

[Why create a Wikiversity account?](#)[\[dismiss\]](#)

Is LGBTQIA+ being forced on society?

[Add languages](#)Resource [Discuss](#)[Read](#) [Edit](#) [Edit source](#) [View history](#) [Tools](#)

This resource is a [wikidebate](#), a collaborative effort to gather and organize all arguments on a given issue. Feel free to **add** new arguments, **rewrite** long or confusing arguments, and **remove** irrelevant or low-effort arguments. That's the unique wiki aspect of wikidebates! You can even **restructure**, **rename** or **delete** entire debates when necessary. See the [Wikidebate guidelines](#) for more.

Nowadays, being homosexual, transgender, queer, non-binary, etc. is relatively no longer considered strange. Everyone is allowed to be who they want to be. But does the whole movement of LGBTQIA+ (abbreviation for [Lesbian](#), [Gay](#), [Bisexual](#), [Transgender](#), [Queer](#), [Intersex](#) and [Asexual](#)) sometimes go too far? Do people have to accept everything, no matter how unusual or unique something is? Are the norms and values of this movement being imposed on society?



Subject classification: this is a philosophy resource.












Subject classification: this is a psychology resource.













LGBTQIA+ is being forced on society [\[edit\]](#) [\[edit source\]](#)

Pro [\[edit\]](#) [\[edit source\]](#)


















- + *Pro* These days, everything seems to be about LGBTQIA+. Take, for example, the opening of the [2024 Summer Olympics](#). The LGBTQIA+ community is a focal point during the Paris Olympics.^[1]
 - ! *Objection* It is not forcing you personally to become gay or lesbian.
 - ! *Objection* It's more that it's being enforced in the sense that everyone has to consider everything and that everything has to be normalized. For example, people don't celebrate being heterosexual or cisgender. You can be yourself, but keep it to yourself and don't bother others with it.
 - ! *Objection* People don't celebrate being heterosexual or cisgender due to those being considered the default options for an individual. In doing so, any representation of queer people becomes hysterized, such as Disney movies with minor characters coded as gay, or focus on the LGBTQIA+ community at the Olympics. Why is the normalization and representation of queer people in public spaces to be considered negative or wrong?
 - ! *Objection* This generalizes the queer community as a homogenous group of people who all seek to force their identities upon the general public. The majority of queer people seek to live their lives with a sense of normalcy.
 - ! *Objection* Unlike heterosexual people, those who are a part of the LGBTQIA+ have been historically oppressed and still are, in varying degrees, oppressed in many countries today hence a need to recognize and/or normalize it. Recognition in this case isn't about enforcement, but rather, general awareness of it.
 - ! *Objection* They are not oppressed in countries like Austria, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, France (the place of the Olympics) and Sweden.
 - ! *Objection* those are not the only countries that exist, the very few rights that the LGBTQIA have are only given to them by the western countries there still isnt nearly enough rights for them both in the countries that try to stop their way of existence and the countries that do provide some albeit not even minimum rights
 - ! *Objection* This is an overgeneralization. In France in 2022, there were over 4,000 cases of violence related to anti-LGBTQIA+ sentiments according to the Ministry of the Interior. These sorts of records fail to include more pernicious, widespread forms of anti-LGBTQIA+ sentiments, such as bullying among children and

unreported incidents.



