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Dan Borchers, a lifelong conservative, is a man of great integrity and humility. If all Republicans and Democrats were like Dan, the world would be a better place.

I am delighted to write this Foreword for his book, which addresses the Orwellian nature of what passes for political discourse these days, particularly as it is epitomized by Ann Coulter.

I first met Dan in – when was that again? Oh, yes, … never. Though Dan and I have never actually met in person, I’ve known Dan for almost a decade.

I know Dan through his friendship, through his writing, and through the sharing of his faith in words, prayer, and acts of kindness.

We first collaborated on a literary work about Ann Coulter. At that time, I discovered Dan’s commitment to principled behavior. He had founded a non-profit organization, Citizens for Principled Conservatism, seeking “to reinvigorate principles and ideals within the Conservative Movement” and combat “extremist elements within that Movement” which he viewed “as both dangerous and self-destructive.”

Although we have some political and theological differences, we share a love for God, honesty and truth, character and integrity, principled conduct, and grace.

In his second book, The Gospel According to Ann Coulter, Dan provided a practical perspective with sound biblical doctrine on what it means to walk with Christ and seek His will. My own story corroborates Dan’s analysis of a paradigm which bedevils contemporary politics and the body of Christ in America today.

With Propaganda, Dan extends his expertise into a new dimension, offering fresh insights into the propagandistic nature of Coulter’s work – and that of so many others involved in the political arena. Drawing upon his own research and personal experiences, Dan offers a critique of propaganda which is useful for those engaged in politics, cultural pursuits, or other endeavors which require communication between people.

Lydia Cornell
Los Angeles, CA
December 29, 2014
Preface

Orwell, Coulter & Me

In the early 1990s, Orwell’s *1984* intrigued me. In particular, I was interested in its application in contemporary American politics.

My studies included examining the nexus of Nazi, Fascist, and Socialist thought and the use of language for totalitarian purposes. In August 1996, my newsletter *BrotherWatch* was born, with distinctly Orwellian themes. Within a few months, *BrotherWatch* transitioned into a broader, more Christian conservative publication.

I mailed the first two issues of *BrotherWatch* to members of the media, including Ann Coulter, and received some interesting feedback. Coulter replied as well, though she critiqued *1984* instead of *BrotherWatch*.

Thanking me for my newsletters, Ann expressed her deep interest in Orwell’s dystopia. Despite her failure to provide any critique of *BrotherWatch*, she did ask me to write MSNBC in order to help her keep her job.

Since then, Coulter has proven herself a *1984* aficionado. She claims to read it every year and she peppers her commentary with Orwellian language. Indeed, her career has been built largely upon her employment of Orwellian constructs which are discussed in *Propaganda: Orwell in the Age of Ann Coulter*.

I met Ann in the summer of 1997 to present her with an Alamo Award for her courage. Since then, I’ve discovered that the person I believed worthy of an award was in reality the product of clever merchandizing.

Ann Hart Coulter had learned her craft far too well. The consummate wordsmith, Coulter had become proficient at selling herself.

Coulter on Orwell

In discussing an *Apple 1984 commercial*, Coulter explained the power of visual propaganda and the importance of Orwell’s masterpiece:

> That is an amazingly powerful ad. I don’t know how anyone can vote for a Democrat again after that. Forget Hillary versus Obama. When I wrote *High Crimes and Misdemeanors*, I got an email from a fan who said, “Great book, but you need to distill it down into a 60-second MTV, you know, video.” And that's basically what this ad does

---

1 See [www.brotherwatch.com](http://www.brotherwatch.com) and [https://brotherwatchblog.wordpress.com](https://brotherwatchblog.wordpress.com).


for Orwell's *1984*. I don't know how anyone can vote for a Democrat after reading Orwell's *1984*.\(^4\)

Here is a sampling of Coulter’s references to *1984* and Orwell’s ideas.

\[2 + 2 = 5\]

Coulter concluded an essay, “Courting George Orwell,” which addressed a then-current Supreme Court case, writing, “Speech is ‘conduct,’ and conduct is ‘speech.’ Under a Constitution that ‘grows,’ two plus two equals five, and freedom is slavery.”\(^5\)

**Big Brother**

In one particular essay,\(^6\) Coulter railed against the pervasiveness of political correctness in our school system and society. She wrote:

> It's well past time for liberalism to be declared a religion and banned from public schools. Allowing Christians to be one of many after-school groups induces hysteria not just because liberals hate religion. It's because the public school is their temple. Children must be taught to love Big Brother, welcoming him to take over our schools, our bank accounts, our property, even our toilet bowls. …

> Religious people keep cheerfully going back and trying to formulate some prayer that won't make liberals angry. But the problem won't go away. No prayer that assumes a belief in a Higher Being will ever be acceptable. God has no part in the religion of sex education, environmentalism, feminism, Marxism and loving Big Brother.

> In a totally unsurprising development, liberals finally suspended their opposition to the death penalty in the case of Timothy McVeigh. He was the sworn enemy of the established religion of Big Brother. Too bad he never stumbled into one of those after-school Christian meetings.

**Groupthink**

Coulter has expressed a repulsion for groupthink, despite the fact that she herself is obsessed with groupthink.\(^7\)

> I hate groupthink. And the libertarians have it every bit as much as the college liberals I speak to. I give a lot of college speeches and it was the same thing, you know where you all have to cheer together and you all have to boo the same stuff. And I guess when you’re young and insecure feeling like you’re part of a group is important to you. If I was ever like that, it would be gun-to-the-mouth time. But OK, I understand the psychology of it.\(^8\)

---


\(^5\) Ann Coulter, “Courting George Orwell,” 10/20/00.

\(^6\) Ann Coulter, “Disestablish the Cult of Liberalism,” 6/15/01.


\(^8\) Ann Coulter, *Dennis Prager Show*, 3/18/13
As far as I can tell, this is the only instance in which Coulter has ever suggested she might be suicidal (“If I was ever like that, it would be gun-to-the-mouth time”).

**Emmanuel Goldstein**

Coulter frequently hearkened back to 1984’s apocryphal enemy, Emmanuel Goldstein. In an interview bemoaning the resurgence of race consciousness in America, she queried whether Rudy “Giuliani would have been as magnificent a mayor as he was if the OJ verdict had not come very early in his term.”

Coulter mused, “Perhaps he wouldn't have been brave enough to risk being maligned and turned into America's Emmanuel Goldstein by the left for pursuing his anti-crime policies.”

In a column defending Mitt Romney during the 2012 primaries, Coulter insisted his critics were out of touch with reality. She wrote, “But the facts are irrelevant to people busy fighting the last war. It's not about Romney at all, but their own posing. Romney is the Emmanuel Goldstein of GOP primary voters looking for a moderate to hate because they fell down on the job last time.”

With the publication of *Slander* (2002), Coulter claimed, “The religious right is the equivalent of Emmanuel Goldstein in Orwell’s 1984.” She explained, “The religious right is this apocryphal organization the masses are trained reflexively to hate, hate it while laughing at it. Interestingly enough, we never hear about the atheist Left. It’s always ‘the religious right, the religious right.’”

Coulter continued, “Just trying to figure out who the members are, the leaders of this vast terrifying organization is like trying to nail Jello to a wall.”

Let us remember that Emmanuel Goldstein was a *fictional* enemy in 1984, while the Religious Right did and does exist.

A few years later, Coulter extended that analogy from just conservative Christians to all conservatives. In an interview, she lamented, “It’s amazing that Republicans ever win any elections with the most powerful institution in America – the mainstream media – trying to turn all conservatives into this week’s Emmanuel Goldstein, while treating the most ghastly liberals as if they are sparkling Adonises.”

In a 2005 essay, Coulter alleged, “Now [Rep. Jean] Schmidt [R-OH] is Emmanuel Goldstein, subjected to the liberals’ Orwellian two-minutes hate, and not one Republican will defend her.”

Coulter defended Schmidt, writing, “Schmidt's precise words were: ‘I received a call from Col. Danny Bubp. He also asked me to send Congressman Murtha a message, that cowards cut and run, Marines never do.’”

**Orwell in Slander**

Orwellian references and allusions permeate *Slander*, the first of her overtly Orwellian tomes. Coulter correctly knows the Left’s penchant for Newspeak, writing, “Race discrimination tends to attract the most preposterous Orwellian circumlocutions, such as ‘equal opportunity’ and ‘affirmative action.’”

---

11 Ann Coulter, interview with Scoobie Davis, 7/11/02.
13 Ann Coulter, interview with PJMedia, 2/2/09.
14 Ann Coulter, “We like you! We really like you!” 11/30/05.
Decrying groupthink, Coulter observed, “The occasional heretics from the liberal orthodoxy are regularly trolled out for the ritualistic Orwellian ‘two minutes of hate.’”

Opposed to the liberal goal of enjoying an monolithic liberal media devoid of conservative voices, Coulter wrote, “It isn’t compartmentalization that liberals are worried about, it is the capacity of Americans to escape the Orwellian drivel.”

But the bulk of Orwellian references surrounded her desire to promote the notion that the Religious Right is a fantasy – an apocryphal enemy – created by the Left to silence people of faith.

According to Coulter,

The “religious right” serves the function of Emmanuel Goldstein in Orwell’s 1984: “The program of the Two Minutes Hate varied from day to day, but there was none in which Goldstein was not the principal figure. He was the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party’s purity. All subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching.”

Coulter asserted, “For twenty years, evangelical Christians had been portrayed as toothless hicks preaching for a nickel in the Ozarks. Then – seamlessly, without remark on the shift in the Orwellian propaganda – they were transformed into Howard Hughes money men, expertly manipulating the system.”

Coulter contended, “As Orwell described the endless, phony war in 1984, despite ‘the regrouping which occurs every few years, it is always the same war – one must realize in the first place that it is impossible for it to be decisive.’”

Coulter claimed, “Not only is there no meaningful definition of the ‘religious right,’ there is no coherence to its life span. It is uncanny how Orwellian it is.” Expanding on her theme, Coulter insisted:

Yet, like Emmanuel Goldstein, though the religious right is universally reviled, it is still, somehow, dangerously beguiling. Despite being “hated and despised by everybody, although every day, and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, [Goldstein’s] theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were – in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less.”

Coulter concluded: “What is fairly stunning is that the left’s carefully nurtured devil term – their Emmanuel Goldstein, capable of producing hate on cue – essentially comes down to accusing someone of being a Christian.”

**Orwell in Treason**

Orwell again invaded Coulter’s next book, Treason. This time, Coulter used an enormous portion of her book to resurrect Joseph McCarthy as a much-maligned (and flawless) American hero. Coulter wrote, “The myth of ‘McCarthyism’ is the greatest Orwellian fraud of our times.”

Coulter relentlessly hammered home her main point: “One of the most Orwellian lies of the McCarthy myth is that he ‘named names,’ as the slogan goes, ruining people's lives with reckless accusations.”
Attacking isolationists (while forgetting that many conservatives were so in the early 1940s), Coulter wrote, “But as George Orwell said during World War II, ‘Since pacifists have more freedom of action in countries where traces of democracy survive, pacifism can act more effectively against democracy than for it.’ In practical effect, the ‘pacifist’ was pro-Nazi.”

Coulter’s lifelong opposition to feminism yielded this surprising assertion: “It is not an accident that the relentless attacks on morality spring from America’s women. ‘The aim of the party,’ George Orwell wrote in 1984, ‘was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act.’”

Coulter continued her quote from Orwell: “The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it.” The Party triumphed because ‘so far as the women were concerned, the Party's efforts were largely successful.’

Whereas, Orwell was certainly accurate in his assessment of Nazi and Stalinist regimes, his prophetic insight did not extend to the 1960s countercultural movement which exalted (not diminished) sex.

**Orwell in How to Talk to a Liberal**

In her first collection of Ann Coulter columns, *How to Talk to a Liberal (if you must)*, Coulter revisited Orwell with a vengeance. In one of her very first syndicated columns, Coulter decried the fascist airlines, asserting, “There is nothing that makes you feel like you are in Orwell’s 1984 so much as being trapped on an airplane with a pilot who thinks he’s Shecky Greene.”

Finding fault with all of America’s political parties for the continual growth of government, Coulter noted, again, in the context of fascist airlines, “Americans may vote for creeping socialism, but deep in their beings they sense that they are still free, that this is not yet Orwell’s 1984.”

Continuing her airline attack, Coulter intensified her argument, asserting, The reason airports already resemble the torture chambers in Orwell's 1984 is that they are natural monopolies.”

Shifting gears, Coulter disparaged the Left’s incessant need to control the media and diminish conservative dominance of talk radio and TV. As Coulter put it: “It would be like being Winston Smith in George Orwell's 1984, forced to listen to Big Brother twenty-four hours a day. Indeed, it’s difficult to imagine a world in which people voluntarily choose to listen to liberals. There is no evidence that it has ever happened.”

Coulter’s last Orwellian reference in *How to Talk to a Liberal* admonished the Left for its prodigious propaganda efforts: “If liberals applied half as much energy to some business endeavor as they do to creating the Big Lie, they would all be multimillionaires.” (But the leaders are all multimillionaires.)

**Orwell in If Democrats Had Any Brains**

Coulter’s second collection of Ann Coulter columns, *If Democrats Had Any Brains, They’d Be Republicans*, incorporated at least two Orwell references.

In the first, Coulter expressed her sense of being the eternal victim of false accusations by the Left: “But now the thrill is gone. The liberal lynch mobs and conservative collaborators are beginning to bore me.
Even Emmanuel Goldstein in Orwell’s *1984* had to put up with only two minutes’ hate per day. With me, it’s becoming nonstop.”

Coulter’s second Orwell reference deals with evolution: “Darwin’s theory is the hoax of the century. It is the religious belief that must be put into children’s heads as early as possible. Everything evil flows from the big lie of evolution.”

While Coulter is often correct in her political and cultural analysis, she is all too often wrong. Coulter has discerned how the Left employs Orwellian constructions and she has incorporated those tactics and techniques in her own work and life. Unfortunately, in so doing, Coulter renders truthful communication inoperative.

Her giftedness as a writer and speaker, in short, covers a multitude of lies, making it that much more difficult to discern truth from prevarication.

Coulter’s lies often pursue an agenda, though they almost just as often promote an image. In the end, far too much of what Coulter writes is purposefully poppycock, damaging the credibility of both Conservatism and Christianity, whom she purports to represent.

---

15 Ann Coulter, *If Democrats Had Any Brains, They’d be Republicans*, Crown Forum, 2007, pg. 24. As noted in “Chapter 6: I Am Victim, Hear Me Whine,” *The Beauty of Conservatism*, 2011, one of Coulter’s favorite roles is to play the victim, the heroic martyr who courageously withstands unjustified attacks from the Left. However, in most cases, Coulter’s own offensive and outrageous behavior prompts justifiable criticism of her words and actions. *The Beauty of Conservatism* is available as a free PDF download at [www.coulterwatch.com/beauty.pdf](http://www.coulterwatch.com/beauty.pdf).

Introduction
Orwellian Constructions

For almost two decades, Ann Coulter has proven herself untrustworthy. From betraying her own client and scamming voters, to using lies and employing elimination rhetoric, Coulter has shown herself to be unscrupulous – all in the pursuit of self-promotion and self-glory. In each of my books about Coulter, I have amply demonstrated that she has little credibility and even less integrity. In The Beauty of Conservatism, Coulter is exposed as a charlatan whose conservative and Christian credentials are fraudulent as judged by her own words and actions.

In The Gospel According to Ann Coulter, she is discovered to be, at best, a hypocrite and, at worst an apostate. Her theological views are an odd mix of orthodoxy, heresy, and apostasy.

Vanity explores Coulter’s narcissism and self-worship and their consequences for herself and those who adore her as a conservative goddess.

Beauty addressed primarily the political realm, Gospel, the spiritual, and Vanity, the psychological.


Writer Jen Kuznicki observed, “Her sweeping change from being a conservative to consistently condemning of conservatives, namely that North Star, all to get the media attention she so needs to exist.”

Continuing, “But the truth is out, and it has been now for years. Ann Coulter is a charlatan out for money, and she is sidling up exclusively with liberalism, which is to say that she is actively working for the demise of the nation.”

This book, Propaganda, delves into the various ways in which Coulter promotes herself and her worldview, and it examines why so many people can come to believe her distortions and lies, even when confronted with a wealth of irrefutable evidence.

That Coulter retains any credibility at all – despite her pathological prevarication, her eager employment of elimination rhetoric, and her enmity to all who do not fit into her scheme of life – is perhaps the mystery of the ages. Propaganda endeavors to explain the seemingly inexplicable.
Orwell’s Blueprint

In a startling manner, Coulter audaciously adopted Orwell’s iconic *1984* as a blueprint for her own career. What totalitarian governments and dictators do on a national and international level, Coulter does on a somewhat smaller scale. Ever ideological, always self-promoting, Coulter uses the tactics and techniques, the verbiage and the principles, of *1984* to pursue her own agenda. Where that agenda collides with conservative principles or Christian values, those interests become subservient to her own.


The publication of *Slander* in 2002 formally marked Coulter’s foray into Orwell’s world of *1984* and its dystopian political and linguistic features. Coulter would prove herself to be an accomplished master of Orwellian constructs which would become even more prevalent and pronounced in subsequent books and commentary by Coulter.

The propaganda techniques employed by Coulter have been used throughout human history, culminating in the totalitarian language of the 20th century, as exemplified by the Nazis in Germany and the Stalinists of the Soviet Union.

Those techniques, to one degree or another, are also used by many political parties, religious and secular organizations, governmental and advocacy groups, and advertising and marketing firms. It must be noted that nefarious motives do not necessarily underlie the use of these techniques; benign motivations often exist for their utilization.

Readers who grasp the Orwellian constructs used by Coulter will be much more alert when confronted with their use by others, regardless of political, religious, or economic affiliation.

Historian Paul Johnson noted that, “A man who deliberately inflicts violence on the language will almost certainly inflict violence on human beings, if he acquires the power.”

Johnson warned, “Those who treasure the meaning of words will treasure the truth, and those who bend words to their purposes are very likely in pursuit of anti-social ones.”

Coulter is extraordinarily adept at inflicting “violence on the language” to achieve her ends.

Orwell’s Constructs

If George Orwell is the Father of Big Brother, then he is the cherished uncle of Ann Coulter. Coulter certainly seems more at home with *1984* than she does with either the Bible or the Constitution.

---

11 The full text of Orwell’s *1984* is available at [http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html](http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html).

Orwellian constructs include the following:

- **Big Brother.** “a person or organization exercising total control over people's lives”**13**
- **The Big Lie.** “a gross distortion or misrepresentation of the facts, especially when used as a propaganda device by a politician or official body”**14**
- **Perpetual Warfare.** Being in a continual state of hostility – emotionally, intellectually, ideology – to further one’s goals.
- **Apocryphal Enemy.** An imaginary enemy created to focus the attention of the people on the goals of Big Brother as well as distract from the truth.**15**
- **Enemy of the Moment.** “The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil, and it followed that any past or future agreement with him was impossible.” (1984)
- **Two Minutes Hate.** A daily period of time devoted to hating the enemy.**16**
- **Hate Week.** A week-long period of concentrated hatred for the enemy.**17**
- **Newspeak.** “speech or writing that uses words in a way that changes their meaning especially to persuade people to think a certain way”* or “ambiguous euphemistic language used chiefly in political propaganda”**18**
- **Groupthink.** “a pattern of thought characterized by self-deception, forced manufacture of consent, and conformity to group values and ethics”**19**
- **Doublethink.** “a simultaneous belief in two contradictory ideas”*20 “To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. That was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word 'doublethink' involved the use of doublethink.” (1984)
- **Memory Hole.** “an imaginary place where inconvenient or unpleasant information is put and quickly forgotten”**21**
- **Thoughtcrime.** “an instance of unorthodox or controversial thinking, considered as a criminal offense or as socially unacceptable”**22**


---

16 See [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0vvvPZd6_D8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0vvvPZd6_D8) and [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two_Minutes_Hate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two_Minutes_Hate).
Structure of *Propaganda*

*Propaganda: Orwell in the Age of Ann Coulter* is structured in a simple fashion.

Chapter One compares and contrasts Coulter with Nazi propagandist Leni Riefenstahl.

Chapter Two provides a humorous review of a fictitious Ann Coulter book, *Delusional*, in which all of the quotations contained therein are from Coulter, demonstrating the schizophrenia of Coulter’s own self-identity.

Chapter Three examines Coulter’s first distinctly Orwellian book, *Slander*, and its incorporation of many Orwellian propaganda techniques. It further looks at Coulter’s own addiction to addictive thinking and its implication in her work.

With Chapter Four, we see the pervasiveness of Orwellian thinking as it is exhibited in Coulter’s third book, *Treason*, which is steeped in the thought processes of 1984. This chapter explores the many and varied Orwellian techniques and constructs employed by Coulter in *Treason*.

Chapter Five looks at Coulter’s first compilation of essays, *How to Talk to a Liberal (if you must)*, which is an instruction book – or, *How To* manual – for conservatives.

A series of case studies then fleshes out the reality of Coulter’s utilization of propaganda and its political and cultural impact.

An Epilog renders hope possible in the life and work of Coulter.

An Appendix critiques an (almost) perfect piece of propaganda by Coulter.
Chapter 1
The Right’s Riefenstahl

Many critics have justifiably compared Coulter with Nazi propagandist Leni Riefenstahl. Megan Fox observed, “The Left always loves to compare conservative media (Ann Coulter especially) to Leni Riefenstahl, Hitler’s propaganda film-maker.”

But even Coulter’s friends joke about her, “I feel like I’m sitting next to a blonde Trotsky.”

Despite obvious differences between them (Coulter is not a Nazi), Coulter and Riefenstahl share distinct and unmistakable similarities. Both were admired for their beauty and creativity. Each exhibited – and even proclaimed – a will to power. Moreover, they share numerous narcissistic traits.

Ann Coulter is the Leni Riefenstahl of the Right.
Ann Coulter is the GOP’s Tariq Aziz.
Ann Coulter is the Wizard of (her own version of) Oz.

---

2 Michael Moynihan, Red Eye, FNC, 6/22/13.
Permit me “to stress the obvious: that to compare is not the same as to equate.”³ Let me repeat, “to compare is not to equate.” That Riefenstahl was a Nazi does not mean that Coulter is as well.

**Is Coulter Riefenstahl Reincarnated?**

Is Ann Coulter the reincarnation of Leni Riefenstahl? Of course not. Riefenstahl died in 2003, when Coulter was just approaching the age of 42. However, it is simply uncanny how many personality and character traits these two controversial and propagandistic figures share.

Riefenstahl biographer, Rainer Rother, reveals many fascinating character traits in his biography, *Leni Riefenstahl: The Seduction of Genius* (excerpts below).⁵

**Strong-willed**

*Those who know Coulter know that she is as self-willed as anyone can be. Coulter seeks to impose her will even as she refuses to either repent, forgive, or extend mercy.*

Riefenstahl considered her primary character trait to be “strength of will”⁶ and “so often demonstrated her exceptional ability to assert her own will.”⁷

Riefenstahl declared, “I swore to myself that in later life I would never let anyone else take the wheel. I would always make my own decisions.”⁸ Riefenstahl added, “And indeed, several years pass before I succeed in imposing my own will on a film.”⁹

**Controversial and Divisive**

*Coulter relishes her self-description as a controversialist, polemicist, and provocateur.*

“The alternative approaches to Leni Riefenstahl are well established: she was a great genius or a mere talent; an obsessive artist or a barefaced propagandist; the supreme ingénue or a calculating profiteer.”¹⁰

“Riefenstahl’s public image thus became established as one of controversy personified.”¹¹

**Ambitious**

*Coulter has always been a “high-aimer” seeking to be an elite among the elites. She always wanted to be a writer, but her father forced her to pursue the law.*

“Her career [began] as a struggle against her father’s will. She had to aim as high as possible from the very start.”¹²

---

⁹ *Ibid.*, pg. 188.
“She made up for her lack of experience and education with demonstrative self-confidence and the desire to be a star from the very start.”\(^\text{13}\)

**Charming**

_Coulter knows how and when to turn on the charm, beguiling many people in the process._

“… but she knew how to pursue her projects with charm and persistency.”\(^\text{14}\)

“… charm and wit.”\(^\text{15}\)

**Egocentric**

_The world still revolves around Coulter, at least in her mind. Narcissism personified._

“Her continuing refusal, long after 1945, even to consider the boycott against her film as a reasoned political response to a propaganda film is more than just a symptom of her egocentric attitude.”\(^\text{16}\)

“The director’s unique brand of egocentrism meant that the sense of being a victim, shared by so many Germans, was particularly pronounced in her case.”\(^\text{17}\)

“Riefenstahl also demonstrated the poor tactical awareness of an egocentric.”\(^\text{18}\)

“Her tenacity was always associated with an astonishingly egocentric attitude – a fact which perhaps makes her reactions understandable.”\(^\text{19}\)

**Well-connected and Influential**

_Coulter’s many professional connections – courted and acquired throughout her adult life – catapulted her career and enabled her to survive many self-destructive periods in her life._

“Yet Riefenstahl’s persistence and her influential connections always enabled her to find a way forward for the film …”\(^\text{20}\)

**Privileged Elite**

_Coulter – born and bred an elite – has become a powerful figure in journalism and politics, and proven herself unscrupulous._

“In fact, Riefenstahl’s public image … [was based] on all the evidence indicating not only that she was a propagandist who had enjoyed special privileges as a director, but also that her character was utterly incorrigible.”\(^\text{21}\)

\(^\text{12}\) Ibid., pg. 12.
\(^\text{13}\) Ibid., pg. 12.
\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., pg. 91.
\(^\text{15}\) Ibid., pg. 93.
\(^\text{16}\) Ibid., pg. 94.
\(^\text{17}\) Ibid., pg. 119.
\(^\text{18}\) Ibid., pg. 166.
\(^\text{19}\) Ibid., pg. 178.
\(^\text{20}\) Ibid., pg. 112.
\(^\text{21}\) Ibid., pg. 121.
Sex Symbol

Coulter’s media career began as “The Babe of the Conservative Movement,” an image she still seeks to possess.

“Her youth, beauty and slenderness were exactly what people wanted; her artistic abilities could not quite live up to the same ideal.”

“[Riefenstahl was] the archetypal phallic woman, before whom every man can only kneel.”

Impensive

Coulter’s impenitence is legendary. She cannot admit error and will neither seek nor extend forgiveness. Hence her addiction to addictive thinking (see next chapter) with its traits of denial, projection, and rationalization. Self-justification figures large in Coulter’s writings.

“Moreover, Riefenstahl’s attempts to justify herself actually helped considerably to fuel the continuing criticism.”

“This naturally tenacious woman needed the rush of adrenalin provided by the questions: it kick-started her fighting spirit. Self-justification became an expression of vitality.”

“Riefenstahl seemed to forbid herself even to think about the way she had benefited from the regime, representing herself as an artist whose successes had been achieved in spite, rather than because, of the Nazi dictatorship.”

“The more banal, commonplace facets of Riefenstahl’s character came to light, creating a counterbalance to her well-publicized tendency to suppress unpleasant truths.”

“Like so many Germans, Riefenstahl refused to take account of any arguments other than strictly legal ones when examining her own conscience.”

Propagandist for a Regime

Coulter unabashedly defends (her brand of) Republicans, just as she reflexively defended the Bush administration and the party platform from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

“She was on the way to becoming the genius of Nazi filmmaking.”

“Leni Riefenstahl – uniquely and, it would seem, paradoxically – enjoyed absolute artistic control over films which dovetailed perfectly with the aims of the regime.”

---

22 Ibid., pg. 21.
23 Ibid., pg. 187.
24 Ibid., pg. 122.
25 Ibid., pg. 168.
26 Ibid., pg. 172.
27 Ibid., pg. 175.
28 Ibid., pg. 178.
29 Ibid., pg. 51.
30 Ibid., pg. 73.
“Her whole stature and influence was founded on the films she made under – and largely in homage to – the Nazi regime.”

Qualities of a Propagandist

What are the qualities of a good propagandist? Perhaps first and foremost, it is essential that a good propagandist believe – and believe in – what she is selling. She must be convinced and convicted of her message. Her certainty and fervor must be unquestioned.

Whatever that moment’s message is, the effective propagandist regards it as truth, even if it conflicts with previously made statements or actions. The propagandist – in that moment – believes what she says. For her, it is truth. In that particular moment. To suit certain specific needs.

Propagandists can become masters at deceiving others, even at deceiving themselves. There are none so deceived as those who deceive themselves.

Another hallmark of the perfect propagandist is a cold-hearted apathy, one which cares not one iota about the consequences of her lies and the pain and heartache they inflict. Narcissists perfectly fit that bill. Their self-absorption puts the interests and needs of others well below their own. Indeed, the needs of others do not even register on their radar unless it directly impacts them.

Thus, successful propagandists can divorce themselves from the emotions of others while marryng their own emotions to their message. (Certainly, they are aware of the emotions of others, not out of compassion or empathy, but as a means of manipulation.)

Propagandists, by definition, seek to impose their will on others and they do so using a variety of techniques. Truth is irrelevant to a propagandist.

Propagandists – from used car salesmen to advertising agencies to political spinmeisters to apologists for tyrannical regimes – want to sell something. They exist to sell. Their products may be utterly benign or be something more sinister. But selling is their raison d’être.

Ann Coulter = Ms. Right!

Selling Ann Coulter is Ann Coulter’s raison d’être.
Coulter’s shtick – controversialist, polemicist, and provocateur – is more than surface deep, it is reflective of her very being. Yet, she simultaneously wants to be viewed as “an extraordinarily good Christian” and the premiere spokesman for Conservatism.

Her conservative credentials have always mattered to her more than her Christian ones.

Promoting herself as “Ms. Right” has proven useful to Coulter, who benefits from many publications disseminating that meme. It is astonishing how many magazines parrot Coulter’s assertions.
Chapter 2
Ann Coulter’s Self-Identity

Propagandists sell. They are always selling a message, a worldview, an agenda. It may be political or ideological, socio-economic or cultural, religious or personal, but it is something the propagandist wishes to convey to others.

The propagandist may seek a large audience or a more targeted one. She may have in mind short-term gains or a long-term game plan. Whatever the situation or circumstances, the propagandist desires to be heard and to be believed. To that end, the propagandist will use whatever tools are at her disposal. Nothing will be off limits. The end will justify the means.

Propagandists like Coulter have a Nietzschean will to power and, certainly in Coulter’s case, self-promotion is at the heart of what they do. Coulter, the consummate self-promoter, is obsessed with her image, with how she is viewed by other people. Her self-image is at the heart of her credibility.

During her nearly two-decade long media career, Coulter has professed and exhibited a varied mixture of confusing and contradictory images. Her many loyal followers latch on to the particular image they favor, discounting or dismissing conflicting images. Failing to see or acknowledge the contradictions and conundrums in Coulter’s image, life, and career, they fail to discern the real Ann Coulter hiding behind her various masks.

Along with “the beauty of conservative” and “conservative goddess,” Coulter’s preferred self-images include a quartet: beautiful, intelligent, courageous, and heroic victim. ¹ Coulter has told so many lies and worn so many masks that she no longer knows who she is or what she believes.

[The remainder of this chapter is an expanded version of a satirical “book review” originally published on my blog. – DB]

Delusional – New Ann Coulter Book

EXCLUSIVE: New Book by Ann Coulter is a personal memoir!

We have obtained an advance copy of Ann Coulter’s latest top secret book. The nine-time New York Times best-selling author is soon to publish a memoir revealing her innermost thoughts and feelings. The beloved and despised “conservative” polemical and “Christian” provocateur talks candidly about herself and her aspirations.


In *Delusional*, you will discover the heart and soul of Ann Hart Coulter, who wants to be both a star and a czar, as she reveals her innermost self-perceptions, regardless of how divergent they are from reality.

Among Coulter’s many whimsical fantasies about herself are her claims to be “more libertarian than most libertarians,” “more Tea Party than most tea partiers,” “totally pro-life,” and “an extraordinarily good Christian.” Yes, she even wants to be “czar of the universe,” despite acknowledging the totalitarian nature of that rank.

Here are some extracts for your amusement and edification.

*Get ready to be captivated by the pundit who is captivated by herself!*

*All quotes are direct quotes from Coulter – vintage Ann Hart Coulter.*

**Introduction: “If I Were Czar of the Universe …”**

“Every once in a while I sit back and think what the world would be like if I were czar. And, if I were czar, I think my position would be that private institutions can do whatever they want to do and only the government can’t discriminate. … If I were czar of the universe, I would say that a private organization can do whatever it wants to, and, yes, it can discriminate on the base of race.”

“But if I were the czar of the universe, she would be allowed to get away with it … I think a teacher or a school ought to be able to … on the basis of gender, race, the color of their hair. As long as it’s not the government, I think a private university ought to be able to do whatever it wants to.”

“(This elusive concept is admittedly difficult to grasp, especially if you are a Supreme Court justice and prefer to think of yourself as ‘Czar of the Universe.’)”

“You’re not Czar of the Universe anymore, SCOFLA.”

“And I started asking my liberal friends, ‘What are you afraid of? If Tom DeLay were czar of the universe, what are you afraid he’d do?’”

“I’m like the conservative ayatollah.”

“You see – I really do need to be the ayatollah of this [conservative] movement.”

---

2 Ann Coulter, *Scarborough Country*, MSNBC, 7/7/03.
4 Ann Coulter, Leadership Seminar, Clare Booth Luce Policy Institute, 6/12/00.
6 Ann Coulter, “Disgusting doesn’t make it ‘speech,’” 8/1/01.
7 Ann Coulter, “National Lampoon’s Florida Supreme Court Vacation,” 12/6/00.
10 Ann Coulter, YAF interview, “Hot Babes will Spark the Conservative Movement,” 8/8/11.
CHAPTER 1: “I'm a middle-of-the-road moderate and the rest of you are crazy.”

“There’s nothing more attractive than a rabid conservative.”

“[I’m] right-wing crazy and proud of it.”

“I’m second to none in right-wing lunacy.”

“I went to Cornell, but I was a casual conservative. After being in Ithaca, NY, I left a violent conservative.”

CHAPTER 3: “I’m more libertarian than most libertarians”

“I’m more libertarian than most people who call themselves libertarian.”

“I’m libertarian on everything except morality.”

“[I regret] when I was 14 and briefly libertarian.”

“My libertarian friends are probably getting a little upset now but I think that’s because they never appreciate the benefits of local fascism.”

“My complaint with [my libertarian friends] is, they don’t appreciate the virtues of local fascism.”

“Libertarian Party – capital ‘L’ – can end up being a little pointless and a little cowardly, I mean, just to attack both parties – ‘Oh, it’s both the Republicans and the Democrats.’ No. Come on! It really isn't.”

“I think people often claim to be libertarians, most people don't even know what you’re talking about. It sort of sounds like ‘liberal,’ and I just think it’s sort of the cowardly thing to say.”

“This is why people think libertarians are pussies. … You know, if you’re a little more manly you would tell them what your position on employment discrimination is. How about that? But it’s always ‘We want to legalize pot.’”

“[9/11 truthers] are like libertarians that way. They take facts but the logic just falls off the cliff. They take facts and they weave them together …”

---

13 Ann Coulter, Vantage Points, 12/5/97.
14 Ann Coulter, Southern Illinois University, 3/27/02.
19 Ann Coulter, Piers Morgan, CNN, 2/11/14.
20 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 2/8/97.
22 Ann Coulter, Booknotes, C-Span, 8/11/02. 
23 Ibid.
“A lot of libertarians are godless. … So many of your rank-and-file libertarians are cowards because they’re godless and believing in God does not allow you to be a coward.”

“If Rand Paul thinks black people are rooting for black crack dealers to go free, he's even crazier than his old man.”

[Asked, Are you for Ron Paul or Sarah Palin?]: “Probably Sarah Palin. But my candidate for President in 2012 is Governor of New Jersey, Chris Christie.”

“I think we can do without the tea partiers and libertarians.”

“If you are considering voting for the Libertarian candidate in any Senate election, please send me your name and address so I can track you down and drown you.”

“If the GOP loses] Republicans were done in by a circular firing squad. Republicans will lose hope, it will be a downward spiral of defeat and all that will be left to do is track down the people responsible and kill them.”

“Libertarians and tea partiers, you were fantastic this election. I have a lot on my plate right now, so it’s kind of a relief that I’m not going to have to drown you.”

“In my book ‘Demonic: How the Liberal Mob is Endangering America,’ I make the case that liberals, and never conservatives, appeal to irrational mobs to attain power. There is, I now recall, one group of people who look like conservatives, but also appeal to the mob. They’re called ‘libertarians.”

CHAPTER 4: “I’m more Tea Party than most tea partiers”

“I speak at a lot of Tea Parties, know a lot of them, and I think I am one.”

“I suppose I consider myself a Tea Partier.”

“I think we can do without the tea partiers and libertarians.”

---

26 Ann Coulter, In Depth, C-Span, 8/7/11.
“… then you have the base – these tea partiers – running off and causing Republicans to lose elections. But for elections lost by Republican consultants and/or the Tea Party, we would already have [a Republican majority in the Senate].”

“I think he’s [Jim DeMint] been paid off by Soros.”

“On their ‘About’ page, [the Senate Conservative Fund] won't tell me who runs it – George Soros, George Soros, George Soros. … I think a lot of these Tea Party groups are George Soros fronts.”

“… Senate Conservatives Fund and the rest of the fake tea partiers.”

“Oh I remember, the tea party’s darling is @marcorubio, spokesman for the tea party on amnesty. No, I won’t be ‘joining’ that party.”

“Please get their addresses [of Chris McDaniel’s supporters] for me so I can fly in and hold their heads under the water until the bubbles stop.”

“Without tea party challenges and greedy Republican consultants, Republicans would be looking at 59 senate seats in the next Congress.”

“Libertarians and tea partiers, you were fantastic this election. I have a lot on my plate right now, so it's kind of a relief that I'm not going to have to drown you.”

“In return for the tea party not being spasmodic and pushing crazy candidates this election, the GOP establishment had better abandon its corporate-benefactor-pleasing ways.”

CHAPTER 6: “I am totally pro-life.”

“I enthusiastically embrace the death penalty [in the context of 14-year-old murderers].”

“Sometimes people are innocent of the crime they were sentenced to death for, but perhaps not all crimes.”

“I think that every day when I take the New York City subway. … I would like to kill all of them. I can analyze that and stop myself from killing people on a New York City street.”


38 Ann Coulter, Hannity, FNC, 10/21/14.  
40 Ann Coulter, Los Angeles, 11/10/13.  
46 Ibid.  
48 Ann Coulter, 4/10/97.  
49 Ann Coulter, 11/9/96.  
50 Ann Coulter, 7/11/00.  
“Once you’ve committed a violent crime, I say, ‘death penalty.’ Why do we waste time with the prisons? I would give Chuck Colson one year of Prison Ministries. If you turn them into a Christian, they can go. Otherwise, death!”

“Take the Virginia governor’s race. [GOP candidate] Ken Cuccinelli is down about 10 points. Guess what the libertarian is polling at? Ten points! We need some strategic hunting accidents, airplane crashes. We need Luca Brasi in our party.”

“It’s not the position of the National Right To Life Committee that a woman should carry the baby of her rapist. I think our position is, ‘No, absolutely exceptions for rape and incest.’

“Those few abortionists were shot, or, depending on your point of view, had a procedure with a rifle performed on them. I’m not justifying it, but I do understand how it happened.

“I don’t really like to think of it as a murder. It was terminating Tiller in the 203rd trimester.”

---

52 Ann Coulter, Red Eye, FNC, 2/5/13.
55 Ann Coulter, Reclaiming America for Christ Conference, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, 3/3/07. Coulter said something similar at a Values Voter Summit in Washington, D.C.: “For two decades after Roe, no abortion clinic doctors were killed. But immediately after Planned Parenthood v. Casey, after working within the system did not work, produced no results...for the first time an abortion doctor was killed. A few more abortion clinic workers were killed in the next few years. I’m not justifying it, but I understand when you take democracy away from people, some of them will react violently. The total number of deaths attributable to Roe were seven abortion clinic workers and 40 million unborn babies.” (See http://www.publiceye.org/christian_right/values-voters/Values%20Voters-09-04.html#TopOfPage.) See Daniel Borchers, “Ann Coulter Speeches Scrubbed by Conservative Groups,” Bradblog, 5/1/07, http://www.bradblog.com/?p=4476.
56 Ann Coulter, O’Reilly Factor, FNC, 6/22/09.
CHAPTER 7: “I’m an extraordinarily good Christian.”

“I do believe in heaven. I’m what C.S. Lewis called ‘the worst sort of Christian.’ I believe enough to feel really miserable about not being a saint, and not enough to actually be a saint. So I’m just sort of miserable all the time.”

“Yeah, I suppose I’m a Christian, it’s just not like I’m constantly writing about it and thinking about it.”

“I’m a born-again Christian.”

“Although my Christianity is somewhat more explicit in this book, Christianity fuels everything I write. … I was raised Christian, but I’ve become more Christian in the past five or ten years, and one most transforming effect in my own life is that I’m constantly at peace.”

“I’m a Christian and everything comes from being a Christian … I do think Christianity fuels all of my books because you are called upon to behave in a certain way as a Christian and that is to fight lies, injustice, cruelty, hypocrisy, that fuels everything.”

“Although my Christianity is somewhat more explicit in this book, Christianity fuels everything I write.”

“I love America, God, and truth, and I hate liars.”

“I’m a Christian first and a mean-spirited, bigoted conservative second, and don’t you ever forget it.”

“If God himself came down from heaven and told me these cops intentionally murdered Amadou Diallo knowing he was unarmed, I would not believe it.”

“… being nice to people is an incidental tenet of Christianity.”

---

59 Ann Coulter, Columbia Spectator, 12/5/01.
60 Ann Coulter, Robert Ringer.com, 11/6/09.
62 Ann Coulter, Hannity & Colmes, FNC, 6/6/06.
63 Lisa de Pasquale, “Exclusive Interview: Coulter Says Book Examines ‘Mental Disorder’ of Liberalism,” Human Events, 6/6/06.
64 Ibid.
65 Ann Coulter, If Democrats Had Any Brains, They’d Be Republicans, Crown Forum, 2007, pp. 77-78.
66 Ann Coulter, “‘A liberal lynching,’” 2/16/00.
“I used to love [John McCain], then I liked him, now I despise him.”

“They forgive [John McCain], I don’t. … I’m reconsidering ‘the love your enemies’ part [of Christianity].”

“Now I can officially hate [Todd Akin]. … Now I officially hate him.”

“I hate the feminists. The real reason I loathe and detest feminists …[they] are also marauding, bloodthirsty vipers.”

“If you don’t hate Clinton and the people who labored to keep him in office, you don’t love your country.”

“I for one bolted past indifference straight into loathing long ago.”

“I hate white liberals.”

“The riot in Ferguson reminds me, I hate criminals, but I hate liberals more.”

“I’ve never said anything so outrageous that I regret it. Though I’ve regretted things that were too tame.”

“You can see I haven’t been transformed.”

[All quotations in this fictitious Book Review are accurate and originate with Ann Hart Coulter.]

[As you can see, Coulter’s self-image in all of its expressed forms is directly contradicted by who she really is and what she actually does. Consequently, hers is a false reality which necessarily distorts the reality she seeks to convey to her audience. – DB]
Chapter 3

Slander – Newspeak & Doublethink

The accompanying parody for Slander stylistically caricatures how a growing number of people view Coulter. Slender\(^1\) metaphorically describes the depth and breadth of substantive analysis contained in Slander (and a large portion of Coulter’s work).

In The Queen of Slander, notice the upraised finger, the arrogant and hostile attitude of Coulter, and the tawdry self-promotion of her book. Some regarded Coulter as the “Queen of Slander” because nearly every column and interview by Coulter during that time period contained fabrications, falsehoods and faulty reasoning. Certainly, Coulter’s in-your-face style of confrontation is divisive.

Coulter’s second book, Slander: Liberal Lies About the American Right (June 2002), became an instant best-seller and a much-sought-after tome, especially among college conservatives. The Conservative Movement fell in love with Ann Coulter once again. To properly understand Slander, it is essential to examine the psychological patterns of addictive thinking which pervade her polemic, energize its author and captivate her defenders.

As a starting point, let’s flash forward to a revealing Esquire profile from 2004 in which Coulter admitted the depth of her addiction to nicotine: “I have two patches on right now – and Nicorette gum in my purse! I quit smoking last October [2003] and I don’t feel any better – no better whatsoever. Plus, it’s like a miracle drug. When you’re upset, it calms you down.”\(^2\)

Here we see that Coulter could not control her addiction. Indeed, she tried unsuccessfully on numerous occasions to quit. So, she rationalized the benefits of nicotine, the substance she can’t stop taking.

Ex-Coulter confederate David Brock once observed that, in the early 1990s in New York City, “Ann seemed to live on nothing but chardonnay and cigarettes,”\(^3\) suggesting an addiction to alcohol as well. (Coulter even admits Brock’s observation is correct.) Many journalists seem to agree.

In 2004, “The acerbic and biting commentator – popping Nicorette gum like candy.”\(^4\) In a fawning 2005 Time profile, John Cloud wrote, “Ann Coulter and I were well into a bottle of white Bordeaux – and I believe she was chewing her fourth piece of Nicorette – when it happened. … [she burst] into gales of laughter so forceful you smell the Nicorette.”

As noted in my earlier books, Coulter suffers from addictive thinking.

---

\(^1\) On several occasions, Slander was mistakenly called Slender. One observer noted that Slander is slender in substance. In a comic ending to a Hardball interview, host Chris Matthews misstated the book’s name, asking, “Is it Slander or Slender?” Counterspin also ascribed “Slender” to Coulter’s book (http://www.soundbitten.com/020829.html).

\(^2\) Emphasis in the original. Scott Raap, “Pick me up at 7,” Esquire, November 2004, pg. 149.


Nicotine is Not Really Addictive

Coulter was addicted to nicotine since at least the early 1990s, yet, on MSNBC, she denied that nicotine is addictive (as she did to Esquire in 2004). In 1997 alone, Coulter vigorously denied the addictiveness of tobacco and even championed its benefits. Her rationalizations included:

- **The reality that people can quit.** “Millions of people have managed to quit without going through the shakes or rehab.” [But addicts who quit were addicted.]

- **Tobacco is not addictive.** “I think [tobacco executives are] right about that because, technically what they were testifying to was whether it was addictive under the FDA definition. If it is, it brings it into the FDA jurisdiction and it can be regulated.”

