

Can Men Get Pregnant? Liberal Professor Has Definite Ideas

UC Berkeley School of Law professor Khiara Bridges' testimony before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee last week was apparently a thing of beauty—if one heeds to the Left's propaganda outlets.

Headlines included:

- "Law Professor Blasts Josh Hawley's Transphobia"
- "'Transphobic' Sen. Josh Hawley 'Schooled' by Berkeley Law Professor"
- "Law Professor Slams Sen. Hawley for 'Transphobic' Questioning During Senate Hearing on Pregnancy"
- "Berkeley Law Professor tells Josh Hawley He's Paving the Way for Violence Against Transgender People"

Conservatives would certainly question the outcome as to who "slammed" who. You can draw your own conclusions by watching this video on Twitter.

Bridges' unflagging reference to "people with a capacity for pregnancy" drew a query from Missouri Senator Josh Hawley: "Professor Bridges, you've said several times, you've used a phrase, I want to make sure I understand what you mean by it. You've referred to 'people with a capacity for pregnancy.' Would that be women?"

Bridges: "Many women, cis-women, have the capacity for pregnancy; many cis-women do not have the capacity for pregnancy. There are also trans men who are capable of pregnancy as well as non-binary people who are capable of pregnancy."

Hawley: "So this isn't really a women's rights issue ... it's a what?"

Bridges: "We can recognize that this impacts women while also recognizing that it also impacts other groups, those things are not mutually exclusive, Senator Hawley."

Hawley: "So, your view is that the Court—this right, then, is about what?"

Bridges: "So, I want to recognize that your line of questioning is transphobic, and it opens up trans people to violence by not recognizing them."

Hawley: "Wow, you're saying that I'm opening up people to violence by asking whether or not women are the only folks who can have pregnancies?"

Bridges: "So I wanna note that one out of five transgender persons has attempted suicide. So I think it's important."

Hawley: "Because of my line of questioning? So, we can't talk about it?"

Bridges: "Because denying that trans people exist and pretending not to know that they exist."

Hawley: "I'm denying that trans people exist by asking you if you're talking about women having pregnancies?"

Bridges: "Are you? Are you? Are you? Do you believe that men can get pregnant?"

Hawley: "No, I don't think men can get pregnant."

Ms. Bridges' peculiar performance was a blatant manifestation of the secular religion imposed by the brazenly secular justices on the Warren Court in the mid-20th century. This unhallowed religion took over public education and rampantly began distorting the once-Christian values, views, politics and laws of the nation.

The real battle in America's marketplace today is not a

political battle between Republicans and Democrats, but a war between two distinct religions vying for ideological supremacy and control of the public square. Ultimately, we envision that the re-elevation of Jehovah God in the culture will result in secularism's complete collapse.

There is no such thing as "neutrality" in religion. To believe in God is every bit of a religious decision as to not believe in God. America's founders positioned the Bible in early American education to provide a theological and epistemological foundation for the nation's youth, and to serve as a bulwark against the wicked.

As to wisdom, Senator Hawley handled himself rather well in the exasperating exchange with a virulently ideological law professor who taunted and insulted him in her perplexing contention that "men can get pregnant!" It included, in addition the professor's absurd assertion, that Hawley's questioning would provoke "violence against trans people."

As the senator differentiated between Ms. Bridges' nonsense and reality, her smug outcry became strident, proving the old adage among lawyers that if you have the facts on your side, pound the facts; if you have the law on your side, pound the law; if you have neither the facts nor the law, pound the table.

The fanciful vagaries of replacing the term 'women' with the bizarre 'people with a capacity for pregnancy' characterizes what may be called semantic indoctrination. Bruce Thornton wrote in an article in *Frontpage* magazine (Jan. 2022):

"This change in usage was popularized to reinforce the dubious, and unscientific idea that biological sex-identity is not binary by nature, but a spectrum comprising multiple variations, just as linguistic gender is not restricted to masculine or feminine. Male and female, masculine and feminine, the 'woke' tell us, are not facts of nature, but

social, cultural and political 'constructs' that serve the selfish interests of the prevailing regime of power. This unscientific antinaturalism is a hallmark of postmodern and poststructuralist ideology, as well as Marxism and its 'epiphenomena' and the 'false consciousness' they create in the oafish bourgeoisie.

"Using the word 'gender', then, to mean biological 'sex'—which today just about everybody does, including Republicans—insidiously and relentlessly reinforces and validates the notion that human will and scientism can override and ignore the restraints of nature and nature's God, and that human reality can be manipulated, changed and perfected by 'technicians of the soul,' as Stalin euphemized the thuggish agents of 'improvement'. Of course, that malignant idea produced not utopia and social justice, but mass murder and dehumanizing tyranny."

Regarding Professor Bridges' exorbitant display, Proverbs 26:4-5 offers counteractive advice: "Do not answer [nor pretend to agree with the frivolous comments of] a [closed-minded] fool according to his folly, otherwise you, even you, will be like him. Answer [and correct the erroneous concepts of] a fool according to his folly, otherwise he will be wise in his own eyes [if he thinks you agree with him]."

Old Testament scholar Dr. Bruce K. Waltke breaks down the apparent contradiction between Solomon's admonitions in the two verses above: "Rather than lowering himself to the fool's level in a debate, but by overcoming evil with good [25:21-22], the wise must show the fool's folly for what it is. The wise do not silently accept and tolerate the folly and thereby confirm fools in it.

"The rationale [v. 4] for the admonition not to answer a fool according to his folly is to avoid the negative consequence of becoming like the fool.

“The rationale [v. 5] for answering a fool according to his folly is to avoid the negative consequence that the fool arrogantly replaces the Lord’s heavenly wisdom with his own. The wise person must expose the fool’s distortions to serve his own interests at the expense of the community and must not silently accept it and thereby contribute to establishing his topsy-turvy world against the rule of God. An answer that is in agreement with the Lord’s wisdom puts the fool’s topsy-turvy world right side up and so is fitting.”

America is in dire need of genuine, sincere debate if we are to make it through. Ms. Bridges and her ilk of secular educated elites insist on things inconsistent with obvious truth, reason or sound judgment, showing their willingness to immerse themselves in such make-believe fantasies as pregnancy of males. Facts seem to be in short supply in contemporary education.

If revival will come to America, it will not be the work of man, but the work of the Spirit of God. Still and all, we are blessed that Gideons and Rahabs are beginning to stand. {eoa}