-  *Objection* AfD is permitted as a major political party in Germany and openly oppose same-sex marriage. Conversion therapy is still legal in Austria and Switzerland, along with there being no laws against discrimination when it comes to LGBTQ people in the latter. Sweden lacks any sort of gender neutral language for adoption proceedings, making it hard for nonbinary people to adopt children, does not allow for one to change their legal gender identity by self-determination, allows invasive surgical procedures to be done on intersex minors, has no third gender option for official forms, only allows gay men to donate blood after a waiting period, and doesn't ban conversion therapy, even on minors. Denmark has no laws against invasive surgery on intersex minors, conversion therapy is not banned, and there are no laws against discrimination on the basis of gender identity, placing trans people at greater risk of violent crime. France is perhaps the best one on the list, and they don't even recognize nonbinary identity, making things like identification on matters of public record a nightmare for nonbinary folks.
-  *Objection* It's a democratic right to be able to oppose marriage or subtypes of marriage. As long as AfD is not both in any position of power and implementing prohibition of same-sex marriage, LGBTQIA+ people are not oppressed. The current over-prioritization of LGBTQIA+ issues and extreme positions in that regard is a substantial factor behind the continued rise of the AfD so a good way to prevent their further rise is to not put LGBTQIA+ issues on the public agenda.
 -  *Objection* Just because a party openly opposed to same-sex marriage isn't in power doesn't mean that LGBTQIA+ people face no oppression. Having the core of one's identity, the monumental decision of how to love, being policed and delegitimized, called into question and made into a political bargaining chip, can have psychological and, indeed, physical effects, on LGBTQIA+ individuals, as proposed by Arline Geronimus in describing the theory of "weathering." Beyond pure politics, claiming that LGBTQIA+ people aren't oppressed ignores a wide array of systemic social mechanisms that police gender and sexuality, some subtle, such as children teasing one another in the schoolyard, others outright violent, like using Grindr to lure a gay man to an apartment to assault him.
 -  *Objection* Claiming that there is "a democratic right to oppose marriage or subtypes of marriages" is a tenuous position. Does one then have a democratic right to oppose heterosexual marriages? What justifies such a right? An overwhelming majority of proponents against same-sex marriage would resort to religious justifications, but there is a distinct difference between acknowledging a personal, internal opinion, and a social, external reality that comes with living in a democratic society. Tolerance is an essential aspect of any functioning society.
-  *Objection* Nearly all of these examples are trivial and are not even worth the debate, especially considering that capacities are limited and there is much work to do in other areas where there are great risks, problems and numbers of years of potential life lost, such as public health, housing, climate change, and other important subjects. It's not important whether gay people can donate blood or not.
 -  *Objection* Calling these examples as trivial is logically unsound due to the fact that this claim assumes a position of cis/het power in a world where being perceived as cisgender and heterosexual provides means of easier navigation through the world. Until one has lived the experience as a Swedish nonbinary person attempting to adopt a child and struggling to do so because of their identity, or an intersex individual in Denmark having their bodily autonomy be violated because of a lack of laws protecting their bodies, one cannot generalize their narratives as "trivial" or "not even worth the debate." When one exists within the norm and has all of its privileges without struggle, one struggles to see how these cases of oppression can alienate an individual and make them feel inhuman. When a gay man must wait to donate blood, it can subliminally support a narrative that all gay men are sexually promiscuous and carry HIV. Conversely, heterosexual people are then seen as naturally healthier and responsible. Additionally, if these examples are so unimportant compared to issues such as public health or housing, why make all this fuss over the visibility of the LGBTQIA+ community instead of going out and trying to solve those problems?
 -  *Objection* None of these examples represent oppression.
 -  *Objection* How, exactly?
-  *Objection* People have the choice not to look at things that do not appeal to them. If people have issues with the LGBTQIA+ movement, they can simply turn off the television.