- **Addiction is a good thing anyway.** “Exercise is addictive. Running is addictive. Coffee is addictive. Addiction isn’t such a bad thing.”

- **Everything is addictive.** “If cigarettes are covered [by FDA] why not coffee, and chocolate, and Nautilus machines?”

- **Smoking-related deaths are a good thing.** “People who smoke save the states and save the federal government money because their deaths are quick.”

- **There are benefits to smoking.** “They’re suppressing all the health benefits of nicotine. And now it turns out it can suppress Alzheimer’s.” There actually are health benefits to nicotine. It’s always suppressed. It’s difficult to get research grants for them. … The big thing that nicotine apparently prevents are Alzheimer’s Disease, Parkinson’s Disease, or at least reduces the rate by over 50%. The same thing with certain types of cancers, interestingly. … I think most people would rather die of a quick heart attack or even an 11-month agony of lung cancer to 10, 20 years of a degenerative Alzheimer’s. … It’s not lung cancer that usually kills smokers; it’s the heart disease.”

In a remarkable behind-the-scenes video outtake, Coulter is seen in an on-camera close-up prior to a scheduled television talk show interview. While vigorously chewing her Nicorette gum, Coulter speaks with an unidentified person off-camera: “I don’t think I’ll need another one before I go on, but thank you! [heartily laughter] If you can chop it up so I can snort it, that would help.”

Coulter even admitted an addiction to shoes: “I love shoes. I had a fiancé once who told me, ‘I will support you for the rest of your life, but not the shoes. That is an addiction.’” However, Coulter’s own list of personal addictions does not end with nicotine, alcohol and shoes. Addiction to fame (Success Syndrome) and power (Lord Acton’s Axiom) appear to have even greater control over Coulter’s life, behavior and thought processes. For Coulter, who always wants to be – or to at least appear to be – in control, this must be humiliating indeed.

---

6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
Addictive thinking eventually came to short-circuit linear logic and rationalize irrational behavior – for both Coulter and her defenders.

Indeed, the patterns and paradigm of addictive thinking became a hallmark of her 2002 best-selling book, *Slander*, and would suffuse subsequent books.

**Addictive Thinking**

People become engaged in addictive thinking for a variety of reasons, as psychologist Abraham Twerski observes: “fear of rejection, anxiety, and despair often result from low self-esteem. Many of the quirks of addictive thinking are psychological defenses against these painful feelings.”

But the person thinking addictively doesn’t realize she is doing so.

Denial, rationalization and projection are “unconscious mechanisms,” according to Twerski, and though “they are often gross distortions of truth,” to those afflicted, “they are the truth.”

Denial is a psychological mechanism for ignoring the problem. Rationalizations are used as justifications for wrong behavior. In projection, the addict projects, or places the blame, onto others for her own thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Rationalization and projection “reinforce denial” and “preserve the status quo.”

The following diagram summarizes the addictive thinking paradigm:

As you can see, the various psychological components involved in addictive thinking are self-reinforcing, self-perpetuating. Each element encourages – and is encouraged by – the others, creating an integrated, closed-loop, system impervious to logic and outside influences.

---

16 Twerski, pg. 55.
17 Twerski, pg. 61.
Projection in *Slander*

One insightful *Washington Post* reviewer\(^{18}\) aptly suggested *Projection* as an alternate title for Coulter’s second best-seller. Others thought *Mirror* even more apropos. *Slander* is replete with examples of Coulter engaging in the very behavior she criticizes liberals for and addictive thinking is its source. Consider this example of projection:

Much of the left’s hate speech bears greater similarity to a psychological disorder than to standard political discourse. The hatred is blinding, producing logical contradictions that would be impossible to sustain were it not for the central element faith plays in the left’s new religion. The basic tenet of their faith is this: Maybe they were wrong on facts and policies, but they are good and conservatives are evil. You almost want to give it to them. It’s all they have left.\(^{19}\)

Could anything more accurately describe so much of Coulter’s rhetoric? Blinding hatred, contradictory claims, illogical inconsistencies, and an unwavering faith that the enemy is evil. Consider Coulter’s own self-revelatory charge: “A central component of liberal hate speech is to make paranoid accusations based on their own neurotic impulses. … There is maybe just the tiniest element of projection and compulsion in all this.”\(^{20}\)

Alert and objective readers will discover that Coulter engages in the very behavior she decries. As noted by Fairness in Accuracy and Reporting (FAIR):

Leaving questions of psychological projection to the psychologists, it’s still worth asking whether the hypocrisy of Coulter’s fervent denunciation of the exact kind of name-calling that is her specialty applies to other charges she makes as well. Could Coulter’s charge that liberals lie remorselessly about conservatives – the full title of her book is *Slander: Liberal Lies about the American Right* – be a sort of furtive red flag, sending a message about her own dishonesty?\(^{21}\)

There must be something to it after all. Perhaps *everything* Ann Coulter says and does is projection. Columnist Bob Somerly observed:

**YES, SHE’S THE GREAT DISSEMBLER:** There’s much to gape at in Coulter’s book. You can enjoy the tribal thinking, in which her tribe – the conservatives – has all the good people, and the other tribe – the liberals – is all “vicious” thugs. Or you can have big fun playing Freud, noting how constantly Coulter assails her own traits, not those found in others.\(^{22}\)

This critical critique of *Slander* by columnist Richard Cohen makes a noteworthy observation:

May I say something about Ann Coulter? She is a half-wit, a termagant, a dimwit, a blowhard, a worthless silicone nothing, physically ugly and could be likened to Eva Braun, who was Hitler’s mistress. As it happens, these are all descriptions or

---


\(^{19}\) *Slander*, pg. 199.

\(^{20}\) *Slander*, pg. 19.


characterizations Coulter uses for others in her book, “Slander.” It ought to be called “Mirror.”

Cognitive Dissonance = Doublethink

Addictive thinking necessarily creates contradictions and conundrums in thoughts and actions. Cognitive dissonance develops and grows, until it eventually reigns supreme, deeply divorcing perception from reality.

It’s amazing, at times, to see Coulter’s mind at work. For instance, she regularly dismisses Clinton’s two terms as president because Clinton won by a plurality of the vote due to third party candidates. Yet, she declares, “It’s stunning that Democrats have not been able to get as much as 50 percent of the country to vote for them in half a century.” Has she forgotten that George Herbert Walker Bush’s sole presidential victory was by a plurality of the vote and that George W. Bush failed to win the popular vote in the 2000 election?

Intelligence and Beauty

Orwellian doublethink (cognitive dissonance) and newspeak abound in Coulter’s chapter on name-calling. In it, she condemns the Left for calling conservatives stupid, yet she calls liberals similar names. Remarkably, one of Coulter’s prime defensive debating stratagems is to call her opponents or their ideas “stupid” or “insane.” (Your homework assignment: do a LexisNexis search for transcripts to discover Coulter’s prevalent use of those and similar labels.) Even more significant, television and radio hosts never challenge her use of those terms.

Moreover, Coulter argues that conservative name-calling isn’t really name-calling because it’s truth based in reality. She writes, “If a conservative says you’re stupid, you’re stupid.” Thus, merely stating an opinion about a liberal is automatically deemed truth. Engagement? Really?

Similarly, Coulter’s views on looksism exemplify doublethink and newspeak in action. Lookism (like racism and sexism) is a product of the liberal psyche, or so Coulter would have us think.

Coulter claims that, “More than any of their other hate speech, the left’s attacks on women for being ugly tell you everything. There is nothing so irredeemably cruel as an attack on a woman for her looks.” But then, on the very same page, Coulter claims, “A blind man in America would think the ugliest women ever to darken the planet are Paula Jones, Linda Tripp, and Katherine Harris. This from the party of Bella Abzug.”

As usual, Coulter continues to assign to the Orwellian memory hole every instance of conservative perfidy and every instance of liberal fidelity.

---
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**Orwell in Slander**

Coulter has long been a devotee of Orwell’s *1984*, so it is perhaps not so surprising that she would develop Orwellian constructs in her rhetorical style. In *Slander* (and then *Treason* and subsequent books) Coulter engaged in Orwellian techniques which include newspeak, doublethink, enemy of the moment, and the unforgettable memory hole.

Coulter’s *newspeak* – redefinition of existing language – incorporates a whole range of rhetorical redefinition which blossomed to full fruition in *Treason*. Among them, the determination that patriotism is a purely Republican prerogative, thus concluding that most Americans are not patriotic.

*Doublethink* (cognitive dissonance: believing in contradictory beliefs simultaneously) pervades *Slander* and her subsequent writing. For instance, Coulter contends that only the Left is guilty of lying, hate speech and demonization of political foes when, throughout *Slander*, Coulter is guilty of lying, hate speech and demonization of political foes. Nevertheless, conservatives commended Coulter for condemning lying, hate speech and demonization of political foes while they applauded Coulter for her lying, hate speech and demonization of political foes.

In *Slander*, Coulter bemoaned “the most preposterous Orwellian circumlocutions” of race discrimination and berated the Left’s politics of personal destruction: “The occasional heretics from the liberal orthodoxy are regularly trotted out for the ritualistic Orwellian ‘two minutes of hate.’”

Defending against spurious attacks on Fox News and other conservative media outlets, Coulter noted, “It isn’t compartmentalization that liberals are worried about, it is the capacity of Americans to escape the Orwellian drivel.”

**Key Themes in Slander**

Two key themes in *Slander* are worthy of extensive analysis. The *first* theme, the existence of a liberal-dominated media, is arguably accurate, but Coulter’s arguments are flawed and her “facts” are fabricated. Instead of citing actual statistics and providing genuine anecdotes, she offered bogus, provably-false assertions.

Throughout *Slander*, Coulter’s refrain is constant: “the left’s hegemonic control of the media,” “total hegemonic control of all major means of news dissemination in America,” “[liberals] own the mainstream media, … hegemonic control over the media,” “left’s monopoly of the news,” “massive control over news in America,” “Liberals have used their control of the media … hegemony over the media,” “monopoly media,” “controlling all major sources of news dissemination in America,” “an atheist, left-wing media that really does exercise vast influence over everything,” and “liberals have near-exclusive control over all major sources of information in this country.”

Coulter’s continued that theme – using the same buzzwords (“hegemonic control”) – in her next book, *Treason*: “American liberals have used their hegemonic control of television, movies, glossy magazines, and newspapers.”

---


The second theme, media hostility towards Christian conservatives, is equally validated by numerous studies and anecdotal evidence. However, rather than use logic and evidence, Coulter proffered a truly bizarre paradigm which denies the existence of the group she claims is being persecuted.

Even more bizarre, Christian conservatives lauded Coulter for her keen insights. In chapter nine of *Slander* (“Shadowboxing the Apocryphal “Religious Right”), Coulter denied the very existence of the “Religious Right” based on 1) conflicting definitions for “Religious Right” and 2) leadership differences within the “Religious Right.”

**Coulter Denies Existence of Religious Right**

Much of her intentional focus on Orwell arose in connection with the Religious Right, a group of people Coulter denies exist. According to Coulter, “Not only is there no meaningful definition of the ‘religious right,’ there is no coherence to its life span. It is uncanny how Orwellian it is.”

Christians are, indeed, under assault by a variety of left-wing groups, but even as Coulter describes liberal attacks on people of faith who are conservative, she also denies the existence of that group of people.

Coulter claims,

> The “religious right” serves the function of Emmanuel Goldstein in Orwell’s *1984*: “The program of the Two Minutes Hate varied from day to day, but there was none in which Goldstein was not the principal figure. He was the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party’s purity. All subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching.”

Despite having to defend Christian conservatives, Coulter rejects the nomenclature of “Religious Right” as a fraud. Moreover, Coulter claims here and elsewhere that there are no Christians on the Left. That helps explain this otherwise inexplicable sentence: “What is fairly stunning is that the left’s carefully nurtured devil term – their Emmanuel Goldstein, capable of producing hate on cue – essentially comes down to accusing someone of being a Christian.”

Moreover, for Coulter, the “Religious Right” is an apocryphal, phony term used to describe what she regards as a real (yet phony) war.

Coulter writes: “For twenty years, evangelical Christians had been portrayed as toothless hicks preaching for a nickel in the Ozarks. Then – seamlessly, without remark on the shift in the Orwellian propaganda – they were transformed into Howard Hughes money men, expertly manipulating the system.”

Coulter puts it this way, “As Orwell described the endless, phony war in *1984*, despite ‘the regrouping which occurs every few years, it is always the same war – one must realize in the first place that it is impossible for it to be decisive.’”

Ensuring her readers do not miss her point, Coulter again incorporates language directly from *1984*:

> Yet, like Emmanuel Goldstein, though the religious right is universally reviled, it is still, somehow, dangerously beguiling. Despite being “hated and despised by everybody,

---
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although every day, and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, [Goldstein’s] theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were—in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less.”

What are we to make of the contradictions and conundrums expressed and exhibited by Ann Coulter? From whence do they arise?

**Errors in Slander**

Despite ever-mounting evidence to the contrary, Coulter contended then—and contends now—that *Slander* was virtually error-free.

We have already noted *paradigmatic* errors: Coulter claims the Religious Right is an apocryphal, non-existent entity, yet she regards the Atheist Left as real, dangerous, and pervasive.

And we have seen *errors in logic* vis-à-vis intelligence and beauty.

“As Projection” and “Mirror” were two proposed alternative titles for *Slander* due to its reflection of the author’s own character traits. A third proposed title, “Slender,” refers both to the author’s physique and the substantive content of her work. Coulter’s first two books came under intense media scrutiny for their factual failures. To this day, Coulter claims that *Slander* contains only a few minor errors.

There are 780 footnotes in the back of *Slander*, and so far, Ms. Coulter said, only two minor, irrelevant errors have surfaced. “Do you realize what this means?” she said she told her agent. “This means the rest of this book is true! This is scandalous!”

That claim—“only two minor, irrelevant errors have surfaced”—was reiterated in the October 2003 issue of *Newsmax*. The truth is that many people found many errors in *Slander*. At the time of its publication, some sought to catalog Coulter’s calumny and failed, due only to the daunting nature of the task—“so many lies, so little time.”

Still, their efforts have borne fruit. Among them: Joe Conason, the *Chicago Sun Times*, the *New York Times*, *Pop Politics*, *Reason*, *Salon*, *Spinsanity*, *St. Petersburg Times*, *Washingtonian*, *Washington Monthly*, and *Washington Post*. Even *Columbia Journalism Review* weighed in on this...

Nevertheless, Coulter says,

> Well, that’s a somewhat dishonest quote. … I’ve written two books now, I’ve written hundreds of columns, I’ve been on TV hundreds of times. The idea that someone can go out and find one quote that will suddenly, you know, portray me just dismiss her ideas, read no more, read no further, this person is crazy is precisely what liberals do all the time.

**One** quote?

On a book tour for her third book, Coulter admitted to **only one error** in all of her books:

> In my three bestselling books – making the case for a president’s impeachment, accusing liberals of systematic lying and propagandizing, arguing that Joe McCarthy was a great American patriot, and detailing 50 years of treachery by the Democratic Party – this is the only vaguely substantive error the Ann Coulter hysterics have been able to produce, corrected soon after publication.

Yet *Slander* alone is almost an encyclopedia of errors. Errors abound in the book jacket, on the very first page, in the endnotes, in the methodology and on the issues. Coulter’s love affair with truth and fact is limited by her ideological fervor, her intellectual pride and her personal pursuits. Why let the truth infringe upon her worldview, or honor upon her behavior? Coulter once boasted on MSNBC (prior to her banishment from that network), “I’m perfectly willing to engage in wild speculation and unsubstantiated rumors.”

Somerby noticed errors on the very first page. Coulter claimed the liberal media vilified Tom DeLay by calling him “the Hammer” and comparing him to Hitler. The reality: Tom DeLay’s nickname – which he himself uses about himself – is The Hammer. As for the Hitler comparison, columnist Maureen Dowd was lamenting the intrusion of religion into politics (the “God Squad”) and used both George W. Bush and Al Gore as examples.

Many blatant falsehoods arise in the very first chapter. Two on page five are especially intriguing given Coulter’s rationalizations when publicly confronted. Coulter wrote:

- *New York Times* columnist Frank Rich demanded that Ashcroft stop monkeying around with Muslim terrorists and concentrate on anti-abortion extremists.
- Yale law professor Bruce Ackerman recommended dropping the war against global terrorism.

---
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Neither claim was true. Each citation grossly distorted the actual words of those gentlemen. Coulter nonetheless claimed vindication based on her own “footnotes” – which cite the columns which do not say what she claims they do.

On page four, Coulter wrote,

after the September 11 attack on America, all partisan wrangling stopped dead. The bipartisan lovefest lasted precisely three weeks. That was all the New York Times could endure. Impatient with the national mood of patriotism, liberals returned to their infernal griping about George W. Bush – or “Half a Commander in Chief,” as he was called in the headline of a lead New York Times editorial on November 5, 2001. From that moment on, the left’s primary contribution to the war effort was to complain.

Elementary schoolchildren would disagree with the “precisely three weeks” formula. Precisely three weeks = 21 days. September 11 to November 5 = 55 days.

Just one more example from chapter one. On page seven, Coulter claims that Jim Jeffords “supported Clinton’s tax hike, and opposed the younger Bush’s tax cut.” In reality, the reverse was true.56

Coulter repeatedly affirms the truth contained in Slander, constantly referring to her footnotes. But, as the St. Petersburg Times observed, “The footnotes Coulter extols are the very weapons being used to attack her.”57 The Times provided an excellent example of a tortured footnote:

In some cases, the footnotes expose her writing as twisted in order to fit her theme. For example, Coulter writes that the New York Times published an editorial criticizing Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. She continues, “He is called ‘colored lawn jockey for conservative white interests,’ ‘race traitor,’ ‘black snake,’” and so on. This gives the impression that those terms were used in the editorial, but they weren’t. (They are attributed to Jocelyn Elders in a Playboy interview and Joseph Lowery if you bother to check the footnotes.)58

Manipulation of Facts

Coulter is adept at excerpting and paraphrasing to reverse the subject’s intended meaning.

Using her technique, one could charge Coulter with Bush-bashing for writing:59 “Dumb George Bush,” “Bush is a dope,” “Bush was dumb,” “and therefore he’s an idiot.” These are her actual words, yet, in context she obviously intends to refute them. But in Slander, when Coulter misconstrues the words of liberals, clarifications or contextualization occur only in the endnotes, if at all.

55 Ibid.
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Within the Conservative Movement, Coulter is hailed as a heroine and exemplar. Her peers praise her for her devotion to truth and liberty. Nevertheless, Coulter’s factually-challenged commentary has been amply documented by many individuals and groups.

Although Coulter asserts, “You want the truth to win out in the end” and acknowledges, “When arguments are premised on lies, there is no foundation for debate,” Coulter ascribes a modus operandi to her ideological foes which more aptly applies to her, as she wrote in Slander: “Even here, the alleged “hate speech” is not likely to be honestly quoted. Rather it is paraphrased, unfairly excerpted, summarized, or … invented out of whole cloth.”

Perhaps more problematic than her own outright lies, deliberate distortions and fabricated footnotes are her rhetorical excesses, hyperbolic stereotypes, and sweeping generalizations, all disguised as substantive analysis – all predicated on her visceral hatred for liberals.

**Flawed Methodology**

In attempting to prove liberal (anti-Christian) media bias, Coulter emulated the Media Research Center’s approach and counted the number of times certain words and phrases were used by news organizations. As Franken pointed out, Coulter’s input criteria predetermind the results. (See chart below.)

_The American Prospect (Tapped) discovered this doozy. Coulter wrote:_

> Since abortion is not the left’s proudest moment, liberals prefer to keep reminiscing about the last time they were giddily self-righteous. Like a senile old man who keeps telling you the same story over and over again, liberals babble on and on about the “heady” days of civil rights marches. Between 1995 and 2001, the New York Times alone ran more than one hundred articles on “Selma” alone. I believe we may have revisited this triumph of theirs sufficiently by now. For anyone under fifty, the “heady” days of civil rights marches are something out of a history book. The march on Selma was thirty-five years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann Coulter <strong>condemns</strong> the Washington Post</th>
<th>Ann Coulter <strong>ignores</strong> the Washington Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of times “Christian conservative” or “religious right” was used in 2000.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of times “atheist liberal” or “atheist left” was used in 2000.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“‘Atheist liberal?’ Who uses that term? She makes up a term to make her point.” – Bob Somerby</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Atheist left” was used in 2000.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Tapped attempted to replicate Coulter’s conclusions by conducting its own LexisNexis search:

Tapped smelled a rat here. Maybe it was Coulter’s repetition of the word “alone”; or maybe it was the fact that the famous 1965 “Bloody Sunday” march was from Selma to Montgomery, not a march “on” Selma. So we searched the New York Times archives on LexisNexis for the word “Selma” for the years 1995-2001. This produced 776 total hits. Of these, 424 were death notices, 18 were wedding announcements, 25 were other sorts of paid notices, 5 were in photo captions, and 234 were either: a) contents listings; b) people with the name Selma; c) references to Selma, California; or d) references to Selma, Alabama that had nothing to do with civil rights (b, c, and d includes letters and op-eds as well as regular articles). Of the remaining 70 items, in our judgment only 16 were centrally concerned with historic happenings at Selma from the civil rights era. The other 54 contained brief mentions of Selma and civil rights but appeared in articles on different topics. Once again, Coulter’s dubious claim that “between 1995 and 2001, the New York Times alone ran more than one hundred articles on ‘Selma’”—is false.65

Coulter’s “Official Position” on Lying

Coulter professes a traditional/universal position on lying: she’s officially against it. Coulter claims to be opposed to lying, to find it morally and philosophically abhorrent. Coulter condemned Clinton because “he has lied to the American people on TV” and demanded “we have to stop this! I think it’s appalling that our President goes on TV and lies to us.”67

Coulter contended “It’s a serious matter that no one can believe the President of the United States” and reiterated “Lying to the American people is a clear betrayal of trust.”69 Coulter emphasized, “Lying is never OK.”70 Coulter even bemoaned the cultural impact of public figures who lie: “It really has seeped into the culture that it’s acceptable to lie for convenience, to get away with it.”71 Moreover, politically-speaking, “Lying is destructive of a constitutional republic.”72 And, on a personal level, Coulter declared, “I also don’t like when people lie.”73

Then why does Coulter lie? Is she psychologically-driven to do so? Perhaps she doesn’t think she is lying: “I don’t think I am being mean. I think I’m being truthful.”74 Denial, rationalization and projection.

So inured is she to her own lies that she virtually (and unabashedly) confessed to lying to the FBI.

Lying to FBI

Almost confessional, Coulter confided:

Well, I just wanted to say about Jerry’s point on the FBI questions – I’ve been through that and a lot of my friends have been through that from working at the Justice

66 Ann Coulter, This Week With Sam & Cokie, ABC, 2/1/98.
67 Ann Coulter, Rivera Live, CNBC, 2/24/98.
70 High Crimes and Misdemeanors, pg. 111.
71 Ann Coulter, Janet Parshall’s America, WAVA, 10/13/98.
73 Ann Coulter, Vantage Points, Amazon City Radio, 12/5/97.
74 Ann Coulter, FoxWire, FNC, 7/6/02.
Department and, in fact, it becomes kind of a joke that your friends you saw doing drugs constantly all the way through college, were never not stoned, you always tell the FBI, “No, never even saw him smoke pot.”

The TV host, perhaps sensing the legal import of Coulter’s words, quickly redirected the direction of the debate. So lying to the FBI is a joke? Everybody does it? (Coulter skewered Clinton apologists for that very same defense!)

Still, Coulter claims to be above partisanship and objectively in search of truth: “Well, I’m not speaking as a Republican. I’m speaking as an American. I’m just trying to sort out the truth.”

But is Coulter really seeking the truth or merely manipulating it? The Columbia Journalism Review examined the controversy over Coulter’s veracity. They discovered:

CJR checked out a sample of forty alleged errors – some backed by footnotes and others not – and found that nineteen were either accurate or could generously be considered fair comment and criticism. (Though some of the latter were hyperbolic or oversimplified to the point of absurdity – “Liberals have been wrong about everything in the last half-century,” for example.) If a number of those nineteen would have raised the eyebrows of any good fact-checker, the remaining twenty-one would not pass without major debate.

Modifying Ronald Reagan’s famous maxim: with Coulter – don’t trust, do verify.

**Coulter v. Franken**

Authors Joe Conason and Al Franken both published books exposing Coulter’s lies. Coulter then called Franken a liar for telling the truth about her in his *Lies and the Lying Liars Who Lie Them*. As a platform for her attack, Coulter used a *Publisher’s Weekly* interview with Al Franken to defend herself and impugn that journalist’s own integrity.

Apparently, Ed, it never occurred to you that Franken’s allegations of errors in my book – or “outright lies” as you put it – are false.

It’s interesting that the most devastating examples of my alleged “lies” keep changing. As soon as one is disproved, I’m asked to respond to another. This is behavior normally associated with tin-foil-hat conspiracy theorists. One crackpot argument after another is shot down – but the conspiracy theorists just move on to the next crackpot argument without pause or reconsideration. Certainly without apology.

So before responding to the two alleged “lies” you cite from Franken – the source of all wisdom – I shall run through a few of the alleged “lies” from Franken’s book that I have already been asked to respond to – and which have now been dropped by the Coulter hysterics as they barrel ahead to the next inane charge. …

Rebutting Coulter’s defense is easy, as many Netizens have handily proven. Nevertheless, despite irrefutable evidence confirming Franken’s criticism of Coulter, *Human Events* sided with their Legal

---

Editor. In rebutting Franken, both Coulter and *Human Events* cherry picked their arguments. Neither addressed what I consider one of the most relevant criticisms of Coulter by Franken: Coulter’s research methodology.

Al Franken, in his book, *Lies And the Lying Liars Who Tell Them*, devoted several chapters to Coulter and analyzed the faulty methodology of her research and citations. Franken’s six observations on “How to Lie with Footnotes” are instructive.

Coulter’s methodology is to conduct Lexis/Nexis searches to prove her arguments by manipulating the input criteria to rig the results. GIGO. Coulter accomplishes this in several ways.

Franken observed that Coulter uses *information overload* to short-circuit the search by providing too many parameters for the search engine to handle (thereby yielding zero, or minimal, results). (Indeed, her combative commentary style often includes non sequiturs and ad hominem to distract from the point being addressed.) As Franken writes, “Using Coulter’s technique, I can prove that no newspaper has ever covered anything.”

Coulter also uses the reverse technique of *data deficiency* – too few qualifiers – thus obtaining too many results (many of which are irrelevant), as the *Daily Howler* noted in 2002.

**Fraudulent Books**

Coulter also contends conservatives do not write hoax books: “Books that become publishing scandals by virtue of phony research, invented facts, or apocryphal stories invariably grind political axes for the left. There may be publishing frauds that are apolitical, but it’s hard to think of a single hoax book written by a conservative.”

Coulter uses several pages to expound upon six examples of liberal literary hoaxes, claiming there are no conservative hoax books, but then she cites one – hidden in an endnote. (But that one doesn’t count!)

Even if Christopher Ruddy’s *The Strange Death of Vincent Foster* was considered a conservative hoax book, it was also conservatives who discredited it. Note the literary construction: “Even if …” as if there might be doubt about it being a hoax. Moreover, Coulter lauds David Brock’s *The Real Anita Hill*, even though he admits his was fraudulent. (Some regard *Slander* as fake, too.)

---
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Chapter 4
George Orwell Meets Joseph McCarthy

What’s a propagandist without a paradigm to promote?


In *The Beauty of Conservatism*,² I briefly examined the nature of addictive thinking and how it afflicts Coulter and permeates so much of her writing. Coulter’s second book, *Slander*, provides an epic example of addictive thinking in action.

Just as the patterns and characteristics of addictive thinking shaped *Slander*,³ exposing the character and psychology of both the book and its author, so too, the themes and propaganda techniques highlighted in George Orwell’s *1984* reemerged in her next book, *Treason*, building upon and amplifying those traits of addictive thinking.

Coulter’s third book, *Treason*, created quite a fuss in turning Joseph McCarthy into a hero and martyr and in convicting all liberals of treason without a trial. As an exercise in propaganda, *Treason* fits the bill.

One reviewer and Coulter fan took the bait, heralding his heroine: “Ann Coulter's *Treason* is as indispensable a reference to understanding the mad modern world as is Orwell’s *1984* or Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago*.”⁴

Coulter’s fifth book, *Godless*,⁵ completed her expression of the parameters of her worldview and her assessment that all liberals are godless, in addition to be liars and traitors.

Coulter’s Orwellian World

With the publication of *Treason*,⁶ Orwellian constructs permeated Coulter’s work and worldview. Bruce Walker, on the website Intellectual Conservative, promoted *Treason* this way:

Anne Coulter’s *Treason* is as indispensable a reference to understanding the mad modern world as is Orwell’s *1984* or Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago*.⁷

---

⁴ Bruce Walker, *Treason and Common Sense*, IntelligenceConservative.com, 7/3/03.
Several intriguing aspects arise from that one sentence. First, Walker misspelled Coulter’s first name, suggesting some degree of unfamiliarity with her work. Second, he upheld *Treason* as an “indispensable” reference. Finally, he equated *Treason* with two contemporary classics. Was Walker’s equation linguistic or propagandistic? Did Walker, perhaps subconsciously, recognize the Orwellian techniques employed by Coulter or notice that a gulag is the necessary result of her rhetoric taken to its ultimate extreme?

One book reviewer contends, “If I actually had gone through with the whole ‘Propagandist of the Year’ thing, the winner probably would have been everyone’s favorite Fascist sex symbol, Ann Coulter, who in June unveiled *Treason: Liberal Treachery from the Cold War to the War on Terrorism.*”

In 1997, Coulter told a friend, “Obviously I love *1984* and have been strongly recommending that it be re-read during the Clinton administration (and the ‘Republican’ Congress).” Coulter has long been a devotee of *1984*, so it is not surprising that she would develop Orwellian constructs in her rhetorical style. Beginning with *Slander* and culminating with *Treason*, Coulter engaged in Orwellian techniques which include newspeak, doublethink, enemy of the moment, and the unforgettable memory hole. Those (and other) techniques have been used by Coulter ever since.

Even before 9/11, columnist Brendan Nyhan observed Coulter’s use of Orwellian constructs, though he didn’t identify them as such. At that time, Coulter’s “jargon vanguard” included name-calling, sweeping generalizations, guilt by association, and emotionally-loaded language – hot button rhetoric.

Enthralled by *1984*, Coulter not only commends it as an annual devotional for members of Congress, she sprinkles its concepts within her writings. Indeed, Orwell shapes her worldview, her rhetoric and her methodology. *Understanding Orwell is key to understanding Coulter.*

Orwell wrote his famous dystopia based upon his observations of the totalitarian systems of his time, principally Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany. In *1984*, three world powers (Oceania, Eurasia, Eastasia) have achieved political stability through the means of perpetual warfare. In Oceania, the ruling elite, headed by Big Brother, maintains control over his version of the Evil Empire by using a variety of physical, psychological, emotional, and linguistic means.

People can acquire glazed expressions when contemplating Orwell and the propaganda techniques and thought patterns he revealed in his dystopia. However, the all-too-real paradigm Orwell proposed is really quite simple.

The ruling elite maintains power through physical coercion, and emotional and psychological manipulation. They employ several propaganda techniques which incite the emotions and deceive the intellect of those being manipulated. Those techniques create certain psychological patterns which become self-reinforcing, until thinking outside of Big Brother’s paradigm becomes nearly impossible. Often the psychological controls become harder to escape than the physical security and surveillance measures employed by Big Brother. The following flow chart summarizes those key dynamics.

Let’s examine the key components of the Orwellian Paradigm.

---


9 Ann Coulter, email, 6/10/97.

The Big Lie

Often, the Big Lie is captivating, mesmerizing, gets one’s attention. The very thought of it can excite the imagination. Or it may feed on one’s deep-seated prejudices or deep-rooted cultural biases. Once the Big Lie is consumed, the smaller ones are far easier to swallow. All the lesser lies serve the greater. Inconsistencies evaporate in the minds of those who prefer their chosen narrative to reality.

Coulter’s grand vision is that of a life-and-death, existential struggle between Good and Evil being waged on multiple levels, from the personal to the civilizational, the local to the global. Many would, perhaps realistically, agree with her. But Coulter’s big lie – replicated in interview after interview, column after column, book after book – is that the forces of Good are populated exclusively by conservatives and the forces of Evil are comprised solely of liberals.

The necessary corollary to Coulter’s principal operating paradigm – the foundation for all she writes and does – is an us-vs.-them paradigm in which all who disagree with her are the “enemy” is all its various shades of evil. For her, the enemy must be destroyed – cease to exist. Remember, utopia, in her words, is a “world without liberals.”

The Christian worldview holds a different perspective, one in which there is a spiritual battle for the hearts, minds, and souls of people who either know God or do not, one in which opponents of Christ are eventually won over to Christ by Christ and by Christians.11

But in Coulter’s world, persuasion is not possible. The enemy is, by nature, evil and hostile to all that is good.

---

11 Christians certainly believe in a universal (as in the entire universe) battle between good and evil, the forces of God and the satanic forces of darkness. See Ephesians 6:10-18.
Even libertarians and the Tea Party\textsuperscript{12} are America’s enemies. Coulter wrote:

In my book “Demonic: How the Liberal Mob is Endangering America,” I make the case that liberals, and never conservatives, appeal to irrational mobs to attain power. There is, I now recall, one group of people who look like conservatives, but also appeal to the mob. They’re called “libertarians.”\textsuperscript{13}

Nazi Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels observed, “If you repeat a lie often enough, it becomes the truth.”

**Perpetual Warfare**

Totalitarian rhetoric frequently employs apocalyptic language, demonization of the (real or perceived) enemy, elimination rhetoric, and an urgency to act before it is too late – to respond to the emotional appeal without thinking things through. It generates the powerful emotions of fear and hate to short circuit critical thinking.

While the Left cynical attacks pro-national defense conservatives as using an Orwellian perpetual state of war to preserve and expand political power, it posits and promotes much of its domestic programs with jingoistic war rhetoric, such as Johnson’s failed “War on Poverty.”

Coulter is one of the most jingoistic polemicists of the modern era, at war with Muslims, liberals, moderates, libertarians, the Tea Party, social conservatives, proponents of gay marriage, and pro-immigration advocates.

Coulter actually began her perpetual warfare against liberalism in kindergarten.\textsuperscript{14} Since then, the scope of her war has deepened and the arsenal at her disposal has expanded. In an early post-9/11 essay, she jokingly encouraged the President to “Attack France!” Since then, her rhetoric has become even more combative, urging nuclear attacks against North Korea and Iran.

On *Hannity & Colmes*, Coulter debated a fellow guest:\textsuperscript{15}

**COULTER:** You have a lunatic running Iran, who’s running around claiming he has a nuke. When do we wait? Do we wait for a city to be taken out? …

**ABORN:** That would mean we need to go into Iran. We should go into China. This is not an intellectually honest argument.

**COULTER:** Yeah! OK. But America, listen to this: Democrats will not take out a threat, they will wait for an American city to be bombed. Pay attention to that.

**COLMES:** I guess, we’re just going to have to go and invade every country.

Few politicians or pundits employ bellicose rhetoric to the extent that Coulter does. They can match neither her frequency nor ferocity. Whether planned or spontaneous, Coulter seems to be in perpetual attack mode. Coulter writes, “Perhaps we could put aside our national, ongoing, post-9/11 Muslim butt-

\textsuperscript{12} Ann Coulter, “Right-Wing Mobs? Say It Isn’t So, Conservatives!” 3/12/14.

\textsuperscript{13} Ann Coulter, “Get Rid of Government,” 6/15/11.


\textsuperscript{15} Ann Coulter, *Hannity and Colmes*, FNC, 3/13/06.
kissing contest and get on with the business at hand: Bombing Syria back to the stone age and then permanently disarming Iran.” She even jokes about annihilating our neighbor to the north: “[Canadians] better hope the United States does not roll over one night and crush them. They are lucky we allow them to exist on the same continent.”

No nation escapes her notice. A New York Observer profile contained this interesting exchange:

**COULTER:** I think we ought to nuke North Korea right now just to give the rest of the world a warning. …

**GURLEY** After we bomb North Korea, what’s the next country we should invade?

**COULTER:** Iran. Though that’s the beauty part of Iraq: It may well not be necessary. Because precisely what I’m saying with nuking North Korea – despite that wonderful peace deal Madeline Albright negotiated with the North Koreans, six seconds before they feverishly began developing nuclear weapons. They’re a major threat. I just think it would be fun to nuke them and have it be a warning to the rest of the world.

Returning to the war in Iraq, Coulter asserted in late 2003, “I think the rebuilding is going extremely well.” Coulter then likened Iraq to post-World War II Japan: “Douglas MacArthur was in Japan five years after V.J. Day. There were enormous casualties in Germany after World War II.” Contrary to Coulter’s assertions, in both Germany and Japan, the fighting was over before the rebuilding began. Yet, she continued, “The rebuilding is actually going quite well compared to past efforts.” At the time of her claims, a civil war was developing and combat deaths were on the rise.

Speaking to Alan Colmes, Coulter proclaimed her own incoherent perception of truth: “Liberals don’t want to fight terrorism. You want there to be lots of 9/11’s.” Liberals want more 9/11s? Moments later, Coulter engaged in a bit of projection, claiming, “Now, there are lies about there being lies. Yes, they are good propaganda people.”

War appears to be the only answer for one of conservatism’s fiercest anti-abortionists, who advocates executing a “less humane war” against even “innocent civilians.”

If you want a shorter rebuilding process, then we’re going to have to wage less humane wars. The enemy – as well as innocent civilians – must be bombed into quivering terror. Otherwise, we displace aggression but don’t destroy it. Americans are weaker for having seen that kind of carnage in World War II. Recall that the Worst Generation was raised by the Greatest Generation. That tells you how awful war is. The Greatest Generation was so exhausted by the war, it didn’t have the spine to stand up to pot-smoking, draft-dodging hippies occupying administration buildings.

Former colleague Eric Alterman warns that “[Coulter’s] great talent [is] to make people like her and think there’s no consequence to saying we should be committing mass murder in the Middle East.”

---
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Apocryphal Enemy

In 1984, Big Brother fuels fear and hatred by inciting people against enemies, both foreign and domestic. The dangers of the enemies without are exceeded only by the insidious traitors within.

Big Brother created a fictional villain, Emmanuel Goldstein, used as a bogeyman or scapegoat by the ruling elite. Goldstein purportedly created a treasonous organization called “The Brotherhood.” The treachery of the diabolical Goldstein and his equally diabolical Brotherhood knew no bounds:

Each member of “The Brotherhood” is required to read the book supposedly written by Goldstein, The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism. Each person is said to have three or four contacts at one time which are replaced as people disappear, so that if a member is captured, he can only give up three or four others.  

Coulter claims the Left employs this Orwellian technique of creating fictional enemies, though she herself is adept at its usage. On the 700 Club, Coulter accused the Left of creating a mythical enemy (religious conservatives) in opposition to the liberal agenda. Most remarkably, the host – a member of the Religious Right whose father once ran for President – seriously accepted Coulter underlying premise that the Religious Right does not exist.

It really is stunning how it is exactly out of George Orwell’s 1984, this is the Emmanuel Goldstein, the apocryphal figure the masses are trained to laugh at while reflexively hating. And attacks on the Religious Right, its occasional defeat only to somehow rise again and start oppressing the masses again. It really is just a mythical symbol to inspire liberals in the absence of an inspiring ideology.

Following the Orwellian model, Coulter not only denied the existence of the Religious Right, asserting it to be an Emmanuel Goldstein-like creation of the Left, she also employed her own Emmanuel Goldstein-like creation, asserting that the Left is a homogenous group labeled the Atheist Left, a theme which would become fully developed with the publication of Godless in 2006.

Like Big Brother, Coulter has declared her own war against the enemy without (terrorists) and the enemy within (traitors), and she employs those very Orwellian constructs to achieve her goals.

Enemy of the Moment

The apocryphal enemy was essential to Big Brother. Because Emmanuel Goldstein wasn’t real, he had to be created. The people needed a specific face to hate. Countless hordes fought overseas, and the destruction of nameless cities, were too impersonal – and too mathematical – to comprehend, or to stir the emotions. One death is a tragedy, one million a statistic. But rage directed at a specific person (or series of persons) is both attainable and sustainable.

---

However, an enemy forever sought but never caught presents a quandary. The *enemy of the moment* offers a solution. As Orwell observed, “The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil.” The propaganda machine can easily target dissidents and other troublemakers, declare them part of the Brotherhood, and turn the authoritarian powers of the state against those selected enemies of the moment. The anger and animosity for Emmanuel Goldstein is thus temporarily transferred to a lesser, but real and *tangible*, target.

That strategy eliminated inconvenient people and irreconcilable perspectives, and had the added benefit of terrorizing potential trouble-makers, those who could be next on the Enemies List. Moreover, it was done in such a way that the patterns of addictive thinking could be employed by the majority of people to rationalize inconsistencies and portray Big Brother as a paternalistic and benevolent leader.

Consider Coulter’s own employment of this technique. During the 2000 presidential election cycle, Coulter maintained a weekly attack against Sen. John McCain (R-AZ), who threatened the candidacy of George W. Bush. Coulter came to “despise” McCain and ferociously assassinated his character.

Likewise, Coulter condemned Gary Bauer as a “fascist,” despite their shared cultural conservatism, because Bauer, like McCain, posed a threat to a Bush presidency. Coulter also repeatedly attacked Rep. Chris Shays (R-CT) solely due to his vote against the impeachment of President Clinton.

Like Big Brother, Coulter’s commentary uses volatile rhetoric to stir up her base and to provoke those she attacks. Her rhetorical arsenal includes a series of *emotional* components – hatred, vilification, polemicism, demonization – all designed to elicit enmity for the enemy of the moment.

**Two Minutes Hate and Hate Week**

The external and internal enemies of Oceania are portrayed as hateful and Big Brother eagerly elicits enmity for those specific individuals and entire groups of people. The *two minutes hate* “is a daily period in which Party members of the society of Oceania must watch a film depicting The Party’s enemies (notably Emmanuel Goldstein and his followers) and express their hatred for them and the principles of democracy.” But daily diatribes are insufficient. Thus, the annual *hate week* was instituted “to increase the hatred for the current enemy of the Party.”

Fear and hatred are the predominant, overarching emotions in Oceania. Adolf Hitler revealed the emotions which animated his own regime: “We store up our hate and think of the day on which we shall cast off the mask, and stand revealed as those we are and eternally shall remain.” Big Brother is adept at using hate speech and “words of wrath” to vilify his foes. Those techniques of vilification include stigmatizing a foe through constant repetition of an epithet. Once again, those epithets (e.g., “traitor,” “lunatic”) are intended to elicit enmity for the enemy.

---
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Coulter’s own use of hate speech, expressions of enmity and clarion calls to hate are legendary.36

**Newspeak**

“Words mean things” became a conservative mantra in the 1990s. Many of my fellow conservatives opposed the misuse and redefinition of language (e.g., Clinton claiming tax cuts = patriotism).37 President Clinton’s impeachment outcome ludicrously hinged on the definition of “is.” Rush Limbaugh, in *See, I Told You So*, has a whole chapter entitled, “Words Mean Things,” as does Kevin McCullough in *Musclehead Revolution*.

John Wesley Young’s seminal book, *Totalitarian Language: Orwell’s Newspeak and its Nazi and Communist Antecedents*, provides insight into the various components of Orwellian rhetoric. According to Young, Orwell’s *newspeak* offered a “satirical imitation of a real-world tendency”38 in which political language was used to “conceal and not elucidate the truth.”39 And so it is with newspeak, whose purpose is “the intentional contamination of words for the purposes of power politics.”40

Coulter’s newspeak – twisting of existing language – incorporates a whole range of rhetorical redefinition which blossomed to full fruition in *Treason*. Among them, the determination that patriotism is a purely Republican prerogative, thus most Americans are not patriotic. A profile in *Salon* noted the Orwellian nature of Coulter’s rhetoric and presaged her own victim status championed in her 2004 bestseller, *How to Talk to a Liberal*.

But just like the liberals she hates … Coulter knows the rhetorical value of crying coercion. The easiest way to protest speech that offends you is to act as if you are forced to listen to it. Rather than doing the work of finding media in tune with your views – not especially hard for either a conservative or a liberal – it’s more dramatic to portray yourself as an oppressed victim à la “1984” enduring the lies of “newspeak.”41

Newspeak42 provides a method for thought control. In fact, the redefinition of terms to suit desired goals subtly subverts rational and independent thinking. The Red Queen speaks and her words mean whatever she says they mean. Young observes, “According to Orwell’s appendix to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the purpose of Newspeak is to give expression to the worldview of the Party and to deprive people of the power to conceive and communicate heretical ideas.”43 Young continues, “In redefining terms to suit its own purpose, therefore, the Nazi party was engaging in thought control.”44 Thus, “[they] use language in an effort to contract and control thought.”45

Newspeak often incorporates a *false redefinition* of terms, even a *reversal* of meaning. Thus, Coulter devises her own definitions of slander, treason, censorship, stalking, and the like to suit her purposes. Coulter’s newspeak mushroomed in *Treason*.

---
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In Oceania,

\[2 + 2 = 5\]

But in Coulter’s world,

Liberalism = Terrorism = Treason

and

Conservatism = McCarthyism = Patriotism

Those most deeply entrenched in Coulter’s worldview somehow see sense in these Orwellian constructs. They are trapped in the addictive thinking processes mentioned in the beginning of this chapter and below.

As author Michael Crichton noted, “The [eugenics] movement was able to proceed because it employed vague terms never rigorously defined. ‘Feeble-mindedness’ could mean anything from poverty and illiteracy to epilepsy. Similarly, there was no clear definition of ‘degenerate’ or ‘unfit.’”\(^{46}\) Thus, “vague terminology helped conceal what was really going on.”\(^{47}\) Indeed, we continually find emerging groups, organizations and governments engaging in newspeak, using “vague terms” – “terms that have no agreed definition – are employed in the service of a new crisis.”\(^{48}\)

**Treason Redefined**

Writing in *The New American*,\(^ {49}\) John McManus notes:

Lawyer Coulter knows that the U.S. Constitution (which she manages to ignore throughout her book) defines treason as “levying war against them [the United States], or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.” But to make that charge stick, the Constitution requires “the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.” A very difficult undertaking. Coulter, however, repeatedly claimed to find “treason” without applying the standard of the Constitution. For her, the term serves as a supercharged measure of her intense dislike for stupid liberals and inept Democrats. No conservatives earn her sensation-seeking accusation. Nor do any Republicans, not even the most socialistic and internationalist “moderates” within the GOP.

