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Message

To who it may concern, I learned today that the drone advisory committee is putting time and efforts into identifying language that may not be considered gender neutral or may discourage people from seeking aviation careers. Truthfully, as a drone operator and UAS business owner for the last 6 years I am disappointed to hear that there is so much effort being put into something other than safety, technological advances, and education. We are all seeing the never ending arguments over meanings of words and it is getting a bit over the top. In this case, removing the term "airman" or "unmanned" from published literature from the FAA seems pretty unproductive when these terms are derivative of the word "human," as in humankind and not "man." This isn't related to male or female and was never intended to be. I'm certain the vast majority of anyone reading FAR's doesn't believe that a specific gender is discounted. I can understand politicians bickering over such things but I know there are far more pressing regulatory items where efforts can be placed. Members of this committee have been chosen to represent multiple facets of the industry and I am truly surprised that this is even an issue. I can honestly say all of the other operators I know and have spoken to agree that this is a waste of time and feel like a fruitless attempt at political correctness. I do thank the advisory committee for their hard work on drone rules and regulations and I hope that effort continues. Thank you for your time.
Respectfully, Nicholas Crawley

From: Justin Evans <jrevans85@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2021 6:57 AM
Subject: DAC Stresses the Importance of Gender-Neutral Language

DAC Members,

I read the NATCA newsletter with the article “Drone Advisory Committee Stresses the Importance of Gender-Neutral Language” and then watched the presentation by Task Group 10. In the example/style guide Airmen and NOTAM were in the harder to change category. I feel that those terms do not need to be changed. The definition of Airmen in the Merriam-Webster dictionary makes no mention of gender.

The push to make everything gender-neutral, I believe, is going the wrong direction. Men or man is the core in most terms describing people. Far fewer definitions of man specify a gender than are gender-
neutral. Mankind is one of the most common terms used to include everyone and not discriminate between male and female. Does the word human need to be changed?

Only in recent history does the term man exclude anybody. Everyone was man, and a woman was a man that could bear children. If we go to a time when nurses were all female due to culture, that does not mean the term nurse is only for females. When males becoming nurses was more common the term male nurse was used and was offensive to both sexes. Many languages such as Spanish and French give words a masculine or feminine emphasis, but that does not define if something is male, female, nonbinary, etc.

Instead of making an already complex language more complex and creating more words that create exclusion, I suggest the FAA and aviation industry start a trend and make a stand to make things simpler. Even if people do not agree with my examples, consider the result of creating new words labeled as gender-neutral. If a gender-neutral term gets created to replace airmen, by default airmen gets defined as having a gender assigned to it. This creates division and more language for exclusion. If the definition for airmen is clarified that it has no gender, then there is only a word that includes everyone, and inclusion is the only option.

Adding a definition to the beginning of the affected documents would be easier to implement than replacing the affected words in all the documents and publications. As stated in the presentation and following comments for the Task Group 10 recommendations, there is already a lot of effort and resources being put into reaching out to underrepresented groups. During these events and programs, a clarification could be made that these words are all inclusive and are not excluding anyone.

If everyone could take a step back and really think if a word is truly gender specific or if recent culture has made us think these words are gender specific. This same process could be applied to words besides airmen and the FAA could be part of a cultural shift that is truly inclusive and not creating more words and more division. I feel the changing of these words will only hurt and complicate the long term goal of gender-neutrality.
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