

PHALAROPED!

Throughout the animal world, males are generally larger and consistently have the more glorious appearance. They also have the responsibility of establishing and defending their territories, and pursue their mate. This glory of the male is most certainly evidenced within the bird creation. Who can forget the glory of the peacock, or the strutting and flamboyant rooster? In New Guinea there is the extraordinary male bird-of-paradise. Then there is the male pheasant, the male cardinal, the male wood duck, and on and on one can go. Clearly, Yahweh God has given His glory to the male birds. This too is consistent with His creation of man, who is “the image and glory of God,” while the woman is “the glory of man” (1 Corinthians 11:7).



Top left, clockwise: Peacock, Rooster, Bird-of-paradise, Golden Pheasant, Cardinal, and Wood Duck.

But in all of creation, sometimes Yahweh provides a counter testimony as well. For example, in [Appendix 5](#) of *The Curse of 1920*, we see the counter testimony of when the woman takes the glory to herself. There we note that the black widow spider is unique in nature in that she is much larger and far more beautiful than the male—stunningly black and polished in appearance, with her characteristic stark red hourglass. But she does not bear this name without cause, for when she mates with the male, if he is not swift she will kill and devour him. This nature she possess is also related in the poem, “[The Black Widow Spider](#),” in *Coverings*. We thus see attested that when the woman

takes the glory, she devours the man, something feminism has effected since the [Curse of 1920](#).



Up to now I thought that this might be Yahweh's sole testimony to this reversal in glorious appearance, with its attesting tragic outcome. But recently I came across yet another, this time in the bird kingdom. So, what is Yahweh's testimony when now the female bird uniquely takes on a glory that is greater than that of the male? And, what does this tell us today concerning the outcome to the family and society when women take the place and glory of the man? The phalarope tells us.

Probably you have never heard of a phalarope. It is a shorebird, living along the water's edge. There are three varieties, and in these two photos you see the Wilson's Phalarope.



Now, upon looking at these, one would immediately conclude that the birds on the right in each photo are the larger more glorious males, while the birds on the left are the smaller and plainer females. Based on nature's normal and highly consistent testimony, you would have a 99.9 percent chance of being right. But, not with the phalarope. Just the opposite, the larger and more glorious birds on the right are the females, while the smaller plain birds on the left are the males. So, with this truly remarkable change in size and appearance, what might we find in the attesting characteristics from this?

Again, normally one would expect the male to be larger so as to defend his domain, and use his splendor to attract a mate. But with this switch in size and splendor, so goes those qualities as well. The female phalarope now takes the lead and aggressively pursues the male, trying to persuade him that she is right for him, and even violently fights with other females to win him. Today we shamefully see these same characteristics in girls and women, where they too now take the role of pursuing the males. They are phalaroped! And like the female phalarope, online videos show how they now even have their cat fights for the boys. These changes are a great shame in the demise of women and womanhood.

Next, when it comes time for the phalarope to build a home for the new family, yes, it is now the male who gathers bits of vegetation and makes the nest. The two then mate, and the expectant mom then enters into his nest, lays three to seven olive-green speckled eggs, rises from the nest, and dad then sits on them. He will faithfully remain on them until they are hatched. And once hatched, he fathers the chicks in the short time it takes for them to take flight into the world.

But, where's mom phalarope during all of this care? As soon as she lays the eggs, she spreads her wings and literally goes south to balmy weather, with no regard whatsoever for what she's left behind. However, on some occasions she will linger for a while if she finds another suitor, and will have a like tryst with him, all the while in the neighborhood of the original male who broods and protects her young. Then once the cycle with the new beau is repeated, she now leaves town with two males sitting at home to bring forth and care for the families, and wings her way to a fairer place. One website calls this behavior, the "most thoroughly modern dad." THAT, is a very sad but tragically real commentary on the family today, a consequence of the deceptive and evil Curse of 1920 when feminism phalaroped society, steering it on a course to ruin. While the phalaropes and black widow spiders may be able to survive this kind of aberrant behavior, mankind cannot and has not survived it. Oh, we still exist. But, it is destroying the home and governance and ushering society into loss and ruin! We are rejecting Yahweh God's divine order for man and the family.

Seeing this failure evidenced so clearly today, let us look back to the time leading up to the Curse of 1920 when women received the national right to vote. Prior to 1920, what were women forewarning? Most people do not realize that the great silent majority of women at that time DID NOT support women's suffrage. It was a smaller number of shrill, angry, militant women who were demanding equality with men (and they have never been satisfied to this day). One of those opponents to women's suffrage was Mrs. Francis M. Scott, the wife of the chief legal officer of the City of New York, and also served for fourteen-years as a member of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. On April 10, 1895, Mrs. Scott spoke before the New York Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to giving women the right to vote. Her words were published in The New York Times on April 11. Here is some of what she said.

