Ann Coulter’s second column attacking Christian missionaries is a study in propaganda. In it, Coulter employs a variety of Orwellian techniques, speaks authoritatively, and uses a wide range of humor to good effect. Those unfamiliar with Scripture and the teachings of Jesus could very easily be deceived. Others could be repelled from the gospel of Christ because of her words.

Here, we expose the deception and provide an anatomy of her false narrative. Consider this a primer in propaganda. Coulter used humor throughout her column to mock her critics and delegitimize their criticisms.

Opening Gambits

Coulter began her narrative with a paraphrase of Scripture, cleverly turning a well-known statement from Jesus into a defense of herself. Her essay title: “Let He Who is Without Ebola Cast the First Stone” hearkens back to one of the most poignant accounts in the Gospels.
The Pharisees wanted to stone to death a woman caught in adultery and Jesus defended her, saying, “Let him that is without sin among you first cast the stone at her (John 8:7).” Immediately – in her essay title alone – Coulter cast her critics as Pharisees and herself as the one defended by Jesus. Just as Jesus rebuked the Pharisees, Coulter rebukes her critics. (Oh, by the way, it was Coulter who actually threw stones.)

**Technique # 1: Frame the Narrative**

But back to Coulter’s essay and its lead paragraph:

> There was some hubbub about my column last week, where I complained about Christians, like Dr. Kent Brantly, who abandon America to do much-praised work in Third World countries.

Using a less poetic version of the Bard’s famous line from *Macbeth*, “full of sound and fury signifying nothing,” Coulter diminished the extent of the controversy concerning her previous column by using a colloquialism to describe it: “hubbub.” Coulter then took the offensive, accusing the missionary of deserting his country for self-glory. Already Coulter contrasted two themes: an inconsequential hubbub over her innocent words and the sinister actions of false Christians.

Coulter, in effect, turned a Christian virtue into treason – and she conflated the gospel with patriotism (and conservatism).³

**Technique # 2: Ignore Inconvenient Truths (e.g., “memory hole”)**

Next, Coulter again diminished her own wrong behavior, dismissing the very notion there was anything at all to criticize, and she contrasted that with the alleged wrongdoing of her critics.

> I planned to respond to my critics this week, but, unfortunately, there’s nothing to respond to. They call me names, say I’m cruel, malicious, not a Christian, compare me to Howard Stern and cite the titles of my books as if they are self-refuting. (Zippy, aren’t they?)

Coulter dismissed those names she was called – “cruel,” “malicious,” “not a Christian,” etc. – as if they were not accurate. Many would contend they are correct!

As you can see, Coulter also defended her books and praised their titles: “zippy” – a word she has employed many times to that end. For instance, during her *Demonic* book tour, when she asked, “Zippy titles, aren’t they?” But don’t those very titles – *Slander, Treason, Godless, Guilty, Demonic* – suggest some measure of name-calling by Coulter – the very thing she is condemning?

---

1 Coulter could not have been oblivious to the fact that the missionary she condemned had contracted Ebola. That was the impetus for her first column and the whole point of her essay title – highlighting his illness. Continuing to mock him, was she also suggesting that – as the one with Ebola – only he was in a position to cast the first stone? As a Christian, would he do so? But, in keeping with her own argument, if Coulter did not have Ebola, what right did Coulter have to criticize the missionary to begin with?

2 Coulter should bear in mind Shakespeare turn of phrase in *Hamlet*: “The lady doth protest too much.” Coulter’s rebuttal was an unusually long 1,301 words.


4 Ann Coulter, *In Depth*, C-Span, 8/7/11.
Next, Coulter further suggested the voluminous criticism she has received from Christians and conservatives over her anti-missionary column is actually comparable to what she receives from liberals attacking her books upon their release:

In other words, it feels like a book tour.

In just eight short words, humorously conveyed, Coulter completely dismissed the substantive charges of her critics. She also reminded her readers that she is a perennial victim of the Left, during (and between) book tours. Further, Coulter subtly suggested that all of her Christian critics are liberals (and, therefore, in her eyes at least, not really Christians at all).

Note that Coulter used humor throughout to defuse the seriousness of the charges against her, to show herself in a positive light, and to attack her opponents.

