

Author Full Name : Anonymous**Received Date :** 02/20/2025 11:18 AM**Comments Received :**

It is my understanding that the proposed changes follow the new presidential EO titled "Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government". I strongly object to the changes on multiple grounds.

Firstly, as a woman, even under the bizarre definition on this EO, I reject the idea that I need defending from an ideology, unless that ideology, like the idea that there are only 2 genders, requires enforcement through invasion of privacy. I am reminded of the school that proposed, or attempted, invasive examinations of female athletes. The so-called "Extremism" that is the belief that all people, whether male, female, intersex, genderfluid, or other, deserve to be seen and treated as themselves does no harm to me. Rather, it allows me to be myself, rejecting society's expectations for how a woman should dress or act, without fear.

My second point is more factual. There is no biological, genetic, or other evidence for strictly 2 genders in humans. Generically, humans can have many combinations of X and Y chromosomes, beyond simply XX and XY. And even "genetically male" or "genetically female" people can develop atypical biological traits that would outwardly contradict definition as "biologically female" or "biologically male". Trying to enforce otherwise would *require* genital mutilation of infants who do not fit into your boxes, in addition to physical and mental harm by medical and government institutions later in life. All because some people want to live tassie own lives.

It is further my understanding that these forms are in violation of the enjoinder put on State by the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado in the Zzyym v. Blinken case (formerly Zzyym v. Pompeo, Zzyym v. Tillerson, and Zzyym v. Kerry). Therefore, the proposed changes should be rejected.