Identifying women's suffrage as "one of the most important social [matters] of the day," Mrs. Scott warned about "giving the voting power to [women, who are] a majority." This truth alone has had hugely determining and devastating effects: feminizing government, making the country a nanny state and thereby dramatically increasing the national debt to the present point of bankruptcy. It has also resulted in the election of more liberal representatives, and thus the appointment of more liberal judges, both of

which have feminized our laws where they are no longer masculine as law must be. Remember, the female is weak and easily deceived (1 Peter 3:7, 1 Timothy 2:14), and this weakness is inherently evidenced in governance when women vote and have a part in governing. Roe v. Wade is a tragic example of this feminization and its deadly results, killing in America alone 3,000 babies a day! Read [The Curse of 1920](#).

Mrs. Scott rightly warned to not mistake “the clamor of the suffragists for truth,” for in fact it was and is the opposite—a destructive and selfish Eveonian lie! And, foretelling the woman’s tragic abandonment of her place, she implored, “who will do our work when we are doing the men’s?” The answer is one word: phalarope!

Mrs. Scott continued her impassioned and truth-filled warning (emphasis added):

To many young persons, to many emotional persons, **change is mistaken for progress**. Thus, in the train of the women so long identified with the demand for suffrage, who do not realize that the times have outgrown their cause, have followed many others.

Since the first development of sex, has specialization of the male and female types gone on. Men have grown more manly, women more womanly. **Are we alone of all nature to forcibly destroy the work of untold ages**, and thrusting men and women together demand that the work that each is beginning to be perfect in, shall be indifferently done by both?

I approach the question of morality with natural hesitation. It and our physical disabilities are the points I spoke of earlier as being ignored when this question is seriously discussed; and yet unless considered, this question cannot be properly dealt with.

Who does not realize the present **disinclination for motherhood** which possesses so many of our younger generation [noted in Thaddeus Russell’s book, *Renegade History of the United States*, addressed [here](#), and is chronic today], and who can see it without alarm? It can be traced to this **unrestful desire for life outside the home**. When motherhood is spoken of with contempt, when a home life is considered too dull to be endured, when the ambition of the intellectual life becomes so warped as to be dissatisfied with any outlet but that of public life—**what is to become of the future?**

Tragically, we now know what did indeed become of the future! It has been the destruction of the home, of society, of government, of masculine law, and yes of morality, and even the corruption of the church. Mrs. Scott’s words have proven to be profoundly accurate.

Our next voice from the past is Mrs. Rossiter (Helen) Johnson, whose husband was a newspaper editor and author. Mrs. Johnson was a writer and poet as well, and a prominent opponent of women’s suffrage. In 1913 she published the book, [Women and the Republic](#). In chapter 11, she clearly stated, “**woman suffrage and the home are incompatible**.” And we might add here that around 1879, [Mrs. William \(Annie\) Wittenmyer](#)—a renowned social reformer and relief worker who lost her founding presidency of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union because she refused to

support women's suffrage—stated that it would “**strike a fatal blow at the home**”! All three of these women were entirely right.

In chapter 12 of Mrs. Johnson's book, she insightfully concludes and rightly warned:

The greatest danger with which this land is threatened comes from the ignorant and persistent zeal of some of its women. They abuse the freedom under which they live, and to gain an impossible power would fain **destroy** the Government that alone can protect them. **The majority of women have no sympathy with this movement**; and in their enlightenment, and in the consistent wisdom of our men, lies hope of defeating this unpatriotic, unintelligent, and unjustifiable **assault upon the integrity of the American Republic**.

Turning to the introduction of this book we find a most important statement. Here Mrs. Johnson writes:

"Movement" and "**Progress**" are not synonymous terms. In evolution there is degeneration as well as regeneration. Only the work that has been in accord with the highest ideals of woman's nature is fitted to the environment of its advance, and thus to survival and development. In order to learn whether Woman Suffrage is in the line of advance, we must know whether the movement to obtain it has thus far blended itself with those that have proved to be **for** woman's **progress** and for the **progress** of government. . . . It is an instinctive announcement of a belief **that the demand for suffrage is not progress**; that it does array sex against sex; that woman, like man, can advance only as the race advances; and that here lies the dividing line.

How absolute is that dividing line between woman's **progress** and woman suffrage, we may realize when we consider what the result would be if we could know to-morrow, beyond a peradventure, that woman never would vote in the United States.