Decoding Ann Coulter

Having identified the problem (criticisms of Coulter) and offered herself as an innocent victim of baseless accusations by the Left (“nothing to respond to”), Coulter then accelerated her offensive against her critics. Coulter reiterated her point that there is no real “point” to her critics “alleged refutations” of her first column.

Missing from these alleged refutations is what we call a “point.” What is with these Christians? I know God didn’t distribute brains evenly, but can’t they make an argument? Christian websites should start separating columns into “Arguments” and “Anger” sections.

Technique #3: Attack the Messenger (e.g., demonization)

Ignoring all of the valid points made by her critics, Coulter then attacked those very same critics. She asked a question worthy of the serpent in the garden: “What is it with these Christians?” The implication is that there must be something wrong with them and that it must be almost unfathomable.

Coulter concluded that the something in question must be stupidity, a major stereotype she promotes. Her entire paragraph asserts that her critics have no point whatsoever but are only responding out of anger. Here, Coulter engaged in name-calling, claiming her critics are intelligence-challenged dolts who cannot formulate a rational argument. (Don’t pay attention to them, they’re stupid!)

But Coulter’s proposition for most of this century has been, “This is how six-year-olds argue: They call everything ‘stupid.’ The left’s primary argument is the angry reaction of a helpless child deprived of the ability to mount logical counterarguments.” Yet, here, Coulter employs that very argument: her critics are angry and stupid! (Why are they stupid? Because they dare to disagree with her.)

Then, Coulter condescendingly suggested “Christians” (notice now the expanded, all-inclusiveness of her term: not “these Christians” but all “Christians”) should distinguish between “arguments” and “anger” – as if righteous anger would not encompass both.

---

Coulter continued:

I’ve decided to help out my detractors with a few pointers.

Treating her critics as if they were “six-year-olds,” Coulter condescends to school them in the art of argumentation.6

First, exposing error is much more hurtful than name-calling.

But didn’t Coulter begin the name-calling in her previous essay? In the previous paragraphs?

As Coulter has often said, “It’s not name-calling, if it’s true.” The vast majority of criticisms of Coulter were justified. But as Coulter herself noted, “exposing error is much more hurtful than name-calling.” Coulter is incensed to have been called-out on her wrong behavior and she feels compelled to lash out.

Coulter’s one-sentence paragraph implies that no errors were exposed in her essay. Her critics did, indeed, expose her errors, In great detail, Extensively, Expansively. But, like the good propagandist that she is, Coulter ignored all of those substantive criticisms, throwing them down a memory hole as if they never occurred.

Targets of the Moment

As Orwell adroitly observed, the propagandist will seize the moment and attack the “enemy of the moment.” In this case, those enemies are all Coulter critics. Also, in this case, they are all prominent individuals.

Coulter has repeatedly said that her rule of combat is to always punch up, not down. “You can never punch down. You can only punch up. A little rule for public figures. It means you cannot attack people who are beneath you. … You punch up; you don’t punch down.”7

In other words, don’t waste your ammunition on the little guy; only publicly fight worthy opponents (e.g., those who can enhance your name recognition). (And don’t elevate those who are beneath you.)

With that principle in mind, Coulter’s first individual target of opportunity is …

Take former Bush speechwriter Peter Wehner’s digs:

“Digs” – a rather coy way to further diminish the seriousness of his criticisms, as if they were the schoolyard taunts of a bully.

Note that Coulter responds to each of the following accusations from Wehner by not responding to them. She cites them as if in doing so they are self-evidently unworthy of response, beneath her dignity.

• “The irony of Coulter accusing anyone of narcissism seems lost on her.”

---

6 Her readers would understandably recall her book cover for How to Talk to a Liberal (if you must), sporting a leather-clad Coulter standing at a chalkboard, schooling readers in the title of her book.
7 Ann Coulter, In Depth, C-Span, 8/7/11.
Technique # 4: Discount the Message

Coulter dismissed this particular “dig” as self-evidently erroneous when, in fact, few people would disagree with the statement that “Ann Coulter is a narcissist.”\(^8\) The fact of its inclusion in her rebuttal – and its prominence as the first accusation cited – suggests its sting was very real.

