and so, if this fallacy is true, then this objection is false.

The No Reasons Matters Childhood Objection: Another objection would be that one may admit GAR is false, but the one rejects GADA because only the theocratic approach towards GAR could defend the children rights, and religious reasons could reinforce the children rights, and secular arguments e.g. GADA could not play for this serious reason. They may propose some sort of evidence to promote the successful achievements of theocracies to undermine GAR. However, the writer’s reply is that:

- To begin with, GADA is not a theory of punishment for LGBTQ+, but it only recalls some intuitions on the children rights. The writer will be enormously unsatisfied if one would apply GADA to punish LGBTQ+. It is owing to facts that those punishments are immoral.

- Second of all, there are too many arguments against theocracies that have made theocracies undeniably illegitimate. Those are beyond the purpose of this work, and so, theocracies have much more fundamental problems to propose the children rights.

- Next, a theocratic government that is defending the children rights in a theocratic way or it may apply religious reasons towards GAR, undeniably it sacrifices morality for religions and/or theocratic governments. It devalues human beings and morality, and it wastes the only objective valued aspect of humankind: morality. The writer thinks it makes a double GADA that will
waste the children rights. It is double GADA, since, first of all, it is possible that
a theocratic government denies the children rights and GADA because of
scripture or religious doctrine, and so, both truthiness of GADA and morality
are valueless and nothing, second of all, if this theocracy admits the children
right, it is not as a result of GADA and the children rights, but it is because of
the scripture or the religious doctrine, and so, not only truthiness of GADA and
the children rights are rejected, but also, they are sacrificed to the scripture or
the religious doctrine.

- Last but not least, if there are some sorts of conservative and/or perfectionist
parties in a country, also, there have to be constant moral tendencies among
many social and political groups in the public spheres of the country, and all of
these will remain the country as an advocate of GADA, thus, we do not need a
theocracy.

The Anti-Child Liberal Objection: The next objection would be that one may claim that
GADA does not come from a fundamental aspect of liberal democracy, thus the writer's
GADA is an anti-liberal democratic argument or GADA could not consist with liberal
democracy or it is a non-liberal democratic argument.

- First of all, repeatedly the writer has to be cautious that GADA is only about the
children rights and GAR. It is neither on liberal democracy nor on other types
of governments.

- Second of all, the writer could be agnostic on liberal democracy, and then, the
writer ought to argue that all different types of governments have to apply
GADA ethically.

- The last reply is that it is enormously unfavorable and untrue to know liberal
democracies' proponents only as proponents of GAR, and so, the writer strongly
refuses GAR because the writer would not let GAR's proponents violate the
children rights.

The No Child Left Sacrifice Objection: Another objection would be that imagine a
disease has been spreading around the world and only a few people are left. Some
intend to have sex with their partners and in favor of new technological medicine that
opens children adoption without the heterosexual intimacy or adoption of other
people's children, LGBTQ+ could have GAR. Strictly, maybe no one left as long as you
deny GAR, thus, we need to confirm GAR.

- First of all, clearly some of those who would claim we confirm GAR in this case,
but may agree GAR is not as same as reproducing children naturally -the
heterosexual intimacy- and/or giving them -a heterosexual couple- a child
legally. Because they will claim that this situation enforces their criteria for
bringing up and parenting children.
Second of all, one would reply that this example not only could permit all of the immoral attitudes, e.g. massacre of all members of ethnicity instead of human beings, but also, it could apply to an opposite case that a child who has been adopted by LGBTQ+ couple may figure lying of GAR, lying of the child's parenthood and lying of the child's rearing up, and then, surely the child will wreak revenge all of humankind as soon as the adoptee grows up.

The No Children Matter Objection: A common objection against GADA is that one would recognize GAR is a choice of a couple,\(^{15}\) and so, it is not on the children rights.

This common objection needs this common reply that children are another part of GAR unless the one denies the children rights. It means GADA has this third part: children, and their needs and personality have to be respected.\(^{16}\)

Another reply is that this work is exclusively and principally on children rights and it is also on any types of adoption rights of adults that is based on monogamy and non-monogamy relationships: polygamy, polyamory, open relationships, group marriage, and so on. This shows that these relationships relate GADA to children which preclude adults from GAR.

Besides that, some of LGBTQ+ fundamentally deny children are naïve and undeveloped, though, young children could be guilty.\(^{17}\) To writer's knowledge, there is no doubt that it is a retrogressive proposal, a shameful one, since it is not only true children are innocent morally. But also, it is an arrogant and arbitrary benefits and interests of the LGBTQ+.

The Irrelevant Religious Objection: The last objection to GADA would come from religious discourse and it is argued GAR is false, it is not because of GADA, but it is because one directly perceives a religious experience i.e. mystical experience, religious feeling, or revelation, etc.