-  *Objection* People that 'identify' as another gender apparently have the right to go into restrooms not designated for their biological gender. It's there not just in the public but also in school and college, especially high school, there's no avoiding it now.
 -  *Objection* Biological gender is an oxymoronic term, as gender is socially constructed. Additionally, this objection seems to assume that bathrooms, as spaces, are intrinsically divided by sex characteristics, which is not true. Sanitary spaces from the antiquity to the contemporary have always been arbitrarily assigned to certain categories of individuals. The desire of, say, a transgender man to use the men's restroom is an attempt to negotiate identity, attribution, and expression. It may be a sign of stability to their personal identity, or a protective measure depending on how far along they are in transitioning. This argument histrionizes what is very often just a human being attempting to use the bathroom.
-  *Objection* But you just can't avoid it anymore. Almost everywhere, there's something to see, hear or read about LGBTQIA+. There are also LGBTQIA+ flags visible everywhere, such as on the streets,^[2] on schools,^[3] at government agencies,^[4] at sporting events,^[5] and so on.
 -  *Objection* Is that *recognition* of a long-oppressed group or "forcing something on people"? Still no evidence of the latter.
 -  *Objection* It's more about the feeling that it's being forced on people, even if that might not be the intention. Of course, these people should be acknowledged, but do it in a subtle way without flamboyantly highlighting how different they are. This also leads to polarization in society. It's the LGBTQIA+ community versus the heterosexual cisgenders. It's better to live and celebrate together without explicitly highlighting what sets us apart.
 -  *Objection* Differences can be highlighted without being seen as points of division. Acceptance and celebration of differences is a necessary point here, as much of what makes LGBTQIA+ people seem particularly "different" or "flamboyant" is in fact an aspect of identity. LGBTQIA+ rights do not come when every queer person manages to cram themselves into a box that society at large is comfortable with, it comes when society at large becomes comfortable with people who defy its norms - without doing harm - as a matter of habit.
 -  *Objection* People are already okay with that in most of these countries in terms of rights.
 -  *Objection* People are uncomfortable with all sorts of quite normal people and that's okay and their good right. Excessively trying to make them comfortable with all sorts of extravagant people is a lost cause and waste of time with all sorts of negative backlashes.
 -  *Objection* Labeling all queer people as "extravagant" is a stereotype, first and foremost. More importantly, there's a distinct difference between being uncomfortable and being discriminatory. When the people one is uncomfortable with is solely queer individuals, the pattern of behavior categorizes itself as discriminatory, and requires a confrontation of one's own perceptions. Tolerance is fundamental to society, and it defines the division between harboring personal feelings of discomfort towards an individual and generalized bigotry towards a marginalized group.
 -  *Objection* These people should not be acknowledged, as they suffer from a mental illness, such as [gender dysphoria](#). They would be better helped by a psychologist.
 -  *Objection* Many things that are classified as mental illness are later classified as more accurately being described by another phenomenon. If somebody told me I were mentally ill for being transgender today, I might respond that they were simply coming down with a case of the vapors, or perhaps hysteria. In plain fact, what is now considered gender dysphoria used to be considered "gender identity disorder", which simply claimed that anyone having a gender identity that varied from the one they were assigned at birth was inherently mentally ill - the definition changed as medical professionals realized that this often did not cause significant distress, and instead focused on **dysphoria**, which is specifically distressing. Not all transgender people suffer from dysphoria, many even experience a sense of **euphoria** when able to exist as their preferred gender. The DSM-V is a diagnostic guideline that attempts to classify sources of mental distress and determine how to best treat them, and historically the best treatment for gender dysphoria has been "let them exist as the gender they want to". It is not a monster manual or a list of things corresponding to what pill you can give someone to make them go away.
 -  *Objection* Not everyone who is a part of the LGBTQIA+ has a mental illness. Regardless, choosing not to






recognize them can cause those who do have gender dysphoria to instead stifle their discomfort and prevent them from seeking professional help as it may be seen as weird or not a legitimate concern.