- “Let’s just say that when one thinks about what St. Paul calls the fruit of the Spirit – love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control – Ann Coulter’s name doesn’t leap immediately to mind.”

Coulter’s non-response again suggested the charge is frivolous, when, in fact, the fruit of the Spirit is fundamental to a Christian life and self-evidently missing from Coulter’s life.

Once again, Coulter is upset at the very notion that she could be lacking in Christian traits.\(^9\) In her mind, Coulter believes (or would like to believe) herself to be “an extraordinarily good Christian.”\(^10\) Anything which argues against her own self-image must be fought, especially such an important aspect of her self-image, an aspect so prominently and zealously disputed by so many notable Christian authorities.

- “Near the end of her 1987 book, Ms. (Elisabeth) Elliot writes this: ‘If there should appear in the 20th century one who was truly holy ... would we say, ‘Away with him! Crucify him!’? ... If Elisabeth Elliot didn’t personally know Ann Coulter, she certainly knew her type.”

Wehner provided a graphic counter to both Coulter’s self-glorious confession of faith and her defamation of faithful Christians. (Why does Coulter so often defame faithful Christians? Is she attacking what she is not?) But here, Coulter does offer a response of sorts. She resorts to retorts. (Humor is, after all, her ally.)

I’ve always hoped to be part of an “ilk,” but I guess “type” will do.

Coulter – who herself has often described others as “ilk” – humorously dismissed the very notion that she fits any “type” at all, especially one which would cry, “Crucify him!” against a truly holy person.\(^11\)

Having dispensed with Wehner, Coulter set her sights on a prestigious theologian:

Russell Moore, president of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention – and I hope, for their sake, the brother-in-law of some important Baptist – wrote:

Why so snarky? Coulter besmirched the man as if he does not deserve his leadership position. But the only flaw in Moore’s theology and character that Coulter could find was his criticism of her, thus her attack.

\(^8\) For insight into Coulter’s narcissism and how it manifests itself in the real world, see Vanity: Ann Coulter’s Quest for Glory at www.coulterwatch.com/vanity.pdf.


\(^11\) Does Ann not realize that she – and the whole of humanity – crucified Him 2,000 years ago? All of us are guilty. But the truth does not fit her own typecasting of herself.
Moore’s criticism?

- “Ann Coulter has not suddenly pivoted to saying some outrageous, shocking thing. She’s made a living at it.”

Ironically, Coulter actually and frequently boasts of being a polemist and provocateur extraordinaire, claiming that she deliberately pushes the envelope to “outrage the enemy.” So why did she find this so upsetting? Why did she consider this an insult, since she brags of it? Perhaps she isn’t upset by that statement after all. Remember, she’s punching up. Moore is certainly up compared to Coulter.

But Coulter does have a singular response:

(Original!)

Nice putdown.

- “Ann Coulter’s ... comments are none of my concern. The church is to hold accountable those who are on the inside, not those on the outside” of the church.

Here, Coulter – again incensed over accusations that she is behaving in less than a Christian manner, indeed, that she may not even be a Christian – went full throttle! Indeed, her emotions surpassed her reason.

Whoa, Russell! You got so wrapped up in your insults, you forgot that your whole point was to defend Christian missions to those so far “on the outside” of the church, they’re practicing voodoo! I don’t care how big a Baptist your brother-in-law is, Russ; you need a class in logic.

In her hysteria, Coulter’s own logic broke down even more. Was Coulter saying that missionaries should never go on missions? That the gospel should not be preached to practitioners of voodoo?

And why, again, try to delegitimize Moore by mentioning for a second time his important Baptist brother-in-law? Is Coulter – whose career depends upon her vast network of friends and colleagues – suggesting that networking is wrong? That family connections are somehow ungodly?

But Coulter gets even more confused (though, due to her linguistic skills, many accept her arguments):

Liberals have been trying to insult me into submission for more than a decade. These guys think they can succeed where Vanity Fair failed?

Speaking of being illogical, Coulter contends that Moore – a conservative Christian – is really a liberal. Why? Because neither a Christian nor a conservative would dare to disagree with an “extraordinarily good Christian” like Coulter.