First of all, the writer believes that religious (and mystical) experiences do not have a direct relation to morality and GADA. The writer thinks the religious experience has nothing in common with the morality of the children rights because imagine a religious experience that prescribes GAR is true, then, a question would arise whether the religious experience could identify itself to deny the children rights e.g. opposite of GADA. If it is possible a religious experience order violates the children rights and we could judge the experience morally, thus, it is undoubtedly true that the morality of children rights is independent of religious experience semantically, epistemologically, and metaphysically.

\(^{15}\) For similar idea see: (Park, 2006, p. 214), (Park, 2013, p. 7),

\(^{16}\) For similar idea see: (Almond, 2006, p. 110).

\(^{17}\) For similar idea see: (Park, 2013, p. 19).
• In the same case, one may argue that a real religious experience could track moral principles and norms exclusively, and this leads us to know that religious experience could track GADA. The writer’s reply would be that it is true that this religious experience epistemologically is the same as the epistemic aspect of the morality of children rights, but it continually remains the morality of children rights is independent of religious experience semantically and metaphysically, since, the religious experience does not present GADA, but it only prescribes justification of GADA epistemologically.

• One more time, one may argue that it is not only true that a real religious experience could track moral principles and norms exclusively, and this leads us to know that religious experience could track GADA, but also, the religious experience really presents GADA as an argument, and the one could perceive the GADA through the experience. The writer's reply would be that it is true that the religious experience epistemologically is the same as the epistemic aspect of the morality of children rights as the first reply, but also, GADA is perceived by the religious experience meaningfully as the second reply. However, it remains that the morality of children rights is independent of religious experience metaphysically, due to the fact that religious experience—both parts of it: the religious or the experience— is one thing and valuable aspect of the morality of children rights is another thing. The former perceives an experience as the religious one, and the latter grasps a value of GADA or the children rights that is the non-religious one.

The by Degree Psychological Objection: One may object that psychological intimacy between children and parents is by degree, and so, no one could form boundaries of their relationship. For instance, a divorce could be harmful to children as same as opposite-sex adoption or as same as same-sex adoption etc. or lack of emotional behavior toward children could be harmful as same as GAR.18 Thus, they are different only in degree, but they have the same quality.

• The writer's reply to this objection is that this objection reinforces the GADA and does not undermine GADA, because, it proves the vast domain of our psychological respectful responsibilities and actions towards children, i.e. we need to prioritize some of the responsibilities and actions to some other responsibilities and actions or we appreciate some parents and we agree that some parents are better than other parents toward children or we acknowledge this rightful question that what would be our reaction and responses toward the children questions on some special cases e.g. divorce or nonexistence of ample emotions.

The Bottle-Feed Objection: One may object that it is true that for example, a gay couple could not breastfeed a child, but there are too many women who prefer to bottle-feed a child to breastfeed a child, or may breast cancer cause pain in the condition of

18 For similar idea see: (Park, 2013).
breastfeeding a child. Another similar objection would be that there is a doubt about whether there is a valuable weight of breastfeeding a child as a respectful action.

- A reply to the former type of this objection will arise that women principally could breastfeed a child, but a gay couple principally could not breastfeed a child. It also is true for similar cases of LGBTQ+.

- The writer's reply to the later type of the objection is that it is a retrogression, since, it is not only true that this objection rejects the valuable aspect of a physical relationship between a mother and her child and it denies a mother's self-denial, but also, the one would not admit the natural aspect of this physical relationship.

The Divorce as GAR Objection: Some may object that moral aspect of GADA could be a constraint for divorced opposite-sex parents, and so, GAR and opposite-sex divorcing are on the same page. Children could ask why their parents got to be separated in the case of bringing them into the world, children reasonably complain they have lost their family which is irreplaceable.

- Although the writer thinks this rightful complaint reinforces GADA and does not undermine GADA, since parents have to explain why they are separated and what are their reasons in favor of this separation, this explanation needs to be very persuasive and reasonable. To illustrate, one of the few reasons to justify this separation is that one or both of them lose their respectful personality and worthiness in the condition that they insist on continuing their marriage, and so, their obligation is that one or both of them have to split up, and this obligation is prior to marriage's obligation.

- Also, this objection has proven that some obligation toward children is very strong, and only a few cases of justified divorce are permissible. Besides that, this aspect of children promotes GADA, because there are the objections against both opposite-sex divorce and GAR to identify the importance of children.

**Conclusion**

LGBTQ+ adoption right is a cloth, a designed cloth that has a humanistic name: right. But, at its heart, it creates violating the children rights. The writer believes that civilized LGBTQ+ have to ask themselves whether they would remain moral persons or they would violate the children rights. They do not have GAR because GADA is the multifaceted argument against GAY that seems it is impossible to escape from it righteously. Altogether, real judges when hearing a plea "he is my wife", will "veto adoption" which is a "moral rightful dissent".
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