-  *Objection* Even if these people had a mental disorder, they still have their own inner experiences where they feel the way they feel. It's better to acknowledge that rather than to problematize it. They can certainly go to a psychologist, but that won't necessarily change how they feel. People should learn to accept themselves and learn to live with their feelings, so they should be recognized by society.
 -  *Objection* One can acknowledge it without making it a major subject or theme of politics, culture, and public expression. People can learn to accept themselves without making large public or media events as in the example. In countries like France, there is no notable oppression of LGBTQIA+ people or anything alike that would make this argument reasonable.
 -  *Objection* See objection above: "This is an overgeneralization. In France in 2022, there were over 4,000 cases of violence related to anti-LGBTQIA+ sentiments according to the Ministry of the Interior. These sorts of records fail to include more pernicious, widespread forms of anti-LGBTQIA+ sentiments, such as bullying among children and unreported incidents."
-  *Pro* The number of U.S. adults who identify as LGBTQ+ doubled in 12 years^[6] and a 2021 survey showed extremely high rise of LGBTQ+ between recent generations.^[7]
 -  *Objection* That is because it is now more socially acceptable. This is people doing what they want, not being "forced" to do something. This could be seen as an argument that LGBTQ topics are gaining more recognition, or that there are more LGBTQ people, but certainly not that anything is being forced on anyone.
 -  *Objection* This many people weren't unadmitting LGBTQIA+ people before.
 -  *Objection* Firstly, that's purely speculative, and secondly, it isn't simply people who were unadmitting, but also people that simply didn't realize, and who now - due to being made aware of different forms of LGBTQ+ identity - recognize that they might fit into one of those categories.
 -  *Objection* The opposite is also purely speculative and that this many people weren't unadmitting LGBTQIA+ people before is the more likely explanation especially as numbers rise even further.
 -  *Objection* This does not refute any of the reasons listed as to why people are naturally now admitting on surveys to be LGBTQIA+.
 -  *Objection* It is not disputed that there are reasons why people do not admit being LGBTQIA+ in relevant data collection methods. However, this does not explain the overall rise, in particular the pace of the rise.
 -  *Objection* I will grant there probably are people out there who aren't honestly LGBT but claim to be for social/aesthetic/political reasons(not many but I'll grant they exist). But the question is what do you think the correct pace would be for a group that only within living memory won legal rights and social acceptability? Like if tomorrow Iran was freed would you be surprised that the number of non muslims suddenly shot way up?
 -  *Objection* The pace would be roughly the same as 1-4 decades ago in developed European countries like Sweden or Germany where LGBTQ+ have good rights and are generally tolerated with no recent drastic change to the already good situation. For example, in Germany annual [gender-affirming surgery](#) cases have doubled within 10 years and in the U.S. the number tripled in just 3 years to 2019. In the U.S. there is a very large difference by generation.^[8]
 -  *Objection* The question is not whether or not they are forced to be so, the question is whether this phenomena (culturally, and so on) is being forced upon society, e.g. by a minority that gets disproportionate cultural amplification.
 -  *Pro* LGBTQIA+ are a constant major subject of contemporary politics when there are nearly no issues in Northern countries like Germany or Sweden and they already have all the rights they need while other subjects due to which many people prematurely lose their lives or suffer don't get much or any political or societal attention.
 -  *Objection* The vast majority of countries, even in the global north and in fairly socially progressive countries, have yet to outlaw things like "conversion therapy", even on minors, to say nothing of ingrained attitudes in communities that lead to the abuse and ongoing risk of death to LGBTQ+ people.
 -  *Objection* What is flawed about this is that no one tested the suicide rate of people before going through conversion therapy.
 -  *Objection* There is not much abuse and ongoing risk of death to LGBTQ+ people, albeit that may be changing to















some, likely relatively small, degree with massive immigration due to open borders policies that LGBTQ+ people are not critical but apparently supportive of.





