

**Author Full Name :** Anonymous**Received Date :** 02/22/2025 12:36 PM**Comments Received :**

The purpose of a passport is to confirm the identity and citizenship of an individual (for travel, immigration, or whenever it needs to be verified). The definitions in the recent executive order regarding the identification of said individuals by virtue of what sex cells their bodies may or may not produce doesn't aid in this process. The "Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government" executive order relies on broad misconceptions about the definitions of gender and sex as binary, interchangeable, etc. This misuse of "biological sex" (especially as poorly and simply defined and understood by the writer of the executive order) as an identifying factor will expose many Americans, transgender and cis alike, to additional screening, skepticism, and potentially assault. If the executive branch is truly worried about the use of language in a way they do not like, it would be more appropriate to remove the marker entirely. Birthday, citizenship, name, and place of birth are vital to assuring identification, not a letter meant to indicate what genitals you have.

While my main concern is the safety and dignity of transgender, non-binary, and gender variant citizens, these changes and are legally and ethically indefensible:

- This process steps on the toes of states that have already enacted Real ID issuance and have established their own processes for changing gender markers, many of which have required physician verification or court orders. If a transgender individual has already met the requirements of their state, why should the state department invalidate that?
- These forms are in violation of the injunction 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).
- Because they serve no practical purpose, are a waste of taxpayer money.