

From: Safety Safety
Sent: Sat, 5 Jun 2021 17:34:12 -0700
To: T9PublicHearing
Subject: Title IX Public Hearing Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Part 1/2 of my comment:

I want to express my support for Title IX's protection of sex, as in biological sex. Biological sex is a material reality affecting every part of a person's life.

Gender identity is very important, but it is still an *identity* that exists within one's mind whereas biological sex is, again, a physical material reality.

Single-sex facilities are single-sex for a reason, same with sports.

Even if a cisgender woman and a transgender woman have the same "identity" internally, their bodies are still objectively different due to being of different sexes. Sports, showers, and locker rooms = all involve the body. The *body* here is what matters first and foremost, not feelings or mental identity.

Female/AFAB individuals have different bodies than Male/AMAB individuals. We have different bodily needs. We need different protections.

Proponents of gender identity readily admit that a person's gender identity can change over time.

Genderfluid is an identity that means a person's gender identity regularly changes, often from day to day. I am not in any way trying to imply that people with this gender identity are invalid.

What I'm saying is, it opens up a lot of complications if we base facilities on gender identity rather than physical sex. A person's gender identity can change many times and is not even constrained to man/woman or male/female. A person's gender can be something else entirely, and that's a valid gender identity too.

If we are trying to make sports facilities and lockers/showers support people based on their gender identities instead of their physical sex, then it's discriminatory to only recognize two gender identities. It's discriminatory not to also let demigender people have their own facilities, and to not let faegender people also have their own facilities, and so on and so forth.

Ask any proponent of gender theory how many genders there are, and you're almost guaranteed to get an answer along the lines of "infinite possibilities."

Again, I'm not saying that ANY of these gender identities are invalid. Gender identity is a person's belief about their gender. It's what they think and what they feel, and it's not invalid even if it sounds unusual compared to what many are used to.

All I'm saying here is, it's not a useful way to categorize human beings for sports or for "undressing facilities" like lockers, showers, etc.

It makes a lot more sense to say "You can be any gender you want in the whole universe and we will recognize and accept you! However when it's shower time, people with this body go here and people with that body go there."

Because, again, Title IX is supposed to protect SEX. Sex is not gender. Sex is physical/objective reality. Gender is mental/emotional/self-identity.

Sports facilities and shower/locker facilities should serve people based on their BODIES, regardless of gender identity, because our bodies being different is the exact reason why we needed sex protection in the first place.

I'm very concerned with how physical sex and gender identity are conflated in these discussion when they have little to do with each other.

I say this as someone who believes all gender identities are valid and respects pronouns. I still think objective, physical reality is important.

Part 2/2 of my comment:

Another thing that is frightening to me is seeing people get punished, fired, "deplatformed" and censored for recognizing physical sex as a different thing than gender identity.

Statements like "trans women are biologically male" are being treated as hate speech. Truthful observations of material reality are protected under the first amendment, even if they are hurtful to a person's feelings.

Calling trans women biologically male isn't *inherently* hate speech; in fact, the prefix "trans" actually means the exact same thing. (Meaning: If a trans woman was biologically female, she wouldn't be called a *trans* woman, she would be called a *cis* woman!)

It is being treated as hate speech nowadays and it shouldn't be. It should be protected as free speech.

I absolutely admit that it can be said in a hateful way like "you're biologically male so you can't be a woman" and I agree that's cruel and hateful and unacceptable... but that's not always the context it's being said in. More neutral statements, completely devoid of hate, are also getting considered hate speech just for saying "biologically male" in non-hateful, objectively truthful ways like "as biological males, transgender women have different bodily needs than cisgender women, who are biologically female." That's not a hateful statement. It's not hate speech.

It's like how a person can be bullied for being short. It can be hateful to say something like "you're so short, no girls will ever like you and no men will ever respect you." That's obviously hateful, but does it mean that now no one's height can be observed and commented on without it being also considered hate speech? Neutral statements like "At four feet tall, this student is shorter than the average for his age" isn't hate speech just because some students get bullied for their height. This is allegorical to how sex is discussed. It's not hate speech to make truthful statements about biological sex just because sometimes other people making statements about sex are hateful about it. Anything can be made hateful by bigots - does that mean the rest of us can't talk about it anymore?

Coaches and teachers and school admin shouldn't have to be scared of losing their jobs and being branded as bigots for making objectively true observations of reality.

Sincerely,

(b)(6) resident remaining anonymous because I legitimately fear for my safety and my life. Women who speak out in favor of biological sex recognition are regularly sent death threats and harassment, if you did not know that.