Coulter’s pride – prevalent throughout her column – is in full bloom. Here she reprised her role as conservative/Christian victim, but one who is courageous and victorious.12 Those atheists at Vanity Fair

---

couldn’t defeat her and “these Christians” won’t either! (*But who is Ann really rebelling against? Other Christians? God’s truth as revealed in the Bible? Or God Himself?*)

**Second, to get the upper hand on someone you disagree with, it’s crucial to know what that person said. I find that the ancient art of reading is invaluable in this regard.**

Coulter added to her recurrent stereotypes: liberals are stupid, liberals are angry, liberals are illiterate. Yes, Coulter has often made each of those claims. Here, she found the ancient art of humor to be invaluable, suggesting her scholarly critic is illiterate. And she offered proof (of sorts).

**On a website called Southern Baptist Convention Voices, Alan Cross wrote: “Conservatives like Ann Coulter, Michael Savage and Donald Trump (or whatever he actually is) have sounded off saying that the Christian missionaries who contracted the virus should NOT be brought back to this country to be treated. We must protect ourselves, they say.”**

Coulter’s jihad against Baptists continued as she tries to lump in all Southern Baptists and, in this instance, referenced a specific website to be representative of the whole.\(^1^3\) Unable to rebut Moore’s criticism, undermine his credibility, or tarnish his reputation, Coulter finally struck gold. Coulter found one example of an inaccurate criticism. (Was this the best she could do?)

**I said nothing of the sort.**

Coulter treated this singular error in criticism as if it was representative of all of her detractors’ criticisms. But in the process, Coulter actually confirmed the analysis of many of her critics. Coulter then explained:

**My complaint was not with the bringing-back part, but with the going-over part. My rationale: 1) America is in the fight of its life and if this country dies, the world dies; and 2) the cost of Dr. Brantly’s medical care has now exceeded any good he did there.**

In this beautifully-worded paragraph, Coulter again reiterated her false theology. For Christians and non-Christians who are unfamiliar with Scripture, Coulter’s arguments might ring true. But for regular readers of the Bible and those well-versed in Christian theology – like Dr. Moore and her other detractors – Coulter errors are obvious and self-evident.

Taking part 1 of Coulter’s rationale: *America* is not the Savior of the world; *Jesus* is.

As for part 2, how does *Coulter* know? How can she possibly know what Brantly accomplished, medically or spiritually? How many lives did Brantly physically save? How many souls?\(^1^4\)

**I also expressly said: “There’s little danger of an Ebola plague breaking loose from the treatment of these two Americans at the Emory University Hospital.”**

---

\(^1^3\) Coulter uses this technique ad infinitum: Find one example of one thing said or done by one individual who is a member of a particular group and then use that isolated example to represent the whole group.

\(^1^4\) Yes, I am using spiritual shorthand here. God alone saves souls. But God often uses human instruments to accomplish His purposes.
Technique # 5: Use Straw Man Arguments

No one accused Coulter of playing Chicken Little with Ebola.

(In his defense, Cross devoted most of his column to promoting his own book, so maybe refuting me wasn’t really the point.)

Speaking of book promotion … when is Coulter not promoting a book? Should we dismiss what Coulter has to say because she’s an author? Should we dismiss Cross because he’s an author? Impugning the motives of other people is one of Coulter’s most proffered weapons.

Coulter re-targeted Wehner:

Wehner also skipped the reading step. He falsely accused me of “mocking” Dr. Brantly (in addition to his main point that I am cruel, narcissistic, callous and malicious). “It takes an unusually callous and malicious heart,” Wehner says, to mock a “husband and father who, while serving others, is stricken with a virulent disease.”

Coulter’s implication is that Wehner is wrong, whereas, he really is right.¹⁵

I don’t think I “mocked” Dr. Brantly. I mocked -- I would say “assailed” -- the whole concept of American Christians fleeing their own country, which needs them, to run off to Third World hellholes.

Technique # 6: Change the Subject

Coulter did, indeed, mock. Wehner responded by noting Coulter’s essay title and adding, “The tone of the rest of the column is consistent with the title.”¹⁶ But Coulter played word games, exchanging “assailed” for “mocked” – both words apply! – and shifted the focus to patriotism (nationalistic Christianity), displaying a xenophobia she would undoubtedly deny possessing.¹⁷

But then Coulter offered a parenthetical example of what real “mocking” would look like:

(“Mocking” would be saying something like, “Let’s just say that when one thinks about what St. Paul calls the fruit of the Spirit ... Dr. Brantly’s name doesn’t leap immediately to mind.”)

