

From: Woman McFemale
Sent: Tue, 8 Jun 2021 21:11:59 -0400
To: T9PublicHearing
Subject: Title IX Public Hearing and EOs 13988 and 14021

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.

Thank you for allowing the public to comment on this extremely important matter. It does not require a law degree to see that there is a conflict between the spirit and letter of Title IX and recent Executive Orders relating to gender identity protections in educational settings. Although I fully support provisions to prevent the discrimination of people on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, it is legally or ethically defensible to conflate gender identity with biological sex in areas concerning sex-segregated accommodations.

Bostock v. Clayton County (140 S.Ct. 1731 (2020)) is cited as the legal authority for E.O. 13988, however, an objective reading of this case shows this to be false the necessary interpretation. The court in *Bostock* determined transgender people can be protected from discrimination by prohibiting sex discrimination. Sex-segregation policies, therefore, do *not* impinge on civil rights under existing law and should be respected where this is a need. This need is most obvious when it comes to female sports, but there is also a need in other areas like housing and locker rooms.

It is maddening, in the year 2021, to have to explain to educated people that sex actually matters. It should not be ignored or downplayed due to ideological beliefs. Young people--regardless of gender identity--need to live in a world with clear boundaries. These boundaries protect themselves and others from harm. If girls are expected to play contact sports against players that have the physical advantages of male puberty, we are not protecting them. We are telling them their safety comes second to the feelings of males who are perfectly capable of playing against other males. We are also denying them the dignity of fair competitions. We would not do this disabled athletes, so why are we doing it with female athletes? Title IX was passed as an effort to level the playing field for girls and now we're taking that away from them? This is unethical.

I sincerely hope you will consider this and similar comments that are critical of this administration's interpretation of Title IX. While it's clear these EOs are well-meaning, the implications are appallingly bad for women and girls. A course correction is about 6 months overdue.