

Top 10 Highlights Of 'Hillary's America'

Exclusive: Chuck Norris urges citizens go see 'superb and enlightening' film right now

Chuck Norris

July 31, 2016

Filmmaker Dinesh D'Souza's latest movie, <u>"Hillary's America,"</u> is already the <u>top-grossing</u> <u>documentary of 2016</u>, earning \$5.2 million in just 12 days after its release. It has already trumped "A Beautiful Planet," which grossed \$4.1 million, and Michael Moore's "Where to Invade Next," which made \$3.8 million.

More than <u>eight out of 10</u> people who have watched "Hillary's America" have loved it.

My wife, Gena, and I went to see it last week. It is superb and enlightening, to say the least. So much so, that I want to give you my top 10 highlights of the film.

No. 10: The lesson Dinesh learned in jail from other inmates: The federal government is the biggest gang there is. The feds use the same tactics that most street gangs use – only on a much larger scale. Theft, extortion and suppression are their chief tactics. Case in point: <u>Dinesh's</u> <u>imprisonment</u> for making political donations through friends. Is it a "coincidence" that his sentence followed the release of his 2012 documentary, "Obama's America"?

No. 9: The <u>Democratic Party</u> was the original pro-slavery and anti-minority party, and still is, when one understands its underlying motives and tactics. From Andrew Jackson's suppression of slaves and slaughter of Indians to many modern Democrats' "purchase" of minorities via government handouts to win their elections, the Democratic Party has maintained the same underhanded goals of Americans' subjection and servitude.

No. 8: The Republican Party was founded as the anti-slavery and pro-freedom movement. Not one Republican politician in the 19th century owned slaves. All of them fought to free slaves. Republicans also fought for minorities' votes – including women's suffrage – through the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, which the Democrats opposed. Despite Democrats hijacking the glory for the 1964 Civil Rights Act, <u>more Republicans voted for it</u> than Democrats, and a conservative championed its passing. And it was actually the Republicans who led the first <u>civil rights movement of 1865-1895</u>, while Democrats again opposed it.

No. 7: <u>African-American Isa Wells</u> (the "original Rosa Parks") was raised in a 19th-century

home of active Republican parents. She led an anti-lynching crusade and was also a proponent of blacks' Second Amendment right to bear arms as their primary means of protection, despite most Democrats vehement objections.

No. 6: President Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, championed black segregation into the 20th century. In 1914, Wilson explained to Monroe Totter, a newspaper editor, real-estate businessman and an activist for African-American civil rights: "Segregation is not a humiliation but a benefit, and ought to be so regarded by you gentlemen. If your organization goes out and tells the colored people of the country that it is a humiliation, they will so regard it, but if you do not tell them so, and regard it rather as a benefit, they will regard it the same. The only harm that will come will be if you cause them to think it is a humiliation. ... If this organization is ever to have another hearing before me it must have another spokesman. Your manner offends me..."

No. 5: Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood and one who is praised by <u>Hillary</u> <u>Clinton</u>, advocated eugenics for birth control and the "Negro Project." In a letter to Dr. Clarence Gamble, she <u>wrote</u>, "We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members."

No. 4: President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, which is often hailed for its goals of reforming the American economy and helping the under-privileged, resulted in negative and fascist consequences for blacks, according to Dinesh and supported by the <u>Cato Institute</u> and others.

For example, as <u>the Atlantic</u> reported, "One of the most heinous of these policies was introduced by the creation of the Federal Housing Administration in 1934, and lasted until 1968. Otherwise celebrated for making homeownership accessible to white people by guaranteeing their loans, the FHA explicitly refused to back loans to black people or even other people who lived near black people. As TNC puts it, 'Redlining destroyed the possibility of investment wherever black people lived."

No wonder Hitler and Mussolini lauded FDR!

No. 3: In response to the <u>1957 Civil Rights movement</u>, Lyndon B. Johnson was concerned about the rise of black power when he said: "These Negroes, they're getting pretty uppity these days and that's a problem for us since they've got something now they never had before, the political pull to back up their uppityness. Now we've got to do something about this, we've got to give them a little something, just enough to quiet them down, not enough to make a difference. For if we don't move at all, then their allies will line up against us and there'll be no way of stopping them, we'll lose the filibuster and there'll be no way of putting a brake on all sorts of wild legislation. It'll be Reconstruction all over again."