From: Safety Safety
Sent: Sat, 5 Jun 2021 17:37:11 -0700
To: T9PublicHearing
Subject: Written Comment: Title IX Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Part 1/2 of my comment:

I want to express my support for Title IX's protection of sex, as in biological sex. Biological sex is a material reality affecting every part of a person's life.

Gender identity is very important, but it is still an *identity* that exists within one's mind whereas biological sex is, again, a physical material reality.

Single-sex facilities are single-sex for a reason, same with sports.

Even if a cisgender woman and a transgender woman have the same "identity" internally, their bodies are still objectively different due to being of different sexes. Sports, showers, and locker rooms = all involve the body. The *body* here is what matters first and foremost, not feelings or mental identity.

Female/AFAB individuals have different bodies than Male/AMAB individuals. We have different bodily needs. We need different protections.

Proponents of gender identity readily admit that a person's gender identity can change over time.

Genderfluid is an identity that means a person's gender identity regularly changes, often from day to day. I am not in any way trying to imply that people with this gender identity are invalid.

What I'm saying is, it opens up a lot of complications if we base facilities on gender identity rather than physical sex. A person's gender identity can change many times and is not even constrained to man/woman or male/female. A person's gender can be something else entirely, and that's a valid gender identity too.

If we are trying to make sports facilities and lockers/showers support people based on their gender identities instead of their physical sex, then it's discriminatory to only recognize two gender identities. It's discriminatory not to also let demigender people have their own facilities, and to not let faegender people also have their own facilities, and so on and so forth.

Ask any proponent of gender theory how many genders there are, and you're almost guaranteed to get an answer along the lines of "infinite possibilities."

Again, I'm not saying that ANY of these gender identities are invalid. Gender identity is a person's belief about their gender. It's what they think and what they feel, and it's not invalid even if it sounds unusual compared to what many are used to.

All I'm saying here is, it's not a useful way to categorize human beings for sports or for "undressing facilities" like lockers, showers, etc.

It makes a lot more sense to say "You can be any gender you want in the whole universe and we will recognize and accept you! However when it's shower time, people with this body go here and people with that body go there."

Because, again, Title IX is supposed to protect SEX. Sex is not gender. Sex is physical/objective reality. Gender is mental/emotional/self-identity.

Sports facilities and shower/locker facilities should serve people based on their BODIES, regardless of gender identity, because our bodies being different is the exact reason why we needed sex protection in the first place.

I'm very concerned with how physical sex and gender identity are conflated in these discussion when they have little to do with each other.

I say this as someone who believes all gender identities are valid and respects pronouns. I still think objective, physical reality is important.

Part 2/2 of my comment:

Another thing that is frightening to me is seeing people get punished, fired, "deplatformed" and censored for recognizing physical sex as a different thing than gender identity.

Statements like "trans women are biologically male" are being treated as hate speech. Truthful observations of material reality are protected under the first amendment, even if they are hurtful to a person's feelings.

Calling trans women biologically male isn't *inherently* hate speech; in fact, the prefix "trans" actually means the exact same thing. (Meaning: If a trans woman was biologically female, she wouldn't be called a *trans* woman, she would be called a *cis* woman!)

It is being treated as hate speech nowadays and it shouldn't be. It should be protected as free speech.

I absolutely admit that it can be said in a hateful way like "you're biologically male so you can't be a woman" and I agree that's cruel and hateful and unacceptable... but that's not always the context it's being said in. More neutral statements, completely devoid of hate, are also getting considered hate speech just for saying "biologically male" in non-hateful, objectively truthful ways like "as biological males, transgender women have different bodily needs than cisgender women, who are biologically female." That's not a hateful statement. It's not hate speech.

It's like how a person can be bullied for being short. It can be hateful to say something like "you're so short, no girls will ever like you and no men will ever respect you." That's obviously hateful, but does it mean that now no one's height can be observed and commented on without it being also considered hate speech? Neutral statements like "At four feet tall, this student is shorter than the average for his age" isn't hate speech just because some students get bullied for their height. This is allegorical to how sex is discussed. It's not hate speech to make truthful statements about biological sex just because sometimes other people making statements about sex are hateful about it. Anything can be made hateful by bigots - does that mean the rest of us can't talk about it anymore?

Coaches and teachers and school admin shouldn't have to be scared of losing their jobs and being branded as bigots for making objectively true observations of reality.

Sincerely,

(b)(6) resident remaining anonymous because I legitimately fear for my safety and my life. Women who speak out in favor of biological sex recognition are regularly sent death threats and harassment, if you did not know that.