Joe DiGenova, a former U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, states unequivocally, “Treason is a very specific crime.”\(^{50}\)

Coulter “explained” her use of the term “treason” – “I’m not using [treason] as a legal term. That’s my point.”\(^{51}\) But what other definition is there apart from the *legal* one? Coulter, a “constitutional attorney,” is not using “treason” with its legal meaning but as a *pejorative*. This is true of much of Coulter’s writing.


\(^{47}\) Crichton, pg. 578.

\(^{48}\) Crichton, pg. 579.


Coulter offered varying definitions of treason. Consider these two:

- Liberals are traitors for *not* clapping:

  Bush got a raucous standing ovation at his State of the Union address when he announced that “this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles.” The excitement was noticeably muted on the Democrats’ side of the aisle. The vast majority of Democrats remained firmly in their seats, sullen at the thought that America would be protected from incoming ballistic missiles. To paraphrase George Bush: If this is not treason, then treason has no meaning.52

- Liberals are traitors for *supporting freedom* in America:

  Manifestly, there is no civil liberties crisis in this country. Consequently, people who claim there is must have a different goal in mind. What else can you say of such people but that they are traitors?53

Thus treason (an *overt act*) is turned on its head into a *passive* response, or into a *belief* about an individual’s innocence, or into *defense* of civil liberties.

Despite the dazzling absurdity of *Treason* – legally and logically – even former, constitutionally-oriented Congressman Joe Scarborough extols this “constitutional scholar” making those assertions. Scarborough exulted, “you really have provided America and the world a great service with this book.”54 Coulter redefined “treason” while excluding the only legal definition for that term. Consider this debate on *Scarborough Country*:55

COULTER: I’m not using it [“treason”] as a legal term. That’s my point.
O’DONNELL: You’re using it as a joke, Ann.
COULTER: You’re using it as a legal term in order to say there’s no such thing.
O’DONNELL: It is a legal thing. The word murder is also a legal term. These are legal terms.
COULTER: So is seduction.
O’DONNELL: You don’t get to come up with your definition of what murder is. It’s a childish thing to do. And it’s beneath you as a law school graduate, but it’s great comedy. …
COULTER: Does that mean there’s no such thing as seduction?

Coulter’s non sequitur – “seduction” – quickly derailed O’Donnell’s point. Coulter also redefined patriotism as 1) *hating* liberals and 2) *being* conservative. Consider this dialogue on *Scarborough Country*:56

SCARBOROUGH: Why, Ann, that sounds like reverse McCarthyism, doesn’t it?
COULTER: Well, no, because that would mean reverse patriotism.

---
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Doublethink

Addictive thinking parallels many of the Orwellian constructs in a number of ways. Denial can be achieved through use of the memory hole. Rationalizations occur with the use of groupthink, doublethink, and newspeak. Projections can include the use of the apocryphal enemy, enemy of the moment, and any of the propagandistic techniques employed by Big Brother. Some of the Orwellian constructs discussed here are really ideological counterparts of the psychological manifestations of addictive thinking.

“‘Doublethink’ is the act of holding two contradictory beliefs simultaneously, fervently believing both, and being unaware of their incompatibility.”57 Doublethink is known, psychologically-speaking, as cognitive dissonance, which “states that contradicting cognitions serve as a driving force that compels the mind to acquire or invent new thoughts or beliefs, or to modify existing beliefs, so as to reduce the amount of dissonance (conflict) between cognitions.”58

Orwell described it this way:

The power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one’s mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. ... To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies—all this is indispensably necessary. Even in using the word doublethink it is necessary to exercise doublethink. For by using the word one admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of doublethink one erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the lie always one leap ahead of the truth.59

Doublethink pervades Slander and much of Coulter’s subsequent writing. For instance, Coulter contends that only the Left is guilty of lying, hate speech, and demonization of political foes when Coulter is guilty of those very same actions. Nevertheless, conservatives commend Coulter for behaving in the very same manner as the liberals she and they condemn.

Although Coulter declares that Democrats comprise the “Treason Party” (one of her favorite expressions), she is unable to identify or name one single traitor.

Another glaring example of Coulter’s cognitive dissonance is her praise for Whittaker Chambers as one of the five most reviled people by the Left who actually did the most to thwart Communism. For Coulter, Chambers is an anti-Communist hero. At the same time, Coulter contends that Chambers’ condemnation of McCarthy cannot be trusted because Chambers was a former Communist. So, he can be trusted, but not really trusted.

Coulter similarly defends the Republican censure of Joseph McCarthy by comparing it to the Senate’s failure to convict Bill Clinton. This misdirection – this non sequitur – attempts to exonerate McCarthy, but unwittingly condemns those Republicans as cowards who acquiesced to liberal pressure. For Coulter, the Republicans just got tired of defending McCarthy and caved in to their enemies.

59 Orwell, George, Nineteen Eighty-Four, Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1949, pg. 35.
Likewise, Coulter lists Nixon as one of the five greatest anti-Communists who “posed the gravest threat to Communism” but then she lists Nixon’s achievements: “established relations with Communist China, engaged in détente with the Soviet Union.”

Were communist dictatorships a threat, or potential allies? In our post-9/11 environment, both Russia and China are making threatening overtures toward the United States. How, then, do Nixon’s “achievements” dovetail with his anti-Communist credentials?

**Groupthink**

Conservatives oppose the promotion of the “Stanford Trinity” – a system of racial, gender and class identity politics which is being foisted on Americans through political correctness. Orwell’s term, groupthink, concisely conveys the thought process.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, many liberals championed group identity, demanding that people think of themselves as hyphenated-Americans and asserting that people within a specific group (whether classified by race, gender, or class) have shared backgrounds, beliefs and behaviors. Anyone who fails to fit the prescribed stereotype is deemed inauthentic. For instance, conservative blacks like Clarence Thomas are viewed through the eyes of group politics as not authentically black because they think and act “white.”

This artificial racial paradigm dramatically exploded in America in 2014.

Similarly, conservatives eschew gender politics and class warfare because of our convictions and belief in the principles of individual rights and personal responsibility. We are all created equally in the image of God with inalienable rights granted to us by God. Although we have different gifts and talents, and come from diverse backgrounds and cultures, we are all equal in the sight of God and in the eyes of the law. Racial, gender and class identity assumes everyone in the designated group is identical and implicitly denies the principle of individual rights by subordinating them to a group dynamic.

However, many conservatives who rail against those politically correct stereotypes have rallied around the group stereotypes promoted by Coulter, whose worldview and rhetoric fit perfectly into the Orwellian model. Coulter’s grandiose “us vs. them” framework deifies those Americans who think like her and demonizes the remainder. As Young notes, “The principle purpose [of bipolar language] is to promote a two-dimensional view of the world.”

Young’s analysis of the use of bipolar language is particularly illuminating:

… totalitarian propaganda unvaryingly divides the world into two antagonistic camps. On one side stands the proletariat, the exploited nations, or the Aryan race. This group embodies the good, the true, the beautiful. Confronting it from the other camp, and embodying precisely opposite qualities, is the bourgeoisie, the imperialist powers, or the counterrace (Gegenrasse) of Jews, blacks, and Frenchmen. Each camp upholds a single set of values – communism, capitalism, racial supremacy – which it seeks to impose upon

---

61 See “Identity Politics Is the Problem” at [http://wp.me/p4scHf-1j](http://wp.me/p4scHf-1j) and “Ann Coulter Takes on the Racial Grievance Industry” at [http://t.co/YgG2rgpZ1c](http://t.co/YgG2rgpZ1c).
63 See “Ferguson: Justice, Race, and Reason” at [http://t.co/ksowFPcX62](http://t.co/ksowFPcX62), “I’m Black: Truth Does Not Matter” at [http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i](http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i), “Ferguson in Flames” at [http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i](http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i), and See “Obamacare’s Orwellian Birth and Inevitable Collapse” at [http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i](http://wp.me/p4scHf-5i).
64 Young, pg. 140.
the other. Between those two implacable enemies and their rival worldviews lies a void; no community of genuinely neutral opinion, no ‘third force,’ no third, fourth, and fifth sets of alternative values can be wedged between them. All is unqualifiedly white or black, light or dark, positive or negative, true or false, good or evil.65

Let’s look at but one example of Coulter’s treatment of the Left as a single, monolithic block. In Treason, Coulter writes: “In an amazing ruse, the left simultaneously blamed Israel and used Israel as an excuse not to take out Saddam Hussein.”66 Coulter’s demagogic delineation ascribes a uniformity of thought or action which was non-existent. Coulter consistently uses that formulaic technique, asserting, time and again, “Liberals said [this and did] that …”

Using Coulter’s logic, one could conceivably claim: Conservative schizophrenia was exemplified when they simultaneously favored and opposed war in Iraq, demanded and renounced U.N. involvement, asserted the existence of weapons of mass destruction but denied having any evidence, called it both a war of liberation and an act of imperialism, insisted Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat but not really that dangerous.

Such “analysis” makes all dialogue fruitless. Various conservatives believed each component of the paragraph above. Groupthink requires schizophrenia as the obvious conclusion. Logic recognizes that conservatives are not created from a cookie-cutter mold any more than liberals, just as history recognizes that divergence of opinion within demographic groups is the norm.

Coulter’s groupthink is primarily political, as exemplified by this assertion: “Liberals are utterly unabashed about their seventy-year pattern of rooting for America’s enemies.”67 Incredibly, many conservatives accept Coulter’s bald assertions at face value.

Post-9/11, Coulter’s groupthink increasingly extends along racial and religious lines: “Meanwhile, 100 percent of the terrorist attacks on commercial airlines based in America for twenty years have been committed by Muslims. When there is a 100 percent chance, it ceases to be a profile. It’s called a ‘description of the suspect.’”68 But what is the “description” of a Muslim? Or of a Christian? Why use racial profiling to catch religious extremists?69

This engagement in groupthink is contrary to Conservatism’s emphasis on individualism and responsibility. Furthermore, in kind, it is no different from left-wing stereotypes on racism, sexism, and classism. Indeed, for instance, Coulter claims “all terrorists are Muslims” – a ludicrous proposition.

During her Treason tour, Coulter refused to name names, instead treating the entire Democratic Party as treasonous. She would use the same modus operandi during her 2006 book tour for Godless: “This naming names idea of who’s a liberal and who’s godless, I mean, that is a way of preventing me – or anyone – from talking about liberalism.”70 Her rationale is that requiring Coulter to substantiate her charges prevents her from making accusations. But shouldn’t opinions be backed up with reason and evidence?
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Memory Hole

The *memory hole* is another essential tool of totalitarian thought. It “refers to a mechanism for censorship”[^71] which enables historical revisionism. This tool, used in conjunction with doublethink and the patterns of addictive thinking, prevents individuals and groups from thinking outside of the prescribed box. While newspeak circumscribes thought, the memory hole eliminates inconvenient truths and historical realities from entering into consciousness.

Consider Coulter’s historical revisionism regarding Joseph McCarthy, the Vietnam War, and the Iran-Iraq War, and her revisionism of more contemporary events, such as the current status of Afghanistan and Iraq as the Bush administration was drawing to a close.

Coulter’s most controversial instance of historical revisionism involves her resurrection of McCarthyism as noble and patriotic. Coulter wrote: “While consistently rooting against America, liberals have used a fictional event forged of their own hysteria – ‘McCarthyism’ – to prevent Americans from ever asking the simple question: Do liberals love their country?”[^72] Fortunately, many historians who lived through that era spoke out against Coulter’s lies.

Coulter claims, “The only important lesson from the Vietnam War is this: Democrats lose wars.”[^73] She added, “A Republican president either wouldn’t have started that [Vietnam] war or would have won it pretty fast.”[^74] Lost in her memory hole are these historical realities: World War II ended in victory under President Truman (D); the Korean War ended in stalemate under President Eisenhower (R); the Vietnam War ended in defeat under President Nixon (R).

Consider this dialogue with Larry King[^75].

**KING:** Ann, would you agree that Iraq has not been a success?

**COULTER:** No, I think it has been a success. …

**KING:** But, you know, the question was, you think Iraq is a success?

**COULTER:** Yes, I mean, we’re in the middle – we still have to do the rebuilding. We weren’t liberating Ohio here. It’s going to take some time, but, you know, immediately after the Normandy invasion, I don’t think I’d say, you know, is World War II a success? Is it over? It had to be done. And this had to be done. And we’re still fighting it.

Coulter’s comparative history is abysmal. D-Day was the beginning of the end of the Second World War, with tough fighting ahead until Berlin fell the following year. Placing D-Day in the context of the contemporary Iraq conflict is nonsensical, ignoring the reality that Baghdad fell within days of the war (not years after war had begun).

A more appropriate comparison would be what occurred after each capitol fell. Post-World War II, the Allies held the Nuremburg trials and rebuilt Germany in a stable military environment. The Iraq War did not end during the Bush administration, with terrorists and insurgents resisting the development of democracy in Iraq.

[^72]: *Treason*, pg. 8.
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In *Treason*, Coulter even overlooked America’s most notorious modern traitor, Robert Hanssen76 – “the traitor of the century” – because he did not fit Coulter’s stereotypical model of treason. FBI agent Hanssen was a Catholic, married with “six children in the Washington suburbs, putting them through Catholic schools and colleges, and making the payments on a Ford Taurus, an Isuzu Trooper and a fast-fading Volkswagen van.”77 Though Hanssen was arrested in February 2001, 78 28 months prior to the release of *Treason*, his profile did not fit Coulter’s thesis.

Author David A. Vise writes that “Hanssen was a traitor of unparalleled dimension. His access to national security and intelligence secrets was broad and deep, and his betrayal of those secrets was far-reaching … [he] obtained an extraordinary array of classified materials. Several counterintelligence experts, including former FBI and CIA director William Webster, have equated Hanssen’s treachery with a ‘five-hundred-year flood.’ He compromised thousands of pages of intelligence sources and methods; cryptology’ communications and technical surveillance programs; counterintelligence operations and military, logistical, and political strategy for surviving a nuclear attack.”79

Coulter conveniently skipped Republican traitor Robert Hanson because he didn’t fit her thesis of liberal treachery. Likewise, Jonathan Pollard and Aldrich Ames are absent from her book because they fail to support her paradigm.

**Apocalyptic Rhetoric**

Big Brother frequently employs apocalyptic rhetoric to incite the populace. The apocalyptic enemy is always engaged in evil pursuits of epic proportions. As Coulter wrote, “America is in an epic global battle with ruthless savages who seek our destruction, and liberals are feeling sorry for the terrorists.”80 But then Coulter uses a verbal sleight-of-hand to attack her real enemy: “They [liberals] aim to destroy America from the inside with their relentless attacks on morality and the truth.”81 Yes, Coulter is talking here about liberals, not terrorists, who are seeking to destroy America.

Her Emmanuel Goldstein and his Brotherhood – *everyone who thinks differently from Coulter* – are intent upon the destruction of Western Civilization itself: “But the left’s anti-Americanism is intrinsic to their entire worldview. Liberals promote the rights of Islamic fanatics for the same reason they promote the rights of adulterers, pornographers, abortionists, criminals, and Communists. They instinctively root for anarchy and against civilization, the inevitable logic of the liberal position is to be for treason.”82

Coulter’s enemy – the Left – epitomizes all that is evil in her eyes: “Whether they are defending the Soviet Union or bleating for Saddam Hussein, liberals are always against America. They are either traitors or idiots, and on the matter of America’s self-preservation, the difference is irrelevant. Fifty years of treason hasn’t slowed them down.”83

Those enemies of liberty have been seeking our destruction for half a century! Who knew it?
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Coulter’s demonization of the Left is perhaps unparalleled in modern history. Coulter contends, “Liberals have a preternatural gift for striking a position on the side of treason. … Whenever the nation is under attack, from within or without, liberals side with the enemy. This is their essence.”

Coulter asks the question “Why do they hate America?” and provides her own observations: “Whether they are rooting for the atheistic regimes of Stalin and Mao, satanic suicide bombers and terrorists, or the Central Park rapists, liberals always take the side of savages against civilization.”

**Coulter’s Orwellian Constructs**

In examining the various Orwellian constructs which are foundational to Coulter’s work it quickly becomes clear that those constructs pervade every aspect of one’s life and identity. Consider the “two minutes hate” and “hate week” (*emotional*), “newspeak” and “memory hole” (*intellectual*), “doublethink” and “perpetual warfare” (*psychological*), “apocryphal enemy” and “enemy of the moment” (*ideological*).

These synergize to create a false perception which *seems* real, which *must* be real if one accepts the totality of the Orwellian constructs entering one’s consciousness. In fact, to refute even one aspect of the structure is to endanger the whole, to threaten the collapse of this Orwellian house of cards.

The victim, whose life is predicated on a false reality, can actually fear its demise. Here, fear of change, fear of the unknown, fear of being wrong – and being so completely wrong – hinders the victim from either entertaining or accepting alternative views. Fear becomes a crutch.

Perhaps Coulter’s interest in *1984* arose precisely because she was already ensnared in using those very techniques.

**“Alleged Conservatives”**

One propaganda technique effectively employed by the Nazis circa World War II, and by Marxist-Leninist regimes wherever socialism sprang up, is that of disparaging one’s foes by using words like “alleged” and “so-called” to describe their foes. By using such modifiers, or “ironic quotation marks,” around those challenged characteristics, the speaker questions the credentials or legitimacy of the person or group under discussion.

This is one of Coulter’s favorite techniques. When Republicans, conservatives, or Christians disagree with Coulter, her views, or her agenda, Coulter will often challenge their credentials, treat them as somehow illegitimate or fraudulent. Indeed, Coulter’s colleagues and defenders apply the very same knee-jerk response to Coulter’s critics, contending that anyone critical of Coulter *must* be a closet liberal.

Similarly, Coulter continually makes distinctions between “real” or “genuine” Americans/heroes and “phony” or “fraudulent” ones. For example, Sen. John McCain is indisputably the real deal while Sen.
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John Kerry is a total fraud. Triple-amputee Max Cleland is a phony war hero while Rep. John Murtha is a “gutless traitor.”

While Coulter lauds as heroes Republican military leaders, she lashes out as traitors those of the liberal persuasion. When not outright calling them traitors, she dismisses their credentials. According to Coulter, “usually Democrats run candidates with some sort of phony Americans. They run these generals or veterans or some phony southern white male.” Phony, faux, fake – these are aspersions Coulter adeptly employs: “Clinton has sort of ended the Democrats’ trick of running a phony southern white male for their faux patriotism. … Now they need phony military guys.”

Coulter dismisses authentic war heroes, like Max Cleland and Wesley Clark, as illegitimate for not being patriotic enough to be conservatives: “When Wesley Clark is the commander of a war that was specifically billed as a war that serves no American interests, and now he opposes a war with Iraq that manifestly does serve America’s interests, his credentials as a general can only get him so far. It’s another masquerade ball by the Democrats.”

Coulter routinely regards other people, ideas and even issues as “phony.” Coulter’s calcified worldview permits no dissenting viewpoints. (Fears and phobias foment petrified perspectives and political paralysis.) In covering contemporary issues and scandals, Coulter employs a similar technique of discounting the individual as insignificant, such as in the Valerie Plame case: “I never heard of Scooter Libby until 10 minutes ago.”

Coulter’s linguistic manipulation of words – designed to make sense out of her worldview – has a profound psychological impact. People who are caught up in addictive thinking and cognitive dissonance are unable to discern the irrational nature of her paradigm.

### Orwellian Psychology

Just as the good citizens of Oceania accepted daily, even contradictory, pronouncements from Big Brother, so, too, do Coulter’s acolytes. One of the many factors to account for this Orwellian phenomenon is that many of her followers want to believe what Coulter says is true.

Many of Coulter’s fans want to believe the worst of liberals. They want to believe the conspiracy theories of liberal hegemonic control of the media. They want to believe the opposition party seeks to destroy America. Most importantly, they want to believe that they themselves are the true and exclusive guardians of freedom and democracy.

They want to believe a lie. The truth might challenge their beliefs, or themselves.
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How else do we explain how her advocates defend the indefensible and accept her most absurd arguments as gospel truth? They accept Coulter’s proposition that her own name-calling is not hate speech because everything she says is true. They accept her assertion that it is OK for conservatives to sin because at least they have standards. And they embrace her claim that all liberals are traitors though Coulter can’t even name one.

Why believe a lie? Insecurity? Lack of faith? An inability to articulate a worldview or debate the issues using facts as opposed to opinions? Fear of being proven wrong? They accept the lie because they want to believe it. They want to believe it because they inwardly fear that they might be wrong. Fearing the truth, they accept the lie. Indeed, they need the lie.

And the blind follow the blonde into Orwell’s universe.

**Traitors Everywhere!**

Nonetheless, Coulter has cried “Treason!” for years, using criteria at once elastic and evanescent. Treason, per Coulter, *consists of rejecting any portion of the Republican Party’s agenda.* Moreover, mere failure to applaud appropriately is treasonous in her eyes.

Treasonable offenses, per Coulter, include (this is a partial list to save space):

- Opposition to tax cuts
- Opposition to ANWR oil drilling
- Opposition to the new “Star Wars” defense system
- Opposition to racial profiling
- Opposition to invasion of Iraq
- Being a Democrat
- Being a moderate Republican
- Being a liberal

For those of you who think I am kidding, here are a few gems from Ann Coulter herself:

- “I think they are *worse* than Democrats. I mean there really is *nothing* so despicable as a weak-kneed Republican. They’re always trotted out when these Democrats are coming up with the most *heinous*, *treasonous* ideas. Whenever you hear, you know – ‘Even Chris Shays, even Lawrence Walsh’ – you know *treason* is afoot.”

- “Liberals are up to their old tricks again. Twenty years of treason hasn’t slowed them down.”

- “I think everyone should be patriotic Americans right now, which Democrats are not being. … Democrats [make] these obstructionist objections to reasonable domestic security measures. They refuse to pass a tax cut in order to pull us out of this recession. And they won’t let us drill in Alaska to preserve some mud flat. I would like the Democrats to be Americans.”

- “… in my next book, [I’m] going through 50 years of treason by Democrats.”
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• “When contemplating college liberals, you really regret once again that John Walker is not getting the death penalty. We need to execute people like John Walker in order to physically intimidate liberals, by making them realize that they can be killed too. Otherwise they will turn into outright traitors.”

• “Democrats adore threats to the United States. Bush got a raucous standing ovation at his State of the Union address when he announced that ‘this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles.’ The excitement was noticeably muted on the Democrats’ side of the aisle. The vast majority of Democrats remained firmly in their seats, sullen at the thought that America would be protected from incoming ballistic missiles. To paraphrase George Bush: If this is not treason, then treason has no meaning.”

But treason does have meaning – only not the meaning Coulter gives it.

What exactly is treason? The Constitution defines treason thus:

“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.”

When confronted with the actual Constitutional definition of treason, Coulter blustered, “Right. I’ve heard that definition like a billion times since the book [Treason] came out.”

Then Coulter completely ignored that definition, adding, “I’m answering now to the question. … look, there are millions of suspects here. I am indicting an entire party. I am indicting the entire Democratic Party.”

Coulter has seemingly determined, through her own unique “strict constructionist” interpretation of the Constitution, that anyone who disagrees with her about anything is a traitor. Since most Americans at some point disagree with Ann Coulter on most issues then most Americans must be traitors.

If the emperor had no clothes then Treason has no traitors – at least no contemporary ones. In fact, for her book, Coulter had to go back to the McCarthy era to find any treason (thus necessitating making McCarthyism the “linchpin” of her book).

Unable to unearth any actual contemporary traitors, Coulter redefined “treason” with rhetorical sleight-of-mouth to magically lead her audience to her preconceived conclusions.

Evidence be damned. If liberals aren’t really traitors they should still be regarded as such. Why? Because they are liberals. (Horror of horrors!)

If Coulter’s foundational premises are so fatally and factually flawed, how can anything she says be credible?

Scurrilous accusations of treason only serve to trivialize the reality of actual treason, stigmatize the victims of false accusations, traumatize people already terrorized by war, demonize whole political parties, paralyze our democratic system of government, and, eventually, marginalize the very individuals and organizations who employ them.

---
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The New McCarthyism

Coulter carved out a niche for herself as the Joseph McCarthy of our era, even surpassing him in the process. Rather than denounce specific individuals and particular groups for treason, as McCarthy did, Coulter declares the entirety of liberalism treasonous.

Coulter has out-McCarthyd McCarthy.

_Treason_ was explicitly marketed as “an explosive defense of Joe McCarthy,”*100 with Coulter asserting: “The myth of ‘McCarthyism’ is the greatest Orwellian fraud of our times. … Liberals are fanatical liars, then as now. Everything you think you know about McCarthy is a hegemonic lie.” Notice Coulter’s trademark hyperbole: “greatest Orwellian fraud … fanatical liars … hegemonic lie.” Unfortunately, many on the Right regard her hyperbolic content as an accurate reflection of reality.

Many exclusive excerpts provided on the Drudge Report eulogized McCarthy as an “indispensable” American hero – a white knight who saved America from treasonous Communists, just as Coulter herself is now saving America from treasonous liberals.

In her very first chapter, titled “Fifty Years of Treason,” Coulter asserts, “liberals are always against America. They are either traitors or idiots, and on the matter of America’s self-preservation, the difference is irrelevant. Fifty years of treason hasn’t slowed them down.” Even before 9/11, Coulter contended that liberals are traitors. Just being liberal is treasonous in her eyes. Coulter has concocted her own Axis of Evil: liberalism, terrorism and treason. In Coulter’s contorted, conspiratorial mind, they are virtually synonymous: liberalism = terrorism = treason.

Indeed, the preponderance of Coulter’s post-9/11 work comes to life in this sound-bite summary of _Treason_: “Liberals have a preternatural gift for always striking a position on the side of treason.”

And why are liberals traitors? “Whenever the nation is under attack, from within or without, liberals side with the enemy. This is their essence.” The essence of liberalism is treason predicated on hatred of America!

Coulter’s grand conspiracy claims McCarthyism was a “hegemonic lie” propounded by the Left to hide its own fifty-plus years of treason, just as last year’s _Slander_ perpetuated the myth of liberal hegemonic “control of mainstream national media.”

Orwellian Conundrum

The conundrum of Conservatism is that in seeking to promote its principles – in outreach to grow the movement – it exalts as its standard-bearer a “conservative” celebrity whose worldview is markedly anti-conservative. Coulter’s radicalism is contrary to Conservatism’s most revered principles and ideals yet, today, many conservative leaders and institutions exalt that very radicalism.

_Treason_ – and the entirety of Ann Coulter’s post-impeachment work – is predicated upon a worldview encapsulated by two equations: liberalism = terrorism = treason and conservatism = McCarthyism = patriotism. No subtleties or ambiguities. No nuances. No sense.

Coulter’s Orwellian construct emulates Big Brother’s insistence that two plus two equals five.

---
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Two critiques of *Treason* typify the thinking of her more discerning fans and provide insight into both why Ann Coulter is so adored by her followers and why Ann Coulter poses such a danger to Conservatism (and to America).

**Critique # 1 – David Horowitz**

“In 2003, right-wing columnist Ann Coulter published her book *Treason*, in which she attempted to resurrect the execrable communist hunter Joseph McCarthy as a hero and patriot. This was too much even for conservative columnist David Horowitz, one of Ms. Coulter's clients, who chastised her for discrediting conservatives and conservatism.”

David Horowitz gallantly (and laboriously) defended *Treason* while pointing out a number of flagrant flaws. A repentant Marxist, Horowitz recognized one glaring aspect of Coulter’s Orwellian constructs, noting:

Equally disturbing was Coulter’s use of the phrase, “functionally treasonable” – as in “[the Democratic Party] has become functionally treasonable.” This is a problematic phrase on several counts. In the first place, “treasonable” is not a word but seems to suggest “capable of treason,” which is different from being actually treasonous. The distinction is important.

But “functionally treasonable” is also disturbingly reminiscent of the old Stalinist term “objectively fascist.” This was how people who swore their loyalty to the cause were condemned (often to death) if they deviated from the party line. Stalinists defined all dissent as “objectively” treacherous. This is not a path that conservatives should follow. When intent and individuality are separated from actions in a political context, we are entering a totalitarian realm.

We see here the very same totalitarian impulses which are reflected in Coulter’s musing over what she would do as “czar of the universe” or desire to be the “ayatollah of the conservative movement.”

Horowitz concluded with a point that I’ve been making for many years:

The final reason for making these distinctions is that this charge – that no Democrat, apparently including Jack Kennedy, can root for America – is obviously absurd, and if conservatives do not recognize that it is absurd, nobody is going to listen to us. …

The problem with Coulter’s book is that she is not willing to concede that McCarthy was, in fact, demagogic in any sense at all, or that that his recklessness injured the anti-Communist cause.

**Critique # 2 – William F. Buckley, Jr.**

Finally – after months and months of being unable to name a single contemporary traitor, Coulter did produce a traitor: the publisher of the *New York Times*.

---
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Conservative giant William F. Buckley, Jr., responded, “But even as Ms. Coulter clearly intends to shock, why shouldn’t her reader register that shock? By wondering whether she is out of her mind, or has simply lost her grip on language.”

Buckley explained:

What except that prompts her to come up with (or the Post to publicize) her syllogism? The man who heads the paper that employs an editorial writer who dangles the proposition that a thought given to moral equivalency is appropriate and humbling on September 11, 2003 is a “traitor”? That end-of-the-road word, bear always in mind, is hers. Coulter is a law school graduate and isn’t using the “T”-word loosely. The opening sentences of her article reject any such explanation. She means to charge that Sulzberger is engaged in traitorous activity. That, after all, is what traitors engage in.

Buckley continued:

The thought-process used here is everywhere in evidence in her best-selling book, *Treason: Liberal Treachery from the Cold War to the War on Terrorism*. The book’s central contention is that liberals critically situated on the American scene aren’t fatuous asses – that’s baby talk. They are enemies of the United States and of American freedom.

*But that is precisely what Coulter wants to convey:* “there are millions of suspects here. I am indicting an entire party. I am indicting the entire Democratic Party.”

**Yes, but …**

Horowitz and Buckley both denounced the foundation of Ann Coulter’s worldview, yet they praised her for specific details in her work. This is comparable to calling a painting ugly but saying some of the brushstrokes are lovely, and, therefore the painter is a master craftsman.

If Coulter is wrong on the big issues, if she is wrong on her foundational beliefs, then why should we believe any of the details or the particulars of her claims? Essentially, both Horowitz and Buckley wrote that “Ann Coulter is wrong, but …” How can there be “buts” when the foundation is a sandbox of sophistry? Rather, we should build on a foundation of truth and sagacity.

Nevertheless, Coulter remains lauded as a courageous conservative icon, an “exemplar of the conservative movement” and “the Joan of Arc of the right.”

Noted historian Lee Edwards calls McCarthy a patriot with large flaws and fissures in his character who, consequently, caused conservatives to carry “the albatross of McCarthyism” around their necks for generations. He decries the “excesses of McCarthyism.” Coulter denies any excesses existed.

For *Treason*, the *Weekly Standard* provided a parody in lieu of a review. That full-page parody presented a fictional magazine cover emblazoned “Ann Coulter Living,” with a picture of Coulter hugging a beagle on the left and a series of headlines on the right.
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Sample on-the-mark headlines included these:

- Joe McCarthy Christmas Cookies
- How to Signal When It’s Over: Castration
- Contempt Is Sexy!
- Ann’s Custom-Made Flame-Proof Lip Goss
- The Verdict on Kittens: Filthy, Rotten, Lying Scum
- Home Improvement: Bob Barr Redoes His Gun Room
- Inspiring Stories of Intimidation and Humiliation
- Plus: Excerpts from Ann’s Books – *Slander*, *Treason*, *Betrayal*, and her latest, *Tardiness*

That subtle repudiation of Coulterism coming from such an eminent neo-conservative publication spoke volumes to more discerning readers. But subtlety was not sufficient to stop, or even slow down, the Coulter Phenomenon.

**Treason Acknowledgements**

Having denied the existence of the “gospel lobby” in *Slander* and asserted the dominance of the “treason lobby” in *Treason*, Coulter’s acknowledgements for *Treason* were cleverly presented as a whole series of tiers of people and organizations who are/would be on a contemporary blacklist for liberals. Her final acknowledgement asserts that God is on her side: “Also God, but He’s already on the liberals’ blacklist.”

In *Treason*, Coulter provided a stark demarcation between conservatives (good) and liberals (evil):

Liberals chose Man. Conservative chose God.

Why do they hate America? … Whether they are rooting for the atheistic regimes of Stalin and Mao, satanic suicide bombers and terrorists, or the Central Park rapists, liberals always take the side of savages against civilization.

[The liberal cause is] anti-Americanism [based on] hatred of civilization.

… liberals once again are cheering for the destruction of civil society.

Betraying the manifest national defense objectives of the country is only part of the left’s treasonous scheme. They aim was to destroy America from the inside with their relentless attacks on morality and the truth.

The fundamental difference between liberals and conservatives is: Conservatives believe man was created in God’s image; liberals believe they are God.

Coulter’s worldview would grow ever narrower with the passage of time, even as her apocalyptic language would intensify.

The renowned historian, Paul Johnson, observed:

A man who deliberately inflicts violence on the language will almost certainly inflict violence on human beings, if he acquires the power. Those who treasure the meaning of words will treasure the truth, and those who bend words to their purposes are very likely
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in pursuit of anti-social ones. The correct and honorable use of words is the first and natural credential of civilized status.\textsuperscript{108}

When will the conservative movement and conservative media take Coulter to task for minimizing actual treason? Do conservatives no longer care what words mean? Have they, in Buckley’s parlance, “simply lost their grip on language?”

Chapter 5
Coulter’s Little Red Book

As a propagandist, Ann Coulter has a paradigm. Coulter promotes that paradigm which requires actions to be performed. Coulter’s first compilation of columns in book form – How to Talk to a Liberal (if you must) – is a handbook providing guidelines for her followers.

Coulter’s How-To book – her own version of Mao’s Little Red Book – provides a set of ten “rules” (not to be confused with Yahweh’s Decalogue). Yes, Coulter codified her ideology with ten rules.

Chairman Ann (that’s how her own website refers to Coulter) dictates and we are to obey. On her book cover, Coulter appears as a leather-clad school-teacher/dominatrix ready to school her students in the art of propaganda.


Saul Alimsky had his infamous “Rules for Radicals,” and Coulter dispenses her own set of ten rules for conservatives.

Ann Coulter’s Rules

1. “don’t surrender out of the gate.”
2. “you don’t need to be defensive.”
3. “you must outrage the enemy.”
4. “never apologize …”
5. “never compliment a Democrat.”
6. “never show graciousness toward a Democrat.”
7. “never flatter a Democrat.”
8. “do not succumb to liberal bribery.”
9. “prepare for your deepest, darkest secrets to become liberal talking points.”
10. “always be open to liberals in transition.”

Ann Coulter = Michael Moore

Ann Coulter is in print what Michael Moore is in film.

Bruce Reirstein referred to Moore’s Fahrenheit 9/11 as “Propaganda, yes. Documentary, no.” He concluded “and that the film itself was far less than the sum of its publicity: distorted, inaccurate, filled
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with cheap generalizations, sophomoric editing tricks and a laundry list of omissions – none of which would stand up to the true test of a documentary.”

Reirstein compared Leni Riefenstahl’s *Triumph of the Will* film to Moore’s, noting, “Beyond the true believers, Mr. Moore is now seen as a liability – both to much of Hollywood, and the Democratic Party.”

Regarded by some as a contemporary Leni Riefenstahl for the extreme right, Coulter’s own propaganda is acclaimed truth by her devotees, even though every criticism of Moore’s films can be ascribed to Coulter’s work:

- Distortion
- Inaccuracy
- Filled with cheap generalizations
- Sophomoric editing tricks
- Laundry list of omissions

In print and in person, Coulter uses those very same techniques, often emphasizing not logic and reason but emotion and response.

The question remains exactly when conservatives will, as a whole, view Coulter as a liability.

**Triumph of the Will**

Leni Riefenstahl’s *Triumph of the Will* has been called “The most awesome, frightening and powerful film ever made!” It epitomized “propaganda as the systematic attempt to manipulate the attitudes, beliefs and actions of people through the use of symbols such as words, gestures, slogans, flags and uniforms.” It combined elements “to create a hypnotic and visually rich emotional experience.”

Like Riefenstahl, Coulter employs emotional words and phrases, symbols and code words, to elicit visceral responses from her fans and foes alike. Rare is the Coulter interview or debate without emotive elements. Boring? Surely not. Truth? Hardly.

Consider Coulter’s third rule for how to talk to a liberal:

> You must outrage the enemy. If the liberal you’re arguing with doesn’t become speechless with sputtering, impotent rage, you’re not doing it right. … Start with the maximum assertion about liberals and then push the envelope, because, as we know, their evil is incalculable. … Nothing too extreme can be said about liberals, because it’s all true.4

Every word – noun and adjective, verb and adverb – is carefully crafted to ignite fervency in her followers and to incite the wrath of her foes.
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Nothing Too Extreme

Coulter’s publisher, Crown Forum, promoted How to Talk to a Liberal with typical Coulter flair:

“Nothing too extreme can be said about liberals because it’s all true.”

--Ann Coulter

In just 12 words, Coulter – with her famous fanatical fervor – justifies liberal genocide.

This sensationalist message is packaged using clever sound-bites, calling upon a patriotic spirit and inciting a missionary zeal to eradicate evil – liberals – thus creating a utopian (conservative) world. Coulter’s rhetoric is reminiscent of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia.

Let’s look at the first of those 12 words – “Nothing.” Taken in context, this implies omniscience on Coulter’s part. She knows everything that has, can, and will be said about liberals – and she declares (like God, after each day of creation), “It is good.”

Ironically, in her previous book, Treason, Coulter charged liberals with a godlike mentality: “The fundamental difference between liberals and conservatives is: Conservatives believe man was created in God’s image; liberals believe they are God.”

The next two words – “too extreme” – correctly suggest there are degrees of extremeness, but erroneously imply that any extreme against liberals is acceptable, even laudable.

The next three words – “can be said” – gives moral authority to assassinate the character of liberals, the first step towards literally assassinating them.

The next two words – “about liberals” – ensures that we all know who the enemy is, at least the enemy in “The World According to Ann Coulter” (the subtitle of her book).

The final four words – “because it’s all true” – pronounce irrevocable judgment upon her enemy.

If it’s “all liberals’ fault,” as Coulter charged in Slander, and all liberals are evil traitors, as she charged in Treason, and liberals can be justifiably accused and summarily convicted of every crime imaginable, as Coulter asserts in Talk, then the Final Solution – to achieve Coulter’s utopian goal of “a world without liberals” – necessitates genocide.

Execution of Liberals?

The conservative audience at the Conservative Political Action Conference in 2002 applauded Coulter’s advocacy for the execution of liberals: “We need to execute people like John Walker in order to physically intimidate liberals, by making them realize that they can be killed too.”
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Coulter’s intent could not be clearer. Consider this essay title (“N.Y. Times: Better Dead Than Read”) and an extract:

I prefer a firing squad, but I’m open to a debate on the method of execution. A conviction for treason would be assured under any sensible legal system. … This is how Bush "intimidates" the press? The level of intimidation I had in mind is more along the lines of how President Dwight D. Eisenhower "intimidated" Julius and Ethel Rosenberg at 8 in the morning, June 19, 1953.⁶

That same year, the Wall Street Journal and Washington Times defended Coulter’s heartfelt desire to kill liberals: “My only regret with Timothy McVeigh is he did not go to the New York Times building.”⁷

Indeed, in a series of essays stretching back to 1999, Coulter has implicitly or directly stated her desire that liberal White House officials and presidential candidates be assassinated.

- **Elizabeth Dole.** “One morning she stopped all employees of the Department of Transportation at the gate to the parking lot with a stop sign – to make sure they were all wearing their seat belts. In her current campaign, the only position Dole has taken … is to support the ban on so-called ‘assault’ weapons. But we need so-called ‘assault’ weapons. Otherwise, some government busybody might get the bright idea of stopping us to make sure our seatbelts are fastened.”⁸

- **Norman Mineta.** “According to initial buoyant reports in early February, enraged travelers rose up in a savage attack on the secretary of transportation. Hope was dashed when later reports indicated that the irritated travelers were actually rival warlords, the airport was the Kabul Airport, and Norman Mineta was still with us.”⁹

- **Al Gore & Gray Davis.** “Both were veterans, after a fashion, of Vietnam, which would make a Gore-Davis Presidential ticket the only compelling argument yet in favor of friendly fire.”¹⁰

Coulter’s very first book, *High Crimes and Misdemeanors*, targeted President Clinton for assassination: “Otherwise there would be debates only about whether to impeach or assassinate.”¹¹

**Assassinate Liberals**

Character assassination is the most valued coin of Ann Coulter’s realm and the “conservative” queen of invective will tolerate no dissent.

Few conservatives publicly object to her paradigm. Remember, the Coulter calculus is premised on two equations: liberalism = terrorism = treason and conservatism = McCarthyism = patriotism. Those twin equations give justification for Coulter and her colleagues to denigrate the character, integrity and patriotism of American war heroes who are on the other side of the political aisle.

⁶ Ann Coulter, “N.Y. Times: Better Dead Than Read,” 7/12/06.
⁸ Ann Coulter, essay, 8/18/99.
¹⁰ Ann Coulter, “The Dems' laboratory: The host organism dies,” 8/13/03.
Even before 9/11, Coulter defined patriotism and love of country as a peculiarly Republican prerogative. In her words, anyone who objects to any facet of the Republican agenda is patently un-American. Thus, Coulter and others like her feel at home demonizing Max Cleland, Wesley Clark, John Kerry, John McCain and other patriots who bravely served their country but do not ascribe to their ideological beliefs.

Coulter’s Talk — like Slander and Treason — contributes to America’s deepening political and cultural divide and coarsens the political and cultural climate. Demonization is the means, destruction (of the Left) is the goal. Coulter’s paradigm divides people into two groups: noble, honorable, patriotic and godly Americans (conservatives) at war with evil, corrupt, anti-American, terrorist-loving traitors (liberals).

Elimination Rhetoric

One Orwellian technique alluded to earlier is that of character assassination. In Orwell’s fictional world, and in that of the totalitarian regimes he parodied, character assassination was often a prelude to the real thing.

Coulter ironically concluded Treason with a warning to Americans that the destruction of language is often a precursor to something worse. Though directed against her foes, Coulter’s finger should have been pointed in the mirror:

In Enemies of Society, Paul Johnson warned: “A man who deliberately inflicts violence on the language will almost certainly inflict violence on human beings if he acquires the power. Those who treasure the meaning of words will treasure truth, and those who bend words to their purposes are very likely in pursuit of anti-social ones. The correct and honorable use of words is the first and natural credential of civilized status.”

Paul Johnson, an eminent historian, plainly expresses a human proclivity which can be expressed with this formula:

violence on language → violence on people

A similar formula is equally important:

character assassination → assassination.

Big Brother depends upon verbal and real assassination for his survival. The import of elimination rhetoric is often disguised in humor and is frequently presaged by emotional goading, fear-mongering and expressions of enmity. “Not by accident alone did the Nazis strip away the dignity of men and women with words,” wrote Young. “They did it deliberately.”  “By depicting people … as soulless entities, the Nazis made it easier to act with inhumanity towards them.” Thus, “the language of dehumanization abridges their consciousness of reality.”

---

13 Americans saw this principle in action in December 2014, when mobs chanting — “What do we want? Dead cops. When do we want it? Now.” — led to the assassination of police officers in New York City.
15 Ibid., pg. 88.
16 Ibid., pg. 89.
Young’s clarity is chilling: “The Party had murdered its enemies figuratively long before murdering them in fact.”17 He observed, “Because in a totalitarian view of the world the enemy personifies evil, no terms of abuse (Schimpfworte) are too harsh to heap upon him.”18

How was Talk promoted? With Coulter’s claim, “Nothing too extreme can be said about liberals because it’s all true.” In Slander, Coulter opined, “Conservatives already know that people they disagree with politically can be ‘charming.’ Also savagely cruel bigots who hate ordinary Americans and lie for sport.”19 If liberals are all evil, then her oft-repeated goal – the elimination of liberals – naturally evolves from that belief. Her elimination rhetoric, however humorously conveyed, seeks the fulfillment of that utopian dream.

We have already seen enmity erupt from the wellspring of Ann Coulter’s heart. Virulent hatred towards feminists in 1991; hatred of all things Clinton in the late 90s; and hatred of the totality of liberalism in the new millennium. Coulter’s own declarations of personal hatred subsided (due to criticism of that espoused enmity) even as her attacks upon the object of her hatred have intensified.

Coulter’s heart harbors hatred as if it were something precious to be preserved. But Coulter has learned from past mistakes and now disguises her hatred with humor. Death threats and elimination rhetoric season her words and worldview. The desires of her heart – a final solution to liberalism – give voice in words of death and destruction.

In a 1999 column, Coulter explicitly expressed her enmity as a patriotic duty: “If you don’t hate Clinton and the people who labored to keep him in office, you don’t love your country.”20 On the eve of the 2000 election, Coulter exulted: “Oh, how I hate them! And, oh, how I hate the waiting. To quote wacky comic Prof. Irwin Corey, when asked about his feelings on the subject of love: ‘I like love, because it’s so close to hate. And without hate, there could be no revenge.’ Tomorrow, we take revenge.”21

Eliminate the humor and what remains is hatred. As the author of Totalitarian Language notes: “for the bloodthirst and savagery so evident in their [Nazi and Stalinist] language seem to spring from deeply felt hatreds and abiding grievances that have to be vented regardless of the consequences.”22 Those irrepressible emotions must be expressed. “In violent language they give vent to both the hatred and the wish.”23

---

17 Ibid., pg. 91.
18 Ibid., pg. 96.
21 Ann Coulter, National Review Online, 11/7/00.
23 Ibid., pg. 155.
Remember, Coulter even advocates executing a “less humane war.” “The enemy – as well as innocent civilians – must be bombed into quivering terror.” Bloodthirst personified. Coulter’s “violent language” giving “vent to both the hatred and the wish,” is evident in her lavish employment of elimination rhetoric.