Coulter paraphrased Wehner’s quote to deflect the target of an attack on her to her foil. However, what Wehner said was true: few people would associate those terms – those qualities of God’s Spirit – to Coulter. But many have and do ascribe those self-same qualities to the good doctor.

Coulter’s attempted humor failed her at the moment of her greatest need. Coulter’s spiritual obtuseness – indeed, blindness – is all too obvious. For those who actually know Brantly, those spiritual traits really do spring to mind.

¹⁵ Both of Coulter’s essay titles mocked Dr. Brantly, who was, at the time, in danger of dying. He has since been cured.
¹⁷ See “Ann Coulter’s Xenophobic Anti-Gospel of Hate” at http://t.co/aQGhLuWwtD.
Wehner observed:

“I’ll leave it to discerning readers to decide if this tone strikes them as mocking, or whether Ms. Coulter is the victim of a terrible smear. (It may inspire most of you, if not Ms. Coulter, that this ‘Christian narcissist,’ when he learned while still in Liberia that there was only enough experimental serum to be used on one of the two infected workers, asked that it be used on his colleague rather than on himself.)”

Coulter continued:

True, Dr. Brantly’s mission was my example. I like to give examples in my writing. I find it’s more effective than abstract theorizing about how a hypothetical person might go on a Christian mission to Liberia that would end up being completely counterproductive by costing his Christian charity $2 million if he ended up catching the Ebola virus there.

Coulter’s condescension exploded out of this paragraph in which she exalted her own writing habits and attacked both her critics and, again, Brantly. Again, she brought it back to money: overseas missions are costly and counterproductive by costing his Christian charity $2 million if he ended up catching the Ebola virus there.

Wehner is unimpressed with Coulter’s concern over the costs incurred. He observed:

“Ms. Coulter’s concern for the cost incurred by Samaritans Purse is quite touching. She’ll be reassured to find out, I’m sure, that its medical evacuation insurance will cover much of the cost."

“Samaritans Purse’s budget, by the way, is $422 million. That money is raised because people believe in the mission of Samaritans Purse, which includes this statement: ‘Samaritan’s Purse specializes in meeting critical needs for victims of war, disaster, and famine in the world’s most troubled regions... Each year, the medical arm of Samaritan’s Purse places hundreds of doctors, dentists, and other medical professionals in voluntary, short-term service with hospitals and clinics in the world’s least-developed countries.’"

“In other words, Samaritans Purse raises money from individuals precisely to support the work of people like Dr. Brantly. The reason it has a medical evacuation insurance is because the organization and its supporters know situations like Dr. Brantly’s will arise. Samaritans Purse wisely prepares for worse-case scenarios, but neither do they operate on the assumption that they will be normative. If tragedy strikes, the organization responds.”

Another Coulter claim bites the dust:

No one has responded to that argument. It was a major strategic error for my critics to ignore one of my central points, while beating a straw man to death. (He’s a “husband and father”!)

Claiming non-response implied the correctness of her position. However, a number of people actually did respond to her argument, but Coulter chose to ignore them. Coulter claimed ignorance of counter-arguments – and actually suggested they purposely ignored one of her “central points” – as proof of its compelling nature.

---

Third, I strongly advise against using one-size-fits-all arguments that can be turned back against you.

They say: “How do you know whether God called Dr. Brantly to go to Liberia?”

Ah ha! But then I riposte: “How do you know whether God called me to write that column?”

Coulter used her sense of humor here to great effect to mock her critics and “riposte!” is a lovely word choice. But my response follows Ann’s next artful sentence.

And there we are, stuck at an impasse.

There is no impasse. *We know that God did not call Coulter to write her column* because He is a God of truth and love and Ann’s column contained neither. (Though it is quite likely that His will was to expose the hardness of her heart through that column and her subsequent one.)

This is the weakest technique of my critics, and one that is sadly common among certain types of Christians. (We usually call them “atheists.”)

