

Author Full Name : L Bell**Received Date :** 02/19/2025 08:39 PM**Comments Received :**

To start with the most basic problem, gender/sex is not a meaningful way to categorize people for identification purposes; any person of any gender may wear any clothing, hairstyle, or cosmetics that may not be reflected in a simple word on a form. The inclusion of this information on official documents is not useful when presented alongside a standardized identification photo of the person in question. Next, persons whose bodies fall outside the standard definition of "male" and "female" do exist and make up around 1% of the total population (this condition is not rare!), and the president's executive order do not account for them. Not all of these people will have had surgeries performed to make their bodies closer to the "norms" that people are accustomed to, and not all of them can be simply categorized as "male" or "female." The unscientific definitions of "male" and "female" presented by the EO likewise do not account for people who are infertile because they do not produce gametes but otherwise conform to popular understanding of "male" and "female." Beyond these people, however, many transgender and non-binary people exist and their individual identities are as they say they are. If the president's interest is in "protecting women" with his EO, he should be advised that rape and assault are already crimes, which one does not need to claim to be a woman to commit (the president, himself, did not claim to be a woman when he assaulted a woman in a dressing room, for example) and for which being the same gender as the victim does not ensure reduced punishment. Furthermore, forcing transgender women into men's spaces can "out" them in a way that puts them in danger of being victimized themselves, as a population which is often the target of violence up to and including murder simply for existing (that is, hate crimes); meanwhile, there is no history of trans women assaulting other people in single-gender spaces. While the EO seems to sometimes forget this, not all trans people are women--trans men and non-binary people also exist. Forcing people who may have facial hair or other traditionally "masculine" features to identify as women on legal forms and use single-gender spaces intended for women is a sure way to make cisgender women feel uncomfortable or unsafe even if these people are not harassing them in any way. Because the other main idea of the EO is that "gender ideology" is being used to confuse cisgender people into becoming trans or non-binary, I would like to add the additional information that gender-affirming medical procedures have the lowest regret rates of any medical procedures (around 2%, lower than other surgeries to correct physical health issues, like hip/knee replacements), and that regret rates are almost entirely tied to being treated negatively for being trans or non-binary, rather than regretting the treatment itself--that is to say, no one seeks gender-affirming care because they are "confused." Trans and non-binary people simply are who they say they are, and if gender/sex must for some archaic reason be noted on official paperwork, it should be one that accurately represents the person.