One blogger contrasted Coulter and Moore, writing: “Ann Coulter is an inversion of Michael Moore: he’s ugly and ill-kempt, she’s glamorous and perfectly coiffed. They share only an hysterical hatred.” I am unaware of Moore ever threatening Coulter, but not so for Coulter: “If the death penalty doesn’t deter murder, how come Michael Moore is still alive and I’m not on death row?”

Couched in humorous terms designed to soften the point and elicit laughter, Coulter nonetheless is saying that if there were no death penalty, if she could get away with it, she would murder Moore.

In column after column, Coulter expresses murderous fantasies toward liberals:

Why hasn’t the former spokesman for the Taliban matriculating at Yale been beaten even more senseless than he already is? According to Hollywood, this nation is a cauldron of ethnic hatreds positively brimming with violent skinheads. Where are the skinheads when you need them? What does a girl have to do to get an angry, club- and torch-wielding mob on its feet?

Lest she miss anyone, Coulter provided a “six-word memoir” entry for a 2010 book: “Some are left alive, quick reload.”

Defending Elimination Rhetoric

I raised the issue with Clifford May, President of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, who is at the forefront of anti-terrorist efforts in the United States. May rebukes those who promote terrorism, issue death threats, and advocate assassination. Nevertheless, despite Coulter’s frequent use of elimination rhetoric, May refuses to rebuke Coulter.

On a Washington Post chat, May defined terrorism as “the deliberate killing of innocent men, women and children for political purposes.” On MSNBC, he said “Someone who calls for the slaughter of innocent civilians should not be teaching.” In an interview with me, May unequivocally reiterated those views, stating, “I guess I’d say that in the 21st century our moral evolution should bring us to the point that we understand that it is always wrong – immoral, evil – to intentionally kill non-combatants for political purposes.”

May added, “Such behavior should never be condoned, excused, justified, legitimated or rationalized. Any cause that utilizes terrorism should be de-legitimized by that use – no matter how otherwise virtuous the cause.”

---

27 Ann Coulter, “Conservatives Need 12-Step program to Manhood,” 5/10/06
I then asked May:

Q: In the context of your previous answers and the stated mission of your organization, please review and comment on the following remarks by constitutional attorney Ann Coulter [remarks and citations provided].

A: I’m going to take a pass on this question, if you don’t mind. Ann Coulter can speak for herself – besides, I don’t know the context and I don’t have time to research it.

Q: I appreciate your reluctance to comment and I can certainly understand that we are talking about a powerful and high-profile individual here. However, haven’t you repeatedly said that there is no context in which terrorist acts or calls for terrorist acts should be tolerated?

A: I did not hear Ann make the remarks to which you refer, and I have not read the columns you mention. Therefore, I really don’t know the context. My hunch is that she is not seriously advocating killing liberals or Norman Mineta or anyone else. My hunch is that she is engaging in a form of parody and theatrics. But if you are correct and if she is seriously advocating the slaying of non-combatants, that would obviously be wrong and I would condemn it.

I then provided the context for her remarks, to which May replied: “I’m really swamped right now and don’t have time to do more than I’ve been doing for you on this particular project.”

In August, speaking of the McVeigh quote, May replied, “I’m sorry. I have a store to mind – it’s called the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. Ann Coulter and the conservative movement cannot be my priorities right now. I’m sure you understand.”

Q: Am I correct in assuming that you have no qualms or reservations about Ann Coulter, her views and her rhetoric and that you will, therefore, refrain from criticizing her or taking an official position on this?

A: You’re correct, I prefer not to wade into this particular war.

Q: In other words, though Ann Coulter sometimes expresses the views of a terrorist – whether advocating the indiscriminate slaughter of innocent civilians in time of war, executing or assassinating liberals, or destroying the New York Times – you will not speak out against it?

A: NONE.

May, like so many others, refuses to condemn Coulter’s terrorist rhetoric. Why do Coulter’s enablers accept the Just Joking Defense when Coulter herself insists she is speaking clearly from her heart? Coulter insists, “No [I’m not using parody]. I’m accusing the Democrats of being traitors. Am I being elliptical?”29 Coulter provides further clarification, explaining “I believe everything I say.”30

In late August 2002, Coulter made one of her most-talked-about controversial statements. Surprisingly, she insisted that the reporter tape her words to ensure she was accurately quoted. Coulter said, “My only regret with Timothy McVeigh is he did not go to the New York Times Building.”31 Amidst the consequent uproar, conservatives rushed to her defense, despite the fact that Coulter spoke those words within blocks of Ground Zero just weeks before the first anniversary of 9/11.

29 Ann Coulter, Hannity & Colmes, FNC, 5/14/02.
31 Ann Coulter, New York Observer, 8/26/02.
The otherwise rational and realistic family-values columnist, Suzanne Fields, extolled Coulter’s courage:

Femme fatalist Ann Coulter, for example, sends sparks flying as a blond incendiary twirling great batons of fire, cheerleading for the conservatives … She's a new kind of conservative critic who provides the devilish (and sometimes outlandish) persona for the right that Norman Mailer once did for the left, delivering slash-and-burn prose that's entertaining, usually over the top and sometimes absurd. …

But she's good for conservatives by risking a hard satirical point even when it fails. A woman with testosterone can sometimes make men of boys.

Testosterone-filled Coulter is “good for conservatives” by providing a “devilish (and sometimes outlandish) persona?” In a similar vein, Wall Street Journal columnist Melik Kaylan wrote:

There are many surprising dimensions to the Coulter phenomenon. She has defied expectation, overturned prejudice even, in so many ways. She surprises, at the most basic level, by her effortlessly guilt-free flights of extroversion, her fierce – but never humorless – conservatism.

We have been programmed to think that such impassioned outrage, and outrageousness, are permissible only on the left, from counter-culture comedians or exponents of identity politics, certainly not from nice blonde Connecticut-born Republican girls. From Lenny Bruce, George Carlin, Angela Davis, Reverend Farrakhan, yes. Ann Coulter – heaven forbid. She cannot claim that her affronts have been much exaggerated by her enemies – she has certainly courted outrage, called Katie Couric “an affable Eva Braun,” dreamed out loud that all liberals be obliterated, that liberal media organs be bombed. It's merely that such effrontery sounds more palatable in the mouths of Black Panthers. …

The difference between Miss Coulter's and the Black Panthers' fuming is surely very clear. They meant it literally, bombs and all. Miss Coulter, on the other hand, acts out her thoughts in a kind of “what if” political theater, a tongue-in-cheek agitprop, and believes that most Americans understand the difference. …

Miss Coulter's very survival as a public figure has been her most startling trick, indeed has offered a kind of breathtaking spectacle. For much milder remarks than she daily defiantly serves up, we've seen veteran broadcasters hounded out of their careers.

Here we see Coulter held to a totally different standard, using the Just Joking Defense and treated as a courageous heroine for daring to say what others would get fired for. Why? Because she’s a conservative and her jokes are funny. That rationale would become a primary defense of Coulter’s rhetoric over the ensuing years.

By the Numbers

Let’s put this into concrete terms. According to Coulter, there are at least 50,999,897 traitors in America – all those who voted for Al Gore in 2000. That’s 48% of the electorate. Those 51 million Americans are clearly and demonstrably traitors – because they voted for a liberal and against a conservative.

---

33 Melik Kaylan, “Dr. Johnson, Meet Ann Coulter!,” Wall Street Journal, 8/26/02.
Extrapolating to the general population, then estimated at 294,330,642, 48% of whom are probably traitors, we discover a total of 141,278,708 potential traitors.

Using Coulter’s own logic, any votes against Bush were treasonous, thus Buchananites (448,895) are presumably traitors as well. In fact, most Americans, by Coulter’s calculus, are anti-American, pro-terrorist traitors!

What would she do? Kill all of them?

Despite claiming to be an “extraordinarily good Christian,” Coulter does not adhere to that faith’s doctrines on either life or love. Indeed, Coulter corrupted the evangelical acronym – WWJD: What Would Jesus Do? – to WWJK: Who Would Jesus Kill?

Nice.

Classic Propaganda

Spin is the propagandists métier. A 180° spin completely divorces propaganda from reality. Propagandists like Coulter distort facts, twist logic, and decontextualize sound-bites. The following example shows Coulter at her worst. Her bald assertions are false (note the heavy use of exclamation points) and her cited
material is used out-of-context and is temporally-challenged, as if she were using a prediction about the Korean War to condemn prognosticators of the Vietnam War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Essay:</strong> “Tit for Tet,” 5/25/04; <em>Talk</em>, pg. 69</th>
<th><strong>Nicholas Kristof, New York Times, 9/27/02</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The goalpost of success keeps shifting as we stack up a string of victories. Before the war, *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof warned that war with Iraq would be a nightmare: “(W)e won’t kill Saddam, trigger a coup or wipe out his Republican Guard forces.” (Unless, he weaseled his way out, “we’re incredibly lucky.”)  

We’ve done all that! How incredibly lucky.  

Kristof continued: “We’ll have to hunt out Saddam on the ground – which may be just as hard as finding Osama in Afghanistan, and much bloodier.”  

We’ve captured Saddam! And it wasn’t bloody! Indeed, the most harrowing aspect of Saddam’s capture was that he hadn’t bathed or been de-liced for two months.  

**Reality check:**  
- Hussein is **not** dead (he was deposed)  
- There was no coup  
- The Republican Guard **remains** active  

As the last gulf war showed, a bombing campaign can knock out bridges and barracks, but unless we’re incredibly lucky, we won’t kill Saddam, trigger a coup or wipe out his Republican Guard forces. We’ll have to hunt out Saddam on the ground – which may be just as hard as finding Osama in Afghanistan, and much bloodier.  

**Reality:**  
- published five months **before** the war began  
- referred to bombing campaign  
- we **did** hunt Hussein on the ground

In that very essay, Coulter even alludes to Orwell: “*We have always been at war with Eastasia.*”

**Perpetual Warfare**

The world laughed at Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz when – as American troops seized Baghdad – he proclaimed Iraqi victory. Ann Coulter is the GOP’s Tariq Aziz.

From the universal to the particular, Coulter’s world is propagandistic. Her universal (liberalism = terrorism = treason) is as nonsensical as her particulars (people are safer in Baghdad than Washington, D.C.).

But the propagandist knows how to skew fantasies into “facts” and conspiracies into “reality.” In our post-9/11 world, Coulter seized upon the Orwellian construct of perpetual warfare as a means to preserve power.

Ever since 9/11, Coulter has adopted the Orwellian strategy of waging perpetual warfare against an endless enemies list. In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, Coulter spoke of America’s war against

---

terrorism and her own fatwa against liberals, whom she calls terrorists and traitors. On 12/20/01, yet another target emerged in “Attack France! (Talk, pp. 27-30).”

The invasion and occupation of Iraq, per Coulter, is a textbook military model. All is well in Iraq. (Orwell: “War is Peace!”)

The rebuilding in Iraq is going better than could possibly have been expected.

– Talk, pg. 65

We have found weapons of mass destruction. We found the plants for manufacturing, we found the experiments, we found the room for human experimentation labs. We found lots of weapons of mass destruction.

– O’Reilly Factor, 5/27/04

War is Peace!


O’REILLY: But don’t you believe that the administration underestimated the problems in the post-Saddam era? Don’t you?

COULTER: No, …

O’REILLY: … but again I have to tell you that our Fox News military analysts disagree with you. They say there are a lot of things going wrong in Iraq right now that shouldn’t be going wrong. The commanders on the ground don’t have a lot of respect for the Secretary of Defense. Did you know that?

COULTER: I don’t believe it.

O’REILLY: … that’s what our military guys are getting from the commanders, and I believe them because they’re really good. They were absolutely right on, right up through Saddam
being deposed, our Fox News military analysts were right on, but then there were mistakes made and, of course, there are going to be mistakes made in every war.

COULTER: In every human endeavor and, you know, I can’t argue with these people because they’re not here, they’re anonymous, I mean, you’re telling me about them, but I would like to know what they think has gone wrong.

O’REILLY: I’ll tell you. Here’s what he thinks has gone wrong. Not enough troops on the ground, number one.

COULTER: Yeah, but that’s not a problem. That’s something that can cause a problem.

O’REILLY: Well, it’s a problem in the sense we can’t provide the security that we need to provide for the country to be free.

COULTER: But it’s pretty darn safe over there.

O’REILLY: Our Fox correspondents in Baghdad won’t go out of the hotel. That’s not a good sign, Ann.

COULTER: I wouldn’t go out of the hotel in Washington, D.C. This is the Middle East. This is a country that’s been under a brutal dictator for 30 years ...

O’REILLY: They said there’s not enough boots on the ground, number one. We don’t have enough people providing security. This is the military people, not me. Number two...

COULTER: Not my military people. My military people are [Defense Secretary Donald] Rumsfeld.

O’REILLY: The weapons of mass destruction fiasco when they couldn’t find them.

COULTER: Wait. We have found weapons of mass destruction.

O’REILLY: No we didn’t, not to any great extent.

COULTER: That is an important point. We have found weapons of mass destruction. hat is something the media is repeatedly lying about. We have not found stockpiles. We found the plants for manufacturing, we found the experiments, we found the room for human experimentation labs. We found lots of weapons of mass destruction.

O’REILLY: But not enough to justify what [Secretary of State Colin] Powell said at the U.N.

COULTER: He’s the only one, by the way, it’s enough to justify what Cheney, Rumsfeld, and President Bush said. The one guy in this administration who made the case that turns out to have been not completely correct, I don’t think it was a lie, lie, Bush lied...

O’REILLY: No, but he took what the CIA gave him and he took it to the U.N. and it didn’t work out.

COULTER: It’s one guy and I note the one that the liberals like the most.

O’REILLY: Well, whatever. I just think that for you to say that the war has been going magnificently well, you’re really going against the tides – which you’re absolutely can do.

COULTER: No, but that is precisely my point. This is the new Tet Offensive. Tet was also a victory, and ABC, NBC, CBS, “The New York Times,” “The Washington Post,” they all said it was a horrible defeat. Walter Cronkite went on TV and said we’re in a stalemate, it’s a quagmire while meanwhile...

O’REILLY: I agree with you in a sense that the military certainly is performing magnificently, but I do think that the administration underestimated the difficulty of this campaign.

COULTER: No.
Coulter – Censored Author

With the publication of her *fourth* book, Coulter claimed, “I am one of the most unpublished writers in America – except for my books, which sell pretty well.”

Coulter is perhaps the *most uncensored person in America*. No one holds her accountable for her words. *Far from being unpublished*, everyone can read her words in syndicated columns and on the Internet. Everyone can watch her on TV and listen to her on the radio. Everyone can see her in person on college campuses and at numerous political conferences. *Coulter is an A-list, high-profile celebrity.*

Author and editor David Horowitz was among the first of many to regurgitate Coulter’s claim, buying into her perverse charge that the left-wing media establishment is somehow censoring or suppressing her. When reading the introduction to Ann’s book, I came across her surprising commentary that she is “the most unpublished writer in America.” Hyperbole is Ann's metier, but there is always a heavy dose of reality in any of her claims and this was no exception. Yes, her books make her one of the best-selling authors in America today. But Ann is a columnist first and foremost and to this day, despite her prominence as a public intellectual, her biting wit and colorful prose, not a single major newspaper will carry her column. To read her you need to pick up a copy of *Human Events*, or go to the Internet, the media outlet the left doesn't control.

Despite Coulter’s counterintuitive formulation, in reality, the most unpublished writer is one who has never been published (and they can conservatively be counted in the hundreds of thousands). As for Coulter, early in her writing career she contracted to write a weekly column for *Human Events*, a monthly column for *George* magazine, and a twice-weekly column for Universal Press Syndicate. Thirteen columns a month! Paychecks from three different publishers each month! (Hardly unpublished.)

Add to that four best-selling books, a plethora of profiles and interviews probably nearing the 2,000 mark, and one is only left to wonder if Ann Coulter is insane. *Unpublished?*

Moreover, Coulter has been interviewed and/or profiled in liberal publications such as the *Washington Post*, *Salon*, *New Republic* and *Time*, as well as in popular mainstream magazines like *TV Guide*, *People* and *Esquire*. Of course, political publications like *National Journal*, *Insight* and *Newsmax* have catered to Coulter.

Evidently, *Coulter’s self-portrayal is intended to reinforce her image as a conservative martyr and add ammunition to her charges of “liberal hegemonic control of the media.”* During Coulter’s *Slander* and *Treason* book tours, she alleged liberal media exclusion of her views – censorship from radio and TV talk shows – even though the facts (as usual) proved otherwise.


For an unpublished writer, Coulter gets an awful lot of press. Far from being a conservative victim of the vast left-wing conspiracy, Coulter appeared on a significant number of TV and radio talk shows to promote Talk. (Of note, Coulter often appears on TV talk shows anyway to discuss her columns – something she’s written and, of course, published.)

Coulter’s chapter title in Talk (for her “censored” essays) – “What You Could Have Read If You Lived in a Free Country” – though obviously ludicrous, also suggests a degree of haughtiness. Coulter suggests:

1. We don’t live in a free country.
2. We don’t live in a free country – because Coulter is “censored.” Coulter writes: “The following columns are what editors don’t want you to see.”\(^{37}\)
3. Patriotic publications would publish her work. Coulter writes: “Apparently the only people who want to read me are actual Americans.”\(^{38}\)

Coulter continued:

Perhaps these columns are not as good as I thought they were. But on rereading them, I still think they’re better than they are!\(^{39}\)

As with so much of Coulter’s work, one is left to ask: what does this mean? – “not as good as I thought they were [but] better than they are!”

A Conservative Book Club promo repeated Coulter’s claim that she is “too hot to handle.” Its promo asserted, “Her syndicated column, although brimming with her trademark wit and incisive political observations, appears in only a handful of papers.” Now, at last, we have an answer to that nagging question – just how much is a handful? A “handful” = 100. (Yes, at that time, Coulter was syndicated in about 100 papers, as many as William F. Buckley!)

Coulter’s claims to being unpublished are laughable, even lunatic. Four best-selling books, frequent prime time television talk shows and college campus speeches and debates all correlate with, derive from and fuel her writing career.

If Ann Coulter is unpublished and censored, may we all be so lucky.

\(^{37}\) Talk, pg. 323.
\(^{38}\) Ibid., pg. 321.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., pg. 323.
Case Study # 1
Ann Coulter’s Groupies and Useful Idiots

Several propaganda techniques were employed by Coulter and those who would defend her no matter what. Among them, Newspeak, doublethink, demonization, denial, and projection.

Groupies and Useful Idiots

Ann Coulter’s groupies are impervious to logic, and, like communism’s “useful idiots” of past and present, they will believe what they want to believe, irrespective of the truth. While I would not characterize David Kraemer, the owner of Conservative American, as a Coulter groupie, at the moment he is surely behaving like a useful idiot.

Coulter made false statements in relation to the death of her friend’s sister and has never apologized or corrected the record. Conservative American has repeatedly defended those statements, using an assortment of linguistic word games and propaganda techniques.
The circumstances and background are provided in my essay, “Ann Coulter Exploits Death of Friend’s Sister,” which goes into great detail.

The writer of *Conservative American*’s first essay defending Coulter, Peter Andrew, falsely claimed:  

Polifact jumped to the conclusion that this person lived in California and had Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Neither statement was true.  While a viewer could infer those things from what Coulter said, Coulter did NOT say Julie Stovall was from California and she did NOT say Stovall had Blue Cross.

But Polifact’s analysis and conclusions were correct – based upon the information provided by Coulter, who knew exactly what she was saying when she said it. Polifact inferred what Coulter implied. No, not just implied, but Coulter actually said.

At the time of the controversy – and, indeed, for weeks thereafter – everyone believed that Coulter had claimed Julie lived in California and was thrown off Blue Shield. No one – not even Coulter – disputed those words. No one! Until March 1, 2014, when *Conservative American* concocted its own theory.

**Demonization**

One technique employed by *Conservative American* must be addressed here – demonization. In direct response to my essay critical of Coulter, Kraemer demonized me, ascribing motives of hatred toward Coulter. (Obviously, he has not read my work.) I contacted Kraemer multiple times – via Facebook, tweeter, and his on-line email, to correct his defamation, but to no avail.

For a number of months, there were no changes or retractions to his story. Then, *Conservative American* “corrected” the portion of its column which defamed me.

---

1. Daniel Borchers, “Ann Coulter Exploits Death of Friend’s Sister,” 3/1/14, [www.coulter.com/files/exploited.pdf](http://www.coulter.com/files/exploited.pdf). While one might reasonably argue that my essay title and theme was hyperbolic and sensationalistic, it actually reflects the reality of what transpired. Coulter learned of the death of her friend’s sister. Without getting the exact details, she announced it to the world to get her scoop. Caught in two mistakes, she refused to correct those mistakes – errors which wholly discredited the truly important aspect of her scoop: Julie’s death. Did Coulter ask Doug Graham to write his essay? Perhaps. Indisputably, Coulter posted it on her website to, I believe, take the pressure off of herself – pressure to admit to making a mistake. Surprisingly, to the best of my knowledge, Coulter has never spoken of this story on any other radio or television program, suggesting she is uncomfortable with her own rollout of her scoop.


Apology accepted.

**Infer or Imply**

Kraemer reiterated the logic of the first essay, writing,

> As “evidence,” that she “lied” about the whole story, they pointed to Coulter’s error that Blue Cross had completely pulled out of California. Liberals, especially PolitiFact, incorrectly inferred from that statement something that factually was not implied. As we pointed out in our story, the left assumed that this incorrect statement meant that the friend’s sister lived in California and that she had Blue Cross. Neither of those things were said. Neither were implied. Those are facts.

Sorry, David, but your “facts” are wrong, which will be obvious shortly.

Moreover, it was not “the left” that assumed the inference Kraemer proffers. Rather, everyone believed the inference Coulter implied. Moreover, as I wrote, “Coulter inserted her remarks about California and Blue Shield in the midst of talking about Julie – seamlessly, with no break in thought flow – to specifically detail the cause of Julie’s death. California and Blue Shield were contextually part of Julie’s story and integral to Coulter’s charges.”

**Perfect Sentences**

Kraemer continues:

> Borchers is treating Coulter’s spoken words as if they were written ahead of time in sentence form with grammar check. That’s not how people speak. For some people, many thoughts are going on at one time, and when one hits the surface it comes out, even in mid-thought on something else. It’s sloppy, but it is reality.

Sorry, David, but political experts such as Coulter – who give hundreds and thousands of interviews a year – are accomplished speakers and they very often actually do construct sentences which are grammatically correct. They are accomplished at presenting structured sets of facts and logical sequences
of arguments to support their views. They do it all the time. Lawyers (like Coulter), in particular, are adept at doing so.

Kraemer continues: “So here’s how we would write down the spoken words, the same words, that Borchers writes …”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Borchers’ Version)</th>
<th>(Kraemer’s Version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“She had been thrown off her insurance plan, you know Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California.”</td>
<td>“She had been thrown off her insurance plan. Ya know Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kraemer continues: “The removal of the comma, indicating this Blue Cross statement is a new thought is accurate. Our written version is accurate and Borchers’ is not.”

What evidence does Kraemer provide for the accuracy of his version?

Kraemer continues: “How can we be sure that Borchers is wrong? At the time Coulter made the statements to Fox, she knew Julie Stovall did not live in California. That necessarily means this was just a thought that hit her and she blurted it out.”

How does Kraemer know that Coulter “knew Julie Stovall did not live in California?” How? Because it must have been so? In fact, *Coulter has never publicly stated that Julie did not live in California.*

**Creative Reinterpretation**

Strikingly, no one disputed Borchers’ Version⁵ for almost a month. Coulter – the speaker of the actual words in question – never disputed the conclusion *everyone* reached: that Coulter had said Julie was thrown off Blue Shield in California. Everyone!

Politifact behaved professionally. It operated from the same knowledge base as everyone else. Because the information Coulter provided was false, Politifact’s conclusions were tainted. Politifact even checked with Coulter before publication and she “did not respond to” their request.

We don't know the name of the woman (beyond Julie), the type of coverage she had or anything about her medical history, and Coulter did not respond to our request for more information. But the claim that someone “died from Obamacare” because Blue Shield “completely just pulled out of California” is something we can fact-check.⁶

Coulter’s “lie” became a story because she made a critical mistake and did not correct it! If, in fact, Coulter did not mean to say Julie lived in California, then why did she not correct the reporting right away? Because, even after Politifact’s report, Coulter still believed Julie lived and died in California.

Remember, Kraemer wrote:: “At the time Coulter made the statements to Fox, she knew Julie Stovall did not live in California. That necessarily means this was just a thought that hit her and she blurted it out.”

---

⁴ The two-column, side-by-side, text box is mine, not Kraemer’s.
⁵ This is actually Politifact’s – *and everyone else’s* – version.
Let’s back up here. Coulter knew her friend lives in California. Why would Coulter have to know where her friend’s sister resided? How is it that she had “a thought that hit her and she blurted it out” and that thought was about something that never happened? How could Coulter remember something that never took place?

Again, how did Coulter remember something that never took place? Make that two things that never took place. Coulter claimed people in California used the Obamacare website and that Blue Shield dropped people from coverage. Coulter claimed those two things happened in California, clearly thinking California was where Julie lived – because that’s where her friend, Melanie, lives.

**Coulter was Wrong**

Kraemer continues:

It supported her position, she thought, that Obamacare is kicking millions off insurance plans they liked. It was as if she wanted to say, “Yeah, and Obamacare is doing this to many people, not just Julie.” Obamacare is kicking millions off of plans they liked, but Coulter was wrong about Blue Cross leaving California.

Kraemer finally admits “Coulter was wrong about Blue Cross leaving California.” That was the whole point to begin with. Politifact (and others) investigated this tragedy based upon the scanty information provided by Coulter — information which is now known to be wrong! Politifact’s wrong conclusions necessarily derived from Coulter’s wrong suppositions. Yet, Kraemer and company blame Politifact for Coulter’s errors.

Coulter has never corrected those errors. Instead, as noted in my earlier essay, Coulter attempted to cover them up. If Coulter innocently inserted remarks in the midst of her talking about Julie, why did she never correct the “misunderstanding?” When Politifact and others published their conclusions based upon what Coulter said, why didn’t Coulter explain the error? Because it was Coulter’s error, not theirs.

For fully a month, Coulter did not correct her statements regarding Blue Shield and California even though those statements taint her testimony and detracted from the point that someone had died from Obamacare. Later, Coulter hid behind the grieving family, and, later still, endorsed Conservative American’s phony explanation for her false words.

Kraemer continues: “That does not make the previous sentence (again without the comma) untrue. In fact, the previous sentence was true. Julie Stovall had been thrown off her insurance plan.” Disregarding the debatable comma/period argument, Kraemer is correct in this: the false information provided by Coulter regarding Blue Cross leaving California has no bearing on whether “Julie Stovall had been thrown off her insurance plan.”

The point, once again, is that conservatives have been condemning Politifact for accurately analyzing the information provided by Coulter and reaching the wrong result — solely because of the faulty information provided by Coulter. The error here is Coulter’s, not Politifact’s. Conservatives should ascribe blame where it belongs: to Coulter!

---

7 If Obamacare is truly the single most important issue facing the nation for the foreseeable future (as Coulter would later claim in March), then why would she not immediately correct the record? Because, at first, she didn’t realize she had made a mistake, and, later, because she couldn’t admit she had made a mistake.
Referring back to the title of Kraemer’s hit piece: Yes, I do criticize Conservative American for defending Coulter when it should be standing up for the truth.

Logical Thought Flow

When looked at as everyone at the time viewed Coulter’s words, there is a logical flow of thought. In her lawyerly way, Coulter laid bare the facts of the case she was presenting to sway the jury of her hosts and audience. She presented, step-by-careful-step, her indictment against Obamacare, doing so with her own characteristic flair. Let’s revisit Coulter’s actual words [my comments in bold and brackets].

[1] gets everyone’s attention] A shocking and horrible thing happened to me yesterday. I mean, this does have real-world consequences. I got up in the morning and got an email from a friend saying, [2] states the tragic situation] “my sister almost died [3] provides the cause] because of Obamacare.” [4] provides details] She had been thrown off her insurance plan, [5] adds specifics] you know Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California. A lot of insurance companies have just had to pull out. And there is no competition, I mean, there is fake competition. There are a million insurance companies but they all have to provide under federal law the exact same product. So, have it and go and compete.

So, anyway [6] repeats initial details] she was thrown off her insurance, [7] explains result] she was trying to get insurance some other way, get on Obamacare, she couldn't get through the website. [8] adds health crisis details] And she started to get a fever and she didn’t want to go to the hospital, the emergency room. She didn't know what it was until she got her insurance. So she put it off, she put it off. On Thursday, she went into septic shock.

I was giving a speech yesterday [Saturday], a lunch speech, I went down and mentioned this during the speech – you know, [9] states final outcome] this woman nearly died, she went into septic shock. I got up to my hotel room after the speech and my friend sent me email saying, “my sister died from Obamacare.”

[10] offers conclusion: others will die] But really, it isn't [shocking]. It's expected. We knew this would happen. It's a horrible story and people need to know about these stories. I emailed her, I asked her, “Can I tweet this?” She said, “Julie would be very happy for you to tweet this.”

As noted earlier above, “Coulter inserted her remarks about California and Blue Shield in the midst of talking about Julie – seamlessly, with no break in thought flow – to specifically detail the cause of Julie’s death. California and Blue Shield were contextually part of Julie’s story and integral to Coulter's charges.”

Only Scenario That Fits Facts

The only scenario that fits all of the facts is the one outlined in my essays and briefly bullet-pointed below:

1. Coulter’s friend, Melanie Graham, told Coulter of the death of her sister, Julie Stovall.

---

8 Ann Coulter, Fox & Friends, FNC, 2/2/14. This abbreviated transcript excludes the hosts’ comments.
2. Coulter broke the story of Julie’s death, attributing it to Obamacare. Knowing Melanie lives in California, Coulter assumed Julie did, too, and she therefore presented the facts that had been given to her as if they had happened in California.

3. No specific details were known about Julie, giving rise to much speculation.

4. Politifact investigated what it could – the California aspects given by Coulter – and, based upon that information provided by Coulter, concluded that she was wrong (not just on California insurance, but on the entire scoop).

5. Coulter was silent about those conclusions, probably still not yet realizing where she went wrong.

6. No one – not even Coulter – disputed Politifact’s interpretation of Coulter’s California statements.

7. Whether or not prompted by Coulter, Doug Graham published his story on her website, but without mentioning where Julie lived. Was that an oversight, or did Graham intend to hide the fact that his friend had mistakenly given the wrong state of residence for his sister?

8. Critics (including me) justifiably questioned the credibility of Coulter’s entire story due to the discrediting of part of her story.

9. Coulter continued to remain silent about the entire tragedy (with merely a couple of tweets).

10. Conservative American published its first essay on the tragedy. It creatively reinterpreted Coulter’s easy-to-understand words to explain away any fault on Coulter’s part.


12. Conservative American published its second essay on the tragedy, this time demonizing me.

**Totally Exonerated**

The third paragraph of Kraemer’s diatribe against me begins: “Yet Borchers, always willing to see negative in Coulter, claims we ‘attempted’ (actually, we succeeded) ‘to fully exonerate Coulter’s erroneous scoop.’”

Far from exonerating Coulter, Kraemer has succeeded in generating more questions, the answers to which, in turn, actually serve to solidify the evidence against Coulter.

Ironically, Coulter herself contradicts Conservative American, which had initially claimed in its first essay, “While we did have communications with Ann Coulter …”

In fact, Coulter later posted on her website “I also never communicated with Kraemer, other than an open tweet telling him to READ MY WEBPAGE for Doug Graham’s story …”

Further, Conservative American initially reached the same conclusion I had reached regarding Coulter’s

posting of Doug Graham’s essay. *Conservative American* originally asserted, “After taking heat for the comment, Coulter posted an article …” It later followed Coulter’s lead, changing it to read: “CORRECTION: Ann did not post this in response to any criticism.”

*Conservative American* should have kept its original (accurate) version of that sentence.

**Restoring Conservative Credibility**

As I wrote earlier, “To date, Coulter has yet to correct her false statements and conservative bloggers have falsely attacked Politifact and others for accurately analyzing those errors.”

Coulter groupies and useful idiots who think they are aiding Coulter by defending her errors should come to understand that they are not really helping her. They are, in fact, doing her harm. In over half-a-century of living, Coulter has yet to learn how to admit wrongdoing, apologize, and set things right. Her pride will not permit it. Unless she is held accountable for her words and her actions, she will never grow up.

Those conservatives who defend Coulter when she does not deserve it also do a disservice to Conservatism, besmirching the movement and giving ammunition to its enemies. Words matter. Integrity matters. Principles matter.

If *Conservative American* really wants to combat Obamacare, it should admit Coulter’s errors – errors which, unacknowledged, deeply detract from the merits of Julie’s “true story” – and thus lend greater credibility to its case against Obamacare. By insisting that Coulter was right when she was wrong, *Conservative American* permits its critics to dismiss the story of Julie’s death in its entirety.

That is a double tragedy for the Graham family.

---

Case Study # 2
Plagiarism

Ann Coulter Falsely Accuses Journalist of Plagiarism

In a stunning entry on her website, Ann Coulter falsely accused a journalist of plagiarism. On July 11th, Coulter wrote, “When people wonder what plagiarism is, here’s a perfect example:” Her example (contained in the graphic below) certainly isn’t “perfect.” In fact, it isn’t plagiarism at all.

Ann Coulter Falsely Accuses Journalist of Plagiarism

Where does this nonsense come from? Perhaps from far too many years defaming innocent people and getting away with it. No one ever holds Coulter accountable for her lies!

Coulter’s Plagiarism

Remarkably, while she falsely accused another journalist of plagiarism, Coulter herself has plagiarized on at least two occasions: in High Crimes and Misdemeanors (1998) and Godless (2006).

Coulter very first book, High Crimes and Misdemeanors, contained the words and work of her co-worker, Michael Chapman, whom she later claimed she had never even heard of.

According to Chapman (corroborated by published materials provided by him),

“From what I have seen so far, verbatim passages from my writing are found on pages 121, 122, 219 and 220 of the High Crimes book. Rewritten passages are reproduced on pages 125, 126, 127 and 220. Other material I wrote is paraphrased on pages 123, 124, 203, 204, 205, 214, and 218.”
Chapman continues:

“Furthermore, mostly all of chapter 18, ‘Wampumgate,’ is a rewrite or paraphrase of reporting I did for [Human Events].”

Coulter later privately admitted that she should have given Chapman credit, but she has never done so publicly. The paperback version omitted Chapman entirely.

Coulter’s fifth book, Godless, also plagiarized the work of others, as extensively unearthed by numerous bloggers. As noted by Rude Pundit,

“Much of what has been found in Godless has come from right wing websites or speakers, so the chances of someone suing Coulter is practically nil.” [He was right.]

“The Coulter story is about the basic acceptance of dishonesty in the conservative movement.”

**Conservatives Should Be Embarrassed**

This reality should embarrass conservatives. Do honesty and integrity no longer matter?

As with her first book, the publishers of Godless, of her Human Events’ column, and of her syndicated column all defended Coulter.

The golden goose had to be defended at all costs.

**Interview with A.J. Delgado**

*[Ms. Delgado was kind enough to provide a statement regarding Coulter’s defamation. – DB]*

Ms. Coulter’s allegations are utterly and entirely false. Simply because it seems (someone on Twitter was kind enough to link me to her piece from May 2013) we both used a very similar (and extremely obvious) metaphor to describe an issue, she rushed to accuse me publicly of plagiarism, definitely declaring my work a "clear" case of plagiarism, in front of her 500,000+ Twitter followers, many of which are, undoubtedly, readers, editors, writers, and producers in the industry.

Apparently, no writer can think of an analogy or argument on his/her own, if Ms. Coulter has used it in an article at some point in her career.

To make matters even worse, despite my immediately reaching out to Ms. Coulter via Twitter Direct Message that very day, upon seeing her angry tweets – to assure her I did not use/reference her article in writing mine, nor even read it – and even generously offering to discuss it with her via email or phone, she not only failed to reply but has steadfastly refused to delete the multiple Tweets about me, continuing to defame me.

I wrote an article that discussed the way in which Democrats are abandoning African-Americans in favor of Hispanics. In doing so, I employed the most obvious metaphor: that of a husband leaving his wife for someone else, a ‘trophy wife.’ This is an analogy many, if not most, writers would think of. Yet Ms. Coulter said my doing so was a "clear" case of plagiarism.
I used to appreciate some of Ms. Coulter's stances, and have defended her in the past (it is important to me, at least, that women in media defend and promote one another), so, in addition, this came as quite a shock and has been very hurtful. I suppose my *genius* plan of copying (a) a well-known conservative; and (b) in an article for a major outlet (*National Review*) where she would undoubtedly see it, was foiled. If I were to plagiarize anyone, something I have never and will never do, it would (a) not be Ms. Coulter and (b) at the very least, it would be for an angle far more original than a silly trophy-wife metaphor.

As I am currently exploring my legal options, that is all I am going to comment at this time.

[Notice, Delgado did not plagiarize. Delgado repeatedly contacted Coulter to clear her name. Coulter will not do so. Coulter cannot admit to being wrong. – DB]

**Interview with Mark LaRochelle**

*[On July 15th, I briefly interviewed Mark LaRochelle, columnist for Human Events, about a number of matters. The next morning, we continued our interview. I initiated the chat and he said he would be right back. A few minutes later he returned. It quickly became apparent that Coulter was coaching him. He was more reserved, not as forthcoming as he had been the previous evening. The relevant portions are provided below with annotated footnotes. – DB]*

**July 16, 2014**

**Daniel Borchers**

Have you seen my essay, “Ann Coulter Falsely Accuses Journalist of Plagiarism” at http://t.co/lig5hQLg5S? If so, what are your thoughts?

**Mark LaRochelle**

No.

**Daniel Borchers**

Would you mind checking it out and giving me your thoughts? As a member of the *Human Events* team, you might be able to provide some insight.

**Mark LaRochelle**

I know Chapman.

We talked about the dispute. I understand his frustration.

**Daniel Borchers**

What did Chapman say to you?
Mark LaRochelle

He wanted Coulter to give him something more for his articles from which she had copied passages.\textsuperscript{1} Instead she removed him from the acknowledgements.\textsuperscript{2}

Daniel Borchers

Do you mean that he wanted payment of some kind?

Mark LaRochelle

I don't know the details. I think Coulter had paid him something for research.\textsuperscript{3} He may have wanted co-author (or "with") credit or something.

Daniel Borchers

Do you think it was right for Coulter to fail to ever publicly acknowledge his contribution to her book? To claim that she wrote every word of it? To even deny ever having heard of his name? To threaten lawsuits against those publishing reports about it?

Mark LaRochelle

I don't know about all that.\textsuperscript{4}

I do research, too.\textsuperscript{5}

Sometimes I ghostwrite.\textsuperscript{6}

I'm more concerned about getting the information out than getting credit.\textsuperscript{7}

Daniel Borchers

You don't have an opinion, Mark?

Do you think her behavior is emblematic of someone with integrity?

Michael wasn't ghostwriting. Totally different. Did you get paid for ghostwriting?

Michael published articles and reports and did research and he was given absolutely no credit. Ann even besmirched his name.

\textsuperscript{1} This is an admission that Coulter “copied passages” from Chapman’s articles.
\textsuperscript{2} This is an utter impossibility as High Crimes and Misdemeanors did not have an Acknowledgements section. Already the lies are materializing.
\textsuperscript{3} Coulter paid Chapman absolutely nothing!
\textsuperscript{4} He doesn’t have an opinion about a colleague’s adherence to moral and ethical practices in journalism?
\textsuperscript{5} So? Don’t all journalists?
\textsuperscript{6} Relevancy?
\textsuperscript{7} That’s nice. Stealing credit is illegal. Besides, Chapman did want the credit – credit to which he was entitled.
Mark LaRochelle

I have too many beams in my own eye to go around throwing stones. I have forgiven people for much worse. And there are much bigger problems confronting us.  

Daniel Borchers

This isn't about throwing stones, it is about accountability. And it is about the truth.

Ann plagiarized from Michael, lied about Michael, threatened legal action against anyone who spoke the truth about it. Is that integrity?

Moreover, this is but one example – an instance you are personally familiar with. But Ann has exhibited a pattern of such unethical, immoral, and ungodly behavior.

How can conservatives possibly hold liberals accountable for their misconduct if we can't even address significant failings such as this on our side of the aisle?

And would God – the God who indeed does forgive – would He want the truth to be hidden, the lies to be concealed, the sin to be continued? I think not.

Mark LaRochelle

I don't think criticism of Coulter is that well hidden. She is probably the single most defamed individual since McCarthy.

Daniel Borchers

It's only defamation if it is false.

But you still haven't addressed my questions.

Mark LaRochelle

Virtually all the vilification of Coulter that chokes the media is false.

Daniel Borchers

We can disagree on that. But what of Ann's plagiarism? Do you condone that? Excuse that? Ignore that?

---

8 In other words, he is turning a blind eye to his colleague’s wrongdoing – because she is his colleague (and rich and powerful). What she did wasn’t so bad, so let’s forget it. Let’s hide the truth. Besides, I forgive her, so Chapman should, too.

9 Certainly, Coulter is a very criticized person – from the Left. Very few conservatives criticize her, especially when she deserves criticism.

10 Actually, Coulter is probably the most defaming individual since McCarthy. Most substantive criticisms of Coulter are largely accurate and based in reality. Coulter does lie, does use hate speech, does employ elimination rhetoric, and does deliberately offend other people.

11 The reverse is true.
Mark LaRochelle

Any number of left-wing luminaries have committed genuine, legally actionable plagiarism.\(^{12}\) Yet they are lionized and promoted by tax-funded agencies like the National Institute for the Humanities, PBS and NPR; they are given awards and rewards.\(^{13}\) Whenever a conservative such as Rush or Coulter dares speak out, they must be silenced and banished like McCarthy.\(^{14}\)

Daniel Borchers

So, because others do it, it's OK for Ann to break the law? It's OK for Ann to besmirch the reputation of the person she victimized? It's OK for Ann to threaten truth-seekers? It's OK for Regnery to side with Ann – lie! – and leave Michael high and dry?

When does doing the right thing cease to be the right thing to do?

Mark LaRochelle

When Chapman wrote for *Human Events*, he was writing for Regnery. They paid him for his work. It was theirs.\(^{15}\) They allowed Coulter to use it. She put Chapman in her acknowledgements.\(^{16}\) I understand Chapman's position. Been there, done that.

Daniel Borchers

1) Ann did not put Michael in her acknowledgements. She has never publicly acknowledged his contribution. In fact, she denied his contribution, denied even ever having heard his name.

2) Michael's research was Michael's.

3) Regnery lied about Michael's part in her book, saying that every word was Ann Coulter's. EVERY WORD.

Mark LaRochelle

I have a first edition hard copy. Chapman is in the acknowledgements.\(^{17}\)

*I was taken aback by his clear, bold, and unequivocal statement. For a very brief moment, I questioned myself. But then I distinctly remembered that High Crimes is the only Coulter book without an Acknowledgement.*

LaRochelle lied. Why would he lie about possessing a book he did not have with an Acknowledgement it did not contain? Why would he lie about something so fact-checkable? It wasn't his lie, it was Coulter's.

\(^{12}\) Consider his immediate parsing and equivocation: “genuine, legally actionable plagiarism.” Coulter's plagiarism was definitely genuine and legally actionable, but his assertion implies it isn't.

\(^{13}\) The Left gets away with it, so shouldn't Coulter? Can we please dispense now and forever with the “everybody does it” defense?

\(^{14}\) The issue is not silencing or censorship, it is plagiarism – a crime!

\(^{15}\) *Human Events* may have owned the published work, but not the credit. Chapman deserves the recognition.

\(^{16}\) Once again, *High Crimes* did not contain an Acknowledgement. This is pure fiction.

\(^{17}\) A flat out lie, as noted above. Coulter must have provided these words to LaRochelle. Who would volunteer such an assertion on their own, one which could so easily be refuted if inaccurate? LaRochelle clearly did not know there was no Acknowledge in *High Crimes*. Coulter must have dictated his answer, lying to me (and to LaRochelle).
Liars live in the moment. They always believe that their next lie will cover-up their last one. Besides, Coulter wasn’t lying to me (she knows I know the truth). She was lying to her colleague. – DB]

**Daniel Borchers**

Would you please provide the citation?

**Mark LaRochelle**

After Chapman made a public dispute, Coulter (or Regnery) removed his name from later editions. ¹⁸

**Daniel Borchers**

Please provide the citation.

Also, why spitefully remove his name if he was originally acknowledged? His contribution to her book still remains his contribution.

When privately questioned about the omission of Michael's name, why did Ann say it would be corrected in the softcover, but never correct it?

**Mark LaRochelle**

I don't know about that. Acknowledgement is at the author's discretion. If I accused an author who acknowledged my research of plagiarism, I wouldn't be surprised to be removed. ¹⁹

As far as “Chapman's research is his own” – I wish! *Human Events* retains the rights to every article I ever got paid for.

**Daniel Borchers**

"Research" not "article" – unpublished research.

**Mark LaRochelle**

How did Coulter acquire Chapman's unpublished work?

**Daniel Borchers**

Terence Jeffrey wanted Ann and Michael to co-author the book. Terence asked Michael to give everything he had to Ann. He did so, expecting credit and/or co-authorship.

**Mark LaRochelle**

I'll ask Terry about that.

---

¹⁸ Yet another *detailed lie* provided by Coulter. Chapman certainly never made that claim. Coulter is the only possible source for this lie. Moreover, the public dispute arose years later, not 1998. Chapman tried, *privately*, to address the matter.

¹⁹ Yet another rationalization. If Coulter had credited him in her Acknowledgement, there would have been no basis for a charge of plagiarism. She could have easily said, “Look, here’s your credit!”
Daniel Borchers

Please do. Also, would you mind scanning that Acknowledgement for me?

Thanks in advance.

[After a lengthy pause]
Can you get back to me on Terry and the Acknowledgement?

July 21, 2014

[I waited for several days for LaRochelle to do his research on Terry and the Acknowledgement. – DB]

Daniel Borchers

Hi Mark. Are you there?

Hi Mark. Do you have a moment?

Were you able to scan the High Crimes’ Acknowledgement for me?

[Shortly afterwards, LaRochelle blocked my access to his Facebook page. – DB]

July 22, 2014

[The following morning, I sent the following email to LaRochelle. – DB]

Subject: Ann Coulter’s Plagiarism

Dear Mark,

Thank you for your (abruptly terminated) Facebook chat. Have you ever noticed that people who refuse to talk are generally those who have something to hide?

