

Author Full Name : Anonymous**Received Date :** 03/04/2025 11:00 AM**Comments Received :**

This falls under the executive order of “defending women from gender ideology extremism” - without even getting into the meaning of that and how transphobia doesn’t protect women in any way, what about this example: my boyfriend is a trans man, who looks like what anybody would consider to be a stereotypical “man.” No one passing him on the street would think “that is a woman pretending to be a man.” So, is it better for this man to be unable to change his passport to reflect who he really is? It’s better for the “safety of women” for someone who is a man to be identified as a woman?

Because this executive order expresses the intent to “protect and defend women” - you think it is safer for women to have a man in their spaces?

And of course the answer is no, because in these situations a lot of the fear comes from trans women who are “men pretending to be women” (they’re not). The world has made it very clear how they treat trans people: there is ostracization, abuse, and extreme cases of literal murder. Why would somebody choose that life, that comes with a myriad of potential struggles and complications, just for the chance to be a “creepy man in a woman’s space,” or whatever other fear-mongering characterizations are used for trans people. What about the cis men who are already preying on children in schools, or in churches? Who is protecting women and children from that?

How is somebody changing their name, gender, etc. on their passport to match who they are threatening anybody? As a woman, I would feel much safer knowing that nobody is having their life or happiness threatened; because another consequence of that is potential harm that person might do to themselves or to others. That is not the country, or the world, that I or other women want.