



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 17, 2018

Published in the September 17, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 18

Undoing the Democratic Narrative

Death of a Nation is the fourth movie that Dinesh D'Souza has made, continuing his theme that the American Left — which he traces through the history of the Democratic Party — has much in common with movements such as fascism and national socialism.

Don't expect the liberal media to give you an accurate review of this movie. The *Washington Post's* scathing review offered little in the way of telling readers what the movie was actually about, dismissing it as riddled with historical inaccuracies, without offering much in the way of examples. While D'Souza certainly pushes the historical envelope at times, his motion picture is much closer to the truth than the "review" offered by the *Post*.



"It aims to link Democrats to slave owners and segregationists, ignoring the fact that the two parties swapped places on race in the mid-20th century, most decisively with the Democrats' support of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act," argues the *Post*. I would agree that it is somewhat unfair to tar modern Democrats with slavery, but the *Post* answers here with its own myth it dishonestly calls a "fact," that myth being that the parties "swapped places on race." Their assertion that the Democrats supported the 1964 Civil Rights Act, for example, simply ignores the fact — an undeniable historical fact — that a larger percentage of Republicans voted for the law than did Democrats.

Perhaps most devastating for the Democrat myth that all the segregationists became Republicans, the film notes that only two out of dozens of office-holding segregationists in Congress switched to Republican — Albert Watson of the House and Strom Thurmond of the Senate. On the contrary, as documented in the movie, Bill and Hillary Clinton actually praised arch-segregationist and former Klan recruiter Robert C. Byrd upon his death.

The *Post* review also mentioned that D'Souza interviews Richard Spencer, the notorious white nationalist, in the film, without giving any indication that D'Souza strongly denounced Spencer's views. Spencer admitted that he is deeply collectivist, arguing that collectivism equates with conservatism, and that he is not opposed to socialism "if done right." In the movie, D'Souza said that Spencer is "not on the right," but rather is a "tool" of the liberal media.

But if one only reads the *Post's* "review," the conclusion would be that D'Souza had done a favorable interview with Spencer.

Legitimate criticism of the movie can be made — he has a Confederate battle flag hanging from the front of a Southern mansion *before the Civil War*, which is ahistorical. He continues his "thing" about



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 17, 2018

Published in the September 17, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 18

demonizing practically every Democrat politician from Andrew Jackson to the present day, while lionizing almost every Republican. One would almost think that Abraham Lincoln was Christ-like from watching this movie.

Perhaps the biggest problem I have with the movie — from a historical point of view — is D’Souza’s position that the Civil War was fought to end slavery, as though the “slave” states and the “free” states simply lined up to settle the issue of slavery on the battlefield. In his interview with *The New American* (see page 25), D’Souza said: “The Civil War was mainly, though not exclusively, about the issue of whether slavery should be permitted to spread into the new federal territories. Other issues like tariffs also played a role, but they were subordinate to the slavery issue. Secession when it came was over slavery, as Alexander Stephens, a Democrat and vice president of the Confederacy, admitted in his Cornerstone Speech.”

With all due respect to D’Souza, who has produced a high-quality movie, he needs to review his Civil War history. First of all, Stephens was *not* a Democrat, but rather a Whig (just as Abraham Lincoln was in the years before the creation of the Republican Party). Second, as many do, D’Souza confuses the causes for the secession with the causes for the Civil War. Certainly, South Carolina and some other “slave” states cited the issue of slavery as the cause for secession, but when Lincoln took office in March 1861, more slave states were still in the Union than out.

Other states — Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and North Carolina — rejected secession until Lincoln’s call for 75,000 volunteers to invade the seven seceded states and force them back into the Union. One can agree or disagree with Lincoln’s decision to invade the South, but the facts are clear: Had Lincoln not sent troops into the seceded states, there would have been no war.

Then there were the slave states that never left the Union — Delaware, Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland. If the Civil War was simply fought to end slavery, then Lincoln’s call should have been for troops to invade those states, as well. When Lincoln finally did issue the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, as a war measure, he specifically did not propose to touch slavery in those Union states.

And while the tariff issue should not be overplayed, it should not be discounted, either. A dispute over the tariff — and nothing else — almost caused a civil war in the 1830s. Considering that the greatest amount of federal revenue was derived from the collection of the tariff in *Southern* ports, it would be difficult to argue that it did not play a role — a significant role — in Lincoln’s decision to use force to bring those states back into the Union.

All in all, however, I was pleased with this movie, which fairly makes the case that the American Left shares much in common with the collectivist ideologies of the Italian Fascists and the German Nazis. He documents that Benito Mussolini was a Marxist as a young man, and even edited a socialist newspaper, before concluding that he needed to appeal to Italian nationalism to win power in Italy.

D’Souza performs a valuable service by demonstrating that Franklin D. Roosevelt admired Mussolini, a feeling that was reciprocated (Mussolini, the film chronicles, said that FDR was “one of us”). Roosevelt’s director of the fascist National Recovery Act, Hugh Johnson, openly admired Mussolini. The historical truth is that the New Dealers and the Italian Fascists had something of a mutual-admiration society in the early years of the Roosevelt administration.

Hitler effected a similar merger of nationalism and socialism in Germany. Nazi is simply short for National Socialism (it would be like calling communists “commies”). Hitler had no problem with



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 17, 2018

Published in the September 17, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 18

socialism, but considered German communists to be traitors to Germany because they had allegiance to Moscow over their own nation. He employed typical leftist politics, railing against the wealth of the Jews.

D'Souza also slays the myth that Hitler was somehow a "Christian," noting that Hitler's long-range plan was to exterminate the Christian religion in Germany.

From early 20th-century American progressives, Hitler and the Nazis got the idea for eugenics, and Hitler praised Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood. After his escape to South America, Hitler's "angel of death," the notorious Joseph Mengele, built a new career as an abortionist.

Another service performed by D'Souza in this film is his analysis of Charlottesville "Unite the Right" organizer Jason Kessler. Portrayed now by the media as some sort of "conservative," Kessler was actually a supporter of both Barack Obama and the leftist Occupy movement.

Near the end of the movie, D'Souza dramatizes the inspiring story of a young German Christian, Sophie Scholl, who was executed by the Nazis. D'Souza used the example of her courageous underground efforts against Hitler as inspiration for Americans today to stand up against the American Left.

Honestly, after his previous movie, *Hillary's America*, I expected a dry repeat of thinly disguised Republican Party propaganda. Yes, D'Souza still found nothing negative to say about the Republican Party's role in moving our nation away from the principles of limited government found in our Constitution. But he expertly used cinema to expose many of the ideological and historical connections between modern American liberals and the progressives, socialists, national socialists, and fascists.

This is a movie worth seeing.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 17, 2018

Published in the September 17, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 18

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.