I eagerly anticipated seeing your scan of Ann’s Acknowledgement in High Crimes. My own first editions (both hard cover and soft cover) of High Crimes contain no Acknowledgement whatsoever. I’d like to see what yours looks like.

Ann lied to you, she lied about Michael (and me), and she has turned you into a liar, too.

You have discovered how easy it is to become an enabler, to condone and enable sin, instead of what we are called to do: expose the unfruitful works of darkness (Eph. 5:11-14).

The bottom line: Ann plagiarized from Michael, using his words and his research without giving him credit. That is the very definition of plagiarism. Then she denied knowing him, attacked him, and threatened legal action against the press reporting on it. Cover-up? Of course.

Moreover, Regnery literally said that High Crimes was 100% Ann Coulter. A lie. And now you have joined the ranks of those who will defend Ann no matter how wrong she is.

Would Jesus approve?
If you want to talk, I can be reached at 240-476-9690.

You can use this email address: coulterwatch@yahoo.com.

Sincerely,

Dan Borchers

[Not without its irony, in my first interview with LaRochelle, Mark wrote “My personal experience (with Ann) is mostly in helping with the research for her McCarthy chapters in ‘Treason.’” Would that be the Treason in which LaRochelle was not credited? Yes!

I wonder what Mark thinks of Ann’s tweets: “I do all my own research”20 and “No one does my research for me, but me.”21 – DB]

The Plagiarism Trap

The publication of High Crimes and Misdemeanors launched Ann Coulter’s literary career and expanded her meager credentials as a journalist.

In 1998, on Washington Journal, Coulter boasted of how impressed her law professors were over her own research: “Both my undergraduate at Cornell and University of Michigan professors have been quite impressed with what I’ve turned up on “high crimes and misdemeanors.”22 What, exactly, did Coulter “turn up” that so impressed her professors? As it turns out, one of her most cited sources was the Rodino Report (on Watergate), which was coauthored by Hillary Rodham Clinton who, seemingly, did the grunt work for Coulter.

While Coulter verbally took credit for research performed by Hillary Clinton, wife of her intended impeachment target in High Crimes, in late 2001, it was discovered that she also took credit for her colleague’s research into and reporting of various Clinton scandals.

In October 2001, the Boston Globe published a scoop revealing allegations of plagiarism by Coulter, who then threatened a lawsuit if the story was published. Regnery stood by its best-selling author (money talks, power corrupts), denying any plagiarism took place. The facts prove otherwise.

The most factual of Coulter’s books, High Crimes perhaps owes that accuracy in part to its undisclosed de facto co-author, Michael Chapman.

Published in June 1998, to both capitalize on and influence the impending impeachment of President Clinton, High Crimes included both the words and the research of Michael Chapman.

---

20 Ann Coulter tweet, 3/7/12, 11:37 p.m.
21 Ann Coulter tweet, 3/7/12, 11:23 p.m.
who at that time was Associate Editor for *Human Events*. According to a corroborating source at *Human Events*, Regnery “should have given him credit. They treated him wrong on that. He really wrote and researched most of the material. The book does not acknowledge the huge amount of research done by Michael Chapman.”

As of this writing, Regnery and Eagle Publishing have never officially credited Chapman’s contribution to this book, despite the written evidence and the direct personal knowledge of key players at Eagle Publishing. Indeed, they – and Coulter herself – assert Coulter’s sole authorship of *High Crimes*.

Not only does Coulter continue to claim she wrote every word, she even denies knowing – and knowing of – Michael Chapman, a co-worker with whom she attended weekly editorial meetings at *Human Events*. However, Coulter did admit to a Coulter fan and friend of Chapman, at a CPAC conference, that the exclusion of Chapman’s name from her book was “an editorial oversight.” The chronology – and the actions of Coulter et. al. – prove otherwise.

**Plagiarism & Ghost Writers**


> “[*Hillary Clinton*] has a ghost writer ... I believe you write your own books.”
> — Ann Coulter

MATTHEWS: “Let me ask you, why’s your book going to be better than Hillary’s?”

COULTER: “Well, for one thing, because I wrote my book.”

MATTHEWS: “Are you charging Hillary with plagiarism or having a ghost writer?”

COULTER: “No, no, well, of course, she has a ghost writer. I mean, I don’t think that’s disputed or particularly dishonorable. But I believe you write your own books.”

Coulter chided Hillary Clinton for not writing her book when, as it turns out, Coulter’s first book, *High Crimes and Misdemeanors*, was not entirely her own. Coulter borrowed some sections from a co-worker whom she later disavowed even knowing. Portions of *High Crimes* were unquestionably plagiarized from Michael Chapman and portions may even have been ghostwritten by David Wagner. Let’s examine the chronology.

**February & March, 1998 – Other Authors**

Circa Feb. 12th – Terence P. Jeffrey (Editor, *Human Events*) and Michael Chapman (Associate Editor and Clinton reporter for *Human Events*), were originally tasked with writing an impeachment book.

Circa Feb. 13th – Jeffrey dissolved the agreement because he didn’t believe that Clinton had committed an impeachable offense.


---

23 Author interview.
24 *Hardball*, CNBC, 5/1/03.
25 Author interview.
Feb. 20th – Chapman presented Regnery with a proposal containing the same terms and conditions of his previous agreement with Jeffrey.

Circa Feb. 23rd – Mark Ziebarth rejected Chapman’s conditions, which included insistence on co-authorship credit and copyright retention.

Circa March 2nd – Coulter entered Chapman’s office, demanding his files and research. Chapman says, “She was adamant, impatient, and acted as if she deserved those files.” Chapman later gave those files (paper and electronic) to Thomas M. Winter (Editor-in-Chief, Human Events). “Tom told me that he was sure they would have to give me some type of credit or acknowledgement.”

Early March – David Wagner (former writer for Insight magazine) took possession of the office next to Chapman’s to ghost-write the manuscript for Coulter. Chapman says, “Wagner was ghostwriting the Coulter manuscript. He had Human Events articles and the booklets on impeachment and other materials in his office. Everyone in the office knew what was going on. It was no secret.”

June 8, 1998 – Original Research

Coulter appeared on C-Span’s Washington Journal boasting that “both my undergraduate at Cornell and University of Michigan professors have been quite impressed with what I’ve turned up on ‘high crimes and misdemeanors.’” Actually, Coulter drew heavily from Raoul Berger’s book, the Rodino Report and the Federalist Papers.

Indeed, the preponderance of materials directly related to “high crimes and misdemeanors” is actually contained in those three sources. Hardly “original” research. One could reasonably contend that Hillary Rodham “turned up” more on “high crimes and misdemeanors” in the Rodino Report than Coulter did in High Crimes.

August, 1998 – Book Publication

Regnery published High Crimes and Misdemeanors under Coulter’s sole byline. The cover prominently featured President Clinton’s photo. Subsequent reprints and paperback versions sport a Coulter photo and sole authorship given to Coulter.

December 17, 1998 – Michael Chapman

Michael Chapman sent a letter to the Trustees of the Phillips Foundation. In it he stated:

From what I have seen so far, verbatim passages from my writing are found on pages 121, 122, 219 and 220 of the High Crimes book. Rewritten passages are reproduced on pages 125, 126, 127 and 220. Other material I wrote is paraphrased on pages 123, 124, 203, 204, 205, 214, and 218.

Furthermore, mostly all of chapter 18, ‘Wampumgate,’ is a rewrite or paraphrase of reporting I did for HE.

---

28 Staff report, House Committee on the Judiciary, 93rd Congress, “Constitutional Grounds for Presidential Impeachment,” 2/22/74.
Consider this comparative sampling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 13</strong>: “Four Democratic fundraisers have stated that former DNC Finance Chairman Marvin Rosen explicitly advocated selling access to the President...”</td>
<td><strong>Page 219</strong>: “At least four Democratic fund-raising officials have revealed that former DNC Finance Chairman Marvin Rosen explicitly advocated selling access to the President...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 13</strong>: “A DNC fundraiser told Nynex executives they would receive invitations to White House ‘coffees’ if they joined the DNC’s ‘Managing Trustees’ program and agreed to donate $100,000 ...”</td>
<td><strong>Page 219</strong>: “A DNC fundraiser told Nynex Corporation executives that they would receive invitations to White House coffees if they joined the DNC’s ‘Managing Trustees’ program and agreed to donate $100,000 ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 28</strong>: “Harry Thomason, the Hollywood TV executive famous for producing ‘Evening Shade’ and ‘Designing Women,’ ... He is an old friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton, having first met the future President when Thomason was a high school football coach in the 1970s in Arkansas. ... Thomason, meanwhile, started to spread rumors about the Travel Office.”</td>
<td><strong>Page 121</strong>: “Harry Thomason, the Hollywood television executive famous for producing such shows as <em>Evening Shade</em> and <em>Designing Women</em>, was a major Clinton fund-raiser. He is an old friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton, having first met the future president when Thomason was an Arkansas high school football coach in the 1970s. ... Thomason spread rumors about the Travel Office.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**October 18, 2001 – Boston Globe**

Rumors about Chapman’s work reached the *Boston Globe* and Coulter’s attack machine *immediately* went into action. Coulter threatened lawsuits and denied ever knowing – or having heard of – Chapman.

Richard E. Signoreli, Coulter’s lawyer, sent Alex Beam an email to dissuade him from publication.

> I am legal counsel for Ann Coulter. I write in connection with an article that I understand you are preparing about my client and her book, *High Crimes and Misdemeanors*. You should know that Ms. Coulter’s book was not ghostwritten at all. Ms. Coulter researched and wrote the entire book from beginning to end with no assistance whatsoever from any ghostwriter.

> This e-mail will put you on notice that the information you are receiving from a Michael Chapman about this subject is completely false. Ms. Coulter does not even know who Mr. Chapman is and Mr. Chapman did not contribute any writing or research for her book.

> We consider any statement by anyone that Ms. Coulter’s book was ghostwritten not only to be totally and recklessly false, but libelous as well. Ms. Coulter’s reputation will be significantly harmed if such a statement was printed in your newspaper. Please be

---

29 Alex Beam, *Boston Globe*, 10/18/01.
30 Email provided to me by Richard E. Signoreli.
advised that legal action will be taken against you, the Boston Globe, and Mr. Chapman if your article states that Ms. Coulter’s book was ghostwritten, or was even partially written by someone else.

Nevertheless, the *Boston Globe* story was published:

… But now Coulter is facing less welcome publicity – the suggestion that she is not the sole author of the 1998 bestseller “High Crimes and Misdemeanors” that brought her to national prominence as a telegenic Clinton-basher and poster girl for the right-wing establishment.

The charges were first leveled in a memo by Michael Chapman, formerly a colleague of Coulter’s at the conservative weekly Human Events. In December 1998, shortly after Coulter’s book came out, Chapman complained to his bosses that a lot of his original research and reporting – carried out for a special 1997 Human Events supplement called “A Case for Impeachment” – ended up in Coulter’s book. In several instances, he wrote, his work was reproduced verbatim, paraphrased, or slightly rewritten, but never acknowledged. Chapman had originally volunteered to ghostwrite the impeachment book, but Regnery Publishing, which is owned by the same company as Human Events, didn’t sign a contract with him. Instead, David Wagner, then a writer at Insight magazine, was hired to write a draft of the impeachment book project. …

Regnery’s executive editor Harry Crocker said Wagner “drew some stuff together. Ann read those chapters and she read Chapman’s work as well. They offered some basis for source material, but it was my impression that she threw those drafts away as irrelevant. … If you took a page of [Chapman’s impeachment report] and a page of her book, she thinks you wouldn’t find any overlap. The book is 100 percent Ann Coulter.” …

Richard E. Signorelli sent Beam a second email, this one to encourage a retraction. In the second, Signorelli wrote:


As is obvious on the face of the report, Chapman was the sole author only of the introduction to that report (which is not the source of the statements you cite as evidence of misuse.) The rest was a Human Events staff report that lifted passages directly from, among other things, Ms. Coulter’s earlier columns in Human Events. It is outrageous – intentionally malicious – that you neglect to mention the indisputably crucial fact that Ms. Coulter herself was part author of the very report you accuse her of misusing. Incidentally, Ms. Coulter still does not recall knowing Mr. Chapman. …

As I repeatedly informed you, Ms. Coulter researched and wrote all of High Crimes and Misdemeanors from beginning to end with no assistance whatsoever. Her editor and publisher can confirm this. …

---

31 Email provided to me by Richard E. Signorelli.
Errors in these two emails from Coulter’s lawyers include:

- If Coulter was a co-author of the Special Report, this contradicts her claim of not knowing Chapman. Material from Chapman’s article (“Casino Lobbyist: ‘I talk to Al Gore a Lot,’ Wanted Veep to Intervene with Babbitt,” by Michael Chapman, Human Events, 2/13/98) was not in the Special Report, but was in Coulter’s book.
- The Special Report first appeared as a special supplement in the 5/23/97 issue of Human Events. Michael Chapman was the sole byline, with no reference to “Human Events editors.”
- The booklet version of the special report (“A Case for Impeachment?”) also has a sole byline for Chapman. Of its approximately 50 pages, Coulter provided short sections subtitled “The Law” on pages 10, 15, 23, 27, 31, 34, 38 and 43 (a total of 24 paragraphs out of 50 pages). The remainder of the material was not Coulter’s. The plagiarized portions were not part of her paragraphs.

Coulter’s editor and publisher do not confirm that Coulter had “no assistance whatsoever.” Coulter had the benefit of the writing, research and analysis of both Michael Chapman and David Wagner. (The Globe published the feature but rewarded Coulter with a coveted seat at their table at the next White House Correspondents’ Dinner.)

Alfred Regnery, President of Regnery Publishing, explained the genesis of Coulter’s first book. “We originally came up with it in our office. Part of it was published in Human Events originally. Ann Coulter then got involved in it. She wrote the book. It didn’t take more than six months probably from the time she got involved till we had book. The book’s first printing went out in large quantities. Subsequent printings. New York Times best seller. Lots of promotion. It was a big book.”[^32] He confirmed that the concept arose before Coulter became involved.

**January, 2002 – Book Publication**

Regnery published High Crimes in paperback, again without acknowledging Michael Chapman’s contribution.

**Current Status**

Coulter lied and threatened lawsuits to conceal the personally humiliating fact that her career-making first (and perhaps best) best-selling book plagiarized the work of a colleague. Neither Coulter nor Regnery will publicly acknowledge Chapman’s contribution to High Crimes, nor have they even offered Chapman a private apology for their “editorial oversight” in failing to give credit where credit is due.

[The media resurrected Coulter’s plagiarism in High Crimes when it was discovered that she also plagiarized in Godless (2006). This chapter does not delve into that already well-documented instance of plagiarism. The point has already been made: Coulter is a confirmed plagiarist! – DB]

[^32]: Author interview.
Plagiarism Redux

Allegations of plagiarism in Godless arose on the heels of Coulter’s “ecstatic widows” controversy. The New York Post broke the story in early July. Philip Recchia reported:

John Barrie, the creator of a leading plagiarism-recognition system, claimed he found at least three instances of what he calls “textbook plagiarism” in the leggy blond pundit’s “Godless: the Church of Liberalism” after he ran the book's text through the company's digital iThenticate program. …

Barrie, CEO of iParadigms, told The Post that one 25-word passage from the “Godless” chapter titled “The Holiest Sacrament: Abortion” appears to have been lifted nearly word for word from Planned Parenthood literature published at least 18 months before Coulter's 281-page book was released. … [other examples cited]

Instances of plagiarism appear throughout Godless. One lengthy sentence on page five apparently came from a 1999 Portland Press-Herald article. Language on page 37 appears to have been derived from a Parents Television Council report in 2002. One sentence on page 95 came from a 2004 Planned Parenthood pamphlet. Another lengthy sentence on page 209 was lifted from a San Francisco Chronicle article in 2005.

On page 55, “Coulter employs language similar to a December, 2004 article written by Gregory D. Kesich for the Portland Press Herald on convicted killer Dennis Dechaine, but offers no citations for her summation of the case.”

On page 63, “Coulter employs language similar to that in a February, 2005 article published in the New York Sun, written by David Salisbury, the Director of the Center for Educational Freedom at the Cato Institute, as well as numbers used in the Sun, without citing any source at all.”

Several sentences and phrases on pages 66-67 were taken from an “October 27, 1988 press conference with Republican Senate candidate Alan Keyes and Cliff Barnes.” Coulter “presents the exact same information in the exact same order as Barnes did back in 1988, including many directly quoted phrases, without citing anywhere the source for the information. As if it just appeared out of thin air. No footnotes. No mention in the text.”

36 “Retraction to WWE And the Public,” Parents Television Council, 7/11/02.
38 “Pity This Blushing Bride-To-Be,” San Francisco Chronicle, 7/3/05.
On page 162, “Coulter apparently lifted language, along with the entire premise, primarily from the ‘executive summary’ of a 35-page report44 written by Paul Ciotti in March of 1988 for the Cato Institute called ‘Lessons from the Kansas City Desegregation Experiment.’”45

Chapter 7 of Godless provides 16 examples of “successful treatments achieved by adult stem cell research.” Columnist Ron Brynaert notes that 15 of those examples “are nearly identical to items in a longer list of seventeen compiled by the Illinois Right To Life website,46 that has been available since at least September of 2003.” Brynaert adds, “For these fifteen items, Coulter appears to do little more than remove the parentheses and slightly change a word or two, such as ‘using’ into ‘with.’”47

Coulter’s publisher, Crown Forum, after a cursory examination of only three “snippets,” ridiculed plagiarism accusations in their official statement: “We have reviewed the allegations of plagiarism surrounding Godless and found them to be as trivial and meritless as they are irresponsible. Any author is entitled to do what Ann Coulter has done in the three snippets cited: research and report facts. The number of words used by our author in these snippets is so minimal that there is no requirement for attribution. As an experienced author and attorney, Ms. Coulter knows when attribution is appropriate, as underscored by the nineteen pages of hundreds of endnotes contained in Godless.”

About those endnotes, Recchia also reported:48

Meanwhile, many of the 344 citations Coulter includes in “Godless” “are very misleading,” said Barrie, who holds a Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley, where he specialized in pattern recognition.

“They're used purely to try and give the book a higher level of credibility – as if it's an academic work. But her sloppiness in failing to properly attribute many other passages strips it of nearly all its academic merits,” he told The Post.

Initially, Universal Press Syndicate claimed it would investigate these allegations, declaring, “We take allegations of plagiarism seriously. It's something we'd like to investigate further. We'd like to see a copy of the report. We'd like to start looking into it.”49 A whitewash was apparent in its final statement to Editors & Publishers: “In addition to looking at the columns mentioned in the New York Post story, we also reviewed a sampling of other columns that have been mentioned in the media. Like her book publisher, Crown, Universal Press Syndicate finds no merits to the allegations of plagiarism brought by the software company executive. There are only so many ways you can rewrite a fact and minimal matching text is not plagiarism.”

The websites of Coulter’s two alma maters offer definitions of plagiarism which refute the claims of Coulter’s publishers.50 Cornell University is very clear in what constitutes plagiarism:51 “where you reproduce part or all of someone else’s idea in your own words (commonly known as paraphrasing), where you use or summarize someone else’s research, where you use facts or data that are not common

References courtesy of Rude Pundit.

knowledge, where you reproduce source material in slightly altered form while retaining the main idea or structure. Both direct and indirect citations require proper documentation.”

The **University of Michigan** is equally direct and damning:“Plagiarism is representing someone else's ideas, words, statements or other works as one's own without proper acknowledgment or citation. Examples of plagiarism are: Copying word for word or lifting phrases or a special term from a source or reference without proper attribution. Paraphrasing: using another person's written words or ideas, albeit in one's own words, as if they were one's own thought. Borrowing facts, statistics, or other illustrative material without proper reference, unless the information is common knowledge, in common public use.”

52 See [http://www.lsa.umich.edu/lsa/detail/0,2034,53%5Farticle%5F294,00.html](http://www.lsa.umich.edu/lsa/detail/0,2034,53%5Farticle%5F294,00.html).
Case Study # 3
Xenophobia: Soccer Flops and Nativism Gone Amok

[This case study was originally published as a series of essays on my blog. – DB]

Part 1: Coulter’s Soccer Flop
Part 2: Coulter’s Soccer Flop – Part Deux
Part 3: Coulter’s Soccer Flop – Part Trois
Part 4: Ann Coulter Auditions for U.N. Ambassador

Coulter’s Soccer Flop

Why Coulter Trashed Soccer and What It Reveals About Coulter

Ann Coulter leapt off the cliff with her universally-criticized polemic against soccer. Many questioned why she would write something so absurd about something of which she is so ignorant. Permit me to offer both a rationale for her behavior and insight into what it reveals about Coulter.
Last week, Coulter again garnered global attention with a laughable column\(^1\) devoted to a sport she neither likes nor understands. Her xenophobic diatribe was absurd, inaccurate, irrational, and dogmatic. (Even conservatives panned it.) Moreover, she politicized a global sport and demeaned its fans.

But this as merely an extension of Coulter’s politicization of the whole of life.

**Shoddy Journalism**

The Fourth Estate and social media were awash with reports which revealed Coulter’s utter ignorance of the subject of her essay, which was replete with basic factual errors in virtually everything she asserted. (A simple Google search will find many items providing detailed examinations of all of her claims.)

Although Coulter asserted that soccer is a left-wing conspiracy to undermine America, many conservatives rebuked her.\(^2\)

On *Townhall* (one of Coulter’s primary distribution sites), two conservatives observed:

“We’re guessing Ann’s never watched a soccer game because if she had, she’d realize most of her points are ludicrous. We’re reminded of Nancy Pelosi’s comment about having to *pass the bill so we know what’s in it.* Ann just simply doesn’t know or understand soccer.”\(^3\)

At the *Daily Caller*:

“Ann Coulter is, at her best, a provocative and entertaining performance artist. Unfortunately, there are times when her poststructuralist reasoning falls short of insightful analysis. An excellent example of such a time comes from last week, when she dedicated a column to soccer. … And it goes on and on like that, misunderstanding after misunderstanding.”\(^4\)

One Coulter critic asserted that we need Ann Coulter in order to unify against a common enemy, writing, “We need Ann Coulter because the world needs villains to unite everyone.”\(^5\)

Coulter, a villain? Please explain! “Ann Coulter is doing what Ann Coulter does – showing what it means to be the worst humanity has to offer.” This blogger observed what others have in the past:

“If you’re surprised by Ann Coulter’s rage against the World Cup, then shame on you. This type of blind rage and mindless speculation is what has made her career. She is a shameless opportunist who will use

---


whatever is in the news to push her message of hatred, bigotry, and divisiveness. She plays to an audience of rage-machines who love to hate what they don’t understand.”

Criticisms of Coulter’s column populated the social media. Here are a few samplings from the *Fairfield Daily Voice.*

- "Ann Coulter meets a new low. I have no words. Probably the worst column I’ve read. And I don't even like soccer," Alexander Hallberg said via @wingate32
- "The biggest fail of Ann Coulter's presumably mock-Xenophobic and tongue-in-cheek-ignorant anti-soccer rant is that it wasn't actually funny," Jim Piddock said via @realjimpiddock.
- "Hate to give it more attention because that was the whole purpose of the article, but Ann Coulter's piece on soccer was truly truly awful," Alex Eaton said @EatonGood.
- Alex Kantrowitz @Kantrowitz called it "Ann Coulter self-parody."
- "Hilarious anti-soccer anti-immigration op-ed from @AnnCoulter that reads like an Onion piece," Kris Nielsen said @KrisNielsenKC.

**Conservatives United**

One of Coulter’s fellow Floridians, Frank Cerabino of the *Palm Beach Post*, offered six reasons why conservatives should love soccer:

1. Soccer rewards top performers
2. Soccer punishes failure
3. Soccer is anti-regulatory
4. Soccer is not litigious
5. Soccer celebrates the corporation
6. Soccer prizes a strong defense

**Sampling of Headlines**

A sampling of headlines this past week provides a sense of the coverage given Coulter’s column. It should be noted that many critiques of Coulter included conservatives as a whole within those critiques – considering Coulter as *representative* of all conservatives.

**Headlines included:**

- “How Ann Coulter Lost Her Mind Over World Cup Soccer”
- “Americans enjoying the World Cup is driving Ann Coulter crazy”

---

“Romneycare Supporter Ann Coulter is 100% Wrong About Soccer”
“Ann Coulter is not so much wrong as stupid about Soccer”
“The Only Response To Ann Coulter’s Completely Idiotic Comments About Soccer And America”
“Ann Coulter's Rant Against Soccer Is Her Craziest Yet”
“5 Reasons Ann Coulter's Anti-Soccer Rant Is Brilliant”
“Some people will use any reason to be angry or to keep us angry at each other – even soccer”
“Ann Coulter calls soccer a liberal conspiracy”
“Is Anne Coulter writing for The Onion these days?”
“Ann Coulter's World Cup jaw-dropper”
“Ann Coulter's ridiculous World Cup claims underline conservatives' growing anxiety about our hyper-connected world”
“Ann Coulter Slammed by Conservatives for Dissing Soccer”
“Ann Coulter, the World Cup, and the Right’s Extreme Xenophobia”
“‘Soccer Operative’ Ann Coulter Should Stick to Bashing Liberals”
“Ann Coulter’s Anti-World Cup Rant Is Stuck on American Exceptionalism”
“Coulter, not soccer, to blame for country’s moral decay”

**Another Miley Cyrus Moment?**

Coulter’s continual use of the shock factor prompted conservative author Bernard Goldberg to write, “Ann Coulter is the Miley Cyrus of political commentary.” Goldberg even suggested that Ann’s next book should be a memoir entitled, *How I Desperately Tried to Stay Relevant by Becoming Miley.*

Ironically, Coulter’s increasingly desperate attempts to remain relevant further erode any credibility she may still have, thus making her even more irrelevant.

Coulter has taken a (soccer) wrecking ball to wreak havoc upon her enemy, using shock and awe tactics to promote herself, keeping herself in the limelight. But her very position in the limelight sheds light upon every error (forced or not), every misstep, and every excess that she employs to get all those lights shining on her.  

---


9 Coulter is used to, comfortable with, and feels entitled to being in the spotlight. She thrives on the attention – and she will do anything she can to get it. See David Daley, “Ann Coulter: light’s all shining on her,” *Hartford Courant,* 6/25/99.
One columnist observed: “(Key investment rule: When Ann Coulter starts calling something a sign of America’s decline, you know it has caught on.)”

Coulter Doubles Down

Rivaling President Obama’s arrogance, last night Coulter posted a second soccer polemic, doubling down on her depravity. In that piece, Coulter claims vindication, blames her critics for the furor over her words, deflects attention from herself to the New York Times, and uses humor (again, contrary to facts) to attack her foes and defend herself. (Yes, Coulter considers herself a courageous heroine attacked by the very people she purposely offends.)

Why would Coulter make such astonishing – and verifiably false – claims about a sport of which she remains so ignorant?

Coulter’s Soccer Flop – Part Deux

With her second soccer column, Coulter performed a strategic retreat without retracting anything. Whereas her first column emphasized the foreign – the anti-American – nature of soccer, the second placed far greater emphasis on its un-masculine nature and boring qualities. Both columns asserted that soccer is not a real “sport,” just as some say that Coulter is not a real “journalist.”

---

12 Depravity? Yes! Deliberately lying and willfully defaming whole groups of innocent people for the purpose of offending them – and garnering attention for oneself – is depraved.
As noted in my commentary on her first column,14 “Coulter’s Soccer Flop,” her polemic against soccer exhibited shoddy journalism – she was incorrect in every significant point – and expressed a xenophobic spirit. All of her commentary on soccer exposes her ignorance of that sport, one she clearly detests and can’t comprehend because it is so foreign to her. (This is surprising as she is a world traveler who, as a child, spend her summers in Europe.)

Montserrat Algarabel is representative of bloggers critical of Coulter.15 She makes a number of salient points in response to Coulter’s assertions, among them:

- Coulter claimed soccer fans become violent because they’re bored, which, Algarabel notes, is “psychologically, sociologically, culturally, and even historically inaccurate.”
- As to Coulter’s claim that soccer is a sissy’s game because there is no danger of injury, many players have died or been maimed as a result of playing.
- Coulter’s confusion over how much time is left in a game prompted this suggestion: “Just look at the clock on the screen and heed the referee's announcements.”

**Coulter’s Soccer Tweets**

Before continuing with an analysis of Coulter’s commentary – the root causes of her hatred of soccer – here are Coulter’s tweets regarding that sport (so you don’t have to search for them). These will give you a sense of the flavor of her humor and of her low regard for both soccer and liberals. Pay especially close attention to her sixth tweet.

---

Doing the job Americans just won't do: Immigrants fill up roster of “U.S.” soccer team - bit.ly/TOADlO

RT @djholzem: @cockacolo @RDubThree @AnnCoulter Soccer lovers have awesome comebacks

WAPO: “only a measly 17% of Americans are watching the World Cup very closely” - wapo.st/1qfBlj4 100% R unatheletic journalists.

RT @djholzem: @cockacolo @RDubThree @AnnCoulter Got me with that zinger Arturo. I guess you had four hours during the soccer game to come …

NEW COLUMN IS POSTED! SOCCER: PART DEUX -www.anncoulter.com

Xenophobia

Coulter’s tweet (July 2nd) on the U.S. soccer team being composed of immigrants was as wrong as Pelosi’s tweet from over two weeks earlier. Christine Rousselle reports:

“While five members of the team were born and raised in Germany, four of those are the sons of U.S. servicemen who were stationed there and were granted U.S. citizenship at birth because at least one of their parents is an American citizen. Another, Mix Diskerud, was born to an American mother in Norway. The others featured in [Pelosi’s] tweet are first-generation Americans who were all born on U.S. soil, making them U.S. citizens by default. They are not immigrants and never had to undergo a naturalization process – their parents did.”

But in Coulter’s mind – despite the furor caused over Pelosi’s erroneous tweet – anyone with a foreign-sounding name or non-American family members can’t be a real American. So, let’s call them all immigrants and lump them into the current immigration crisis.

Coulter condemns soccer as a foreign, European, socialist, and liberal phony “sport” designed to subvert American morality. She encapsulated her thesis in two words: “It’s foreign” – the very definition of xenophobia. (Yet, Coulter loves Mexican food – prepared by foreigners, those immigrants she so despises.)

A number of commentators took Coulter to task for her xenophobia:

- “Releasing a reactionary hit piece on the next great American success story is not constructive to the cause.”

“… we turn to the last paragraph of her column, where we observe some deep-seated xenophobia: … This xenophobic tone can be explained in one way and one way only: she’s literally scared of the foreign.”

“… (like many on the far right, Coulter takes pride in endorsing xenophobia).”

Notice that Coulter’s words tarnish conservatism!

Immigration Obsessed

Coulter has been immigration obsessed since the mid-1990s. From 1994-1996, Coulter worked for the Senate Judiciary Committee. As Coulter recently explained on Hannity:

“When I worked for Senate Judiciary Committee this was my issue. It wasn't at all for illegal immigrants. It was for immigrants who come to this country and commit felonies. They're convicted. Their convictions are upheld. If they committed an aggravated felony the law said they were supposed to serve time and then be deported. At that time, they were being deported at a rate of four percent a year because they could go into endless hearing. Once they finished all the immigration hearings they could have their habeas corpus hearings. That's, you know, a decade in the United States, at which point they've married and then they throw themselves on the mercy of the court, saying, ‘Oh, but I have an American spouse, I have an American child.’ Well, that is because you've been living here.”

Coulter offered her expertise on MSNBC in 1996, claiming, “Democrats don’t want all immigrants. What they want is welfare recipient immigrants, which is why they’ve rigged the rules.”

Even then, Coulter demonstrated her bias against foreigners from non-white nations, adding, “It’s extremely difficult to come in if you’re coming from a Western European country. However, if you are from a Third World country, ‘Welcome.’ If your genetic ancestors did not invent the wheel, ‘Oh, well, let them come in.’ But they’re the natural Democratic voters.”

Coulter’s disdain for Third World countries in 1996 was mirrored in her commentary last week, when she wrote: “The only risk of death in a soccer game is when some Third World peasant goes on a murderous rampage after a bad call.”

Third World peasant.

---

20 Ann Coulter, Hannity, FNC, 6/30/14.
21 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 8/23/96.
Classic Coulter. A xenophobic elite.

**Narcissistic Elite**

In 1996, Coulter commended America’s colonists, saying, “The reason this country has ended up with such stellar immigrants throughout the years, is that, absolutely – stellar … [they were] religious protesters.”

As an American who champions an American exceptionalism which arose from our Judeo-Christian heritage, I appreciate Coulter’s perspective on our Founding Fathers. But Coulter goes many steps further, especially in light of her own family pedigree. Her ancestry goes back to the Puritans.

Coulter takes our present-day immigration crisis personally. And a racial tinge inhabits her worldview. Her commentary consistently alludes to the racial composition of new (legal and illegal) immigrants. In contrast, the colonial immigrants that were “stellar” immigrants from Western Europe were her people. These foreigners from other parts of the world are interlopers.

Coulter’s narcissism and elitism are noticeable in both of these columns as well.

One blogger provided an accurate psychological critique of Coulter. “Every inch of her is covered with the criticism-resistant armor of narcissism, Teflon-grade shamelessness, Kevlar-quality self-confidence so unearned as to be unfathomable.”

Noting that Coulter wants sports to be more violent, he asks, “Why is she so callous?” (Callousness is one of the traits of narcissism.)

He continues, “When Ann Coulter doesn’t like something, that thing is immoral and un-American. That means Ann Coulter’s caprices, tastes, and predilections are, for Ann Coulter, the guiding lights of Americanness.”

Precisely! Coulter, in her mind, embodies what it means to be an American. Her pedigree tells her so.

He adds, “Point of fact, soccer from England. But the point isn’t the origin, for Coulter. Foreignness is a class- and race-based criteria for discrimination: you know who to hate by knowing what they like!”

**Soccer Moms**

Coulter took traits she believes characterize liberals and superimposed them on soccer and, then, exclaimed, “Voila! See, soccer is evil!”

Consistently, since before 9/11, Coulter has denigrated those with whom she disagrees, disparaging women as “soccer moms” and men as wimps, sissies, girly-boys, pantywaists, and the like. Intriguingly,

---

22 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 9/29/96.
Coulter’s dispersions against liberals typically contain what she would regard as feminine or effeminate qualities.

As with immigration, Coulter also has a split personality on “soccer moms.” In 1996, she claimed real soccer moms are Christian conservatives, saying, “The real-life soccer moms I know are all members of the Christian Coalition, They’re right-wing crazies.”26 As for liberal soccer moms, you know, the fake ones, well, she has much to say.

Two columns from the beginning of this century are worth examining. The first essay utterly trashed liberal soccer moms. It’s sentiments were summarized by its title, “No shadow of a doubt – liberal women are worthless.”27 Unmistakably pejorative. (If they are worthless, then Coulter’s frequent death threats take on even greater significance.)

What is Coulter’s vision of a typical liberal soccer mom? “They sit at home waiting for their husbands to bring home the money, or toil away at little jobs dreamed up to assuage the egos of bourgeois women living in the suburbs.”

Coulter’s ego required her to add a parenthetical remark lifting herself up: “(I eagerly await such a station in life. But when I'm there, I won't forget how horrible – horrible – it was to wake up to an alarm clock, respond to bosses, and be responsible for my own rent.)”

Her peculiar historical revisionism is astonishing: “As a class, women have never borne collective responsibility for work, they have never had to store food for the winter, and they have not generated economic growth.” Did Coulter’s female Puritan ancestors sit around all day watching soap operas?

For Coulter, “Liberal suburban soccer moms are impervious to logic.”

The second Coulter essay addressed here likened both liberal men and women to emasculated eunuchs, calling them “girls.” Her essay title: “The eunuchs are whining.”28 Perhaps they were also throwing “hissy-fits.”

Echoing her claim that “Liberal suburban soccer moms are impervious to logic,” Coulter declared, “Liberal soccer moms are precisely as likely to receive anthrax in the mail as to develop a capacity for linear thinking.”

Speaking of all liberals, Coulter wrote of “stereotypes of liberals as mincing pantywaists” who “whine.” They are hysterical, scared girls.

26 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 12/28/96.
27 Ann Coulter, “No shadow of a doubt – liberal women are worthless,” 4/19/00.
28 Ann Coulter, “The eunuchs are whining,” 10/31/01.
Note her misogynistic argument here (and throughout her essay): “Women – and I don't mean to limit that to the biological sense – always become hysterical at the first sign of trouble. They have no capacity to solve problems, so instead they fret.”

Contrasting liberals and conservatives, Coulter contended: “Men are out in the driving rain trying to change a tire, while the womenfolk sit in a warm roadside cafe demanding to know what's taking so long. Just pipe down! The men are working as fast as they can.” Coulter succinctly concluded her essay: “You just stay warm, girls … the men are fixing the car.”

Would that make Ann a man whose fixing Western Civilization? Yes! Coulter declared, “I’m more of a man than any liberal.”

Irrational Fears

Coulter claimed that all liberals are “hysterical,” “scared,” and “whining.” Projection?

Coulter appeared on Inside Edition to defend both of her anti-soccer screeds. Coulter explained her underlying motivation for writing those columns: “What got my gourd was the force-fed nature of it. Every year I have to read in The New York Times, ‘Soccer is catching on!’ Take 27, ‘Soccer is catching on!’ No it's not! Americans hate soccer!”

The utter indefensibility of her position is self-evident in that demonstrably false statement which expressed the animating animus for her rants.

No one is forcing anyone to watch soccer – or anything else. Countless sports channels offer a dizzying variety of programming to suit any taste. No one forced anyone to participate in block parties across the nation, or view soccer in sports bar, or gravitate to TV sets in stores and malls. And, most indisputably, Americans don’t “hate soccer.” OK, in Coulter’s worldview, “real Americans” do.

Coulter’s Soccer Flop – Part Trois

Ann Coulter garnered global attention for her nonsensical rants against soccer. Part I in this series addressed Coulter’s shoddy journalism (wrong in almost every detail), the national and international fallout from her essay, her attention-seeking with the resulting loss of her credibility, and her doubling down on her depravity.

Part 2 addressed Coulter’s xenophobia, obsession with immigration, and her narcissism, elitism, and irrational fears, which all stem from Coulter’s own self-identity and how America’s political and cultural identity swirl around her. Here we dig a little deeper, discovering that Coulter’s hatred of soccer has its source in Coulter, not in the sport she claims is not a sport.


29 Ann Coulter, O’Reilly Factor, FNC,
Attention Seeking

There is almost universal agreement among those critiquing Coulter’s soccer columns that her intent is to get attention. Chris Osterndorf put it well:

“The only agenda Ann Coulter is advancing in this case, and in every other, is her own. Coulter is a master at the art of trolling – because she knows that if you are offensive all the time and every time, it doesn't matter what you say. All that matters is that you pay attention to who’s saying it. Which, in this case, is her.”

Consequently, Coulter gained international attention spanning almost every continent. Osterndorf has certainly grasped Coulter’s very self-absorbed nature, noting:

“Trolls are always charlatans, by their very nature. Through riling people up, screaming about how right they are, and how wrong everyone else is, trolls reveal that they aren’t really interested in anything except themselves. A troll’s main goal is to be noticed, not be taken seriously.”

But Coulter wants to be both noticed and taken seriously.

One blogger clearly discerned this aspect of Coulter’s nature, addressing Coulter, “It reads like a self-asserting monologue, not like a dialogue; it seems to me your interest is not discussing any topic but disposing of any other opinions, save yours.”

---

Some, like Michael Kolander, view Coulter’s diatribe as simply a marketing strategy and they have a point, to a point. The problem is – Coulter believes every word she writes. Kolander’s five-points praising Coulter:

1. She Doesn't Give A Damn About The Blow-back
2. She Lets Her Haters Do The Heavy Lifting
3. She Played On People's Emotions
4. She Used The List Format
5. She Piggybacked On A Trending Topic

Ironically, as Coulter garners attention for herself she diminishes her own credibility (and that of the conservative movement).

**Dunning-Kruger Effect**

For two weeks, Coulter’s columns, tweets, and interviews have shown her utter ignorance of soccer. (And she wonders why people are upset.) Even Fox News hosts trashed Coulter’s column. 37 Brian Kilmeade said, “I will outline what she said and try to find anything factual in it. That will be an interesting little exercise.” Kilmeade is an expert on sports who once covered soccer as a reporter. Shepard Smith also chimed in, noting, “I'm told it's a sign of moral decay. It's not.”

Did Coulter write about something of which she knew she was ignorant? Or did she think, as is her wont, that she understood it perfectly? In other words, was Coulter ignorant of her ignorance?

In this instance, Coulter may have suffered from “The Dunning-Kruger effect [which] is a slightly more specific case of the bias known as illusory superiority, where people tend to overestimate their good points in comparison to others around them, while concurrently underestimating their negative points.”

Not knowing what she doesn’t know – or how much she doesn’t know – she assumes she knows enough and that it can’t be all that difficult. In this case, her critique of soccer revealed her ignorance of even the most rudimentary facts.

Coulter doesn’t understand soccer, so she doesn’t like it. She wants to change the rules because she doesn’t like the rules. Because Coulter doesn’t like soccer as a sport, it 1) can’t be a “sport” and 2) must be bad. Being bad, it must be liberal.

Coulter’s sense of superiority pervades so much of her commentary. One blogger writes: “But having no idea what … she's talking about is, for Coulter, a badge. It's a credential of her Americanness. Ann Coulter, to quote Chris Rock, loves to not know. Not knowing anything about soccer lets Ann Coulter feel superior to it, even though Ann Coulter, of all people, shouldn't feel superior to anything in the world for any reason.”

---

Arrogance

One could reasonably call Coulter the stereotypical “Ugly American,” flaunting her ignorance of geography and sports and providing the definitive derogatory: “It’s foreign.” Coulter is certainly a poor ambassador for America and for Conservatism. Disparaging soccer as a “game for girls,” Coulter wrote: “a guy from the Paraguay team (Uruguay? Who cares?).” Quite a few people, actually.

“Ugly American is a pejorative term used to refer to perceptions of loud, arrogant, demeaning, thoughtless, ignorant, and ethnocentric behavior of American citizens mainly abroad, but also at home.” Does Coulter come to mind?

Jonathan Corbett writes: “Ann’s not a sports writer, she’s a button pusher. And that button is attached to a machine that spews out bizarre, hate-filled rants about liberals, the New York Times and foreigners.”39 A Forbes columnist observed, “She’s never happy in her skin unless your jaw is around your ankles.”40

Ann Coulter is arrogant.41 She has a finely-calibrated sense of superiority, both personal and cultural. But that sense of superiority masks deep-rooted insecurities from others and from herself.42

As noted earlier, Coulter has a deep-seated fear of the Other as revealed in her attacks against non-whites, non-Americans, immigrants, liberals, multiculturalism, and soccer – the poster-game for Evil.

But Coulter has an even greater fear of exposure: that her flaws, weaknesses, and fears will be seen by others, especially by those closest to her.

Coulter’s Cover-up

In an act of pure evil – and calling evil good and good evil is, in and of itself, evil – Coulter’s close friend and ally, Sean Hannity, fully supported Coulter’s wretched columns in a rather intriguing manner.

On June 30th, Coulter appeared on Hannity’s TV show via satellite from Paris! (Did Coulter fly to France just to appear on an overseas satellite link to look important?) Surely her appearance was designed as an optic to counter her shoddy journalism regarding soccer. (Perhaps next time she can pose as a war correspondent.)

42 For an examination of how addictive thinking (denial, projection, rationalization, etc.) plague Coulter, see The Beauty of Conservatism, 2011, at www.coulterwatch.com/beauty/pdf.
Hannity willingly became the propaganda arm for Coulter’s nonsense. Fox News promoted his show that evening with a graphic of Coulter referencing her soccer column. Hannity himself gave teasers on his show telling viewers Coulter would be on to discuss fallout from her soccer column.

But what were the top news stories of the day, also featured on Hannity? Topics included two Supreme Court decisions (Hobby Lobby, unions), the Benghazi terrorist arriving in DC, the establishment of the Islamic State in Iraq, and the burgeoning crisis of child refugees on our southern border.

Still, Hannity’s sole promotion for his show that evening was a graphic of Coulter and her soccer imbroglio.

On his show, Hannity brought up the soccer controversy without addressing any of the substantive criticisms. Instead, he allowed Coulter to attack her critics for their “hissy fits” and affirmed the boring nature of soccer. Hannity ended the segment with approval for Coulter, saying, “I agree with you on soccer and immigration.” Hannity utterly ignored the myriad mistakes in Coulter’s column and, in the end, unconditionally validated her.

Cute strategy: ignore her errors, attack her critics, and claim she is perfect.

**Hannity-Enabled**

Are you surprised at Hannity’s conspiracy with Coulter? Don’t be. He does it all the time. Most famously when Coulter defamed the 9/11 widows43 – Hannity spent most of that week defending her.

Late last year, Hannity admitted, “Ann and I have been friends for many, many years. She’s gotten me in trouble on radio and TV many, many times. And, I’m like, ‘Ann, did you have to say that?’ But she’s a dear friend. She is a true American original and a patriot and a wonderful human being.”44

Hannity added, “I spend half my life defending her.”

If Coulter is such “a wonderful human being” then why does he have to spend half his “life defending her?” Why the hypocrisy?

Hannity frequently condemns the “breathtaking” hypocrisy of Obama and his administration. He claims, “I don’t like to be lied to.”46 He proffers, “You never go wrong in doing the right thing.”47

Yet, Hannity never points out Coulter’s hypocrisy, allows Coulter to lie on his show, and commends her when she most certainly does not do the right thing.

Classic enabling.

**Impenitence**

Ann Coulter boasts of being impenitent.48 Indeed, Coulter is renowned for never apologizing or admitting error. She is recalcitrant and impenitent. All to her own detriment.

---

44 Sean Hannity, Ft. Myers, FL, 12/21/13.
47 Sean Hannity, Sean Hannity Show, Premiere Radio Networks, 10/17/13.
Calling herself an exemplary Christian, Coulter eschews repentance. How can that be?

“One could reasonably conclude that a person who won’t repent can't be a Christian. Repentance is crucial to salvation and to living a Christian life. Both Old Testament prophets and New Testament apostles called people to repentance. Repentance is, after all, a requirement for salvation. Strikingly, both John the Baptist and Jesus Christ used identical words early in their ministries: “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand [Matthew 3:2; 4:17].”