Here again, Coulter resorted to name-calling, saying “certain types of Christians” (e.g., those who are not hard-core conservatives, nativists, and Coulter-lovers) are really “atheists.”

At heart, Coulter wants the people of God to worship a god who has been created in her image.19

But Coulter continued with her bald-faced accusations against a godly man and self-less Christian missionary, writing:

In this case, it’s even worse than the usual “who’s to say?” dodge, inasmuch as I set forth evidence for what I’m saying about there being glory-seeking and cowardice in Christian missions to Third World hellholes.

Claiming to have provided “evidence” she never proffered, Coulter offered up conjecture:

Among other things, I wrote: “Of course, if Brantly had evangelized in New York City or Los Angeles, The New York Times would get upset and accuse him of anti-Semitism, until he swore – as the pope did – that you don’t have to be a Christian to go to heaven. Evangelize in Liberia, and the Times’ Nicholas Kristof will be totally impressed.”

Again, Wehner’s response to Coulter’s rebuttal is outstanding:

“Let’s examine this assertion. The United States sends out well over 100,000 missionaries each year (not all of them to ‘Third World hellholes’). Question: How many of them have taken a path that leads to ‘worldly glory’ and positive mentions in the *New York Times*? Answer: Very, very few. Dr. Brantly may have gotten a favorable mention by Nicholas Kristof after having contracted the Ebola virus, but that surely wasn’t what motivated him to Liberia in the first place. There’s no way he knew he would contract

---

the virus and, if he had, that a *New York Times* columnist would find out about it and write favorable about him. Ms. Coulter’s mistake is assuming Dr. Brantly is as desperate for attention as she is.”

Wehner continued:

“The notion that missions to ‘Third World hellholes’ is the way to achieve worldly glory, which Coulter argues is why most people go on overseas missions, is risible. No one remotely familiar with the work of the vast majority of Christian missionaries would ever make such a claim. And by the way, if you’re a Christian in America who is intent on earning world glory, there are probably better ways to do so than to become a missionary to Liberia.”

Wehner continued:

“As for serving God in America: there are countless ways to do so, and some of those who do receive abuse and ridicule. But the vast majority do not. They serve quietly, without attention, in dignified ways. They aren’t after worldly glories nor are they the object of ridicule. Yet Ms. Coulter has created a crude caricature of missionaries in order to support her thesis.”

Another astonishing Coulter parenthetical:

(Hey, you know what else a Christian desperate for a pat on the head from The *New York Times* might do? Write a column questioning Ann Coulter’s salvation!)

Coulter has impugned the *motives* of people with whom she disagrees since the late 1990s. For instance, during the 2000 election cycle, Coulter repeatedly berated John McCain, accusing him of pandering to the Left to garner positive coverage from the *New York Times*. Here, she did the same to Christ’s disciples.

*Thus, I clearly pointed out that one path – missions to Third World hellholes – leads to worldly glory, while another – serving Christ in America – leads to abuse and ridicule.*

Coulter again repeated a false dichotomy, and an incredibly obtuse one at that. (But some of her followers remain convinced that she is right!) Jesus spoke of the wide and narrow paths. Coulter dismissed Jesus’ words and came up with her own paradigm, *one which is not true*!

Coulter’s first “path” declares that faithful, compassionate, selfless Christians following God’s will in service to His people overseas are doing it for “worldly glory” – an absolute absurdity which rightly garnered the most criticism of that given Coulter.

With Coulter’s second “path” – essentially political activism leading “to abuse and ridicule” – Coulter continually failed to grasp the *identity* of the world’s savior: Jesus.

Then Coulter continued her discussion with herself (her own solitaire rap session):

*The counter-argument to that point would be to say that Dr. Brantly has never been hailed as a hero or won humanitarian awards. But that would be false. Or they*

---

might tell me that Christians in Hollywood are the toast of the town – maybe Mel Gibson could write a guest column! That also would not be true.

As noted above, Brantly had no reason to expect awards. He merely did what tens of thousands of missionaries do: serve others selflessly.

Here, Coulter presented a “counter-argument” to her own false claim which itself is false. (See my previous counter-arguments.) Coulter’s entire perspective is worldly. Because Coulter covets glories on earth, not in heaven, she is utterly oblivious to the spiritual realm.