-  *Objection* This is blatantly false. A simple Google search and a modicum of media literacy disproves this.
-  *Pro* Support for LGBTQIA+ is being required by governments and employers in some parts of the world and opposition is illegal and/or would cause a person to get fired in some parts of the world. For example, a baker in Colorado has faced multiple legal challenges for refusing to make cakes for LGBT clients.^{[9][10]} In another example, employers such as supermarket chain Kroger often expect employees to participate in LGBT Pride celebrations, and there are significant challenges for those who refuse to do so, such as the two Kroger employees who were fired for refusing to wear an apron with a pro-LGBT emblem.^[11] In the United States, critics of LGBT and/or the LGBT movement enjoy some protection under the United States Constitution, and some other countries such as India and Russia have similar freedom, but these protections do not exist in all countries. LGBT "hate speech" is illegal (with criminal penalties) in the European Union^[12] and Canada,^[13] and in some cases *any* criticism of LGBT could be considered hate speech. For example, protesting an LGBT pride festival could be treated differently legally than protesting any other kind of festival that does not embrace any sexual orientation. Beyond decrees from governments and employers, people are often subjected to intense social pressure to support LGBT and to not criticize LGBT.
 -  *Objection* Refusal to make cakes specifically for LGBT clients is, specifically, discrimination. Discrimination being illegal is not the same as forcing something onto people, it is rather enforcing the freedoms of those who might otherwise be discriminated against. Russia and India have incredibly regressive laws concerning the rights of LGBTQ people, and should absolutely not be seen as a model for the rest of the world, being as Russia classifies the LGBTQ "movement" as an extremist organization, whose membership (read: any and all LGBTQ+ people they can find) are subject to up to 10 years in prison, substantial fines, restrictions on their work, etc.; the Indian supreme court unanimously voted against gay marriage being legalized in 2023. The amount of social pressure to support the rights of LGBT people is, if anything, a reaction to the sheer extent of social pressure that exists in many places to revile and scorn them, particularly in religious or conservative communities, such that even torturing LGBTQ+ people outright is seen as permissible and even morally necessary.
 -  *Pro* Most of the people that identify as some illogical gender or find themselves more comfortable in the position of the other gender (transgender without a genetic disorder) are doing so as an excuse to call everything a hate crime and are attention-seekers.
 -  *Objection* This is an entirely speculative and denigrating claim. Calling gender-nonconforming individuals as "people that identify as some illogical gender" is purely based off a singular worldview that doesn't consider other perspectives. The argument that these gender-nonconforming individuals do so mostly to gain attention or social capital is made entirely without evidence.
 -  *Pro* Why do people have to propagate their gender? I don't go all day shouting 'I am normal' or 'I am Christian' or 'I am Muslim' or 'I am atheist.' If all people are equal, then putting a label on people will differentiate them from other people. The same for black, white, yellow, light-colored, etc. Relationships between people are something so private that no one should even consider having an opinion about it. For LLM comment, see [/Response from an LLM](#).

Con [edit | edit source]

-  *Con* It is good that LGBTQIA+ is being promoted. This allows everyone to be themselves, even if they feel they were born in the wrong body. By giving attention to LGBTQIA+, it becomes socially normalized, which is positive. This encourages people to [come out of the closet](#) sooner and to be who they want to be. This way, we develop a more inclusive society where everyone feels at home.
 -  *Objection* Born in the wrong body? What is this wizardry that science hasn't heard of?
 -  *Objection* Both the DSM-5 and the ICD-11 contain diagnoses pertaining to conditions of gender incongruity.
 -  *Objection* The inclusion of gender incongruity in the DSM-5 and ICD-11 doesn't actually demonstrate that transgender identity is objectively valid or ontologically real. These manuals function as diagnostic frameworks for identifying and treating psychological distress, not as arbiters of truth about human nature or identity. Their classifications are historically contingent and have changed in response to shifting social norms and medical philosophies. As such, by citing the DSM-5 or ICD-11, it really only establishes that certain experiences are currently medicalized, not that society must accept the underlying identity claims nor restructure social categories around them.
 -  *Objection* The DSM and ICD are definitely not the final arbiters of conditions across the wide spectrum of

bodies and experiences, and, indeed, medicine and science as branches of study tend to be conflated as absolute monoliths of human truth. But looking at the objection the previous objection responded to, it stated "What is this wizardry that science hasn't heard of?" The question asked for evidence to show that gender incongruity has validity under a scientific lens. If science is discredited due its constant self-refutation, doubling back on the opinions it once held a century, a decade, a year, or even months ago, then what can one use to claim with absolute certainty that a transgender ontology is either real or illusory? Is the ontological realness of a transgender identity, contingent upon the societal and cultural forces working upon and around the subject, even of importance; or is the true question of a phenomenological nature, of how the individual who is going through the process of self-discovery and change in identity, is subjectively perceiving their gender identity?

