

3339

RECEIVED

From: CARL HELMAN
To: HR, PHRC Reqs Public Comment
Subject: [External] IRRR 3339 Protected classes by PHRC
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 3:46:48 PM

MAY 11 2022

**Independent Regulatory
Review Commission**

***ATTENTION:** This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.*

For race definitions

Many of the definitions are vague, subjective, and open to wide interpretation. Impossible to objectively determine what is discrimination. Discrimination cannot simply be in the eye of the beholder but rather must be definitive, objective, and consistently defined and applied. .

Ethnic characteristics - by whose judgement?

Interracial marriage or association - what is meant by association?

To what extent interracial marriage; white-black, white-Asian, black-middle eastern, Asian-black, Asian-middle eastern, white-middle eastern?

What is the forms of discrimination?

Where is the public need for such demonstrated?

Traits historically associated with race –

Very subjective and looking for problems - are we talking "ownership" where people of one race acting/presenting in way some perceive as "trait historically associated with another race" get accused of discrimination ?? Again where is the public need for this? Are we not risking actually creating more problems?

Persons of Hispanic national origin or ancestry - are these not covered in race, ethnic groups? Why a whole separate group that some people who can be classified in this broader group don't care for? Why are we forcing this definition?

Persons of any other national origin or ancestry as specified in a PHRA complaint?

How vague and undefined it this? This could cover literally anything and certainly

does not rise to any evidence of problems necessarily rising to civil rights protection status as separate entity.

For Sex definitions

Many of these definitions are vague, subjective, and widely open to interpretation. An impossible standard to understand and therefore impossible to apply or enforce fairly or consistently. .

Sex assigned at birth –

Sex is not “assigned” at birth. One is born male or female sex and is scientifically, biologically determinable at birth. You're not biologists

Gender identity - based on what consensus someone can legitimately identify differently?

This used to be the .3% or less population (across multiple cultures/countries) with true, organic gender dysphoria that the majority resolved in children once they went through puberty for whom there was clinical evidence of consistent, persistent belief in an other-than-genetic/hormonal gender identity.

Today what does this mean? What anyone says they are on a given day? What non-organic-gender-dysphoric children get persuaded into believing or might mistakenly believe about themselves during stressful times of life/development when they naturally struggle to understand sex, growing up, relationships, dealing with painful changes? (gay boys, teenage girls and autistic kids being highly disproportionately effected by this)

Sexual fetishes that are now getting lumped into gender identity by LGBTQ activists groups?

Does it include a lot of philosophical/exploratory so-called attractions again being pushed by activists some of which just want to disrupt traditional definitions?

Gender expression - very subjective and ill defined

Affectional orientation - see above on so-called attractions. Vague and impossible to be a legal definition. There is no scientific, social, or judicial definition of this term, yet you somehow expect to enforce it fairly and judiciously?

differences in sex development – This is yet another example (along with the one above) of made-up phrases, word salads, or otherwise simple mumbo-jumbo, that sounds like something but really means nothing. Just another word weapon to use against those who don't identify with your radical agenda. Please provide a definition and cite medical references to back it up?

Stakeholders consulted? The only stakeholders consulted for this proposed regulation by the HRC's own documentation are LGBTQ groups. LGBTQ as a stakeholder can only properly be defined as a loosely related group of individuals who share a common ideology/activist/political message and in no way can be considered a specific group to be viewed under civil rights violations, though it's clear this is the way the HRC is viewing them.

How does LGBTQ support as I defined? They don't properly accept gay or trans etc. members who don't support their total belief system (i.e. that sex is artificial construct, that biological fundamentals like genetics/structural hormones/gametes define the binary male/female immutable fact, that changing some structures/hormones later in life does not eliminate that fact, and growing belief that childhood innocence is also artificial construct).