Seven years later, little changed, as then President Johnson sought to <u>"buy" and control the black</u> <u>vote</u> via his Great Society, <u>saying</u>: "I'll have them ni—rs voting Democratic for two hundred years."

Considering points 10 through three above, Dr. Carol Swain, a black law professor at Vanderbilt University and a scholar of Democratic Party history, who also appears in Dinesh's documentary, explained at its premier to <u>National Review</u>: "It's a sordid story. Democrats have long practiced plantation politics while blocking economic opportunity for minorities." (Dr. Swain switched from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party because of what she has learned about Democrats' control of blacks.)

No. 2: I've pointed in earlier articles how President <u>Obama</u> and <u>Hillary</u> Clinton were fans and followers of the radical social engineer <u>Saul Alinsky</u>, who confessed to using mob tactics to organize communities and manipulate society. He became affiliated with Al Capone's number-two man and "Enforcer," Frank Nitti. In 1972, Alinksy said of him, "Nitti took me under his wing. I called him the professor and I became his student." And so, Obama and Hillary likewise carried Nitti's torch and legacy as they became disciples of Alinsky. And whom do we imagine they are trying to manipulate and control with Alinsky's <u>"Rules for Radicals"?</u>

No. 1: The movie rightly compares Hillary to Eva Peron, the Argentine politician famously accused of money laundering in the Andrew Lloyd Webber musical "Evita."

Most of the world now knows that Bill and Hillary Clinton have been partners in crime when it comes to dirty laundering for the Clinton Foundation – something I also wrote about in length in an <u>earlier column</u>.

Whether we are talking international bribery with other countries, gargantuan honorariums for corporate speeches, cattle futures controversy, Whitewater, Travelgate, Pardongate, Frank Guistra and the Kazakhstan deal, Haiti relief, Renting Lincoln's Bedroom or the transfer of uranium production to the Russians, the Clintons are pros at backdoor deals and you-scratch-my-back-and-I'll-scratch-yours political purchases when it comes to their own personal and political gain.

The Clintons' cash corruption plays both sides of the coin: international and national. Even a host of American companies with global interests gave millions to the Clintons while simultaneously soliciting the State Department.

"At least 60 companies that lobbied the State Department during her tenure donated a total of more than \$26 million to the Clinton Foundation," according to a <u>Wall Street Journal</u> analysis of public and foundation disclosures.

In 2000, Bill and Hillary Clinton left the presidency with millions of dollars in debt. Since then, they've amassed over \$130 million. Think about it!

In conclusion, my top 10 above are just the tip of the information iceberg in Dinesh's "Hillary's America," so please go see the movie. You can see a trailer below. I wish a copy of the movie could be sent to every independent voter as well as every American who is waffling or wondering who to vote for.

Dinesh responded to such questions on <u>Fox News</u>: "What I am hoping the movie will do is reach well-meaning people in the middle, sincere Democrats who go, 'I can't believe this," he said. "We have had people who have been in the movie, particularly minorities particularly Hispanics and blacks, and they say, 'Dinesh, the only question I have to ask you, is this true? Because if they are true, it changes everything.' And that's the thing. The things in my book and movie are true, and they cannot really be disputed, and it does change everything."

For anyone who doubts anything Dinesh's film documents, you can receive corroborating evidence concerning each of his claims on <u>the film's website</u>.

Even if only half of what Dinesh claims is true about Hillary's corruption and the secret history of the Democratic Party, we need to protect our country from any further influence of both of them. Eight years of Obama is enough – too much. We definitely don't need another four years of Obama in Hillary.

Gena and I congratulate and commend Dinesh in being willing to stand up for the truth, especially in the face of his own personal sacrifices and risks. God and Americans have blessed him for doing so, as we witnessed even with <u>his last films</u>: "2016: Obama's America" in 2012 made \$37 million, and <u>"America" in 2014</u> made "\$15 million."

You can like or dislike Dinesh or his movies, or even call him jaded and a demon, but you can't deny his facts and the right that Americans have to know the truth.

As our second president, John Adams, said: The people "have a right, an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge -I mean of the character and conduct of their rulers."