

# **Abolition of Identicide (Adoption):** a neologism to name the abolitionist framework against the erasure of identity

**Author:**

Olmo Gómez Aldaz

**Affiliation:**

*Genus Homo* Group, *Identicide* Project

**Year:**

2025

**Abstract**

The term *Abolition of Identicide*, coined by **Olmo Gómez Aldaz** in 2025, is an **abolitionist development** of the author's earlier concept *Identicide*, and is proposed as a neologism to name the ethical, political, and epistemic framework from which the abolition of all institutional forms of identity destruction is conceived. The expression *identicide* defines the deliberate suppression of biological and symbolic filiation through legal, religious, or social mechanisms, among which modern adoption represents its paradigmatic form.

In this sense, *Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* designates the moral and political response to that structural crime: the need to dismantle the adoptive system as a device of genealogical erasure and fictitious restitution of origin. The text develops the philosophical foundations of adoptive abolitionism, articulating the concepts of truth, filiation, and memory against the narratives of charity, salvation, or destiny that legitimize the destruction of identity.

To name the *Abolition of Identicide* is to recognize adoption as a form of structural violence—an institutional practice of identicide—and to situate its abolition not merely as a legal demand but as an ontological necessity: the right to be, to remember, and to belong to one's own genealogy.

**Keywords:**

abolitionism, identicide, adoption, identity erasure, structural violence, symbolic violence, genealogy, truth, memory, decolonization, restitution, critical theory

**Contact:**

olmo.gomez.aldaz@gmail.com

**DOI<sup>1</sup>:**

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17458108>

---

<sup>1</sup> This article has a Spanish version: *Abolifobia: un neologismo para nombrar la violencia simbólica contra el pensamiento abolicionista de la adopción* (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17457820).

## Index

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Conceptual Framework.....	3
3. Definition of the Term “Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)” .....	4
4. Abolition of Identicide: Ethical and Political Foundations .....	5
5. Impact on Abolitionist Individuals and Movements.....	6
6. Conclusion.....	6
References .....	7

## 1. Introduction

*The Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* begins from an ethical and political conviction: the harm caused by adoption cannot be reformed — it can only be abolished. Wherever a practice is founded on the deliberate destruction of identity — on the suppression of origin and the falsification of filiation — the only possible form of reparation is the cessation of that violence.

The term thus designates both a proposal of thought and a call to action. *Abolition* here does not refer to a punitive gesture or the mere elimination of a legal model, but to a process of restitution. To abolish identicide means to restore the right to the truth of origin, to dismantle the structures that sustain its erasure, and to open a horizon of justice that returns to each person their genealogy, their name, and their memory.

From this perspective, modern adoption is recognized as the central device of institutional identicide: a practice that fabricates fictitious filiations and dissolves biographical truth in the name of good. Abolition, by contrast, does not destroy; it reveals. It does not deny the existence of affective bonds, but dismantles the structure of power that imposes them through falsehood.

This text develops the philosophical and political foundations of that abolition: an ontological rather than juridical demand that seeks to bring an end to the civilizational principle of identity erasure and to replace it with an ethics of restitution.

## 2. Conceptual Framework

Abolition is, above all, a position toward the world: the recognition that there are structures of violence that cannot coexist with justice. To abolish does not mean to destroy, but to restore; not to erase the past, but to interrupt its repetition. Abolition is grounded in a moral certainty: institutionalized harm cannot be reformed — it must end.

Historically, abolitionist movements have represented the limit of what is tolerable: that which a society decides it can no longer endure. The abolition of slavery, patriarchy, or colonization was not merely a modification of laws, but a transformation in the very meaning of humanity. *The Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* belongs to that genealogy: it asserts that the suppression of origin and the falsification of filiation are not administrative errors, but structural forms of violence that must be brought to an end.

Abolitionist thought is not defined by what it denies, but by what it affirms. In the face of structures of harm, it affirms the possibility of true justice; in the face of falsified identity, it affirms the ontological right to the truth of origin. In this sense, abolition is not a reaction but a creation — a new way of conceiving the relationship between being and genealogy.

Applied to adoption, abolition does not seek to improve a system but to dissolve a principle: the legitimacy of substituting identity in the name of good. Every abolition dismantles a language of justification; here, that language is one of salvation and charity, concealing the violence of dispossession. To abolish identicide is to abolish the narrative that sustains it.

For this reason, *The Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* is not merely a moral theory but a praxis of restitution. Its purpose is to build a framework of thought that restores truth to those who have been dispossessed of it, while imagining a future free from institutions founded on the erasure of identity.

### 3. Definition of the Term “Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)”

The concept of *Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* was formulated by **Olmo Gómez Aldaz** in 2025 as an extension and development of the term *identicide*, coined by the same author in the mid-2010s. While *identicide* designates the deliberate or institutionally legitimized destruction of a person’s natal or natural identity, *abolition of identicide* names the ethical and political response to that form of violence: the process of restoring the truth of origin and dismantling the structures that make its erasure possible.

The abolition of identicide does not merely denounce harm; it affirms a principle of justice. It recognizes that the erasure of identity cannot be reformed — it must cease — and that the restitution of the truth of origin constitutes a condition of existence. In this sense, the concept introduces a new moral category within abolitionist thought: one that links truth, filiation, and memory as the foundations of all justice.

In the context of modern adoption, *Abolition of Identicide* expresses the need to dismantle the legal, religious, and symbolic systems that legitimize the substitution of filiation in the name of good. It is not an opposition to human bonds but an effort to free those bonds from the institutional falsification that produces them. The abolition of identicide,

therefore, does not seek punishment but restitution — the return to every human being of their genealogy and their right to truth.