As noted by Lauren Ashburn, “The arc of a mistake story goes as long and as high as it takes you to apologize.” Because of Coulter’s refusal to apologize or to admit error – and her orchestrated cover-up with Hannity – her controversy was prolonged and her credibility was further damaged.

The hero of Rob Roy (1995) remarked in a pivotal point in the story, “Honor is the gift a man gives to himself.” The same could be said of repentance. When we repent, we bring ourselves back into the good graces of God and we can be at peace with ourselves.

50 Lauren Ashburn, Media Buzz, FNC, 6/29/14.
Ann Coulter Auditions for U.N. Ambassador

Fresh from her diplomatic victories vis-à-vis that global phenomenon, soccer, Coulter ramped up the rhetoric – building upon her disdain for “foreign” – by proclaiming, “All countries suck compared to America.”

This from the stereotypical Ugly American who had again become international sensation for her repeated denunciations of soccer as un-American, succinctly encapsulated in two words: “It’s foreign.” Coulter’s antipathy toward foreigners and immigrants (legal and illegal) is legendary.

Surprisingly, Coulter, a world-traveler, “spent summers in Spain” as a child and, as an adult, travelled worldwide to Grateful Dead concerts and ski resorts. In fact, her first soccer diatribe was published while she was in Paris (France, not Texas).

Let’s consider Ann Hart Coulter for the next U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Wouldn’t that be a sight to behold? Coulter favors Western Europeans (those who are non-liberal, non-feminized, and non-pacified) over the rest of the world, particularly the Third World. But English must be spoken!

Here is a sampling of classic Coulter commentary. Travel the world through Ann’s eyes.

Coulter’s If Democrats Had Any Brains contained a section entitled, “FOREIGNERS, OR THE ‘NON-SOAP-ORIENTED.’” Her lead paragraph began, “They’re no good. Don’t trust ‘em – except Denmark, Australia, the Czech Republic, and the rest of new Europe, which, amazingly enough, has recently come

---

52 Ann Coulter, Heritage Foundation, 7/11/14.
to include France and Germany. … Canadians, for example, are either great or awful, and at the outset of the War on Terror, the balance was swinging perilously close to awful. Better shape up, Canada! At this point, we’re only keeping you around for the beer.”

Canada

“[Canadians] better hope the United States does not roll over one night and crush them. They are lucky we allow them to exist on the same continent. … We like the English-speaking Canadians.”

China

Asked about invading China, Coulter replied, “Yeah!”

Although she is opposed to the totalitarian regime in China, Coulter nevertheless ridiculed blind Chinese dissident Chen Guangcheng, tweeting, “Couldn’t we just tell that blind Chinese dissident that he’s in America now?” Responding to the controversy she had created, Coulter joked, “I’d say they’re being a little myopic, except they’d be offended.” One could say that Coulter is blind to her own insensitivity.

Europeans

Asked why “Europeans prefer liberals to conservatives,” Coulter answered, “Because you’re all a bunch of atheists, humanists, and moral relativists. Love the food, though! And don’t get me started on the shoes you wonderful people make! They’re to surrender for.”

France

“Attack France!” Her essay title concluded with these words: “If this is a war against terrorism and not a Eurocentric war against Islam, the conclusion is ineluctable: We must attack France. What are they going to do? Fight us?”

“This is as opposed to France, against whom I think we should launch a preemptive nuclear strike.”

Iran

“Well, I keep hearing people say we can’t find the nuclear material, and you can bury it in caves. How about we just carpet bomb them so they can’t build a transistor radio?”

“How about [invading Iran] right now? You have a lunatic running Iran, who’s running around claiming he has a nuke. When do we wait? Do we wait for a city to be taken out?”

54 Ann Coulter, Hannity & Colmes, FNC, 11/30/04.
55 Ann Coulter, Hannity & Colmes, FNC, 3/13/06.
59 Ann Coulter, “Attack France!” 12/20/01.
Coulter said, “It’s good for Wall Street if we bomb Iran,” adding, “I think it would be fun.”\textsuperscript{63}

Coulter tweeted, “Let’s destroy Iran by giving them ObamaCare.”\textsuperscript{64}

**Lebanon**

“Some have argued that Israel's response is disproportionate, which is actually correct: It wasn't nearly strong enough. I know this because there are parts of South Lebanon still standing.”\textsuperscript{65}

**North Korea**

“I think we ought to nuke North Korea right now just to give the rest of the world a warning. Boom! … I just think it would be fun to nuke them and have it be a warning … to the world.”\textsuperscript{66}

**Syria**

“Perhaps we could put aside our national, ongoing, post-9/11 Muslim butt-kissing contest and get on with the business at hand: Bombing Syria back to the stone age and then permanently disarming Iran.”\textsuperscript{67}

**Third World**

“It’s extremely difficult to come in if you’re coming from a Western European country. However, if you are from a Third World country, ‘Welcome.’ If your genetic ancestors did not invent the wheel, ‘Oh, well, let them come in.’ But they’re the natural Democratic voters.”\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{62} Ann Coulter, *Hannity & Colmes*, FNC, 3/13/06.
\textsuperscript{63} Ann Coulter, *Cashin’ In*, FNC, 9/15/07.
\textsuperscript{64} Ann Coulter, tweet, 10/22/12.
\textsuperscript{65} Ann Coulter, “Liberals: Born to Run,” 7/19/06.
\textsuperscript{66} Ann Coulter, *New York Observer*, 1/10/05.
\textsuperscript{67} Ann Coulter, “Muslim Bites Dog,” 2/15/06.
\textsuperscript{68} Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 8/23/96.
Case Study # 4
Coulter v. Christians

[This case study was originally published as a series of essays on my blog. – DB]

Part 1: Ann Coulter Condemns “Moral Show-offs”
Part 2: Ann Coulter’s Xenophobic Anti-Gospel of Hate
Part 3: Ann Coulter is Not a “Good Person” – An Open Letter to Erick Erickson
Part 4: Ann Coulter’s Ebola Fallout
Part 5: Ann Coulter to God: “STFU”

Ann Coulter Condemns “Moral Show-offs”

On Wednesday, Coulter went on a half-hour Twitter rant upon reading a New York Times story about the chaos on our southern border. Her condemnation was a mixture of hatred for immigrants, hatred of liberals, and hatred of liberal Christians (who, in her mind, not only aren’t Christians at all, but don’t even believe in God).

Above all, it was an arrogant expression of self-righteous indignation.
Coulter’s Tweets

Before continuing, it would be worth reading her complete set of tweets on the subject.

---

Coulter’s Censorious Spirit

Notice Coulter’s intense hatred of people – church leaders and parishioners alike – whose theology compels them to adopt political positions with which she disagrees.

Because Coulter does not agree with them, they must be lying hypocrites. She claims none of them believe in God!

Coulter seems incapable of recognizing faith in action. She abhors the intended results and presumes evil motivations.
Because Coulter regards them as “fake ‘Christians,’” then something other than biblical doctrine must be motivating them, such as personal aggrandizement. These “moral show-offs,” in her mind, are “phony, grandstanding, Bible-toting hypocrite(s).” Consequently, Coulter impugns not only their motives but their character.

Pretty tough words for people Coulter has never even met!

But that’s our Ann.

I remember when she spoke of censoriousness on MSNBC. In defense of smoking and the tobacco industry, Coulter said …

“The main overarching point I wanted to make is that I think, especially since listening to the callers, and the sort of moral fervor and censoriousness – I think it’s a strong human impulse to be self-righteous and censorious and, now, it’s gotten to the point where we can’t be self-righteous and censorious of the things that humans have been censorious for the past 5,000 years, like illegitimacy, like deserting your country in a time of war … It’s because we are not censorious and self-righteous about promiscuous sex, not to say perverted sex, all of the censoriousness comes bubbling up and it’s all directed to smokers. I mean, people who are handing out condoms in schools are the ones who are most upset about smoking.”

But as we have seen, Coulter is incapable of controlling her own “strong human impulse to be self-righteous and censorious.” All of her “moral fervor and censoriousness” “comes bubbling up” – and it’s all directed at liberals!

Coulter, devoid of charitable impulses, cannot grasp simple Christian charity. She is right that the government should not be involved in dispensing compassion. But she attacks individuals, charities, and churches for doing what they are called to do.

**Is Coulter a Moral Show-off?**

Let’s think about that. Consider a sampling of her books:


*Treason* (2003) – All liberals are traitors.

*Godless* (2006) – All liberals are godless.

*Demonic* (2011) – All liberals are demonic.

Since even before 9/11, Coulter has portrayed and promoted herself as the premiere representative of patriotism and godliness. Would that qualify as being a “moral show-off?”

---

2. See “Ann Coulter Auditions for U.N. Ambassador” at [http://t.co/R7JDzwnUI8](http://t.co/R7JDzwnUI8).
Ann Coulter’s Xenophobic Anti-Gospel of Hate

Ann Coulter is on a roll. Her commentary is becoming more deplorable by the week. Yesterday’s column hit an all-time low.³

Ann Coulter, meet Dr. Livingstone.

Dr. Livingstone was not a fake Christian. He lived out his Christianity, taking to heart the apostle Peter’s admonition, “you also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:5).” As a renown explorer and missionary in Africa, Dr. Livingstone’s motto was “Christianity, Commerce, and Civilization.”

I suppose that Ebola Ann Coulter would also have chastised medical missionary Albert Schweitzer and the selfless humanitarian, Mother Teresa, who lovingly devoted herself to the “least of the least.”

None of these people were deterred by, as Ann so delicately put it, “medieval diseases of the Third World.” Nor would they have shirked their divine calling based on risk factors “listed by the Mayo Clinic.”

Highlighting the absurdity of Coulter’s theology, Erick Erickson remarked, “St. Thomas should have never gone to India and Jim Elliott should have never gone into the jungle. Sigh.”

Regarding Dr. Kent Brantly’s trip to Liberia, Coulter asked, “What was the point?” Her having to ask the question suggests she would not understand the answer.

Coulter’s essay title, “Ebola Doc’s Condition Downgraded to ‘Idiotic,’” tells us exactly where she stands! Anything she doesn’t understand or agree with is automatically “idiotic.”

**Christian Narcissism**

From the onset of her discourse, Coulter impugned the motives of Dr. Brantly – and other Christian missionaries – suggesting pride and self-interest in enduring the hardships of overseas missionary work. Ann, this is just plain silly. But then, Coulter does not mind defaming innocent people.

Coulter began her column asking, “I wonder how the Ebola doctor feels now that his humanitarian trip has cost a Christian charity much more than any services he rendered.”

She then detailed some of the costs to his charities and alluded to, of all things, Obamacare. (I don’t recall Coulter complaining about the extensive cost – to the American people – of search and rescue operations to find her boss and one-time mentor, John F. Kennedy, Jr., in 1998.)

Coulter asks, “Why did Dr. Brantly have to go to Africa?” Following up with, “Can’t anyone serve Christ in America anymore?”

According to Coulter, overseas missionaries 1) seek the rewards of feeling and being perceived as “heroic” and 2) are really cowards, fearful of combating political correctness and engaging in the culture wars at home.

Coulter’s conclusion: all of these overseas missionaries are guilty of “Christian narcissism.”

(I would submit that the narcissist is Coulter herself.)

The whole matter of *self-sacrifice* seems, too, to be foreign to Coulter. But aren’t Christians supposed to live a sacrificial life, to die daily to oneself as Jesus put it? Yet, when Christians sacrifice for what they believe God has called them to do, Coulter goes on the offensive. Why? Because they are what she is not.

**Coulter’s False Gospel**

For well over a decade, Coulter has preached a false gospel, calling herself “a mean Christian” and declaring “being nice is an incidental tenet of Christianity.” Never one to promote the compassionate course of action, Coulter also eschews the principled course of action.

*Coulter is at war with Christians and conservatives!* (Yet, she claims to be a Christian conservative.)

Coulter condemns the principled, excoriates the compassionate.

In yesterday’s assault on principled, compassionate Christians zealous to do God’s work, Coulter distorts the gospel to achieve her ends. Coulter claimed that countries are “like your family” and, of course, charity begins at home. But then her thesis seems to be that it should also *end* at home.

Coulter wrote, “The same Bible that commands us to ‘go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel’ also says: ‘For there will never cease to be poor in the land. Therefore I command you, “You shall open wide your hand to your brother, to the needy and to the poor, in your land.”’”

Naturally, Coulter conflates Old and New Testament theology. In the Parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus made it pretty clear that *everyone* is our “neighbor.” Moreover, the Samaritan reached out to help
what many would consider a helpless “foreigner.” Also, in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (Matthew 25), Jesus commends those who have helped what Mother Teresa called “the least of the least” as if they had helped Jesus Himself.

But for Coulter, none of that matters.

**Only America Counts**

Typical Coulter, xenophobia fills her Ebola column. Nativism at its worst. Coulter, however accurately, observed, “America, the most powerful, influential nation on Earth, is merely in a pitched battle for its soul.” Coulter accurately detailed aspects of that “pitched battle.”

Coulter boasted, “America is the most consequential nation on Earth … If America falls, it will be a thousand years of darkness for the entire planet.” [In her very next essay, Coulter doubled down, writing, “America is in the fight of its life and if this country dies, the world dies.”] The “world dies!”

*A millennium of darkness will engulf the Earth if America falls?* A bit hyperbolic, what? Yet, I suspect Coulter doesn’t think she is exaggerating.

In order to save America – and thus the planet, too – Christians “need to buck up, serve their own country.” (Actually, Christians need to serve their Lord and Savior – wherever He leads them. Moreover, Coulter appears to see America as the Savior of the world, instead of Jesus, whose very title is “Savior of the world.”)

**As one person observed:** “Couple that with the fact that Coulter’s position is some infinitely regressive BS. Why go to the rest of the world when my country needs help? Why help my country when my state needs help? Why help my state when my city needs help? Why help my city when my neighborhood is suffering? Why help my neighborhood when my own family is going through a difficult time? Why help family when I’ve got problems of my own? Let me fix myself before I help others.”

The worst epithet Coulter could say about soccer was “It’s foreign.” Her hatred of immigrants (legal and illegal) stems from their foreignness. Now the future of mankind is at stake – get rid of all the foreigners!

**Let Them Hate Us**

Coulter’s metric for one’s spiritual state of being has been – for over a decade – whether one is hated and the depth of that hatred. Consider Coulter’s words:

“[Christians need to] remind themselves every day of Christ’s words: ‘If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you.’”

Well, yes, Christians are often hated *because* they are Christians. But some Christians (or fake Christians) are hated because they *do not behave as Christians should behave.* Sin and hypocrisy breed hatred and contempt.

Coulter has for so long worn the hatred of others as a badge of honor that she now sees herself as righteous because others criticize or hate her. Could the criticisms be *called* for? The hatred be *earned*? Wherein does Ann’s righteousness really lie? If she in in Christ, then it is *in Christ alone.*

---

Is Ann Coulter displaying the righteousness of Jesus or the self-righteousness of Ann Coulter?

The really sad thing is that Coulter thinks she is taking the *high* road!

**Ann Coulter is Not a “Good Person” – An Open Letter to Erick Erickson**

Dear Mr. Erickson,

In your recent criticism of Ann Coulter, you stressed how much you *like* her, as if that is relevant. Perhaps you are trying to reassure Ann not to take your criticism personally. I do not have the same luxury. While there is much about Ann that I, too, like (and, unlike many Coulter critics who hate her, I do not), my opinion matters not to her. So, perhaps I can be a bit more blunt than you.

You unequivocally began your column: “I like Ann Coulter. There is no ‘but’ after that. I like Ann Coulter, period.”

Yes, we get it, you *like* Ann. Period.

As for me, Erick, while I do value your views and your website, I must say that your concluding paragraph is nonsense. You wrote: “I have no reservations or caveats in liking Ann Coulter. She is a warm, kind, and generous person. I know this from my own experience. I must, however, disagree with her in this.”

Once again, we get it: You *like* (with no “buts,” “reservations or caveats”) Ann. Period.

---

But your *personal* observation – “She is a warm, kind, and generous person” – does not comport with either *your* analysis of her column nor Coulter’s *observed* behavior. *Is Ann Coulter really a good person?*

Are you confusing charm with character? Personality with integrity? A quick wit with a pure heart?

Coulter *cannot* – by any *reasonable* measure – be described as a *good person*. Just consider the column you yourself critiqued. In it, Ann blamed an altruistic and selfless medical missionary for contracting Ebola (in the course of doing God’s will as he saw it), blamed Samaritan’s Purse for sending him to Liberia (in accordance with its mission), and castigated all foreign missionaries for having the audacity to do God’s work and follow His will by evangelizing overseas.

Last March, you criticized *Ann’s myopic support of Mitch McConnell*, again stressing how much you *like* her: “But I like Ann and I find myself with her more often than not.”

In your critique of that column, you chided Ann for *falsely accusing* Jim DeMint and the Senate Conservatives Fund of being charlatans and a right-wing mob.

Didn’t Ann just *falsely accuse* Christian missionaries of being charlatans? Does that establish an *ungodly* pattern of behavior? Yes!

Bearing *false witness* – falsely accusing Christian missionaries and *falsely accusing* the Tea Party of being charlatans – is hardly proof that Ann is a good person, or, in your words, “a warm, kind, and generous person.”

Ann said those Christians missionaries were cowards egotistically seeking to be viewed as heroic. Just days before that, she *condemned compassionate Christians*, calling them “*moral show-offs.*” Surprisingly, Ann once claimed, “I’m an extraordinarily good Christian.”* Do you agree?*

But Ann has also *falsely accused a fellow journalist of plagiarism* and she has *besmirched the reputations of Chris McDaniel and his supporters*.

*These are but a few examples* of how Ann is *not* a good person.

Might I suggest a reevaluation of your perspective on Ann as well as your prayers on her behalf?

Sincerely,

Daniel Borchers

**Ann Coulter’s Ebola Fallout**

Ann Coulter has been almost universally criticized for her supremely anti-gospel Ebola *polemic against faith-filled Christians seeking to do God’s will in overseas missions*. She was almost uniformly excoriated

---


across the Christian community – from biblical scholars, to evangelists, to missionary leaders, to lay members.

Those rare individuals who defended Coulter did so almost uniformly in support of her accurate observations about America’s need for spiritual reformation. Coulter accurately diagnosed a set of serious cultural problems in America that are at root spiritual in nature. But Coulter’s solution – that Christians should be less Christian and not follow God’s call in their lives – is ludicrous.

I have culled the best and most interesting excerpts from commentary on Coulter’s column and the subjects she raised. Your comments would be most welcome.

Free Republic

Free Republic was once a repository of libertarian-conservatives who almost literally worshipped Ann Coulter. No longer. Here are just a few of their observations:

- “I think she’ had an Ann-eurysm.”
- “Coulter and Pelosi belong in the same psychiatric ward.”
- “Christian missionaries have been going to the uttermost parts of the earth for centuries. Perhaps Ann would prefer that Islam or paganism or some such thing have total sway over the lost of the world. Jesus Christ has a different preference.”
- “Ann seems to think snarky equals clever. This is just peevish and mean.”
• “I think the ignorance of Ann is stunning and I think your fears are irrational. I work in hospitals on a daily basis and have as much fear of Ebola as I do of KmRSA. Which is none. Respect and common sense is good. Phobia is bad. Ann is phobic. Are you as well?”

• “Ann, you blew it big time! It isn’t narcissists that go where they sense the Lord is sending them, it takes a servant heart with a total sacrifice of self to answer the call of God. We have no business condemning those who are willing to go anywhere for the gospel!”

• “This was an attack on Christianity, and Evangelical Christians, which is a huge leap forward into the direction that Ann has been moving into for years.”

• “How about Ann Coulter’s narcissism? It’s all that has ever held her together.”

For the remainder of this column, the headings are actual hyperlinked titles of commentary on the Internet. The quotes below are all excerpted from those sites.

“Ann Coulter to Jesus: Fix Bethlehem First!”

[Isn’t that a great title? – DB]

It seems that she believes that Dr. Brantly, who is a medical doctor, has some mysterious power as a Christian to evangelize “Hollywood power-brokers,” and it’s only his vanity (“Christian narcissism,” she calls it) that sent him off to the third world with his medical supplies, rather than – what, trotting up to Quentin Tarrantino’s gate, introducing himself as an M.D., and suggesting that Mr. Tarantino repent? And this would have been more effective than ministering to the dying in Liberia.

“Ann Coulter: The World’s Worst Theologian”

Mark Twain famously said, “To a guy with a hammer, everything looks like a nail.” Perhaps “to a woman with a political column, everything looks like the Democrats did it.” Here, without any knowledge of Brantly or his politics, she writes that Christian doctors are “tired of being called homophobes, racists, sexists and bigots. So they slink off to Third World countries, away from American culture to do good works…”

Apparently, Coulter couldn’t be bothered to do any research about Brantly before writing her article. And haven’t Christians been serving overseas well before anyone ever heard of Jerry Falwell?

“The Gospels rewritten”

Apparently, his altruism didn’t measure up to Coulter’s brand of superior morality.
“Ann Coulter, Stop Speaking for Jesus”

Instead, she dresses up her vitriol in an feeble attempt to appear a caring Christian, lamenting the lost in this nation who are not cared for while this doctor apparently flitters about in Africa, as if to say Jesus cares more for Americans than He does for the lost in other nations.

This would be sad if not so sickening and jingoistic. …

But minus the venom in her sentiment, why does it have to be either/or? Why would we ever think that we need to ignore one group while focusing on the other? Can’t it be that the Church is far big enough to reach lost Americans AND lost Africans (and lost Europeans and lost South Americans and lost Asians and....)?

In Jesus’ last earthly words, as recorded in Acts 1:8, he encourages His disciples that “you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth.”

The last time I checked a map, the U.S. is not the sum-total of the end of the earth. I believe that Africa can be included in that description.

“Are Christian Missionaries Narcissistic Idiots? – A Response to Ann Coulter”

And yet from a Christian concern we cannot leave the issue of the Ebola outbreak without turning to another kind of atrocity. In this case the atrocity was an opinion piece published just yesterday by conservative commentator Ann Coulter. …

Well the real annoyance here, indeed outrage, is not over the service of these two missionary doctors. It is over this kind of column that flies in the very face of everything Christ taught his disciples. The logic of the Christian church and of Christian missions has nothing to do with American nationalism. Some parts of Ann Coulter’s article where she speaks especially of Africa come very close to racism, but she certainly falls directly into nationalism when she says that American Christians need to “serve their own country.” …

Coulter has written a very sad and infuriating article – an article that should lead to outrage in Christian circles. It reveals a radical nationalistic and libertarian worldview that is fundamentally incompatible with evangelical Christianity, with the Scripture, and with the command of Christ. …

True gospel missionaries – those faithful to the command of Jesus Christ – are not driven by “narcissism” to use Ann Coulter’s word, they are indeed heroic. More than heroic, they are simply faithful.

“Ann Coulter Plays God”

Further, would Coulter tell the people whose lives were touched by Brantley, people whose broken bodies were repaired by the doctor and people who may have come to know God as a result of his witness, that in light of the money it cost to bring him home, they weren’t worth it? …

Of course it doesn’t occur to Coulter that perhaps God Himself directed the path of Dr. Brantley to serve in a land far away. … Did God share the road map of Brantley’s life with Coulter? Did she know something he *should* have known? …
[Coulter] cannot know the Hollywood power-broker would be saved. He could as easily reject Christ as the Liberian. Likewise, she cannot know that the Liberians will not experience a spiritual revival as a result of the ministry of Dr. Brantly and others. And yes, Ebola kills the body, but even the body being killed by Ebola can house a soul that is at peace and in communion with God. Further, Coulter forgets that it is God who opens the eyes of the unbeliever to see their need, not man. Who and where He chooses to deliver the message is His business. …

So, choosing to leave the most extraordinary country in the world and all the comforts that come with a first-world existence to go help others in a third-world place which often comes with huge built-in risk and sorrow factors, is because ooh, name calling! For the Christian in America, name calling, mockery and being maligned comes with the territory. For the Christian in other parts of the world, being killed for their faith comes with the territory. And likely they would say the risk posed is a small price to pay to show the love of Christ to those in need.

The Christians I have known who have served in faraway places are a humble lot. They choose to do what they do because they care deeply about those in need. They want to give back for having been given so much and they want to know God more fully through their service. The last thing they would ever want to hear themselves described as is “heroic.”

“Ann Coulter’s no voice for Christian conservatism”

Coulter isn’t a spokesperson for any brand of Christian conservatism. Her statement directly contradicts one of the things that Christians think is most important – the inherent dignity of all people. We believe that every single human person is made in the image of God, is worthy of dignity, and has an eternal soul. That eternal soul has a destination, and the message of Jesus is for them.

“Ann Coulter Becomes Unhinged”

Has Ann Coulter become unhinged? It looks as if she may have. …

Pardon me for taking a moment to vomit.

Apparently, Coulter has read neither the New Testament parable about the sheep and the goats nor the parable about the Good Samaritan, both parables having been told by Jesus himself. Had she read and understood them, the Coulter would know that Dr. Brantly was doing exactly what living out the Gospel message requires, which requires taking personal risks when necessary. …

Only time will tell if Coulter feels enough shame to apologize for what she wrote, or if she will be too narcissistic to make such an apology.

“A Failed Test of Compassion: Whatever Ann Coulter has, It’s Worse than Ebola”

Like so many things that Coulter writes about, this article begins with a false premise and runs wild from that point. Is she trying to claim there are there no Christian charities working inside the US? If so, she needs to do a little more research before picking up her poison pen.
Here’s an easily-found website that offers a list of Christian charities and I assume that most of them work inside the US. (I will not vouch for any of them but that is surely enough evidence to scrap the Coulter article at its inception.)

But perhaps I have misread: is she trying to claim that American-based Christian charities have no business helping the poor outside of American borders? I don’t happen to remember Jesus saying any like that. …

The most ironic part of this particular Coulter rant is that the lack of empathy that Coulter herself promotes on a daily [basis] is the best example why more and more people have simply stopped caring about what happens to the poor and the needy.

If there is a culture war in the US then Coulter should be looking in the mirror to find who is firing the salvos.

“Ann Coulter Channels Margaret Sanger”

You see Ann Coulter is angered that an American Doctor went abroad to West Africa to confront the recent Ebola infestation when he could have been treating sick people here in the United States. She sees it as foolish … I’m reminded of one Jesus’ parables at this juncture. Something about a doctor going to where people are sick. That could involve a risk factor. Bless Ann’s heart for pointing that out. …

Ann, Americans who feel entitled to tell a man like Dr. Brantly who he should save and who he shouldn’t be bothering with are about one-step removed from the morality of eugenicists. One of Margaret Sanger’s big arguments in favor of Planned Parenthood involved the Malthusian conceit that resource constraints gave us the right to predetermine which of God’s Children should be permitted to breed. If only Dr. Brantly had treated the Burt Reynolds character from the movie “Boogie Nights” – the guy who gave the world Dirk Diggler and Chest Rockwell. What a wonderful service to humanity that would have been. They could have co-founded a charity together: “Dildos for Jeebus!” But no, he had to go waste his talents on poor people from Africa.

“Ann Coulter’s Casual Cruelty”

(The irony of Coulter accusing anyone of narcissism seems lost on her.) …

Helping people in lands other than America, Coulter argues, is not only cowardly and selfish, but unbiblical as well. …

Even grading on the Coulter curve, the column is cruel, biblically illiterate and morally incoherent. Cruel because she’s mocking a man who has contracted a brutal and often lethal disease, a man whose family is now terrified for his life. It takes an unusually callous and malicious heart to devote an entire column to attacking a husband and father who, while serving others, is stricken with a virulent disease. And as an added grace note, Coulter divines Dr. Brantly’s heart, accusing him – without a shred of evidence – of being both a coward and vainglorious. …
Ms. Coulter’s biblical illiteracy is evident in taking a verse from Deuteronomy (15:11) and building a doctrine that argues that serving people outside of your nation is a violation of God’s word and ways. The logic of her column is that until every problem in your nation is solved, no person should serve as a missionary to other lands. This doctrine would surprise St. Paul, whose missionary journeys took him to (among other places) modern-day Syria, Turkey, Greece and Rome. If Ms. Coulter wants to defend her peculiar missiology and hyper-nationalism, she needs to find sources other than the Bible. …

Ms. Coulter seems unaware of the fact that the global medical missions movement is one of the great achievements of Christianity. But then again, there is much about Christianity she seems unaware of. 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. …

The poor we shall always have among us. The cruel and heartless, too.

“Why is Ann Coulter mean?”

Is pundit Ann Coulter unloved and do inner demons tell her she’s unlovable forcing the conservative pundit to project a disturbing meanness onto others? …

Coulter projects emotional demons and insecurities and doesn’t seem to realize it …

[Coulter asks, “But why do we have to deal with this at all?”] But she doesn’t. No one asked her to engage in Christian mission work in Africa. In addition, this isn’t about Ann Coulter. …

Jesus isn’t an American and what he taught was universal and transcendental not to be contained within artificial borders or boundaries. The holy author doesn’t make a distinction by loving some children more than others depending on the disease, country, continent, or overall wealth of a nation. …

Should Father Damien who helped lepers in Hawaii in the 19th century and Mother Teresa who cared for the sick and hungry in India in the 20th century have both stayed in Europe? Should American Christian workers in Haiti, after one of the country’s worse natural disasters, stayed away in 2010?

“Are You ‘Idiotic?’ Ann Coulter Might Think So”

Wow. So basically, anyone who helps anyone, and it happens to involve personal sacrifice, is “idiotic.” …

Unfortunately, in the majority of the world, you can have all the desire and drive to change or improve yourself, but there are no programs, there is no government assistance, there is no hope. Places such as Liberia, where the average income is about $400 a year. … thousands do it to honestly help others, and we never hear anything about them. They go to “risky” places to help people, where there is no other help available. Guess what. Some people, Christians and non-Christians alike, who serve within the United States are narcissistic. Some do it for attention, a free t-shirt, and an Instagram photo. Thousands do it to help others as well, without the thought of being “heroic.” God calls us in Mark 16:15 to “go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel” just as much as He commands us to help our brothers. If all of us serve in one capacity or another, we are all obedient to the individual desires and callings God has put in our hearts. And there’s nothing idiotic about serving each other.
“Can Christ Not Spare One Man?”

I also think had St. Thomas stayed in Jerusalem instead of journeying to India, many Indians would have never found salvation through Christ. Had Paul stayed in Tarsus instead of going on his missionary journeys, we would not have his contribution to the body of faith or the churches he planted along the way. …

Should Jim Elliott have never gone into the jungle? He was savagely killed there. His death inspired countless Christians to follow in his footsteps delivering the gospel to places it had not been delivered. …

Liberals treat prosperity in America as a zero sum game – if there are winners, there must be losers. They are wrong. Christians should not do the same with Christianity – surely a Christian may lose his life, but even then he is a winner. There are no losers except the Devil himself when a Christian goes therefore unto all the nations. …

Christians should be focused on saving souls where the Lord leads them and lends them talent and we should all praise the work of the Holy Spirit in so doing.

“Ann Coulter causes firestorm for her attack on Ebola victim Kent Brantly”

One might also make the point, besides the notion that Christians believe that both the bodies and souls of Africans have equal worth in the eyes of the Almighty as those of Americans, that the suffering of Brantly and of his nurse Nancy Writebol is likely going to have a beneficial effect far and beyond the current outbreak of Ebola. Research and testing for treatments of the deadly disease have been fast tracked because of them having been infected. This means that many thousands of lives will likely be saved from an agonizing death as a result of their sacrifice. …

The consensus seems to be that she is missing a basic tenet of the Christian faith, that one is called to go and do good wherever one is called to go, no matter where in the world, no matter where that happens to be.

“Forget EBOLA: The Greatest Threat To Africa’s Medical Missionaries Is Ann Coulter!”

It’s easy to take cheap shots at Ann Coulter these days: Ann Coulter is without a soul. Ann Coulter is heartless. Ann Coulter is evil. Ann Coulter is ... Ann Coulter. …

… her mockery was aimed at the heart of her own self-professed religion: Christianity. And not just any Christianity, but Evangelical Christianity and its missionaries: Dr. Kent Brantly was part of Franklin Graham’s Samaritan’s Purse. If Coulter had mocked Pat Robertson’s Operation Blessing, she could not have picked a more overtly Christian missionary team to add to her list of enemies. She also compounded her anti-Semitism by insinuating that Hollywood was controlled by Jews who needed to be saved (or rather, “perfected”). …
Writing about the latest Coulter outrage may seem to be futile since even her supporters know the obvious: Coulter is for Coulter is for Coulter is for Coulter. But oddly enough, she does have followers/readers who live vicariously through her outrage and mockery: most of them do not dare to enact her opinions for fear of seeming too un-Christian or inhuman. …

Yes, a “provocateur” is always worth the effort to focus upon when one knows the people she is provoking.

“Ann Coulter teaches us, ‘better hate than ever’”

This story is about Coulter being dead wrong, again. I know first-hand there are plenty of Christian do-gooders that get into the business because they want to right wrongs and help miserable people be less miserable, here and all over the planet. These people have two things that Coulter doesn’t: charity and compassion. … they work to feed starving people, take care of the sick, build houses, bury the dead, stuff like that. I’ve known these people first hand. …

Coulter would never listen to the likes of someone like me. Perhaps somewhere in history someone could speak to Coulter. Someone she could relate to. Maybe she and Marie Antoinette might have cake and tea together and talk about what can happen when the little people are expected to be someone else’s problem.

“Ann Coulter and Our Mission”

Many Christians were horrified because they rightly understood that Coulter’s comments are a repudiation of the gospel and the Great Commission. Many felt betrayed. We should not feel betrayed, any more than we would when Howard Stern mocks us on the radio. The same thing is at work. …

The church is built on the rock foundation of apostles and prophets, not hucksters and outrage artists.

“Ann Coulter’s American Christianity”

Coulter, in her rant, was terribly insulting to Africa, Liberia, and every third-world country on the planet. She was almost equally insulting to Dr. Brantly’s hometown, calling it a town of deadbeats. Finally, she was incredibly insulting to Dr. Brantly, accusing him of being a Christian narcissist. …

Ann is also why so many in our culture view conservatives as cold and uncaring. Just look at her attitude toward third-world countries! She places them in an entirely different category than Americans as if God does the same thing. She refers to these human beings as a cesspool! How could any Christian ever love God and see helpless women and children as a cesspool? Add to this her description of the small struggling town in Texas as a “deadbeat” town. What? Clearly there is nothing godly about an attitude that pretends to know the motives of Christian missionaries, and that categorizes people less fortunate than them in the way Ann Coulter does in her article. Here is a man who put himself in harm’s way and he is classified as a Christian narcissist. Liberia is a third world cesspool. And the doctor’s little town in Texas is a deadbeat town.

In her attempt to preach to Dr. Brantly, Christian missionaries, and other Christians living in America about the evil that resides in our culture, Ann Coulter has demonstrated in so many ways that that very evil resides in her own heart as well. The only difference is that Ann’s evil displays itself differently from
the evil she doesn’t like. And that is what we call self-righteous hypocrisy. The only evil that is really evil is the evil I don’t like.

“Coulter’s ‘Idiotic’ Response to Christian Missions”

It is ironic that someone as so publicity-obsessed as Coulter would have the gall to assert that if missionaries weren’t so “narcissistic” and had courage or weren’t burned out over all the social problems in the U.S., they’d stay in “some deadbeat town” in the U.S. and forego all the “superlatives” they get for serving as foreign missionaries.

It probably is a waste of time to ask the question: did you really mean to reveal how shallow your thinking can be? …

As a former member of the Board of Trustees for a mission organization for over a decade and marrying into a family of missionaries, I have learned a lot over the years about the sacrifices that missionaries make to answer God’s call to services overseas. Several generations have been inspired by Jim Elliott, who responded to the challenge: “There is one Christian worker for every 50,000 people in foreign lands, while there is one to every 500 in the United States.” In addition, reading church history reveals the enormous contributions that missionaries have made to bring education and health care to nations around the world. The biographies of many national leaders reveal how missionaries and the education provided by mission-run schools have had profound influence in developing international leaders.


Lead Republican thinker Ann Coulter has declared war on American Ebola victims. …

Yes, imagine a doctor going where there is disease. What was he thinking? …

Except one problem. While Ann Coulter divides the world up into Americans and others, and Republicans and others, and good Republicans and others, actual good human beings see people as, you know, human beings. And a Liberian in need of medical care is no different from an American in need of the same. They’re both human beings, and Dr. Brantly doesn’t lower the value of the social good by helping a cesspool Liberian instead of a vainglorious American.

“Ann Coulter And The Spiritual Poverty In America”

The Gospel is poured out on our society in great quantity via some 1,000 Christian radio stations. Despite this America is becoming more and more godless. …

I learned a valuable lesson that day: missionary service isn’t always about doing the safe thing; it’s about being obedient to God. …

Coulter … clearly is convinced that Christians from this country go for short stints to “disease-ridden cesspools” as a form of missionary tourism. As I learned in the harshest way from my former best friend, it is not tourism but a peek into God’s Heart.

Coulter’s jingoism is her god. …
Coulter’s passionate deprecation of Dr. Brantly is swaddled in the American flag. She has determined which acts of sacrifice are worthy of undertaking and which souls are worth saving. Her tortured thinking, calling Dr. Brantly a narcissist for following the call to God, is wrong.

“An Open Letter to Ann Coulter Regarding that “Idiotic” Ebola Doc”

Reading your article in which you put so much emphasis on Dr. Brantly’s potential influence a Hollywood power broker, I wondered why you spend your time tearing down the work of Dr. Brantly rather than building up the ones doing the very thing you wish the Ebola doctor would do? …

This is the point where I think you may have skipped a regiment of medication, or had too much red bull, or spent too much time in the sun. Let me tell you, Ann, international mission work is the last enterprise one goes into for the purposes of being perceived as heroic. …

The dirty little secret is that most missionaries go overseas knowing that they will be serving in virtual anonymity, that they will spend an inordinate amount of time struggling to understand a culture and a language that is not their own, that they are choosing to watch from afar as family members back home are born, others marry, and still others die – while they are absent. And they do it because it is their calling. …

I know it’s not your style, but I would finally recommend that you consider writing an article where you take back most of the things you said in your August 6th article, and possibly even – shudder – apologize.

“Don’t Wanna Be an Evangelical Idiot”

… right wing warrior princess Ann Coulter managed to pen what is perhaps the most virulent anti-Christian column ever seen by this author. …

This is not a man on the public dole, he is a Christian using his gifts to carry out, not some merely humanitarian mission, but the Great Commission of Christ. Who is Ann Coulter to object to the volunteer work of a Christian missionary? …

But Coulter doesn’t stop there. She also manages to betray her inner Pharisee when she has the gall to recommend to Dr. Brantly and presumably other Christians the proper object of their evangelistic efforts. No surprise, it’s not the poor. …

In her mind, the Pharisees were right to criticize Jesus for spending so much time with the poor, diseased and downtrodden of Judaea. If only he had focused his energies on opening the eyes of a single Sadducee, Pharisee or other member of the ruling elite, he would have done infinitely more good than he did by wasting so much of his time with the sinners, tax gatherers, harlots, crippled, diseased, dying and poor people that he seemed to have so much misplaced compassion for, none of whom had the status or ability to change the corrupt culture of Second Temple Judaism or the larger pagan Greco-Roman world. What a fool Jesus was. If only he had been more like Ann Coulter. …
When it comes to hatred, Coulter needs to get the log out of her own eye. For by her comments she shows herself to be one of those who hate the servants of Christ. And if she hates the servants of Christ, she hates him as well. The words of the Apostle Paul are applicable to Coulter, “Who are you to judge another’s servant? To his own master he stands or falls. Indeed, he will be made to stand, for God is able to make him stand” (Rom.14:4).

As for Coulter, in the view of this writer her condition has been downgraded to clueless.

“How Should We Respond to Ann Coulter’s Article on the Ebola Doctor?”

I think the answer is: grace. God is a God of grace, and since grace is unmerited favor, it by definition cannot be clearly seen if the primary focus is on helping those who seem most influential. For then it looks like there are conditions – namely, how influential you are. To show manifestly and decisively that grace is grace – that is, without conditions of merit or influence or ability – God serves (and commands us to serve) those who seemingly have nothing to offer, even at great risk.

This, in turn, allows us to see those with seeming influence (in Coulter’s example, Hollywood power-brokers) in the right light as well – namely, as those who in fact do not have anything to offer of their own either, but rather who are just as dependent on God as those visibly in great need and without influence.

So God isn’t creating an us vs. them scenario where people of influence don’t matter but those of no influence do, or where people next door don’t matter but those 8,000 miles away do. Rather, he is doing exactly what it takes to make it clear that we are all equally and fully dependent on grace.

That’s why we read “God chose what is low and despised in the world, even things that are not, to bring to nothing things that are, so that no human being might boast in the presence of God” (1 Corinthians 1:28-29). …

In sum, the problem is not first of all Coulter’s pragmatic argument that helping influential people here in the U.S. is better because it will be more effective (as insensitive as that is).

The problem is that she is failing to recognize that when people like Dr. Brantly go help those who have nothing to offer in faraway lands, it helps those of us in America as well. For it helps us see that we are all equally dependent on God’s grace. That’s the message America needs. It’s the message we all need to grasp to the core of our being, and something that can’t happen if we avoid helping the sick worldwide.

In this sense, then, Dr. Brantly’s going to Liberia is indeed far more influential for God’s kingdom than had he focused on helping turn Hollywood power-brokers to God. For it shows that God is not dependent on such power-brokers, and that those with influence in the world are not in any special category before him.

That’s the message of grace, it’s the message we all need to hear, and it’s exactly what Dr. Brantly has demonstrated in his life.

“Are Missionaries Idiots and Narcissists?: a Response to Ann Coulter”

Her most scathing comments are aimed at motive. Why would anyone do such an idiotically wasteful thing as try to help Liberians? …
To me, the most shocking aspect of Ann Coulter’s article is the allegation of cowardice and narcissism. 

Church history is filled with inspiring stories of missionary exploits. From William Carey to Hudson Taylor, from the Moravians to the “Auca Five”, the Spirit of Jesus shines brightly in these tales of courage and commitment.

I believe we must re-commit ourselves to standing strong in America, loving our land, and caring for our own nation. We must win back the heart of our country. But in doing so, we cannot back away from our world mandate. Jesus said, “Go into all the world...” It will be costly. It will be dangerous. But, please let’s not crucify and criticize our own.

God bless Dr. Kent Brantly and Mrs. Nancy Writebol.9

“Why Ann Coulter Has It All Wrong About Missions”

I have spoken to literally hundreds of missionaries and have yet to meet one who was timid to speak the truth, in their own country or otherwise. The missionaries I have met are bold and ready to share the gospel with anyone who will listen – whether in America, Europe or Asia, it really doesn’t matter. They just want to spread the gospel. …

Every missionary I have met has had a call. A deep, undeniable call to take the gospel to the world – anywhere: at home, at work, and on a foreign field. Most would be embarrassed to receive accolades and honor for what they do. They don’t serve for that reason – they serve to please an audience of One – Jesus Christ. …

Whether you are called to take the gospel to Hollywood or the Bronx, to Africa or Europe, to your neighbor or your co-worker, you have to answer the call. Staying at home to “care for your fellow countryman” would be disobedient if God called you to medical missions in Liberia; just as it would be disobedient to travel to China if God called you to be a missionary in your hometown. …

And I have news for Ann – the angels rejoice in heaven just as much when a leprosy-ridden body in a jungle someplace receives Christ as when a multi-million dollar executive in a corner office prays the sinner’s prayer.

“Coulter owes Ebola doc an apology: priest”

Presented with Ms. Coulter’s absurd dichotomy – as if the Church must choose between serving at home or abroad – we have an opportunity to remember how the Church is poorly served by those who reduce her or her teaching to merely ‘conservative’ or ‘liberal’ labels. Ms. Coulter has no idea what motivated Dr. Brantly, and mocking a father who faces death for his service is simply reprehensible. At the very least, she owes him and his family an apology.

9 God did bless them. Both were treated in an Atlanta hospital and pronounced cured. They believe they have been miraculously healed. See Maggie Fox, “Docs Declare Ebola Patients Kent Brantly and Nancy Writebol No Risk to Public,” NBC News, 8/21/14, http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/ebola-virus-outbreak/docs-declare-ebola-patients-kent-brantly-nancy-writebol-no-risk-n185626.
Ann Coulter to God: “STFU”

In yesterday’s column, Coulter told God to shut up. Coulter lambasted all of her Christian critics – those whom God is using to prophesy truth into her life. But Coulter has not rejected them. She has rejected God.

Coulter asserts, “I’m a born-again Christian.”\(^\text{10}\) She insists, “I am as born-again evangelical Christian as they come.”\(^\text{11}\) Coulter boasts, “I’m an extraordinarily good Christian,”\(^\text{12}\) but she goes to great lengths to show how unchristian every other Christian is. Compassionate Christians are “moral show-offs.” Christian missionaries are traitors doing it for their own self-glory. And, now, Coulter calls those selfless missionaries – and all those who defend them – atheists!

With but a few notable exceptions, Coulter has spent most of her professional career contradicting God, while claiming to be “an extraordinarily good Christian” and being regarded as a Christian leader.\(^\text{13}\)

At the turn-of-the-millennium, Coulter laid down the gauntlet before her audience – and her Creator – writing, “If God himself came down from heaven and told me these cops intentionally murdered Amadou Diallo knowing he was unarmed, I would not believe it.”\(^\text{14}\)

Who would deny the very words of God spoken personally to them? Coulter!

---

11 Ann Coulter, CPAC, 2/12/11.
14 Ann Coulter, “A liberal lynching,” 2/16/00.
Coulter has been contradicting God throughout this century, whether in denying His gospel of grace and love or disavowing repentance and forgiveness. Truth (and Jesus is the “Truth”) is a casualty in most Coulter columns. False witness is one of Coulter’s most prevalent sins. Her pride is perilously persistent.

Twisting Scripture and Logic to Defend Herself From Truth

For the second time, Coulter attacked Christian missionaries. Coulter clever but deceptive essay title, “Let He Who is Without Ebola Cast the First Stone,” parodies a statement and concept by Christ which she clearly cannot grasp. Oh, by the way, it is Coulter who has been throwing stones.

