

**Author Full Name :** Juni Kim**Received Date :** 03/11/2025 02:43 PM**Comments Received :**

While it appears that the orders in E.O. 14168 are in defense of womanhood, a further look into the items of the executive order enact policies that harm the rights of women, or "biological females".

For one: Any biological male who intends to "infiltrate" women's spaces or abuse women's resources by identifying as a woman is more likely to be putting themselves at risk rather than threatening people around them. This nation and its policies are inhospitable to anyone who identifies outside of traditional ideas of male or female-- including women who identify as women but may appear masculine. Women who aren't beautiful enough already find themselves beaten down with false accusations condemning their womanhood and the idea that they don't deserve it for not appearing feminine enough. The implementation of policies that open the door for further harassment will not defend womanhood.

For another: Biological sex identification would also require the need for an "intersex" marker, as there are individuals who are biologically intersex at birth. If no amount of surgical correction or hormone treatment therapy changes their biological sex at birth, then they will always be intersex by the nature of E.O. 14168. Fausto-Sterling's (1) estimate places the intersex population at 1.7% by genotype (not phenotype). If the E.O. is issued considering the "large" and "small" sex cells produced, then sterile individuals also have no gender and would need a fourth classification of sex.

Requiring that passports state the sex of an individual gives no clarity or value to officials using the document as identification. Gender was only added to passports in 1977 and security has functioned without it in the past. Other countries also use Gender instead of Sex, and allow X markers, so there is not a foreign security benefit. In addition, an individual's appearance may be a feminine male or a masculine woman, and having a sex marker would only confuse people who may conflate sex and gender. A transman who was biologically female at birth but currently has facial hair will be stopped and questioned when the passport that they own has an "F" sex marker.

Lastly, it should be said that even individuals who are masculine men who identify as male, or feminine women who identify as female, should be able to choose "X". Gender bias is real, and when passports are involved as documentation for securing jobs, housing, and more, allowing an individual to retain privacy on their sex assigned at birth can help establish equal opportunity.

In defense of womanhood: Please allow women to continue to choose "X" as their Gender marker on passports.

Sincerely,  
Juni Kim

(1) Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality. New York: Basic Books.