#### 4. Abolition of Identicide: Ethical and Political Foundations

Abolition does not arise from hatred of an institution but from the recognition of a moral limit. When a practice is sustained by the negation of being — by the suppression of origin and the falsification of identity — its continuity cannot be justified. *The Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* begins from this ethical certainty: it is not possible to reform what exists through falsehood.

In its deepest sense, to abolish identicide means to restore truth. Every abolition throughout history has implied the affirmation of a denied truth: the humanity of the enslaved, the freedom of the body, the equality of the subject. In this case, the truth that has been denied is natal identity, and abolition becomes an act of restitution. To restore origin is not to look to the past, but to restore the possibility of being.

From a political perspective, the abolition of identicide is not a slogan but a transformation of the symbolic order. It means breaking the pact of silence that turns the erasure of identity into a natural fact. It demands the dismantling of the legal, religious, and familial systems that have made the alteration of identity an acceptable form of “protection.” Abolition does not seek to punish but to put an end to the logic that normalizes the falsification of being.

Ethically and politically, the abolition of identicide entails a reorientation of law toward truth. The legal framework that legitimizes the substitution of filiation must be replaced by a law of restitution. Instead of recording new identities, it must guarantee the recovery of real ones; instead of silencing genealogies, it must protect them.

Abolition, understood in this way, does not destroy a system — it creates another. To abolish is not to empty but to inaugurate. It means liberating care, filiation, and love from the framework that perverts them. To abolish adoption is to return to human beings the sovereignty over their own origin, and to affirm that no society can call itself just while falsehood remains its form of kinship.

## 5. Impact on Abolitionist Individuals and Movements

Every abolition implies a restitution. There is no end to violence without the recognition of what has been taken away. In the case of identicide, what has been stolen is not a material good but a truth: filiation, name, and the memory of belonging. For this reason, abolition cannot be limited to repealing laws or closing institutions; it must restore the broken continuity between being and origin.

Filiation is not a form of property but a form of truth. To know one's lineage does not mean to possess it, but to recognize oneself within it. Identicide destroys that possibility: it replaces history with a fictitious narrative, and real bonds with a tale of salvation. Against this, abolition calls for an ethics of filial truth. Restitution is not a sentimental gesture but an act of justice.

Truth, in this context, does not stand opposed to fiction but to falsification. Adoption, as an institutional device, does not create new families: it erases the real ones and replaces them with administrated versions of biography. To abolish this practice is to return to human beings their narrative coherence — the right to inhabit their own history without intermediaries.

Restitution, then, is the core of abolition. There can be no reparation without truth, and no truth without filiation. The abolition of identicide does not seek vengeance but restitution: the symbolic and legal return of origin, and with it, the possibility of healing the ontological wound produced by identity erasure.

Restoring the truth of origin is not an act of the past but a condition of the future. Recovered filiation does not close a wound; it allows the reconstruction of the sense of belonging and existence. In this horizon, abolition becomes an ethics of memory — a way of living without lying about origin.

## 6. Conclusion

To abolish identicide is not merely to end a practice, but to transform the very idea of humanity upon which modern adoption has been built. *The Abolition of Identicide (Adoption)* does not propose a reform or an institutional adjustment; it declares the moral impossibility of a practice founded on the falsification of origin.

At the root of every abolition lies an act of truth. Just as the abolition of slavery affirmed the freedom of the body and the abolition of torture affirmed the inviolability of being, the abolition of identicide affirms the right to the truth of birth and filiation. Identity is not an attribute to be administered but a condition of existence. Wherever the State or the Church replaces name, genealogy, or memory, a form of civil disappearance is perpetuated.

Abolition, understood as restitution, does not destroy a system — it restores reality. To restore the truth of origin is to free the human being from the lie that defines them; it is to return continuity between life and history. In this sense, abolition is not the end of a conflict but the beginning of a truth: the recognition that there is no justice without filiation, and no filiation without truth.

To abolish adoption as a form of identicide is therefore an act of emancipation and of memory — a boundary drawn against the power to name and to replace; a radical affirmation of truth as a right and of origin as a form of dignity.

## References

Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes toward an investigation)*. In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–186). Monthly Review Press. Retrieved from

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>

Bardall, G. (2020). Symbolic violence as a form of violence against women in politics: A critical examination. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 65(238), 379–389. <https://doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2020.238.68152>

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. Stanford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804768822>

Brodzinsky, D. M. (2011). Children's adjustment to adoption: Developmental and clinical issues. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 4(2), 1–8.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2011.02.004>

Kramsch, C. (2020). From symbolic power to symbolic violence. In *Language as symbolic power* (pp. 97–116). Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108865631.006>

Mulligan, A. (2022). Anonymous gamete donation and Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights: The case for incompatibility. *Medical Law International*, 22(3), 119–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09685332221096210>

Sanders, V. M. (2023). *The connections among adoption, attachment, and violence* (Doctoral dissertation). Liberty University. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/3678>

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan / University of Illinois Press. Retrieved from <https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~sj6/Spivak%20CanTheSubalternSpeak.pdf>

Virgiel, V. (2014). *Adoption and child trafficking: Structural violence in the international adoption system* (Honors thesis). Portland State University. Retrieved from <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses/1133>

Wiegmann, W. L. (2017). Habitus, symbolic violence, and reflexivity: Applying Bourdieu's theories to social work. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 44(1), 47–65. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol44/iss1/4>

Young, I. M. (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195392389.001.0001>