But man would never know what that blessed future would have continued to be like without women voting. Instead, time has revealed the outcome of the peradventure, the chance, that they did take at that time—a chance they should not have afflicted upon subsequent generations. Today, we know and are their to-morrow! And if men and women of that decisive generation could see women and society and the family today, they would be shocked, appalled, and ashamed, and would wholly regret their destructive actions. Even the suffragists would be shocked and appalled at the woman's nakedness and masculine appearance, at the abortion of our young which came directly from their movement, at the accompanying homosexuality, at the abandonment of the home and the family, at the painted lady with all her makeup, at the lack of womanly values and virtues that were once the anchor of the family, all the things that they disapproved of. They took the chance, and we have paid the price!

Women, as women should be by the design and order of Yahweh God, have NOT progressed since those decisive years of the early 1900s. Watch the video, “[The Slippery Slope of Compromise](#),” and you will see the certain reality of this—the immodest and masculine way women dress today is a shameful anomaly to the way women have dressed since the time of Yahshua, and undoubtedly even before. Women are no longer

true women, women true to their calling; but rather, they have been phalaroped, taking on the glory and place of the male, and have abandoned and rejected their place and purpose as a God-ordained woman.

Today, women are no longer responsible women, faithfully occupying and upholding their God-given role and place as a woman and mother. They have forsaken their role. Now, they dress like men, they vote as men alone once voted, they stand in the jobs and roles that men alone once held, they go to war like men, they pursue a higher education that men alone once pursued, they take on the vices and vileness that men alone once took on, and the list continues. And in becoming like, in trying to take the place of the man, they fulfill the ways, testimony, and practices of the phalarope and abandon their place as a woman, as a godly woman and mother. They have abandoned and forsaken the home and child bearing, and being a wife and helper to her husband. No longer is the woman the glory of the man; but like the serpent in the Garden she has become a usurper, and instead seeks to take the man's glory.

I have shared this story before, but it is fitting to repeat it here. When my oldest daughter was maybe twelve or so, she came to me and made the most insightful observation. She told me that men and women seem to seek to change roles. She noted that in creation God made the males to have the greater appearance; but, women put on makeup and adorn themselves in such manner as to gain the greater appearance, and thus take the place of the man. On the other hand, men, who have been given the beard, shave it off so as to take on the fairer appearance of the woman. That was a profound observation for a young girl, and was a beginning of understanding for me. And, I hope this is a beginning or ever increasing understanding for you.

Like the phalarope, men and women have reversed their appearance and roles, and are a shameful anomaly to God's creation. Look back in history, and as Mrs. Scott noted in 1895, men have been men, and women have been women. But not today! Women have now demanded equality with men, and men have blindly and foolishly abdicated their place and God-given role to them. As it is written, it ought not be this way. Instead, men are supposed to rule and to be the head and provider and protector of the home and of the nation. And women are supposed to be the keeper of the home and the mother and teacher and nurturer of her many children—bearing fruitfulness in the home. The man is to be the head of the home and of society as well, even as these two ladies openly testified and appealed. And the woman is to look to the man in that essential and protecting role and not be a usurper.

Briefly, drawing further from history when right was right and wrong was wrong, and men were men and women were women, Sir William Blackstone, the voice of reason, truth, and direction, giving light to the founding and government of this nation, wisely and astutely wrote concerning marriage (and you will need to read this carefully):

By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law; that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband; under whose wing, protection, and cover she performs every thing; and is therefore called in our law-French a *feme-covert*, *foemina viro co-operta* [Latin: woman covered by the husband]; is said to be *covert-baron*, or under the protection and influence of her

husband, her baron, or lord; and her condition during her marriage is called her coverture [her covering]. (*Blackstone's Commentaries*, Volume 1 (1765), page 442.)

What Blackstone was expounding upon is the very government that was set forth in the beginning when Yahweh God declared, "a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh" (Genesis 2:24). The two become one under the headship of the man, who is her covert-baron, her covering lord (1 Corinthians 11:3-5, 1 Peter 3:5-6). Let alone the mere fact that men alone are to govern, since two are one, then the two are one vote, and that set forth by the head, the husband. To give women the right to vote is to nullify the one-flesh union of a man and a woman, the outcome of which we have seen exceedingly evidenced in divorce rates. People fail to recognize the grave effect of altering God's governmental order by the mere act of giving women the headship right to vote. The consequences have been devastating!

Today, in many ways, we are phalaroped, to the extent that society does not even recall what being right and good truly is. As Mrs. Scott and Mrs. Johnson rightly noted, change is not always **progress**, and the only progress society has made in the last one hundred years regarding the family and morals and governance, is that it has progressively gotten worse and worse until it is destroying itself.

Men in 1920 and up to today have not regarded the words of Yahweh God to Adam in the Garden before He cursed him when He said, "Because you have listened to the voice of your woman . . ." (Genesis 3:17). Men, you listened to the shrill voice of the rebellious woman as they demanded the right to vote, and it has been your and society's and the family's undoing and ruin ever since. It is the Curse of 1920! We are now phalaroped, and the black widow has cunningly devoured the man!