Coulter again turned the gospel – and Christianity – upside down. Her gospel is political and nationalistic. Coulter chastises missionaries “who abandon America to do much-praised work in Third World countries.” Abandon? Do it for the glory and praise?

Again, Coulter “assailed” “the whole concept of American Christians fleeing their own country.” But, Ann, Christians are pilgrims and sojourners in this life whose citizenship is in heaven. Sadly, Coulter is too much a part of this world to see the heavenly glories.

Coulter’s assault on missionaries continued: “I set forth evidence for what I’m saying about there being glory-seeking and cowardice in Christian missions to Third World hellholes.”

Abandon. Glory-seeking and cowardice.

What a ghastly human being Coulter has become!

Coulter’s first essay attacking Christian missionaries displayed an incredible lack of judgment and discernment, as if it were a good idea to impugn the work and the motives of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Her follow-up essay was equally as belligerent, impenitent, and arrogant, and – confronted by the truth of her errors – willfully evil. How else to characterize purposeful defamation of innocent, indeed, selfless Christian missionaries serving those desperately in need in Third World countries?

Substantive Criticism

Coulter denied there had been any substantive criticism of her column, claiming, “there’s nothing to respond to.” She continued, “Missing from these alleged refutations is what we call a ‘point.’” Then Coulter called these Christians stupid and incapable of making rational arguments.

Coulter again asserted, “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.” But dozens of people did just that – responded to her central points with facts, reason, examples, and Scripture.

Scriptures Coulter chooses to ignore.

---

Here’s the Point!

Coulter claimed there was no “point” to criticisms of her.

Here’s the point, Ann. You are wrong. Demonstrably wrong. Demonically wrong. And you will not admit it. You would rather thumb your nose at God and His people than repent. You would rather hate those who tell you the truth than accept the love of God offered you.

Every Christian could ask you, Ann, what Paul asked the Galatians in Galatians 4:16: “Have I now become your enemy by telling you the truth?”

Ann, your hubris compels you to boast: “Liberals have been trying to insult me into submission for more than a decade. These guys think they can succeed where Vanity Fair failed?”

How about this, Ann? Faithful Christians – Jesus’ disciples who actually look to His guidance and seek His will in their lives – have spoken the truth to you and you will not hear. You will not hear because that would mean having to choose between doing His will and your will. But, you made that choice long ago, didn’t you?

Coulter’s Conceit

Coulter’s entire column is worth reading for insights into the person she has become. This section reveals both Coulter’s conceit and her ignorance of spiritual discernment. Coulter wrote:

“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?’”

[Great use of humor to mock her critics and lovely word choice: riposte! But my response follows Ann’s next sentence.]

“And there we are, stuck at an impasse.”

Ann, there is no impasse. We know that God did not call you to write your column because He is a God of truth and love and your column contained neither. (Though it is quite likely that His will was to expose the hardness of your heart through that column and the next one.)

Coulter continued:

“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 resorts 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.¹⁸

Case Study # 5  
Coulter v. Tea Party

Ann Coulter likes to be viewed as a Tea Party conservative and she eschews the establishment label. Coulter claims, “I’m more libertarian than most libertarians”¹ Coulter insists, “I’m more libertarian than most people who call themselves libertarian.”² She even asserts, “I’m libertarian on everything except morality.”³

But her words and actions belie her self-perceptions.

Coulter has been part of the establishment for well over a decade. In recent years, she gave up the fight and became a RINO. She either no longer knows what she believes or has ceased believing what she once believed.

**Coulter Attacks Tea Party Leaders**

Coulter consistently attacks Tea Party leaders like Sarah Palin and Jim DeMint. She actually accuses DeMint of being in league with socialists, saying, “I think he’s [Jim DeMint] been paid off by Soros.”⁴

Coulter elaborated, ‘On their ‘About’ page, [the Senate Conservative Fund] won't tell me who runs it – George Soros, George Soros, George Soros. … I think a lot of these Tea Party groups are George Soros fronts.”⁵

---

⁵ Ann Coulter, Los Angeles, 11/10/13.
Coulter Calls Tea Party a Mob

As I wrote in 2011, Coulter’s *Demonic* was deeply flawed, as was her criteria for determining a “mob.” Coulter is now using her flawed criteria to besmirch the Tea Party, which, ironically, mirrors the methods, goals, and intent of the Founders whom Coulter claims to revere.

1. For years, Coulter has favored the establishment over the Tea Party.
2. To Coulter, Romney remains the ideal candidate who ran a magnificent campaign. Now, she thinks Romney is better than Reagan.
3. Coulter denies that RINOs pose a threat to party unity.
4. Coulter is now applying many of her deeply flawed mob “characteristics” as outlined in *Demonic* to the Tea Party — but her analysis of mobs was deeply flawed, as pointed out in *The Beauty of Conservatism* (2011), and, thus, her political prescriptions are problematic.
In April of this year, Coulter again abandoned conservative principles, this time to distance herself from seemingly racist remarks by Cliven Bundy. Calling Tea Party protestors a mob and likening them to Occupy Wall Street, Coulter again missed the point: principles matter. Property rights – even of racists – matter. A commando-style raid of over 200 storm-troopers and snipers against an elderly rancher – in a dispute over grazing fees – matters.

As Ken Cuccinelli observed, “For the failure of conservative principles has not been due to the principles themselves, but to the failure to fight for them.”

But Coulter does not care about principles. Coulter said,

This is what I think is going on. I mean, I was never – I never thought this was a great cause. It's federal property. He needed to pay his grazing fees. There was a court hearing. I wrote a whole book against mobs. I don't see much difference, some difference, between what's going on at that ranch and Occupy Wall Street.

**Coulter Favors RINOs**

When given a choice between a Tea Party conservative and an establishment RINO, Coulter almost invariably goes for the RINO. Especially if they are incumbents. Or well-established power brokers. A few infographics make that point.

---


If Ann Coulter is such a firebrand conservative zealot, why does she fall in love with so many RINOs?

**Arizona Senator John McCain**
- “I used to love [John McCain], then I liked him, now I despise him.” – January 2000

**New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie**
- “[I love him] so much.” – June 2011
- “I remain in love with Chris Christie. He is going to be our cleanup guy in eight years.” – November 2011
- “I’m a great fan of Chris Christie.” – April 2012

**Former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney**
- “[Mitt McConnell is] smarter than Trent Lott [and] more conservative than Bob Dole.” – October 2013
- “I love him, he is a true conservative.” – February 2014

---

Coulter’s love affair with Christie is officially over! But why was she so enamored with him for so long – despite his obvious RINO credentials?

- “If we don’t run Chris Christie, Romney will be the nominee and we’ll lose.” – February 2011
- “I don’t care if [Christie] wants to run, his country needs him, it appears.” – February 2011
- “I love him so much.” – June 2011
- “Every twenty years you get a politician who comes along and speaks the truth so plainly and everyone else is afraid to say it.” – June 2011
- “Now is the time, we need him [to run for President]. And we need a big man after that beanpole in the White House.” – June 2011
- “I’m a great fan of Chris Christie. I think he would be an excellent choice [for VP].” – April 2012
- “I’m warming to him again, I’m waiting for him to switch on amnesty, and I have confidence in his high I.Q.” – March 2013
- “There seems to be a concerted movement by both liberals and conservatives to lie about Christie and make him seem more liberal than he really is.” – May 2013
- “He is no longer my love.” – October 2013
- “Well, OK. Christie does have eight times John McCain’s IQ. That’s a rough estimate.” – November 2013
Coulter’s conservative credentials have been consistently and credibly challenged for most of this century – by Mark Levin, Steve Deace, Gregg Jackson, Jen Kuznicki, and many others.⁸

---

⁸ For numerous examples, see The Beauty of Conservatism, available as a free PDF download at www.coulterwatch.com/beauty.pdf.
Coulter, acclaimed a Gay Icon, constantly promotes establishment RINOs and attacks the Tea Party. Coulter criticizes pro-lifers for being too pro-life and endorses pro-choice candidates. Coulter is willing to lie, engage in character assassination, and employ elimination rhetoric – all to further her own ends: the elevation of Ann Coulter.

Coulter is hardly the fount of conservatism.

[The remainder of this case study was originally published as a series of essays on my blog. – DB]

Part 1: Ann Coulter Attacks Principled Conservatives
Part 2: Coulter is Just Wrong About McDaniel
Part 3: Ann Coulter, Orwell’s Protégé
Part 4: Coulter Trashes Principled Patriot, Promotes Corrupt Incumbent
Part 5: Coulter Goes Off Half-Cocked on Tea Party

**Ann Coulter Attacks Principled Conservatives**

Coulter, called “The Manchurian Columnist” by the American Family Association, is busy attacking the Tea Party again. As Bryan Fischer notes, “her attack on McDaniel and his camp is wrongheaded and unprincipled in almost every respect.”

Using rhetoric similar to her attack on soccer fans and players (“throwing hissy fits,” crying on camera), Coulter, in a “condescending and patronizing” manner wrote that McDaniel was behaving as if he were in a “prom queen election.” Rather, Fischer writes, “It's a hotly contested election for a seat in the most powerful deliberative body in the world.”

Fischer provides numerous principled reasons to contest the primary results, including vote-buying, Cochran campaign irregularities, and other election abnormalities.

According to Fischer, “Coulter falsely argues that Cochran actually won the majority of Republican votes,” adding, “McDaniel won the Republican primary and Cochran won the Democratic run-off.”

Last year, Fischer took Coulter to task for attacking Tea Party candidates.

Coulter claims, “There's no reason to think that a majority of Mississippi Republicans didn't want Cochran as their nominee.”

A Red State analysis of the Mississippi election concludes: “But careful analysis of what Chris McDaniel repeatedly said on the campaign trail, against the backdrop of what voters want, shows that McDaniel understood both the people and the community he sought to represent.”
Moreover, “McDaniel, a two term state senator, is a man who knows the people he sought to represent. It is worth pointing out that in his home county, voters supported him with a solid 85% of the vote. Cochran didn’t receive that majority in any other county.”

What does Ann Coulter have against genuine conservatives? Coulter attacks what she is not.

Standing up for principles – and for principled conservatives – seems to be very difficult for Coulter. Indeed, taking Coulter’s “pragmatic” approach has proven counterproductive for several election cycles.

Coulter’s election analysis for several years has been abysmal. Claiming to be a conservative, Coulter consistently attacks the Tea Party and promotes candidates like Romney and Christie. Her political analysis cannot be trusted.⁹

**Coulter is Just Wrong About McDaniel**

Coulter is wrong – legally and politically – about McDaniel because she supports the establishment candidate over him.¹⁰

The almost two-decades long legal correspondent for Human Events should know better.

**Coulter’s Claim:** McDaniel can’t win!

---


“Cochran won the runoff by 7,667 votes, according to the certified vote count announced this week. McDaniel's partisans don’t just have to prove that more than seven-thousand ineligible voters went to the polls, but also that they all voted for Cochran, not McDaniel. Good luck with that.”

**Reality:** The election results should be invalidated

The validity of that election is in dispute for a variety of legal and ethical reasons. There are ample reasons for invalidating this run-off and redoing it. Among them, credible accusations of fraud, bribery, destruction of records, illegal crossover votes, and absentee ballot fraud.

The **GOP establishment engaged in a multitude of shenanigans** to prevent a McDaniel victory. Coulter is part of the establishment.

According to the law, “it must be shown that legal votes have been rejected, or illegal votes have been received, and that because of the one or the other, or both, the result does not conform to the will of the voters, or uncertainty has been case upon the result …”

Or consider the decision in **NOXUBEE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC E. COM. v. RUSSELL**, 443 So.2d 1191 (1983): “We have employed a two pronged test which though it has been stated in different ways, essentially provides that special elections will be required only when (1) enough illegal votes were cast for the contestee to change the result of the election, or (2) so many votes are disqualified that the will of the voters is impossible to discern.”

**True the Vote** and other organizations are seeking to prove – credibly – that this is the case.

**As one blogger noted:** “This runoff election in Mississippi is so filled with collusion and fraud between the national GOP, the Cochran campaign and the radical left that one doesn't know where to begin. Voter fraud, destruction of election evidence, paying for votes, and race-baiting personal smear campaigns funded by the GOP through back channels are just a few of this campaign's greatest hits.”

**Coulter’s Claim:** Republicans wanted Cochran

“There’s no reason to think that a majority of Mississippi Republicans didn’t want Cochran as their nominee.”

**Reality:** More Republicans voted for McDaniel than Cochran

If Republicans were flocking to Cochran why was Cochran so desperate to reach out to Democrats?

“Coulter falsely argues that Cochran actually won the majority of Republican votes. … **McDaniel won the Republican primary and Cochran won the Democratic run-off.**”

**Coulter’s Claim:** McDaniel could be next in line
“...McDaniel's crew is going to prevent him from having any political career, ever again.”

“They don’t care that they’re gambling with a Republican majority in the Senate – or destroying McDaniel’s future prospects. (Which could come soon – Cochran isn't getting any younger.)”

**Reality:** McDaniel is anathema to GOP establishment

Say what? A compliant McDaniel toeing the party line could be Cochran’s successor? On what planet! The GOP establishment has vilified McDaniel who is opposed to them. The Tea Party wants to replace the establishment.

**Coulter’s Claim:** Al Gore destroyed his career by contesting election results

“Observe that no one is asking Al Gore to run again, except maybe his cardiologist. Even in cases of actual vote fraud, history shows that the contesting politicians get branded as sore losers and destroy their political careers. Better to be magnanimous and live to fight another day.”

**Reality:** Somehow “sore losers” become winners

Gore remained a significant force within the Democratic Party during the Bush ’43 presidency and he remains a hero to the green movement.

As for destroyed political careers, Al Franken contested his defeat (an eight-month battle) and is now a senator from Minnesota. Also consider Alaska Republican Lisa Murkowski, who lost her primary but was elected to the Senate by write-in votes.

**Ann Coulter – an Establishment Flack**

Coulter has been an establishment RINO for many, many years. In the last election cycle, she attacked every Republican who threatened the candidacy of her political savior, Mitt Romney. Indeed, she still regards his as an exemplary candidate who should run for president in 2016.¹¹

As a consequence of her factually-challenged polemics, the reputations of good people have been tarnished and the conservative brand has been damaged.

**Ann Coulter lost her conservative credentials and her credibility** a long, long time ago.¹²

**Ann Coulter, Orwell’s Protégé**

Coulter was recently called a “Manchurian Columnist,” conjuring up images of propaganda and brainwashing. Certainly, Coulter is the consummate propagandist and her recent polemic against Republican Senate candidate Chris McDaniel is representative of her work.

---


Orwellian Techniques

Coulter utilizes many Orwellian techniques to fool her readers into believing her big lies. Among them, Newspeak, doublethink, the memory hole, and character assassination. Coulter also uses humor and ridicule to delegitimize her foes, and uses exaggeration to effect.

Let’s look at a few of the techniques she used in her attack on Chris McDaniel and his campaign. (Remember, McDaniel is a surrogate for the Tea Party and all those who oppose her establishment candidates.)

Coulter’s Big Lies

Since 9/11, Coulter has postulated two principle big lies which were presented in her 2003 best-seller, Treason. Treason — and the entirety of Ann Coulter’s post-impeachment work — is predicated upon a worldview encapsulated by two equations: liberalism = terrorism = treason and conservatism = McCarthyism = patriotism. No subtleties or ambiguities. No nuances. No sense.

Moreover, Coulter claimed that “The myth of ‘McCarthyism’ is the greatest Orwellian fraud of our times.” In 2005, at CPAC, Coulter even called for a New McCarthyism.

But even before then, in order to ensure the candidcy of her man, George W. Bush, Coulter attacked presidential candidate Gary Bauer, calling him a fascist. Her political equation, her big lie? Christian conservative = fascist. Her essay title: “Must Christian Conservatives be Fascists?” Why were they fascists? For seeking a constitutional solution to abortion.
Now, to promote her RINO establishment Republican bedfellows, Coulter has come up with addition political equations, additional big lies:

**Being Principled is Unprincipled**

**Tea Party is bad; Establishment Republicans are good**

**RINO = True Conservative**

Coulter uses Orwellian techniques to undergird her big lies.

**Newspeak**

For years now, Coulter has conflated Tea Party and establishment Republicans, switching identities and descriptions. She frequently denigrates members of the Tea Party – and entire organizations – to support her RINO establishment candidates.

Coulter attacked McDaniel’s team (“Clowns and nuts”), claiming selfishness and an obliviousness to endangering a potential Republican majority:

“But some McDaniel supporters can't think about anything but winning this one primary. They don't care that they're gambling with a Republican majority in the Senate …”

But Coulter defended McDaniel’s rival:

“In Mississippi, they're attempting to destroy a good Republican.”

**Doublethink**

Targeting McDaniel, Coulter avers that the principled thing to do is to be unprincipled. Coulter admits to election irregularities, yet she wants McDaniel to concede – and to ignore the obvious criminal activities of his opponent. Voter fraud by conservatives is unimportant to her. Coulter wants to save the GOP by destroying its soul.

Similarly, during and after the 2012 election, Coulter attacked pro-lifers for being pro-life (just as she did in 2000).

Coulter acknowledges bad blood between McDaniel and Cochran (between the Tea Party and establishment), yet she repeatedly urges McDaniel to concede so that he can be next in line.

What? The establishment doesn’t want McDaniel, who is anti-establishment. But Coulter writes, “McDaniel's crew is going to prevent him from having any political career, ever again.” Coulter cautions, “Better to be magnanimous and live to fight another day.”

According to Coulter, his campaign is “destroying McDaniel's future prospects. (Which could come soon – Cochran isn't getting any younger.)”

Coulter doesn’t make any sense at all!
Memory Hole

As noted in my previous essay, Coulter “forgot” about Al Gore, Al Franken, and Lisa Murkowski, who did not fit her thesis. Many other examples could have been provided of politicians whose careers thrived after contesting election results.

Coulter also wrote of Richard Nixon, but failed to grasp two salient points. First, Nixon was from a completely different political and cultural era. Second, Nixon was an anomaly. Having lost in 1960, he won in 1968 and 1972. Nixon resigned in ignominy over Watergate, yet rehabilitated his legacy as an author and statesman.

Coulter’s Orwellian constructs emulate Big Brother’s insistence that two plus two equals five.

Coulter Trashes Principled Patriot, Promotes Corrupt Incumbent

“Coulter, shepherdess of the RINO establishment,” has again trashed principled conservatives to extol a corrupt establishment Republican who used fraudulent and illegal methods to retain power. Indeed, Coulter is so incensed to enthrone Cochran that she wants to kill McDaniel supporters, “Please get their addresses [of McDaniel’s supporters] for me so I can fly in and hold their heads under the water until the bubbles stop.”

In the midst of crises, character is forged and proven, and true leaders emerge triumphant. In the midst of the darkness of deceit and treachery, the light of truth shines most brightly.

Coulter eschews the light as she runs to the darkness.

Coulter Discounts Integrity and Principles

Coulter began her column by listing a series of current domestic crises, then asked, “why is a dime's worth of money being wasted on trying to replace the Republican senator from Mississippi with a slightly different Republican?” Because principles matter!

_Slightly different_ Republicans? **They are drastically different Republicans.** One is a pro-establishment incumbent who engaged in a smear campaign and voter fraud, then covered it up. The other is an anti-establishment Tea Party candidate standing up for principles and the rule of law.

Ironically, Coulter – who claims that opposition to amnesty is a candidate’s most important credential – is, by her own standards, supporting the wrong candidate: McDaniel has proven his anti-amnesty bona fides, while Cochran has courted amnesty. That’s a _big_ “dime’s worth of difference.”

One Mississippian queried Coulter’s assertion:

> A “slightly different Republican?” Um, Ann, maybe you should check [Thad Cochran’s](http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/miller/140725) and [Chris McDaniel’s](http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/miller/140725) voting records. Maybe you should research their positions (hint: [Cochran has cast numerous pro-amnesty votes](http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/miller/140725)). Maybe you should discover that [Thad Cochran often votes with the Democrats](http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/miller/140725), and that he has an abysmal record on conservatism, because _he's not a conservative._

But for Coulter, the rule of law does not matter as long as her candidate wins.

She treats McDaniel supporters as if they were _iceberg-deniers on the Titanic_ ("Honestly, I think these deck chairs look just fine. Maybe we should check on the Titanic's hull, captain.")

**Coulter, Still Race-Obsessed, Lies About McDaniel**

The majority of Coulter’s column focuses on race, Cochran’s racial bona fides, and the Left’s dark history of racial animus toward blacks. But she blames McDaniel – not Cochran – for injecting race into the campaign.

*For the truth, we must turn to the National Review:*

> But the ads and robocalls against McDaniel went much further. They explicitly warned that McDaniel was closely tied to people involved with the Ku Klux Klan. They said McDaniel had a “racist agenda.” They specifically branded the entire tea-party movement as having “racist ideas.” And even the slightly-less-explicit robocalls, which Barbour already admitted helping pay for (although he says he never listened to them in advance), tied tea partiers explicitly to disrespectful treatment of the first African-American president.

At the onset of her racial attack against McDaniel, Coulter admitted, “Yes, it's annoying to see a Republican appeal to Democratic voters to save his seat.” Coulter utterly ignores [Cochran’s illegal and immoral methods of effecting that appeal](http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/miller/140725).

---

Then she continued her blame game, asserting, “It also doesn’t look great having alleged Republican activists claiming that any votes from blacks in a GOP primary were fraudulent.”

Say again, “alleged Republican activists?” Disputing “votes from blacks?” But that isn’t what McDaniel alleges! McDaniel is focusing on illegal votes, not black votes. It is Coulter who is obsessed with color.\(^{16}\) Color matters to Coulter.

Again attacking McDaniel, Coulter lied, “But it's really fantastic to have McDaniel supporters out there denouncing Cochran for getting blacks to vote for him.” No, McDaniel was denouncing Cochran for getting illegal Democrat votes. McDaniel is addressing a corrupt campaign which used fraudulent means to win a primary election.

Coulter concluded her column by asking, “Why shouldn’t Cochran ask black people for their votes in a primary? The Republican Party was once, and for some still is, the natural political home for black Mississippians.”

These are the real questions:

1. Why is Coulter so adamant that McDaniel ignore his opponent’s voter fraud.
2. Why is Coulter so determined to have a GOP nominee who wins the primary based on the will of the Democratic base and not the Republican grassroots?
3. Why is Coulter accusing the Tea Party of racism? And ignoring the establishment GOP’s defamation of the Tea Party as racist?

Answer: If the election were honestly run, the anti-establishment Tea Party candidate would beat the establishment incumbent Republican.

As noted by others, “Ann Coulter sees the world in the limited viewpoint that Republicans are good and Democrats are bad. She doesn't adhere to principle, but rather views party ID as the determining factor in who is worthy and who is not in the world of politics.”

For Coulter, it’s all about results, not principles.

But if you’re principled, you’ll get the result.

**Coulter Not Principled Conservative**

Coulter is not a principled conservative. Perhaps she never was. Certainly, Coulter does not have faith in her principles. She is not a true believer.

Coulter would rather support a wishy-washy establishment Republican incumbent – with all of the campaign benefits which accrue to being an establishment incumbent – than risk losing an election by supporting a true conservative challenger who might lose.

As one Freeper suggests, “This election cycle how she has made headlines is by being the attack dog for the establishment (of both parties) against the Tea Party movement. She has criticized tea party groups for

\(^{16}\) This has been true for most of the past two decades and, most recently, in her disparagement of soccer as “foreign.” See “Coulter’s Soccer Flop – Part Trois” at [http://t.co/uv7FDPu79v](http://t.co/uv7FDPu79v). See also Chapter 4: “Prejudice,” in *Vanity: Ann Coulter’s Quest for Glory*, 2012, available as a free download at [www.coulterwatch.com/vanity.pdf](http://www.coulterwatch.com/vanity.pdf).
supporting conservative challengers that are running against entrenched moderate/failed Republican incumbents, yet has been noticeably silent about the establishment bankrolling millions of dollars to attack tea party candidates – including incumbents who are being challenged by liberal/pro-amnesty/pro-crony-capitalism challengers.”

Another blogger made a couple of salient points:

“[Coulter] is more interested in the end game than pushing for true conservatism and if that means keeping a RINO who has a chance then take your 30 pieces of silver and move on, unite and vote R.”17

Continuing,

“But she is a typical Northeastern Republican whose idea of conservatism is in line with the establishment view of middle of the road, go along to get along, anything to win an election mentality.”

A Mississippian Rebuts Coulter

A Mississippian familiar with local events and politics provided an important perspective in rebuttal to Coulter’s.18 Heed these stirring words:

“Allow me to finally reply to this opportunistic, money-grubbing Establishment hack masquerading as a conservative.”

“Twice now you have slammed a good man and a damn good conservative who happens to be a friend of mine, and trashed true conservatives in Mississippi as fanatics. I must say that I have been skeptical of you for years, especially when you called Tea Partiers frauds and supported Chris Christie for President, but now you have certainly shown me your true colors. You are not a principled conservative but just another Establishment hack, no different than Karl Rove or Mitch McConnell, or the Democrats you supposedly hate so much.”

“We, the true conservatives in this great nation, are fighters, Ann, which is obviously something you are unfamiliar with. You have shown yourself to be a Tory. Thank God you were not in Philadelphia in 1776! You probably would have argued that King George really wasn’t all that bad. Or that he was only slightly different than Thomas Jefferson, am I right?”

“We believe in fighting for this great country that we are losing by the day. We’ve had enough of cowardly Republicans, like you, who whimper at the slightest hand raised by Democrats. We are proud to stand behind a true conservative fighter in Chris McDaniel and God bless his efforts! But if you are not going to join our crusade, then do us all a big favor and shut up!”

---


Ann Coulter Goes Off Half-Cocked on Tea Party

Ann Coulter was off of national television for over two months – and she should have stayed in her “bat cave.”

In her return debut, Coulter hailed Mitt Romney as the great conservative hope for 2016. Responding to the suggestion by Bill O’Reilly that Romney might again be the GOP nominee for president, Coulter exclaimed, “I hope so. Oh, I hope so.”

I hope so?

Oh, I hope so???

Romney Rave

Coulter’s former fans on Free Republic took her to task for this lunacy.

“Good Lord, the one Republican politician in all of the United States who can’t run against Obamacare and Ann Coulter wants him to run again.”

“ann is a pod person.”

---

19 Coulter’s coy term for her isolation from humanity in order to complete her next book.
20 Ann Coulter, O’Reilly Factor, FNC, 10/18/14.
“This is about year 8 that Ann has been pushing Mitt. Someone should point out to her that during his 22 years of campaigning, he has won a single election with less than 50% and was driven from office that he wanted to win reelection to, exiting with 34% approval and losing the seat to the democrats after having been the fourth Republican governor in a row.”

“Ann thinks Mitt’s last campaign against the worst president in America’s history was impressive. She especially likes the way he defined his principles and initiatives in contrast to Obama, and how he aggressively countered Obama’s campaign and policies.”

“Coulter is all over the map. She lost it long ago. ‘Romney would be great in 2016, or Cruz.’ That makes no sense. When she makes sense, she must be viewed as undependable, politically toxic, since she can turn on a dime.”

**Tea Party Tempest**

Three days later, on *Hannity*, Coulter blamed GOP consultants and, principally, the Tea Party for previous Republican defeats.

“The reason this election is so important is because we have blown Senate seats – I say ‘we’ – you have the Republican consultants on one hand you cannot trust because they’re beholden to the Chamber of Commerce and then you have the base – these Tea Partiers – running off and causing Republicans to lose elections. But for elections lost by Republican consultants and/or the Tea Party, we would already have [a Republican majority in the Senate].”

Notice her use of the imperial “we,” which she quickly redefined as “I’m not to blame.”

Coulter accepts zero blame for Romney’s debacle in 2012 and still touts him as the perfect candidate for the GOP in 2016. Romney lost and, therefore, had no coattails. Running RINOs will never attract the conservative vote.

But Coulter prefers to besmirch principled Republican candidates with character and, instead, support “electable” candidates like Romney and Christie who are fake conservatives. It can never work.

---

Case Study # 6
Romney v. Everyone Else

Coulter became enchanted with Mitt Romney in 2006, charmed by his looks, stature, and wealth. In October of that year, Coulter told Bill O’Reilly, “[Mitt Romney is] my favorite [GOP nominee].”

Coulter once mentioned having Rush Limbaugh and Mark Levin at her house for Thanksgiving dinner in 2011. In talking about the disastrous 2008 election and upcoming 2012 election, Coulter said, “I’m not going to let that happen again this time.”¹ From that moment on, Coulter was intent upon picking the correct (“electable”) candidate and foisting him on the American people.

For Coulter, Romney fit the bill. Coulter fought tooth and nail to get him nominated and elected, irrespective of what actual conservatives wanted. She tarnished the reputations of all viable opponents. And she succeeded in getting him nominated, despite Romney’s very flawed campaign.

Coulter knew what she was doing and she let Romney no that as well. Coulter told Hannity:

Did I tell you I met [Romney] at a fundraiser? I went up to him. I was about to leave. But I said – I just wanted to go up to him and tell him, “You owe me and you better be as right-wing a president as I’m telling everybody you’re going to be.”²

¹ Ann Coulter, Sean Hannity Show, Premiere Radio Networks, 1/6/12.
² Ann Coulter, Sean Hannity Show, Premiere Radio Networks, 2/2/12.
During the 2012 presidential cycle, Coulter became a true believer (or so she would have us believe) in Romney. A fawning Coulter cooed, “Romney has had a Midas touch with everything he has done.”

The electorate disagreed.

Stunned, indeed, crushed by Romney’s striking defeat in 2012, Coulter has remained in denial ever since, unwilling to admit any flaws in her chosen political savior (the one in whom she invested her time, talents, emotions, and reputation).

With almost two years to reflect upon the devastating 2012 election cycle, Coulter concluded that she was right, affirming that Romney was the ideal candidate who ran an exemplary campaign. Now she wants to again vaunt her superior insight to shape yet another election.

Coulter remains crazy about Romney, exposing her RINO roots. Coulter abandoned conservative principles so many years ago that she has herself become a full-blown establishment RINO. Yet, she feels compelled to dictate to conservatives whom we should nominate [more on that in the next case study].

Coulter has been smitten by Romney for almost a decade. Despite Romney’s flip-flops, Coulter remains impressed with her political savior. Indeed, she actually regards those flip-flops as admirable, declaring that Romney “tricked” liberals into voting for him for governor of Massachusetts. (Then why isn’t Coulter concerned about Romney “tricking” conservatives into believing he is “severely conservative,” as he once told a CPAC audience?)

---

3 Ann Coulter, This Week, ABC, 6/10/12.
Romney Gaffes

Coulter excoriated Todd Akin for one gaffe, vilifying him and even issuing death threats. Yet, Romney was very gaffe-prone. But, in Coulter’s eyes, Romney remained a “fantastic candidate.” Indeed, Coulter claims, “Romney was the perfect candidate … Romney is one of the best presidential candidates the Republicans have ever fielded.”

Here is a sampling of Romney gaffes:

- “I was a severely conservative Republican governor.”
- “I'm not concerned about the very poor. We have a safety net there.”
- “I like being able to fire people who provide services to me.”
- “I went to a number of women's groups and said ‘Can you help us find folks?’ and they brought us whole binders full of women.”
- “There are 47 percent of the people who will vote for the president no matter what. All right, there are 47 percent who are with him, who are dependent upon government, who believe that they are victims, who believe the government has a responsibility to care for them, who believe that they are entitled to health care, to food, to housing, to you-name-it. ... My job is not to worry about those people. I'll never convince them they should take personal responsibility and care for their lives.”
- “I'm not familiar precisely with what I said, but I’ll stand by what I said, whatever it was.”
- “I believe in an America where millions of Americans believe in an America that's the America millions of Americans believe in. That's the America I love.”
- “Tomorrow we begin a new tomorrow.”
- “Join me in welcoming the next president of the United States, Paul Ryan.”
- “When you have a fire in an aircraft, there’s no place to go, exactly, there’s no – and you can’t find any oxygen from outside the aircraft to get in the aircraft, because the windows don’t open. I don't know why they don’t do that. It’s a real problem.”
- “PETA is not happy that my dog likes fresh air.”

Romney is Better Than Cruz

Still, Coulter even favors Mitt Romney over Ted Cruz, claiming “[Romney] is head and shoulders better than the other candidates we have.” From the Howie Carr Show:

Coulter: “I think [Romney] was a fantastic candidate. … he is head and shoulders better than the other candidates we have … none of them are as articulate, and reasonable …and as good on immigration as Mitt Romney is.”

---

5 Ann Coulter, Howie Carr Show, WRKO, 3/31/14.
Carr: “What about Ted Cruz?”

Coulter: “Well, he’s a lot worse on immigration.”

---

Coulter Lies Again and Again

In the last few months leading up to the 2012 presidential election, Coulter totally ignored immigration. Instead, she devoted five columns to racism and the race card, two to Libya, one to Obamacare (“the single most important issue in this election”), one praising Joseph McCarthy, and another condemning Todd Akin. Immigration missed her list of highest priorities.

Coulter insists that Romney was and remains a “magnificent” candidate – and that Romney’s defeat arose due to a perfect storm of forces beyond Romney’s control.

But in March of this year Coulter told another story, engaging in historical revisionism to rehabilitate her career, her reputation, and her credibility.

Coulter claimed, “Amnesty is a winner for Republicans and it will only help in 2016, and I would use Romney as an example. That was the reason I supported Romney. He was very good on immigration.”6

In focusing on amnesty, Coulter is trying to absolve herself of blame (and guilt) for her part in Obama’s reelection victory.

For Coulter, Romney is a victim just as she is. Neither are to blame for Obama’s decisive 2012 victory.

---

6 Ann Coulter, Kelly File, FNC, 6/10/14.
Now, Coulter has latched on to amnesty as her *cause célèbre* and she is re-writing the history of her commentary, dispatching inconvenient views down the memory hole to escape condemnation.

In a series of post-2012 election columns, Coulter blamed everyone else but Romney for Romney’s defeat. Coulter also praised Romney’s platform and qualifications without mentioning his position on immigration.

In defending Romney, Coulter listed Romney’s strengths, accomplishments, and goals. Strikingly, she did not mention Romney’s position on immigration, though she now claims his immigration stance drew her to him.

Coulter blamed: incumbency, the extended primary season, pro-lifers, purist conservatives, moron showoffs, and changing demographics.

To quote Coulter: “Romney promised to institute major reforms to Medicare, repeal Obamacare and impose a 20 percent across-the-board tax cut. He said he’d issue a 50-state waiver to Obamacare on his first day in office. (Why he didn’t promise it to all 57 states I’ll never know.) He chose a pro-life, fiscal conservative as his running mate and never praised FDR.”
“Amnesty is a winner for Republicans and it will only help in 2016, and I would use Romney as an example. That was the reason I supported Romney. He was very good on immigration.”

In a series of post-2012 election columns, Coulter blamed everyone else but Romney for Romney’s defeat. Coulter also praised Romney’s platform and qualifications without even mentioning his position on immigration.

Ann Coulter, Kelly File, 6/10/14

Not one word about amnesty!

Who Made More Gaffes?

Akin made one foolish gaffe and Coulter regards him as evil. Romney – despite countless gaffes – was a “perfect candidate” who ran a “magnificent campaign” in Coulter’s eyes.

“I was a severely conservative Republican governor.”
“I’m not concerned about the very poor. We have a safety net there.”
“I like being able to fire people who provide services to me.”
“I went to a number of women’s groups and said ‘Can you help us find folks?’ and they brought us whole binders full of women.”
“There are 47 percent of the people who will vote for the president no matter what. All right, there are 47 percent who are with him, who are dependent upon government, who believe that they are victims, who believe the government has a responsibility to care for them, who believe that they are entitled to health care, to food, to housing, to you-name-it.”
“PETA is not happy that my dog likes fresh air.”
“I’m not familiar precisely with what I said, but I’ll stand by what I said, whatever it was.”
Case Study # 7
Political Playbook

Beginning with the 2000 presidential election, Coulter has continually sought to shape electoral outcomes, whether in local, state, or national races. To do so, Coulter once attempted to run a “total sham” campaign for Congress in 2000, and she has since defamed numerous Republican candidates in order to nominate her personal favorites.

In May 1999, Coulter’s top three presidential candidates were “Buchanan, Quayle, Forbes … those are probably my top three.” Bush didn’t even make the cut.

Just one month later, Coulter was taken aback by George W. Bush’s meteoric ascent, saying, “I do think that the almost overwhelming support for George W. Bush is one of the most peculiar phenomenon in politics this century.” Already, in June, she was convinced that “George W. is going to be the next president.”

She questioned the wisdom of Republicans “coronat[ing] one candidate before we know anything about him” and added that “he isn’t even my brand of Republican from what I can tell with this nonsense about how compassionate he is. I don’t know what that means. How does that translate into a policy proposal?”

Nevertheless, Coulter was firm – already, in June 1999 – that “he’s going to be the next president.”

Coulter’s assessment – and her fervor in promoting Bush – lay not in his platform (at that time he didn’t offer one), but in his popularity and, more importantly, his huge war chest. Even in July, Coulter admitted that she was “still lukewarm” about Bush, because he wasn’t really conservative enough for her taste.

What Bush was – in her eyes – was “electable.” Bush’s platform and policies did not matter. The only thing that mattered was that he was an “electable” Republican. In the end, Coulter smeared many good people, many good Republicans, to help get Bush nominated and elected.

During the 2000 presidential election cycle, Coulter continuously vilified the motives and the character Sen. John McCain (R-AZ), even accusing him of being bought and paid for by the liberal press. In addition to tarnishing the reputation of an honorable war hero, Coulter accused the head of a pro-life, pro-family organization, Gary Bauer, of – of all things – fascism. Why? Because his pro-life advocacy threatened the candidacy of her man, George W. Bush.

[Only after Bush became a lame duck president did Coulter deign to criticize him. Many conservatives supported Bush in international affairs and on cultural issues, but are distressed at the growth of government under his watch. Moreover, Bush favored amnesty, which is anathema to Coulter.]

During the 2008 presidential cycle, Coulter again besmirched McCain, this time claiming that Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-NY) was more conservative than McCain and that she herself would campaign for Hillary. Once McCain became the GOP nominee, Coulter started her lackluster website in support of him: Let’s Get Drunk and Vote For McCain.

---

2 Ann Coulter, Fox Face Off, FNC, 6/18/99.
3 Ann Coulter, Hannity & Colmes, FNC, 7/16/99. Voting for a RINO, even then, was acceptable to her as long as he was a Republican. Party over ideology, pragmatism over principles. And so it continues to this day.
During the 2012 presidential cycle, Coulter again reverted to her now-familiar modus operandi by vilifying her man’s chief rivals, particularly former Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-NC). Coulter claimed Gingrich to be the least conservative and least electable GOP candidate. This time, Coulter said she would vote for Rep. Ron Paul (R-TX – or the Devil – over Gingrich! (But Coulter is the one who calls other people “insane.”)) She also said she’d “vote for” and “support” cannibalistic serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer over Barack Obama.4

In recent elections, Coulter has besmirched many good Republicans for the greater good of seeing her choices nominated. Despite GOP defeats for president in 2008 and 2012, Coulter thinks she knows best for 2016. This despite the fact that she refuses to admit why Republicans lost in 2012: they had the wrong candidate. Now, Coulter wants to nominate that very same candidate for president in 2016.

Not having learned her lesson, why should Americans take lessons from Ann? Coulter has repeatedly failed in diagnosing her blunders in national politics, but we are to trust her in future elections?

Romney was Coulter’s “favorite” in 2006. She “loved him” in 2011, foisted him on us in 2012, and, even after his decisive loss to Obama, called him a “perfect,” magnificent,” and “ideal” candidate. Even now, Coulter favors Romney for 2016!

---

Single Greatest Issue Facing Americans

Regarding herself as an expert politico – the best one to offer Republicans a winning strategy to gain ascendancy – Coulter has also carefully prioritized the issues that Americans are (or should be) most concerned about.

Or has she?

Is Ann Coulter Confused? Conflicted?

After Romney’s disastrous 2012 campaign, Coulter declared immigration the single most important issue of our time. She said she would become a “single-issue” pundit devoted to preventing immigration from destroying America. At CPAC, Coulter even issued death threats against anyone who supports amnesty.

“Amnesty is not just another vote. It is the end of the pro-life movement. It’s the end of the marriage movement. It’s the end of trying to repeal Obamacare. It is the end of everything.”5

Her love affair with Gov. Chris Christie ended over amnesty. “I’m now a single-issue voter (on immigration), so Christie is off my list.”6 And, “The only thing I can't forgive [Chris Christie] for is amnesty.”7

6 Ann Coulter, CPAC, 3/16/13.
Coulter remains passionate in her hostility to amnesty:

Immigration is forever, it is game over when that happens. Amnesty is forever. You gotta vote for the Republicans one more time, and just make it clear that if you pass amnesty that’s it, it’s over. And then we organize the death squads for the people that wrecked America.  

Coulter later clarified her priorities, saying,

It really does all come down to immigration. It is the most important issue at the moment. … Immigration is more important than Obamacare because if we lose on immigration we lose on Obamacare. … Everything is over if the Democrats are allowed to change the voters.

But, just says later, Coulter changed her mind, saying that Obamacare – and *Obamacare alone* – is the “only issue” in the 2014 and subsequent elections.

Coulter insisted, “Let me begin by saying that I think the only issue in the 2014 election should be Obamacare. In fact, that should be the only issue in every election until it’s repealed.”

**Endorses Single Issue Voting**

As an avowed pro-lifer, it is amazing that Coulter champions single-issue voting, but that that single issue is never a pro-life issue.

---

For Coulter that single issue is immigration, no Obamacare, no immigration …

Neil Cavuto took to task those conservatives who would make the 2014 election all about one issue and one issue only, calling them “stupid!”

Here’s his monologue:

I’m not saying that Obamacare wouldn’t be and shouldn’t be an issue, but stopping action on any other issue in the meantime looks pretty stupid. … The Republican act of sitting on the ball [Obamacare] and trying to run out the clock, hoping it paves the way to an easy win in November – stupid! Beyond stupid! … [saying:] It’s health care and only health care. … Who told them abandoning their principles was key to winning back control? Who told the tea parties to shut up simply because they wanted to force spending down? Who told the conservatives who were passionate about controlling benefits that it wasn’t to the Party’s benefit to try? Who told the Grand Old Party to give up its red old soul? Who told them to let the spending go? … Who told Republicans not to be Republicans, to not stand on principle, but to keep compromising those principles?

Principles matter and principled conservatism is a winner. But Coulter seemingly disagrees.

**Elect Republicans, Not Necessarily Conservatives**

For Coulter, it is all about having the letter “R” after your name. Despite her declarations of allegiance to particular single issues – whether amnesty or health care – Coulter only cares about getting a Republican majority in Congress or a Republican president. Hence her willingness to shill for RINOs.

Coulter is insistent: “If we don't elect Republicans; I don't care which Republicans, we will not repeal Obamacare.”

Only Republicans can save the Republic! “The most important issue is winning back Congress.”

“But from my perspective, all I want is a majority Republican in the House.”

It doesn’t matter what they believe or how they vote while in office? Just elect Republicans?

Huh?

The *Common Constitutionalist* observed what many other actual conservatives have noted: Republicans are not necessarily conservative and they will not necessarily vote conservatively. Note the common sense in this essay:

The Republicans gained total control of the federal government and maintained it from 2002 through 2006. During that time they had the presidency, the Senate and the House. What did they do in that time?

---

They did cut taxes, although the first round of cuts was in 2001. Other than that, what did the great Republican majority do? Did they fix education? Nope. They made it worse (No Child Left Behind). Did they fix our energy problems? Did they Drill-Baby-Drill? Nope. Did they seal the border? Nope. Did they reduce regulations, reign in the EPA? Nope. Did they fix the tax code? Nope. Beat back the nonsense that is “Global Warming”? Nope.

They didn’t do jack except cross the aisle, spend a lot more money and kowtow to the minority party and the mainstream media.

But Coulter disagrees. Coulter has despised Sen. John McCain for almost two decades. Nevertheless – despite being a RINO – Coulter said:

We have to concentrate on winning right now. I am second to none in disliking John McCain. I was for Hillary over John McCain. And yet, if he were up for election in 2014, I’d vote for him. All we need now is to rack up people with R’s after their names.¹⁶

Huh?

**Nominate Only Governors or Senators**

As for the presidency, Coulter has developed a multi-pronged strategy for winning, winning, winning.

That strategy includes a simple, yet unyielding, principle: *nominate only governors or senators.*

But would Coulter’s singular directive to conservatives actually work? Let’s look to history.

---

In every presidential election over the past almost sixty years, every Republican nominee for president has been either a governor or senator (as recommended by Coulter), or a sitting/former President/Vice President (see accompanying chart, which begins with 1960 and the television age).

The GOP lost seven of those 14 elections. Reagan’s stunning landslide victories were a direct result of his clearly espoused conservative ideals.

Even greater clarity is achieved by looking at the post-GOP losses (every one of them a moderate). Though the elder Bush benefited from the Reagan legacy, he was a moderate RINO who called Reaganomics “voodoo economics” and thought his administration would lead to a “kinder, gentler nation,” effectively dismissing the Reagan era.

Dole was an establishment Republican with a clearly unfocused and incoherent political agenda. McCain and Romney remain establishment RINOs.


But not for Coulter. Coulter insists, “knock it off with the congressmen or inspirational figures. It’s gotta be a governor or a senator, preferably a governor.”17 Yes, she would definitely prefer a governor, because “You don’t have to be smart to be a senator.”18

First and foremost, the Republican nominee must be a governor or senator. Notice, once again, that the credentials of the candidate matters more to Coulter than his character or conservatism. How has that worked out in the past for Republicans?

---

17 Ann Coulter, Howie Carr Show, WRKO, 3/31/14.
Literally traumatized by Obama’s decisive reelection, Coulter has become entrapped in a vicious cycle of addictive thinking: denial, projection, and rationalization.

Coulter denies Romney’s failings as a conservative and a candidate. Her irrationality informs her confused and confusing analysis of the 2012 election dynamics and it generates a flawed prescription for electoral victory in 2016. In demanding that only governors or senators be nominated, Coulter ignores the reality of politics in her over half-century of life.

Given Coulter’s exceptional memory and her familiarity with local election campaigns and results across the country, her inability to see the forest for the trees is astonishing. The actual political dynamics seemingly elude her.

