

Author Full Name : Emma Aly**Received Date :** 02/25/2025 08:00 PM**Comments Received :**

To whom it may concern,

The primary function of a passport is to authenticate the identity and citizenship of the individual, particularly at points of entry or in situations where such verification is necessary. The definitions outlined in the executive order, which designate the ability to produce a specific gamete as the criterion for determining the sex or gender marker on a passport, do not contribute to this verification process.

Moreover, the president lacks the authority to supersede the standards of care established by medical boards regarding the distinction between gender and sex, nor does he possess the power to declare these terms as interchangeable within the English language. It also does not take into account intersex people.

This proposal poses significant risks, potentially exposing numerous Americans, including those assigned female at birth, to inappropriate screenings, the threat of assault, and more cumbersome and invasive airport security procedures.

For instance, a transgender man who presents a passport with an F gender marker, despite having a masculine appearance, may face scrutiny and additional screenings. Similarly, cisgender women who do not conform to traditional feminine stereotypes may encounter comparable challenges. This could also put an individual at risk when dealing with foreign officials who may rule the passport invalid.

If the executive branch is genuinely concerned about the implications of language, a more sensible approach would be to eliminate the gender marker altogether. Essential elements for identification include date of birth, citizenship, name, and place of birth, rather than a letter indicating one's genitalia. Throughout my travels to numerous countries, I have never been required to disclose my genitals at customs.

Furthermore, this initiative encroaches upon the jurisdiction of states that have already implemented Real ID issuance and established their own protocols for modifying gender markers, many of which necessitate physician verification or court orders. If a transgender individual has fulfilled the requirements set by their state, it is unjust for the state department to invalidate that process. Additionally, these changes serve no real purpose and thus represent a waste of taxpayer money.