

Author Full Name : Anonymous**Received Date :** 02/20/2025 02:40 PM**Comments Received :**

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed changes to passport forms DS-11, DS-82, and DS-5504, which would eliminate the 'X' gender marker and require that passports reflect only the sex assigned at birth. This is an unnecessary, impractical, and costly policy shift that serves no meaningful purpose, yet will undoubtedly lead to legal battles and administrative burdens for both the government and private citizens.

This is a great example of misplaced priorities and wasted resources

1. This Change Serves No Practical Purpose

There is no documented issue with the existing gender marker policy that justifies this revision. Passports exist to facilitate international travel and verify identity, not to enforce ideological positions. The gender marker on a passport does not create security risks, nor does it impact the document's validity for international use.

1. Legal Challenges Are Inevitable and Expensive

Rolling back these rights will lead to lawsuits that the government is likely to lose, just as previous attempts to restrict identity documentation for transgender and non-binary people have failed in court. This means taxpayer money will be spent defending a legally weak, politically motivated change that accomplishes nothing for the majority of Americans.

1. Administrative Burdens for the State Department

Passport agencies will now have to navigate the legal and logistical challenges of revoking or denying identity documents that were already lawfully issued under the existing system. This means additional staffing, training, and resources spent on a non-issue, when those resources could be used to address real concerns, like improving processing times for all applicants.

1. This Affects a Tiny Percentage of People—Why Focus on It?

While the number of people using the 'X' gender marker or updating their gender designation is small, the time and effort being spent to roll back their recognition is disproportionate. The government should be focused on policies that impact millions of Americans—such as reducing passport backlog delays or improving international security measures—rather than targeting a small, marginalized group in a way that serves no functional purpose. This change is a waste of time, money, and legal resources. Instead of pursuing petty restrictions that affect a small percentage of Americans in a way that does not improve security or efficiency, the administration should focus on actual priorities. This is not governance—it's posturing. I urge the Department of State to reject these changes and maintain the current gender marker policy.