

SMILE! or Else



by Carl Nelson

One of the nastiest personalities I ever knew, a fellow bus driver, invariably approached shining a smile, bright as a GMC truck grill. Now, if a stranger starts approaching me with a big smile, my impulse is to dodge them somehow or to back away. So when one of my Facebook woman friends posted this meme:



You seriously
have no idea what
people are dealing with
in their personal life.
So just be nice, it's
that simple.

My comment was, "I favor neutral."

To which her response was: "It is effortless to crack a joke and make someone laugh, to compliment something they're wearing, or to help them pick up their groceries if their granny cart tips over after hitting an uneven patch of sidewalk. Be a ray of sunshine instead of a dark cloud."

Her rebuttal got many more likes than my comment.

Nevertheless I hung in there: "Goodness sakes. How about leaving people alone! You're reminding me of the woman boarding my bus who stabbed her dripping umbrella at me several times and commanded, "Smile!"

I added, "In other words, "You have no idea what anyone is dealing with... back off!"

This latter response was to my experience of having sat alone with my coffee one morning in a mountain lodge where we were staying. I had just quit my SSRI medication cold turkey following seventeen years of use, initially for insomnia. I had escaped our room early that morning, cautioning my wife's questioning eyes before she could respond by commanding, "Don't Say. One. Word." My mind was crinkling with electric charges like tin foil.

The woman dispensing the lattes offered, along with my drink, this observation: "Don't take this wrong. But you can be VERY

intimidating.”

I am 6 foot 8 and weigh over 300 pounds. And this is before my coffee.

“Thank you,” I said. That had made me feel good. Maybe I would be left alone.

So while I’m setting alone with my coffee in the central lodge area – trying to hold my situation together – this middle-aged blond, all dressed up in the latest outdoor hiking apparel – a totally athletic appearing Karen – passed close. She stopped to stare at me as if my fractious expression were a blight upon the lodge culture and her sunny morning in particular. “Smile!” She commanded.

“Fuck off,” I responded.

Considering that there is currently being found an overwhelming correlation between mass shootings and SSRI medication usage and/or withdrawal, perhaps being a Pollyanna isn’t the best survival tactic in these trying times. Someone should mention this to her, but I knew I’d best not get into it.

In a near last comment to the thread, my Facebook friend noted: “The point of my post is that niceness and kindness should be your default. That is the definition of a good human being. But if you prefer to be an asshole, that’s your business.”

She scored way ahead in the likes and hearts for her comments. I had only one cynical, long-time Facebook friend who stood by me.

Such is the way of this modern world. If you’re ‘nice’ you win in the poles, no matter what the situation might call for.

Since 1776 it took our country’s forefathers about 125 years to create an institution of governance which finally

emancipated women. I submit it has then taken these 'emancipated women' near the exact same amount of time to destroy their forefather's creation.

And how is this so?

I would say that at the core of it is that the default of "niceness and kindness" is a woman's definition of a good human being. A good person in my definition is tolerant and will grant others their privacy. My definition of a good human being comes much closer to the definition of a good country, as was created by our forbearers, whose prime purpose was to design a government under which the citizen had their god-given right *to be left alone*.

But women will naturally extend their definition of what defines a good human being onto what makes a good country. A "good" country, by a natural extension of their thought, should make life better for its citizens. To think otherwise would be to be that "dark cloud" who votes: "Asshole." Leaving the citizens free to make their life better for themselves is not enough, when viewed through their eyes, and, in fact, is viewed as selfish. That person addressed in the beginning meme who "has no idea what they are dealing with" – this certainly covers these women. Nevertheless, they must do "good."

As President Reagan archly noted, "The nine most terrifying words in the English language are: I'm from the Government, and I'm here to help." And this shouldn't stop at our borders. No! We must extend this gracious behavior to the rest of the world. And so by the 2024 year mark, we have disrupted not only our own national character, but that of a multitude of other countries around the world – even being so nice as to seed our military far and wide in order to fight on various fronts around the globe. (What use is "doing good", if you can't enforce it?)

As an example, of how such Pollyanna rhetoric has been weaponized by the Left to rend the fabric of our society, a retrospective glance at Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty (by the indices of which, near all that was declared war on has gotten worse), is a brutal example:

"In his January 1964 State of the Union address, President Lyndon Johnson proclaimed, "This administration today, here and now, declares an unconditional war on poverty in America." In the 50 years since that time, U.S. taxpayers have spent over \$22 trillion on anti-poverty programs. Adjusted for inflation, this spending (which does not include Social Security or Medicare) is three times the cost of all U.S. military wars since the American Revolution. Yet progress against poverty, as measured by the U.S. Census Bureau, has been minimal, and in terms of President Johnson's main goal of reducing the "causes" rather than the mere "consequences" of poverty, the War on Poverty has failed completely. In fact, a significant portion of the populations is now less capable of self-sufficiency than it was when the War on Poverty began." – Heritage Foundation

So. What's there to smile about? This sure looks like a dark cloud.