-  **Objection** If you let anyone express their feelings in that way, you can say that acting on necrophilic tendencies is correct. This whole "I want to do things because I feel like it right now" movement and the rise of hedonistic values is not good.
 -  **Objection** There is a massive difference between having sex with a non-consenting corpse and sex between two consenting adults of the same gender/sex. The LGBTQ+ community is not advocating for homosexual *rape*.
-  **Objection** You are right about that, but it can also go too far. For instance, the normalization of [pedophilia](#) continues to advance. There is an attempt being made to normalize pedophilia as a mainstream lifestyle choice.^[14]
 -  **Objection** Pedophilia has nothing to do with LGBTQIA+.
 -  **Objection** It is related in some way. For instance, there is a known case where a pedophile sympathizer support LGBT education for children.^[15] By teaching children about LGBTQIA+, pedophilia will gradually become more normalized as well, because people can't help having this disorder and it could be something they are born with.
 -  **Objection** This is a gross misrepresentation of correlation as causation. The majority of queer people believe pedophilia is morally abhorrent, and decry the efforts of pedophiles to integrate themselves within the queer community as damaging to the reputation of the community itself. Furthermore, using this objection's logic, one could say that the heterosexual community is also normalizing pedophilia because there are countless heterosexual pedophiles.
 -  **Objection** Pedophiles are also often found in positions of leadership in churches that revile and attempt to eliminate the rights of LGBTQ people - to say nothing of their presence in conversion therapy camps and the like, where they can effectively get away with any manner of torture possible. This argument swings both ways. Pedophiles are abusers, and abusers are power-seeking. They will look for any way that they can be placed in a position of power over their would-be prey.
 -  **Objection** Calling conversion therapy torture belittles actual torture.
 -  **Objection** Conversion therapy has been classified as a form of torture by the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims. This claim delegitimizes the deeply damaging psychological effects conversion therapy can have on queer people.
 -  **Objection** This is a hasty generalization that fails to establish a consistent connection between pedophilia and LGBTQIA+.
 -  **Con** In some parts of the world, the exact opposite is true. It is illegal to be gay in 64 countries.^[16] In Russia, there is a ban on "LGBT propaganda."^[17] Beyond the decrees of governments, LGBT around the world are subjected to social pressures and hate speech.
 -  **Con** The norms of LGBTQ+ people are not being imposed on society - nobody is expected to begin suddenly behaving in a different way just because of the presence of LGBTQ+ people - rather, society has been, for centuries, imposing a set of normative values that imply LGBTQ+ existence is not normal, not desirable, and not acceptable. The LGBTQ+ movement seeks to normalize different modes of existence and to break down these regressive values, seeing them as fundamentally antithetical to autonomy, happiness, and equanimity. This is not all of society somehow being chained down by a small minority, it is rather a minority throwing off their chains.
 -  **Objection** LGBTQ+ existence is de facto not normal. It's rare and thus not normal. There is no reason why it would be or even should "desirable". It is considered acceptable in most of the relevant nations - in that metaphor these minorities have long thrown off their chains.
 -  **Objection** How is the existence and sexual orientation of queer people not normal? One could commute to school, not realizing that the bus driver uses they/them pronouns, or that the two women sitting in the next row aren't sisters, but have been married for years?