Consequently, Coulter is blind to the nature of the gospel of Christ, His commission to the church, and our individual roles in following God’s will in our lives. Coulter’s gospel is wholly political and entirely nationalistic.21

Wehner explained:

“When Ms. Coulter insists that mission trips are unbiblical – she quotes Deuteronomy 15:11 as her evidence and unqualifiedly states that ‘We’re supposed to take care of our own first’ – she has a problem. His name is Paul. He wrote 13 epistles in the New Testament. He is also generally regarded as the most important figure of the Apostolic Age. If Paul had followed the Coulter Doctrine, he would never have traveled to modern-day Syria, Turkey, Greece and Rome. The merit of this argument can be demonstrated by the fact that Ms. Coulter ignores it and therefore never even attempts to answer it. The special Coulter touch is she then complains that there’s no argument for her to respond to.”22

Coulter then absurdly made a another well-worded, yet bogus, charge:

My critics are left retreating into absurdity, essentially asking: “How do you know whether God calls on people to behave in ways that will get them standing ovations?”

None of Coulter’s critics offered any such suggestion.

I ask these similarly thought-provoking questions:

Coulter tried to use the absurd to highlight the alleged absurdity of her detractors, but failed. The accuracy and validity of her detractors’ criticisms overcome her farcical and fabricated formulations.

“How do you know whether God called the Dixie Chicks to insult George W. Bush in front of an America-hating audience, winning thunderous applause?”

In this series of “thought-provoking questions,” Coulter trivialized divine Providence and ignored the interplay between predestination and free will. Her questions reveal far more about Ann than they do about her critics.

“How do you know whether God called Gov. O’Malley to grandstand about the poor illegal immigrants at our border – while secretly demanding that none of them be sent to his state?”

Ditto.

“How do you know whether God called Samaritan’s Purse to fly out the affluent white Americans at a cost of millions of dollars, and give them an incredibly scarce medicine, while leaving the poor Africans to die?”

Her critics already addressed this issue (as Wehner also did above). Coulter’s narcissism and flawed theology prevent her from discerning the obvious.

Also striking is Coulter’s reverence to “affluent white Americans,” as if class, race, or nationality figure into Jesus’ determination of whom to save and where to save them. Coulter’s nationalistic and political calculus differs markedly from Jesus’ universal gospel of salvation regardless of race, gender, or class.

Oh I don’t know. Call it a sneaking suspicion.

Yes, Coulter really believes that she is right.

Ironically, despite the flailing anger of my critics – in fact because of it! – I’ve changed my mind. I see now that not everyone is called to be a Christian witness in an advanced nation.

Having – in her mind, at least, though not in reality – rebutted all arguments, Coulter again asserted that their arguments stemmed from irrational “flailing anger” and not facts, principles, and biblical imperatives.

Now, for Coulter’s punchline:

You guys should definitely go to Africa.

Say it ain’t so! Was Ann not so subtly suggesting that her critics go to Africa so that they can die of some disease like Ebola or AIDS?

Go and Sin No More

Coulter began her column alluding to the biblical account of the woman caught in adultery. Overlooked in her column, in her career, and in her life, is Jesus’ exhortation to that woman he saved from stoning: “Go and sin no more.”

Coulter boasts of being forgiven by God but displays no fruit of repentance. The fruit of the Spirit – as attested to by many this past summer alone – is seemingly not evident in Coulter’s life and work.

Jesus exhortation – “Go and sin no more” – requires repentance. Without repentance, there is no forgiveness. Certainly, this (almost) perfect piece of propaganda by Ann Coulter displays not a smidgeon of repentance.
Returning to Wehner’s wise words, he wrote:

“Most people, having written something so uncharitable about someone who has contracted a usually lethal disease in the service of others – having written a column whose words were meant to wound and ridicule – would be embarrassed by it. Ms. Coulter seems intent on wanting to highlight it. I’m happy to assist her in that effort. Let her columns on Dr. Brantly become an enduring testimony to her work, a window into her heart.”

“Mother Teresa went to Calcutta to serve a God whose highest calling includes serving the weak and suffering wherever they are found. That is something that Ann Coulter not only doesn’t understand; it’s something she finds offensive. Which tells you much of what you need to know about her.”