Well, in a nutshell – it doesn't matter.

Because this brings us to the other half of the woman's nature, and that is their antipathy to conflict. Women characteristically prefer a confected conformity over the conflict individual expressions produce – which naturally induces a preference, through the currents of society, towards tyranny. Consolidation of the news sources, consolidation of the political sphere, consolidation of the world bodies which in turn will transmit a single, parroted, soft diet of positive, warm news (except, sadly, about those disruptive parties who, apparently, do not want a better world) – is

comfortable fit for the womanly scheme of things.

You can see this tendency, even among women Trump supporters, as was displayed on Laura Ingraham's Town Hall with Donald Trump in Greenville, SC recently. Where a slight, middle-aged, woman from the audience, who could have been right out of central casting for the glowingly sensitive and empathetic, asked the President:

"Our country is so divided... How can you assure independent and undecided voters that your focus will be on improving the state of our country and not settling those old scores."

Trump, being a far better politician than he is made out to be, replied that his goal was to make the country successful again. Trump's implication was that a less disruptive political climate would naturally result from pursuing our country's success. This was an excellent political response, which greatly pleased the slight lady. Her global, glowing smile, following Trump's answer was that of a person whose dearest desire would be something like the coke commercial where persons representative of the entire world sing in harmony.

But the clear meaning of this woman's question was whether Trump could promise a less disruptive political climate. And, of course he can't. Trump cannot control the outrageous and criminal actions of his opposition. Neither it seems can the Congress, any of our established institutions, nor the courts themselves. What's more, in truth, it has been Trump's successes which have spurred his enemies to perform their most outrageous acts. He stopped illegal immigration; they re-started it on steroids. He bolstered the economy; they propped up a false one by printing money. He made us energy independent; they went to our enemies begging for energy. He produced the first significant diplomatic success in the Near East in decades; they immediately destroyed it. The list goes

on and on. It is impossible for anyone who cares about our country's condition not to be angered about this. And the major media cover this. They make hay of our anger. We are not playing "nice." And there goes the women's vote, ebbing away.

The Democrats have one major strength – or, at least, they would cherish it as such. They have near complete control of the dominant media. And therefore they determine the country's disposition. If under the controlled media's reign the Democrats are said and shown to be producing a placid, smoothly running, growing economy and a country full of happy, progressively minded citizens – then there it is. They have established a Potemkin Village, nationwide! No suspension of disbelief necessary. Just follow the news over a calm dinner. What woman could ask for more?

("Another helping of cassarole, dear?")

Basically, what the middle-aged, Greenville woman's enquiry suggested was whether would Trump, if elected President, continue the Democrat policy of catch and release?

Would the criminal actors involved in the Russian collusion hoax, the Covid-19 pandemic crisis, the Biden administration's politicization of the courts, and major governmental agencies, and the Biden administration's corruption and selling of influences be prosecuted?

It's fairly obvious the woman enquirer would prefer no more ugliness.

("Nothing happening here, folks. Keep moving.")

And this is the problem Conservatives – and, in fact, anyone choosing to grapple with reality faces. When justice must (and should) prevail, women default to making nice – in great enough percentages to allow chicanery of all sorts to continue unabated.

It's a serious question, whether our country can survive as a democratic republic, wherein woman vote. How can informed debate occur? When the issues must always be discussed with doily and teacups ambiance? Where results matter little, when placed up against wonderful intentions, empathic display, backed by a field of purring desires.

Readers (especially woman) might hold that what I'm saying is outrageous. But currently, we have a President who is clearly fraudulently elected, mentally incompetent, sh*ts in his drawers, gets lost, but is as corrupt as he has the ability to be, and has done everything his power to destroy this land and culture – and who is his most loyal and unswerving support? It's young, single, unmarried, college-educated women. That's who. (50% of whom, incidentally, share a history of seeking psychological counseling.)

SMILE! about this situation – or else, it would seem.

Surely, there are a multitude of factors, both present and as yet unforeseen, pushing us as a society from a multitude of directions, which will determine our future. And the above conundrum is just one factor among many. Nevertheless, though the choices are many, this natural default of the feminine for “good” and a conflict free (‘nice’) society cants the gears of the future ineluctably towards tyrannies of one color or another. No price appears too high.