-  *Objection* Just because it is rare does not mean it is not normal.
-  *Objection* "Normal" need not mean "not rare." Something can be "rare" and still fall within what one might logically, or normatively, anticipate as an actualizable possibility.
 -  *Objection* They had a bad reason for it being not normal. I think it's not normal because of it being unnatural. basically, why cant two guys get each other pregnant? Why can't two girls get each other pregnant. Why is the only exception Male-Female?
 -  *Objection* Why is the only way of conceptualizing natural or normal love based off of the potential to reproduce? There are a plethora of examples across the animal kingdom where same-sex relationships have been observed. Are these cases, from nature itself, unnatural? Additionally, this argument generalizes men as solely having penises and women as solely having vaginas, which undercuts both the experiences of transsexual individuals as well as those assigned intersex at birth. With this additional dimensionality dislocating the gender-sex correlation, two men can reproduce when one has a penis and the other a vagina; likewise with two women. Furthermore, the assumption that relationships between men and women are the only that can reproduce assumes that these heterosexual relationships always do so successfully, when the reality is that many heterosexual couples struggle with infertility. Are these infertile heterosexual couples unnatural because of the sole fact that they can't reproduce, or is their heterosexuality innately natural enough justification? Finally, once again: why is pregnancy the sovereign authority that legitimizes which relationships are natural and which are not?

See also [edit | edit source]

- [Is LGBTQIA+ being forced on society?/Response from an LLM](#) - Output from an LLM.
- [Should same-sex marriage be legal?](#)
- [Should sex change operations be guided by mental health specialists or psychologists?](#)

Notes and references [edit | edit source]

- ↑ Zach Bradshaw (July 25, 2024). " 'Gayest Olympics ever': Paris Games will spotlight growing LGBTQIA+ athletic community " . *Cronkite News*.
- ↑ Frederieke Weel (October 28, 2023). "Pride-sponsor Rituals vraagt overburen om Pride-vlag van hun balkon te verwijderen" . *Nhnieuws* (in Dutch).
- ↑ "Leerlingen Almere bedreigd om Coming Out Day, posters van muur gerukt" . *RTL Nieuws* (in Dutch). October 11, 2019.
- ↑ Esther Walstra (October 10, 2013). "Regenboogvlag op tientallen gemeentehuizen " . *Binnenlands Bestuur* (in Dutch).
- ↑ "St. George's Cross op Engels tenue in Pride-kleuren: 'Belachelijk, laat de vlag met rust' " . *De Telegraaf* (in Dutch). March 22, 2024.
- ↑ C Mandler (March 13, 2024). "The number of U.S. adults who identify as LGBTQ+ doubled in 12 years, new poll shows" . *NPR*.
- ↑ "Je jünger, desto queerer: Gen Z weitaus häufiger LGBTQ+ als ältere Generationen" . *Ipsos* (in German). June 16, 2021.
- ↑ https://www.statista.com/statistics/719685/american-adult-s-who-identify-as-homosexual-bisexual-transgender-by-generation/
- ↑ "Colorado baker loses appeal over refusal to make gender transition cake" . Reuters. January 26, 2023.
- ↑ "In Masterpiece, the Bakery Wins the Battle but Loses the War" . American Civil Liberties Union. June 4, 2018.
- ↑ "Kroger Company Sued by EEOC For Religious Discrimination" . United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. September 15, 2020.
- ↑ "Combating hate speech and hate crime: Measures to prevent and combat different forms of hatred and to protect victims" . European Commission.
- ↑ "Government of Canada takes action to protect Canadians against hate speech and hate crimes" . Government of Canada. June 23, 2021.
- ↑ John DeGarmo (August 1, 2023). "How the Normalization of Pedophilia Continues to Grow" . *Medium*.
- ↑ "Pedofielen-sympathisant steunt 'lhbt-onderwijs' voor kinderen" . *Gezin in Gevaar* (in Dutch). October 7, 2022.
- ↑ "Homosexuality: The countries where it is illegal to be gay" . British Broadcasting Company. March 31, 2023.
- ↑ "Putin signs law expanding Russia's rules against 'LGBT propaganda' " . Reuters. December 5, 2022.

Categories: [Wikidebates](#) | [Philosophy](#) | [Psychology resources](#) | [LGBT](#)

This page was last edited on 21 January 2026, at 23:14.

Text is available under the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License](#); additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the [Terms of Use](#) and [Privacy Policy](#).

[Privacy policy](#) [About Wikiversity](#) [Disclaimers](#) [Code of Conduct](#) [Developers](#) [Statistics](#) [Cookie statement](#) [Mobile view](#)

