

Author Full Name : Justin Acker**Received Date :** 02/19/2025 09:41 PM**Comments Received :**

As an American citizen and voter I do not feel these changes are either positive or necessary. There are many concerning drawbacks to replacing a gender marker with one of "biological sex at birth."

First and foremost, the purpose a passport or any other form of personal identification serves is to identify the individual. Knowing one's sex at birth does not assist in identifying anyone. Hormone therapy, surgery, medical conditions, and a whole host of other factors play into an individual's gender presentation. Sex at birth is not determinable by visual or physical inspection at all. Further, as far as I am aware, this is the only identifying factor on the passport (save date of birth) that considers an individual's past state instead of their present state. The passport does not denote a holder's weight, height or even name at birth. Rather, their current attributes are recorded. Handling sex or gender differently does not make any sense.

Second, this change entirely ignores intersex people. Intersex people have a biological sex at birth that cannot be denoted or defined by a simple marker of male or female. This is a known medical, biological phenomenon that has nothing to do with "gender ideology." If the only options available are male "M" or female "F" how are these citizens intended to complete their forms?

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I am concerned that being forced to reveal one's "biological sex at birth" on an official document could expose to risk any individual whose gender presentation or appearance does not conform to societal standards of their assigned sex at birth. There are real, measurable risks of violence, discrimination and persecution inherent in being forced to reveal the sex one was assigned at birth.

I would urge the state department to reconsider these changes and investigate whether this is truly the best path forward for all United States passport holders.