**Dave Brat’s Victory Proves Ann Coulter Wrong!**

Since Romney’s spectacular defeat in 2012, Coulter has blamed everything and everyone but Romney (and herself) for the GOP’s failure to win the White House. Incumbency registered large in her defense of Romney, writing, “Incumbents usually win.” Coulter spent a great deal of time citing incumbency as a primary reason for the defeat of her “perfect candidate.”

In contrast, Virginia’s 2014 primary proves Coulter wrong.

The incumbent, nationally-recognized House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, outspent the newcomer economics professor Dave Brat 25-1.

Cantor – the incumbent – lost! How is that possible? Because people recognized his unknown challenger, Brat, as a genuine conservative. Just as, in 2012, people recognized Romney as what he is – a RINO.

Still, Coulter favors Romney for president in 2016, regarding him as the best candidate out there!

Astonishing!
Since becoming a conservative celebrity in 1998, Ann Coulter has felt compelled to dictate to Americans whom they should vote for. In the last presidential cycle, Coulter foisted Romney on reluctant Republicans, and we all know how that turned out. (Although Coulter, alone, still thinks Romney was an “ideal” candidate who ran a “magnificent” campaign.)

Ever since Romney’s debacle in 2012, Coulter has insisted that only governors or senators run for president. (But wasn’t Romney a former governor?)

Now Coulter is becoming even more strident in her zeal to coronate the next Republican nominee.

Nevertheless, with the 2016 election almost two years away, Coulter is insistent that her choices – and only her choices – be considered as Republican nominees for President.

**Coulter’s Criteria for President**

On *Fox & Friends*, Coulter explained, “On the Republican side, for the first time ever, I would really like if we didn’t have a bunch of crazy candidates.”

Those “crazy candidates” would, of course, be those who were not governors or senators.

Coulter again reiterated her *general criteria for a presidential nominee*: “If you haven’t been a governor or a senator – preferably a governor – please do not run for President as a Republican.”

---

She then whittled away specific candidates who do not conform to her criteria: “We do not want Carly Fiorina. I love her, but no, she can’t run.”

Who is “we,” Ann? Who says “we” don’t want Carly? And why “can’t” she run?

Coulter quickly continued, “Same thing with Ben Carson. Fantastic surgeon. I never wanted Ronald Reagan to be my surgeon.”

Who asked Reagan to perform surgery? How about another non sequitur – Did Ann ask Reagan to act?

Next, Coulter dispensed with an entire category of politicians: “You can’t have congressmen.”

What does Coulter mean by “You can’t have …?” Coulter is telling us (conservatives, Republicans, libertarians, Americans) whom we can or cannot nominate! What we can or cannot do!

Advocacy for a particular candidate or policy position is one thing, but dictating whom we can vote for is quite another.

**Coulter’s Very Short List**

In the end, Coulter offered conservatives her four choices for Republican presidential candidates: “No wasting time. It’s down to Romney, Ted Cruz, Chris Christie, or Scott Walker. That’s it, Republicans!”

Romney and Christie are both on her very short list. 50% RINOs! Romney – her first choice! Again!

And why is Christie back in favor if amnesty is the single most important issue facing Americans today? Remember, Coulter claimed, “I’m now a single-issue voter (on immigration), so Christie is off my list.”

Moreover, Coulter insisted, “The only thing I can’t forgive [Chris Christie] for is amnesty.”

**It makes no sense!**

I guess Coulter has forgiven Christie. Or, far more likely, she does not care that Christie is a RINO. All that matters to Coulter is that Christie is “electable.”

Coulter’s entire convoluted set of criteria for presidential candidates is not really about selecting the best candidate, but the most electable one. For Coulter, it’s about position, not policies.

Whereas most conservatives want a robust and vigorous debate, Coulter wants to stifle and control debate – and be the one in control.

When she tells us she ponders being “czar of the universe,” it should give us pause. When she admits that she wants and needs to be the “ayatollah of the conservative movement,” we have been forewarned. We have already seen her habitual abuse of power.

Principles have never been very important to Ann Coulter. Not in her personal life. Not in her professional life. Not in her spiritual life. And clearly not in politics.

---

20 Ann Coulter, CPAC, 3/16/13.
**Coulter’s Scoop That Never Was**

Given that immigration is one of Coulter’s single most important issues, Coulter penned a rather perplexing column on “unaccompanied alien children.”

*This section was originally published as an essay on my blog. – DB*

This may have been Ann Coulter’s worst summer ever. First, she wrote a series of inane diatribes attacking soccer. Then she defamed principled conservatives and supported corrupt establishment Republicans. Coulter falsely accused another journalist of plagiarism, a charge utterly without merit. She later vilified liberal Christians as “moral show-offs” for exhibiting compassion toward illegals on the border.

Coulter claimed to have discovered a hitherto unknown concept which she called “anti-logic.”

Now Coulter claims to have uncovered the truth about the border crisis – a truth conspiratorially hidden by both political parties and a complicit press.

In her most recent column, Coulter accused the entire media – from the *New York Times* to Fox News – of lying about the loophole which allows Central American children to receive special treatment at the border.

According to Coulter, “But there is no such loophole.”

*“But there is no such loophole … non-existent loophole … imaginary loophole.”

*“people on both sides of the aisle are telling the same lie”*
Having made that startling claim, she frets, “The fact that people on both sides of the aisle are telling the same lie about this law is worrisome. Are Republicans being tricked into thinking we need an emergency bill …?”

She claims to have read the law (implying others have not), citing the relevant portion:

“Any unaccompanied alien child sought to be removed by the Department of Homeland Security, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country shall be – placed in removal proceedings … eligible for relief … at no cost to the child and provided access to counsel.”

**The Loophole’s Definition**

Coulter denied this “non-existent loophole” and argued for its non-existence due to the definition of “unaccompanied alien child,” which, according to the 2008 law she cites, is defined thus:

“(g) Definitions

(2) the term 'unaccompanied alien child' means a child who –

(A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;
(B) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(C) with respect to whom –

(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or (ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.”

**Coulter’s Wrong Analysis**

Coulter concludes that the bulk of this massive group of children crossing our border can be immediately returned because they don’t fit the definition of “unaccompanied alien child.”

Coulter asserts, “But the law's definition of ‘unaccompanied alien child’ limits the hearings to kids who have no relatives in the United States.”

She continues, “No law needs to be fixed. The only thing that needs to be fixed is the president.”

She adds, lest we fail to get the point, “Any Republicans pushing for an immigration bill to seal an imaginary loophole aren't fighting Obama; they're helping him.”

**Where Coulter Went Wrong**

At first blush, her reasoning seems sound. Sounds reasonable. And legal.

But it isn’t.

Her statement about limiting “the hearings to kids who have no relatives in the United States” is flat out wrong – on two counts.

(In full disclosure, I am not a lawyer, and I do not play one on TV.)

**First**, there are matters of the law’s interpretation and implementation.
The Bipartisan Policy Center put out a paper, “Unaccompanied Alien Children: A Primer,” which addresses the salient issues. It notes,

“Although many of the children may already have family inside of the United States, current practice by DHS classifies children as unaccompanied "if neither a parent or legal guardian (with a court-order to that effect) is with the juvenile at the time of apprehension, or within a geographical proximity’ to care for the juvenile. According to interviews conducted with DHS officials in 2006, ‘if a parent or legal guardian is not present to provide care (or cannot be present within a short period of time) that child is technically considered unaccompanied and processed accordingly.’”

Remember the definition: “no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.” That qualification addresses the humanitarian concerns involved and resulted in the implementation noted above.

**Coulter’s non-existent loophole exists.**

Second, the definition is specific to “no parent or legal guardian.” That specificity created unintended complications. What about non-parent family members? Coulter expanded the law to read: “no relatives in the United States.” But the law expressly addresses “parents.”

As noted by BPC, the “Asylum Reform and Border Protection Act of 2014 would change the “definition of UAC. Children will not be considered unaccompanied if they have a sibling, aunt, uncle, grandparent, or cousin over 18 years of age available to provide care. Currently only children without a parent or legal guardian are considered unaccompanied.”

Yes, **Coulter’s non-existent loophole exists.**

**Update:** Upon further reflection, Coulter’s loophole column is rather loopy. Being a lawyer for more than a quarter-century and a journalist for almost two decades, Coulter should now know how to do basic fact-checking.

Coulter should have asked herself whether she might be wrong or there might be more to the story. Instead, Coulter chose to believe that she and she alone – of all the people in the world – both knew there was no loophole and had the courage to speak the truth about it.

**Coulter chose to believe that everyone else** – from CNN to Fox News, from Harry Reid to Ted Cruz, from Nancy Pelosi to Michele Bachmann – was lying about a phony loophole. Furthermore, this grand conspiracy – among establishment Republicans and Tea Party alike – was designed to open the U.S. borders to all people.

Checking facts, Ann, is easier than you think. You might try it sometime.

**Ann Coulter’s Scott Brown Out**

[This section was originally published as an essay on my blog. – DB]


---

22 Ann Coulter, Hannity, FNC, 10/21/14.
“[Scott Brown is] a fantastic candidate” Coulter enthusiastically told a talk show audience.23 “He’s fantastic on immigration. He’s fantastic on Obamacare. … Scott Brown is such a fantastic candidate. … I think he’s fantastic on the single most important issue that he’s raised.”

Coulter’s primary, overarching issue – amnesty – failed to garner the election outcome she envisioned, even with such a “fantastic” candidate.

Coulter continued her praise: “And he’s well-spoken.” Coulter devoted an entire column promoting Brown by attacking his rival. In it, she concluded, “The time to vote for freedom – for Scott Brown – is now.”

In one election-focused column, Coulter highlighted and endorsed Brown, writing,

“Everyone reading this column has got to donate to Scott Brown immediately.”25 Lest anyone underestimate the urgency of her plea, Coulter added another emphatic sentence: Donate. Right now!”

Explaining that Brown, “a very strong candidate,” was “the 41st vote’ against Obamacare,” Coulter underscored, “but more than any other Senate candidate this year, Brown is running against amnesty. Even with a tidal wave of new welfare cases pouring across our border, Brown is one of the few candidates smart enough to make immigration an issue.”

Brown, the “smart” candidate, lost.

---

23 Ann Coulter, Howie Carr Show, 10/23/14.
Supports Fake Conservatives

Conservatives have long questioned Coulter’s obsession with RINOs, from Chris Christie to Mitt Romney. Even now, Coulter supports Romney for president in 2016. When recently asked about that possibility, Coulter exclaimed, “I hope so. Oh, I hope so.”

Coulter also thought Romney was a fantastic and ideal candidate.

As a Massachusetts senator, Brown voted against tax cuts, supported gun control legislation, considered same-sex marriage and Roe v. Wade settled law, and voted with the Republicans only 54% of the time.

Principles matter. But it appears principled conservatives do not matter to Coulter. She is too quick to follow after the money, the glitter, and the charm, and to thereby overlook the importance of substance.

Hopefully, she will shed her RINO affections, stop attacking the Tea Party, and start embracing the Conservatism that she once so eloquently championed.

Update. In her post-Election Day column, Coulter defended Scott Brown at length, again asserting that he “was such a fantastic candidate, aggressively denouncing amnesty and open borders, that he managed to single-handedly turn a safe-seat for the Democrats into a bloodbath. He is surely responsible for at least one Republican senate win by forcing Democrats to divert precious resources to New Hampshire.”

But Coulter repeatedly urged her readers to contribute to Brown’s campaign, thereby diverting precious resources from other GOP campaigns. Most winning GOP candidates opted against emulating Brown’s immigration stance, while Brown, following Coulter’s immigration-as-the-single-issue strategy, lost.

GOP winners took advantage of national disapproval with Obama and his policies while emphasizing significant local issues of the moment.

---

26 Ann Coulter, O’Reilly Factor, FNC, 10/18/14.
Case Study # 8
Life Issues

Coulter regards herself – and is regarded by many Christian conservatives – as a pro-life Christian. Coulter has spoken at many pro-life conferences and rallies. She is certainly a fierce opponent of abortion but she claims, “I am totally pro-life.”¹

Is she really?²

This series of infographics and commentary exposes her claim as fiction.

Convert to Christianity or Die!

Coulter has a decidedly cavalier attitude toward life, as evidenced by her eager use of elimination rhetoric and abundant delight in executing killers.³

Coulter’s solution to eliminate future violence is to kill those who commit violence so that they cannot procreate violent children. Her solution is decidedly stark, and not said in jest:

³ Coulter’s use of elimination rhetoric is legendary. The Gospel According to Ann Coulter (at www.coulterwatch.com/gospel.pdf) provides an analysis of her dismissal of the pro-life movement in practice and also contains an entire appendix devoted to her elimination rhetoric.
Coulter’s solution: “Once you’ve committed a violent crime, I say, ‘death penalty.’ Why do we waste time with the prisons? I would give Chuck Colson one year of Prison Ministries. If you turn them into a Christian, they can go. Otherwise, death!”

This is, of course, reminiscent of her infamous post-9/11 in which she wrote, “We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity.”

When asked about conversion to other religions, she responded, “Muslims?” Then, building upon her joke, she added, “I’m sorry, we are accepting only Presbyterians.”

A short time later, Coulter affirmed the seriousness of her original proposed solution, affirming, “The Devil did make them do it. And then we kill you.”

In rebuttal to disagreement from a fellow panelist, she queried: “If the Devil made somebody do something, you wouldn’t kill them? Of course you’d kill them!”

**Dehumanization of Humans**

Since the turn of this century, Coulter has religiously employed elimination rhetoric and ad hominem language to dehumanize her opposition. The politics of personal destruction, though used before her birth, seems to have been invented just for her.

Coulter opined on Donald Sterling’s character in a remarkable column.

---

5 Ann Coulter, “This is War,” 9/12/01.
Calling Sterling an “80-year-old human-manatee” and “fat racist pig,” Coulter inexplicably concluded an otherwise revealing and humorous essay with ad hominem to dehumanize her subject:

> The innermost thoughts of a pile of crap covered in human skin provide no larger lessons about humanity, though Donald Sterling may be of interest to students of the porcine. For a window into the American psyche, I like to stick to my own species.⁶

An otherwise exemplary (and funny) column was again marred by a concluding paragraph which dehumanized its subject. Why conclude with ad hominem?

The previous night, Coulter said, “I am not in the same species with this person.”⁷

Coulter once defended the inherent dignity and humanity of human life. Now, for over a decade, Coulter demeans and dehumanizes others using ad hominem to deny their humanity, all the while exalting herself in the process.

**Botched Executions Are Good!**

A gleeful Coulter was excited at the news of a botched execution in which the murderer was tortured. Coulter seems more interested in the quality of death than the quality of life.

---

⁸ Ann Coulter, Politically Incorrect, 9/24/97.
Unlike Coulter, even supporters of capital punishment believe it should be done in a *humane* way and were aghast at hearing of this botched execution torturing the convict.

As a constitutional lawyer who hasn’t practiced law for ten years, Coulter is familiar with the distinctions she herself has raised over the years: the rule of law (which Coulter champions) demands justice, while the mob (which Coulter decries) seeks revenge.

Coulter’s essay began, “The next time liberals get indignant when we say they care more about criminals than the victims of crime, remember their hysterical weeping over Clayton Lockett. I refer, of course, to the vile rapist-murderer, whose execution last week is getting more press than Chris Christie’s bridge scandal.”

Coulter’s graphic essay raised serious, substantive questions in the debate over capital punishment. The executed killer was a crazy, cruel, psychopath. But Coulter suggested that it is perfectly alright to cruelly execute a crazy psychopath who has cruelly killed.

Is cruelty a mark of justice or an attribute of revenge?

**Abort Babies Conceived in Rape**

From the death of the guilty to the death of the innocent, it seems that Coulter simply does not care.

Coulter blamed pro-lifers for Republican defeat in 2012, writing, “Can you learn to say, ‘no exceptions’ or rather, ‘no abortions with exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother?’ Learn that. Memorize that. Stop waxing philosophical when you’re running to make laws.”

---

Coulter callously dismisses life in the womb when it is conceived in rape. *Innocent* lives sacrificed in the name of political expediency – all to elect a candidate with an “R” at the end of his or her name.

Moreover, Coulter thinks life in the womb is a “philosophical” argument and wants pro-lifers to be pragmatic by permitting human beings who are conceived in rape to be aborted.

Having repeatedly blamed pro-lifers for being *too* pro-life and, thereby, costing Republicans elections, Coulter hypocritically chastised those who wrongly attack pro-lifers:

> I agree, and it always goes that way, which is why I don't want the conservative Republicans to do what the establishment does, and that is every time Republicans lose for whatever reason, somehow it's the pro-lifers who get blamed. Wait a second. What did we do?"\(^{11}\)

She insists, “Can you learn to say, ‘no exceptions’ or rather, ‘no abortions with exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother?’ Learn that. Memorize that. Stop waxing philosophical when you’re running to make laws.”\(^{12}\)

Absolving Romney for his disastrous defeat in 2012, Coulter blamed pro-lifers:

> The last two weeks of the campaign were consumed with discussions of women’s ‘reproductive rights,’ not because of anything Romney did, but because these two idiots [Akin and Mourdock] decided to come out against abortion in the case of rape and incest.

---

\(^{11}\) Ann Coulter, *Hannity*, FNC, 10/14/13.

Coulter’s disregard for human life is clear in her pretzel-twisted logic:

No law is ever going to require a woman to bear the child of her rapist. Yes, it’s every bit as much a life as an unborn child that is not the product of rape. But sentient human beings are capable of drawing gradations along a line.

A child of rape is “every bit as much a life as an unborn child that is not the product of rape,” yet that child’s life is forfeit for political reasons.\(^\text{13}\)

Ethics have never been Coulter’s forte.

**Ann Coulter Trivializes Rape**

Ann Coulter’s lead paragraph in her latest polemic would be hilarious if it weren’t so Coulteresque.

“Sorry this column is late. I got raped again on the way home. Twice. I should clarify – by ‘raped,’ I mean that two seductive Barry White songs came on the radio, which, according to the University of Virginia, constitutes rape.”\(^\text{14}\)

If anyone else had written that, one could say it beautifully encapsulates the folly of redefining terms to the point where they cease to have meaning. Like Rush Limbaugh, Coulter is using absurdity to illustrate the absurd. But Coulter has no credibility on this issue to make that point.

In her column, Coulter does makes a superb point, “If we're in the middle of a college-rape epidemic, why do all the cases liberals promote keep turning out to be hoaxes? Maybe I'm overthinking this, but wouldn't a real rape be more persuasive?”\(^\text{15}\)

However, Coulter’s brilliant analysis of the alleged “rape crisis” on college campuses makes one’s mind boggle over Coulter’s own disingenuous on rape.

The previous night on *Hannity*, Coulter lamented the trivialization of rape by all of these rape hoaxes. But *Coulter herself has – for years – trivialized rape.*

No matter what Ann Coulter says, it is hard to believe that she cares about rape victims or the offspring of rape. She does not.

Coulter blithely speaks of raping the planet as our God-given duty, and, just this year, made numerous accusations of rape. Indeed, *Coulter claimed that she was being raped.*

---

\(^\text{13}\) See Rebecca Kiessling, “Rebecca Kiessling’s Reply to Ann Coulter – Save the 1,” 11/9/12, 

\(^\text{14}\) Ann Coulter, “The College Rape Club, 12/10/14.

\(^\text{15}\) Ann Coulter, “The College Rape Club, 12/10/14.
Immigration = Rape

At a conference in March, Coulter likened immigration to rape. In her own words:

No, [immigration] isn’t a natural process. It’s like you’re being raped and the guy is telling you, ‘Sorry, my penis is in you. Nothing you can do about it.’ … No, you’re raping me! Demographics are changing by force. There is nothing natural about it.¹⁶

Those bolded words – “you’re raping me” – were shouted, with gasps from the audience!

For nearly two decades, Coulter has railed against rape hoaxes, such as Tawana Brawley, which were perpetrated to make political points. But Coulter’s real attitude toward rape is cavalier. Babies conceived in rape have no value in her eyes. Coulter speaks favorably of raping the planet. And, now, she claims immigrants are raping her!

Was Coulter Raped at CPAC?

“You’re raping me!” – Ann Coulter, 3/8/14

No, Ann was NOT raped.
No, Ann’s non-rape did not take place at CPAC (it was at an event at another location).

For nearly two decades, Coulter has railed against rape hoaxes, such as Tawana Brawley, which were perpetrated to make political points. But Coulter’s real attitude toward rape is cavalier. Babies conceived in rape have no value in her eyes. Coulter speaks favorably of raping the planet. And, now, she claims immigration is raping her!

“Rape Us Again”

Coulter marred another exemplary column on the rapists of the Central Park jogger by invoking the Rape Card yet again. Coulter concluded with these words: “But now de Blasio wants to hold down our legs while the ‘Central Park Five’ rape us, again.”¹⁷

Only a month later, Coulter again diluted the meaning and diminished the significance of rape by making false accusations against the mayor of New York City. Coulter marred an otherwise exemplary column on the rapists of the Central Park jogger by invoking the Rape Card again. Coulter concluded that column with these words:

“But now de Blasio wants to hold down our legs while the ‘Central Park Five’ rape us, again.”¹⁷

---

When did the “Central Park Five” rape Ann, how is de Blasio raping her again, and how are immigrants now raping Coulter? (Let’s be clear: only one person was raped and it was not Coulter!)

Coulter, the consummate wordsmith, should know better! Lacking sense and sensibilities, Coulter – again! – diminishes and trivializes the reality of actual rape.\(^{18}\)

Astonishingly, her column (and a large section in her book) describes the 1989 rape in question, yet Coulter is inured to the reality of what she describes.

Coulter recently suggested that physical violence usually accompanies rape, like “being hit on the head with a brick. People know what a rape is, and to have girls trying to get attention from Lena Dunham to this poor psychotic at UVA …”\(^{19}\)

Coulter has a surprisingly different perspective when it comes to her own safety:

> Men’s hands are lethal weapons. Every male I walk past, every male I walk past, I look at him knowing with his bare hands he could kill me, and I can do nothing. But I have no option. I can’t kill somebody with my bare hands.\(^{20}\)

**Deliberately Kill People by Accident**

From killers to rape-conceived fetuses, Coulter has no problem with the deliberate death of human beings. Moreover, for almost two decades, Coulter has eagerly employment elimination rhetoric –wishing for the death of her chosen victims.

---

\(^{18}\) As brilliant as Coulter can be, she lacks sound judgment, which is one of many reasons why we should Never Trust Ann Coulter – at ANY Age. at [www.coulterwatch.com/never.pdf](http://www.coulterwatch.com/never.pdf).

\(^{19}\) Ann Coulter, Lars Larson Show, 12/11/14.

\(^{20}\) Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 11/10/96.
She even favors “accidental” deaths to achieve her goals.

Coulter advised killing Todd Akin in a “hunting accident” and then lamented that that had not happened. Though in jest, merely reminding people of Dick Cheney’s bizarre accident only serves to further tarnish the GOP’s image.

In fact, Coulter proposes (however humorously) that the Republican Party should retain a contract killer to do its dirty work, a suggestion she has made on numerous occasions:

Take the Virginia governor’s race. [GOP candidate] Ken Cuccinelli is down about 10 points. Guess what the libertarian is polling at? Ten points! We need some strategic hunting accidents, airplane crashes. We need Luca Brasi in our party. \(^{21}\)

**Nihilism on Parade**

Living in her own financially and ideologically elite bubble in which she denies regrets, denies being a polarizer, and asserts that she is “the solution,” Coulter’s disconnect with reality is evident in how she views other people.

In one section of one of her *Piers Morgan* interviews, \(^{22}\) Coulter exemplified the stereotypical cold-hearted Republican she admitted to being in 1999 by cavalierly relegating whole legions of people to die young so that she can save money.

Her argument (in 2014 as it was in 1997): smokers work (which is good for the economy) and die young (saving Social Security). (See graphic below.)


\[^{22}\] *Piers Morgan*, CNN, 2/11/14.
Stating “everything dies eventually” is not an argument pro-lifers would ever use. Her narcissistic self-absorption couldn’t be clearer: “at least we’ll save me money if they just go ahead and die.” Coulter actually grumbles: “But they rarely just go ahead and die.”

Coulter callous, indeed, *inhumane* attitude toward other people is nothing new. Consider these quotes from the beginning of her media career:

“People who smoke *save* the states and *save* the federal government money because *their* deaths are quick and moreover, they’re suppressing all the health benefits of nicotine.”

Nicotine is more addictive, but you don’t take heroin and stay up all night writing a book. You don’t take nicotine and then hold up a liquor store with a sawed-off shotgun. You’re productive on cigarettes. Frankly, we oughta be encouraging cigarettes and discouraging pot because smokers get a lot of work done.

**Miscellaneous Threats and Desires**

Essay title: “Remove Dennis Kucinich's feeding tube!” – circa 11/13/03

“I’m *all* for the Saudi law of cutting of the heads of *murderers.*”

“You know, I am generally against putting razor blades in apples, but if any kid comes to my door in a Big Bird costume …”

“They [Tweeters at Starbucks] should be in prison or sent to, sent to the death penalty.”

“If he was doing this [tweeting false information during Hurricane Sandy] just to screw people over, then he’s a jerk and he should get the death penalty.”

“I am a conservative. Our position is: we love drones. I wanna use drones for stop and frisk. Do not waste a filibuster attacking drones.”

What about Ann? “I’d *much* rather *die* in an *airline* crash than in a *car* crash because no one *really* pays *attention.* You feel a lot sorrier for somebody who dies when a lot of people die *around* them.”

---

23 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 3/20/97.
30 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 11/24/96.
Case Study # 9
Nazis, Demons, and Crazy People

[This case study was originally published as a series of essays on my blog. – DB]

Part 1: Ann Coulter and “the Democrats’ Thousand Year Reich”
Part 2: Ann Coulter’s “Spawn of Satan Convention”
Part 3: Ann Coulter’s “Straightjacket Party”

Ann Coulter and “the Democrats’ Thousand Year Reich”

At an Eagle Forum Leadership Summit earlier this month, Ann Coulter told the youth audience, “It seems like we’re in the middle of the Democrats’ Thousand Year Reich.”

Coulter Abhors Nazi and Fascist Imagery

Coulter claims,

We certainly don’t demonize the opponents the way they do. We may ridicule them, make jokes about them. But the way they turned George Bush into the enemy, a Nazi. George Soros and Al Gore have all compared him to Hitler. He was compared to Osama
bin Laden by a *New York Times* op-ed writer. William Raspberry, Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist, a liberal, called him the devil.¹

A novel released in 2004 advocated the assassination of President Bush “for the good of humankind.” Liberal columnist William Raspberry referred to President Bush as “the Devil.” Remember the good old days, during Bush’s honeymoon with the press, when he was just Hitler?²

**Coulter Employs Nazi and Fascist Imagery**

If conservatives don’t demonize opponents, then Ann Coulter is not a conservative.

Having lambasted those who employ Nazi imagery, what does Coulter do? Employ Nazi imagery.

Coulter’s remarks at the Heritage Foundation come as no surprise to those who have witnessed Coulter’s regular use of Nazi imagery.

Coulter once compared both Barack Obama and John McCain to Hitler – in the same election year. Coulter asserted, “[Obama’s autobiography is] a dime store *Mein Kampf*” [and Obama is a two-bit Hitler].”³ As for McCain, “I’m not comparing McCain to Hitler. Hitler had a coherent tax policy.”⁴ Similarly, Coulter famously named Katie Couric “the affable Eva Braun.”

---

1 Ann Coulter, *Hannity*, FNC, 6/6/11.
4 Ann Coulter, CPAC, 2/8/08.
Coulter has a fascination with fascists. “[Liberals are] total fascists, but they’re going out and imposing their left-wing fascism on the rest of the country. … They’re not only fascist where they live, they’re expanding their fascism to the rest of America.”

Time and time again, Coulter makes the same point: “I think that is not going to inure to the Democrats’ benefit, to be having this obviously political prosecution of a political enemy. No, that just shows them to be the fascists that they are.”

Coulter’s fascination extends to Nazis, with these assertions about liberals: “They’re Nazi block watchers. … Block watchers, you know. They tattle on their parents, turn them in to the Nazis. They’re little Nazi block watchers.” Ever on her mind, Coulter warns, “Those, the Nazi block watchers are coming back and attacking the Democrats now if they’re not crazy enough.”

And now, a new generation of young conservatives – at a Leadership Summit – have been indoctrinated in Coulter’s ideological humor: “It seems like we’re in the middle of the Democrats’ Thousand Year Reich.”

Talk show host Larry O’Connor observes, “It always bothers me when people … play the Hitler card.” His co-host, Brian Wilson, agrees, “When you invoke Hitler you lose.”

Ann Coulter’s “Spawn of Satan Convention”

Just as Coulter claims to abhor Nazi and Fascist imagery, Coulter decries comparisons of conservatives to the Devil:

A novel released in 2004 advocated the assassination of President Bush “for the good of humankind.” Liberal columnist William Raspberry referred to President Bush as “the Devil.” Remember the good old days, during Bush’s honeymoon with the press, when he was just Hitler?”

Eschewing demonization, Coulter nevertheless demonizes. Consider alone her books, Godless and Demonic, which clearly demonize the Left in spiritual terms.

One decade ago, Coulter infamously described the Democratic National Convention in near apocalyptic terms, beginning, “Here at the Spawn of Satan Convention …”

Demonic Liberals

Coulter’s first post-9/11 book, Slander, seemingly laid all the evils of the world at the feet of liberals. She began her book:

5 “Ann Coulter: The blonde assassin,” The Independent, 8/16/04.
6 Ann Coulter, The Big Story, FNC, 10/27/05.
7 Ann Coulter, O’Reilly Factor, FNC, 12/1/05.
8 Ann Coulter, Glenn Beck Show, 10/5/07.
9 Larry O’Connor, Mornings on the Mall, WMAL, 1/10/13.
10 Brian Wilson, Mornings on the Mall, WMAL, 1/10/13.
11 Ann Coulter, Guilty: Liberal “Victims” and Their Assault on America, Crown Forum, 2009, pg. 244.
“Political ‘debate’ in this country is insufferable. Whether conducted in Congress, on political talk shows, or played out at dinners and cocktail parties, politics is a nasty sport. At the risk of giving away the ending: It’s all liberals’ fault.”

Coulter ended her next book, *Treason*, claiming, “The fundamental difference between liberals and conservatives is: Conservatives believe man was created in God’s image; liberals believe they *are* God.” Then, in explaining a litany of liberal abuses, Coulter wrote, “because they are gods. … because they are gods. … because they are gods. … they are gods. … they are gods.”

Her last words: “They instinctively root for anarchy and against civilization. The inevitable logic of the liberal position is to be for treason.”

In *Godless*, Coulter catalogued what she considered an ungodly (anti-God?) religion of the godless:

“Liberals love to boast that they are not ‘religious,’ which is what one would expect to hear from the state-sanctioned religion. Of course liberalism is a religion. It has its own cosmology, its own miracles, its own beliefs in the supernatural, its own churches, its own high priests, its own saints, its own total worldview, and its own explanation of the existence of the universe. In other words, liberalism contains all the attributes of what is generally known as ‘religion.’”

---

Coulter emphasized the ungodly (un-biblical and un-American) nature of this false religion, writing, “Liberals swoon in pagan admiration of Mother Earth, mystified and overawed by her power. They deny the Biblical idea of dominion and progress, the most ringing affirmation of which is the United States of America.”\(^{16}\)

In sneering condescension, Coulter continued: “Although they are Druids, liberals masquerade as rationalists, adopting a sneering tone of scientific sophistication, which is a little like being condescended to by a tarot card reader.”

With *Demonic*,\(^ {17}\) Coulter expanded her critique of liberalism in league with the forces of darkness, noting, “The Democratic Party is the party of the mob, irrespective of what the mob represents.”\(^ {18}\) She then identified the techniques employed by the Left (oddly, techniques employed by Coulter):

> “The Democrats’ playbook doesn’t involve heads on pikes – at yet – but uses a more insidious means to incite the mob. The twisting of truth, stirring of passions, demonizing of opponents, and relying on propagandistic images in lieu of ideas – these are the earmarks of a mob leader.”\(^ {19}\)

One book review made a salient observation:

> “An author that accuses her opponents of doing things that she immediately, in full view of her readers, does – is either very stupid or very evil. I do not think Ann Coulter is stupid. To use the Bible to back up a pack of lies is disgusting and the devil, Jesus said, is a liar.”\(^ {20}\)

**Ann Coulter’s “Straightjacket Party”**

*Coulter claims to abhor Nazi and Fascist imagery.*

*Coulter decries comparisons of conservatives to the Devil.*

*Coulter also rebukes liberals who label conservatives as lunatics.*

In promoting *Slander*, Coulter argued:

> “The big [lie] and the one I, I, that is really all the same lie is – Don’t listen to conservatives. They are stupid or they’re nuts. … This is how liberals respond to arguments, to principled arguments, to facts, to figures, to studies. They respond by calling the conservatives stupid, mean … This is one of, I think, the biggest lies. Liberals are incredibly vicious. They accuse Republicans and conservatives of every malfeasance imaginable and then they sit back and say, ‘Oh, both sides do it.’ Both sides don’t do it, as I demonstrate in my book.”\(^ {21}\)

---

\(^{16}\) Ibid., pg. 3.
\(^{17}\) A comprehensive critique of *Demonic* can be found in *The Beauty of Conservatism* at [www.coulterwatch.com/beauty.pdf](http://www.coulterwatch.com/beauty.pdf).
\(^{19}\) Ibid.
\(^{21}\) Ann Coulter, *FoxWire*, FNC, 7/6/02.
Also in *Slander*, Coulter complained:

“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. Someday we will turn to the *New York Times* editorial page and find the Newspaper of Record denouncing President Bush for being a ‘penis-head.’”22

According to Coulter, “‘Stupid’ means one thing: ‘threatening to the interests of the Democratic Party.’ The more conservative the Republican, the more vicious and hysterical the attacks on his intelligence will be. Liberals have not only run out of arguments, they’ve run out of adjectives.”23

Nevertheless, with a straight face, Coulter contends: “Perhaps if conservatives had had total control over every major means of news dissemination for a quarter century, they would have forgotten how to debate, too, and would just call liberals stupid and mean. But that’s an alternative universe.”24

Yet, in *this* universe, that’s precisely what Coulter does.

Coulter exalts herself above her opponents, saying, “I love to engage in repartee with people who are stupider than I am.”25 Moreover, she contends that virtually everything liberals say and do is stupid.

“Deploying their usual fallacy of composition, liberals say that because they have a constitutional right to say stupid things, the stupid things they say must have merit....Yes, Democrats are constitutionally entitled to be stupid. They are, after all, Democrats. But they’re wrong and everyone knows it – including them.”26

---

25 Ann Coulter, Cornell University, 12/7/05.
Coulter’s Crazy Quotes

Coulter condemns the Left for its derogatory caricatures of Christians as crazy, writing, “The point of the phrase ‘religious right’ or ‘Christian conservative’ is not to define but to belittle. It informs the reader that the object of the sobriquet is presumptively insane by saying he is a member of it.”

However, it is Coulter who is crazy about insanity.


Note also this small sampling from her third book, *Treason*: “insane policies,” “crackpot ideas,” “this idiot,” “infantile logic-chopping games,” “worthless appeasers,” “raving column,” “the left’s dynamite combination of stupidity and arrogance,” “infantile Oedipal disorders,” “a nitwit’s hysteria,” “every idiot liberal,” “psychopathology of celebrity traitors,” “caterwauling idiot,” “knuckleheads,” and “hysterical fascist banshees.”

Ann Coulter is the Lois Lerner of the Republican Party. Her perspective on the Democratic Party is succinctly summarized in this statement: “In my lifetime, presidential elections have consisted not so much of Democrats versus Republicans, or even liberals versus conservatives, but the Straitjacket Party versus the Sane Party.” In anticipation of the 2004 election, Coulter suggested, “This may be the first time in American history that the decisional calculus for many voters will be: Do I really want to throw my hat in with these crazy people?”

---

29 Ann Coulter, “Inmates ‘Have a Plan’ to Run the Asylum,” 10/21/04.
According to Coulter, “It’s as if all the brain-damaged people in America got together and formed a voting bloc.” She blames the media (as well as institutions of higher learning) for this outcome. “Only total hegemonic control of all major means of news dissemination in America could possibly give rise to the insane pig Latin patois of the left.”

Coulter believes, “Yes, of course liberalism is a mental defect.” Indeed, she takes credit for that observation, asserting, “As I was the first to say and other people ripped it off, liberalism is an aspect of mental illness.” And, of course, she wants to eliminate liberals: “Some liberals have become even too crazy for Texas to execute, which is a damn shame.”

Indeed, she even takes credit for liberal lunacy itself: “The imminence of conservative victory has driven liberals to insanity. Have I contributed to this? Gosh, I hope so.”

During her 2013 book tour, Glenn Beck exclaimed, “I’m sorry, Ann, you’re out of your mind crazy.”

---

30 Ann Coulter, “Fork Replaces Donkey as Democratic Party Symbol,” 1/11/06.
32 Ann Coulter, Front Page Magazine, 1/12/04.
33 Ann Coulter, Hannity, FNC, 12/16/13.
34 Ann Coulter, speech, 5/4/05.
35 Ann Coulter, Baltimore Sun, 7/30/06.
36 Glenn Beck, Glenn Beck Show, 10/17/13.
Case Study # 10
No More Tears

Seemingly forever, Coulter has sought to be viewed as a courageous heroine. More so than most, Coulter loves accolades and being thought of as brave. As noted by others, “She seems to despise weakness of any kind.”1 Tears – in her eyes – are a sign of weakness. No tears. No repentance. No forgiveness.

Part 1: Repent, Monica!
Part 2: No Tears for Coulter!
Part 3: No Regrets! Ever!
Part 4: Let’s be Logical, Ann
Part 5: Ann Coulter’s “anti-logic”
Part 6: Ann Coulter Screws Up Again
Part 7: Coulter Crying at CPAC
Part 8: Jesus Wept

Repent, Monica!

At the beginning of a surprising interview on Hannity, Coulter said she would like to tell Monica Lewinsky that “she’s gotta become a Christian.”2 Of course, as a Christian, Monica would then show some “personal responsibility.”

Coulter then urged Monica to repent, telling her that she “should be sorrier” about having “had sex with a married man.”

Repentance and sorrow seem to go hand-in-hand with tears. According to Scripture, the truly repentant feel godly sorrow – are grieved over their sin and its effects – and turn toward God, often accompanied by tears.

However, Coulter – ever one to eschew repentance – equally forsakes tears. Just weeks after 9/11, Coulter said, “I really am sick of [the candle lighting]. I think the candle lighting is bad. It’s womanly. It’s hugging. It’s mourning. Mourning is the opposite of anger, and we’re supposed to be angry right now.”

Grief, mourning – hugging! – is “womanly.” Instead, Coulter prefers “a flag, that’s like a manly thing.”

Being strong, being known as a fearless warrior, being seen as courageous – these things are vitally important to Coulter, so important that she fears repentance. To admit to weakness or a need for help is anathema to Coulter.

No Tears for Coulter!

In an equally striking interview with the Washington Post, Coulter again played the courageous heroine of the conservative movement, basking in the joy of being hated and attacked by the Left.

---


4 Ann Coulter, Politically Incorrect, ABC, 9/25/01.

Coulter said, “Generally, I think it drives them crazy that I so obviously do not care [that I am a] conservative the liberals love to hate … There’s this sense that they haven’t gotten to me, and ‘We just want to make her cry.’ … Well, good luck with that – not since my beagle died when I was 14.”

Over a decade ago, Coulter spoke of that occasion: “‘I had a very happy childhood – nothing conflicted, lots of friends, lots of boyfriends, athletic,’ she said. In the seventh grade her beagle, Tiger, died. ‘That was the only bad thing that ever happened to me.’”

And, according to Coulter’s Washington Post interview, that was the last time she cried. Except …

In that same 2002 interview, when asked the last time she had cried, she replied, “Tears of joy, when Clinton was impeached.”

Seven years later, when asked a similar question, she answered, “November 5, 2008. No particular reason.”

Why lie to the Washington Post about no more tears? Why even bring up the subject of tears only to deny shedding them?

Coulter’s humorously-couched lie furthers her own self-promoted image as a courageous conservative, a victim of unmerited attacks by the Left who is unfazed by their treachery and deceit.

Yes, stoic courage is a mask Coulter wears to disguise her own fears and doubts.

A decade earlier, Coulter spoke of her fan mail, explaining, “Some of the military ones [marriage proposals] are fabulous. They’re never actually hitting on me … but [reading them] brings tears to your eyes.”

Tears of joy. But Coulter also experiences tears of rage.

“I think the last presidential election was the most important election. But as we keep losing, each election becomes ‘oh, my gosh, this is our last shot.’ It makes me want to cry with tears of rage over the races like Todd Akin in Missouri, and Murdock in Indiana, and Christine McDonnell.”

But tears of sorrow? That would be “womanly” – unheroic.

Coulter praised her father as “a man of few words, the un–Oprah, no crying or wearing your heart on your sleeve, and reacting to moments of great sentiment with a joke. Or as we used to call them: men.”

---

8 December 19, 1998.
11 Ann Coulter, Howie Carr Show, 10/23/14.
Coulter’s otherwise sterling performance on one episode of *Piers Morgan*, regarding contraception, and some other topics, was marred by issues of character, maturity, and perspective. The first of those is her impenitence, her lack of contrition, and seeming inability to admit error, something which was addressed in each of my previous books.

Coulter – as she has done on many other occasions – claimed to have no regrets at all for anything she’s ever said or done. When asked, “Not a single regret about anything you’ve ever said?” Coulter replied, “In public? About politics? Absolutely 100 percent not, unless you’re going to go back to when I was 14 and briefly libertarian.”

Coulter clarified, “Ann’s always right.”

Following Romney’s pivotal defeat in 2012, Coulter remained dogmatic about Romney’s innate superiority, regardless of the truth and irrespective of any evidence to the contrary. But, on the margins, she was willing to admit her mistakes about Christie and a few others, mistakes which ultimately had no impact upon the electoral outcome. Three examples from her 2013 book tour demonstrate how she uses humor to downplay even these inconsequential errors:

- “[I regretted supporting] Chris Christie. Turns out I’m not perfect. DRAT!”
- “I was wrong when I was nice to Hillary Clinton and Chris Christie. Nobody’s perfect.”

---

14 One encouraging sign is Coulter’s *qualification* about never having “gone too far,” never regretting anything she’d said. Her qualifying criteria – “In public? About politics?” – is suggestive. Has she come to regret personal behavior, relational gaffes, private indiscretions? If so, has she truly repented and offered apologies to those she has wronged?
15 Ann Coulter, REDDIT interview, 10/21/13.
“I’ve made the same mistake. I’ve supported Pat Buchanan, Steve Forbes. For a while, I supported Herman Cain, even last year, because I loved 9-9-9. Pete DuPont, Duncan Hunter, Phil Crane.”\textsuperscript{17}

However, on the choice that mattered, in foisting Romney on conservatives and engaging in a scorched-earth campaign against all of his rivals, Coulter remains impenitent. Living in denial – because that 2012 defeat was so politically disastrous and so emotionally heart-wrenching – Coulter uses rationalizations to explain away his (and her) defeat.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, she projects her own attitudes and failing onto Romney’s rivals, calling them unprincipled shysters and hucksters.

Denial, rationalization, and projection – all traits of addictive thinking which I have previously addressed.

**Let’s be Logical, Ann**

Three striking things emerged from an interview with Ann Coulter at the Heritage Foundation: 1) a passionate defense of America and national sovereignty; a surprising unfamiliarity with basic English; and the sense that it was all a performance.

\begin{quote}
“It’s not even \textit{illogical}, it’s \textit{counter}-logic, it’s the \textit{opposite} of logic.”

\textemdash Ann Coulter, 7/11/14
\end{quote}

\textbf{Ann, “illogical” means “devoid of logic.”}

\textbf{Let’s be logical, Ann.}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17} Ann Coulter. Book Party, Daily Caller, 10/22/13.
\textsuperscript{18} I suspect that Romney’s defeat was almost as traumatic to Coulter as was 9/11, which was on her doorstep. But with Romney, Coulter was held to blame by many people. Coulter still cannot accept her culpability in Obama’s reelection victory.
\end{flushleft}
Let’s Be Illogical

Coulter, the consummate wordsmith, seemed unfamiliar with elementary English, claiming, “It’s not even illogical. It’s counter-logic. It’s the opposite of logic.”

But Ann, “illogical” means “devoid of logic.” If it’s “devoid of logic,” if it’s “counter-logic,” if it’s “the opposite of logic,” then it is, in fact, “illogical.” Elementary English.

Perhaps Coulter has twisted words so often to mean so many things that she has forgotten their true meanings. We know she has distorted “establishment” to mean “anyone but Romney” and she has suggested that it is more principled to be unprincipled.

Or perhaps Ann misspoke out of the intensity of the moment. Perhaps.

Passionate Policy

With passionate zeal, Coulter vociferously championed restoring border security and developing sound immigration policy, demanding,

“We want a barbed wire fence. I want the same fence that Israel has. Let's start with that. I'd like the same fence Israel has, and we just have to get rid of this refugee policy. What are we going to do, take in the entire world? All countries suck compared to America. Is that the standard?”

All a Performance

Immediately after making her impassioned plea for sanity in the immigration debate, Coulter – in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye – totally changed her demeanor. Check the video (at about 1 Min. 25 sec.). One moment she was on fire defending America. The next moment, a self-satisfied smile appeared on her face, growing as she panned her audience seeking approval and applause for her splendid performance – looking away from her interviewer. But then she was brought back to earth by another question. Coulter’s face turned serious and she appeared frustrated that she had not received the accolades she felt she so richly deserved.


UPDATE: One of Coulter’s colleagues suggested she just misspoke. Wrong. About 36 hours after this essay was published, Coulter posted her weekly column with this illogical absurdity: “This is something I don’t recall encountering before. It’s anti-logic.”

Instead of just admitting, as her colleague suggested, that she simply misspoke, Coulter doubled down, called it “anti-logic,” and claimed it to be a totally foreign concept to her. As we have seen, admitting error is anathema to her, as are repentance and forgiveness.

What is it about elementary English that Coulter cannot grasp?

In her column – in which she makes “anti-logic” its centerpiece – Coulter expands on her remarks of the previous Friday. Coulter continues to make a distinction between “illogical” and something more superlative, more hyperbolic: “counter-logic,” “opposite of logic,” and, now, “anti-logic.”
But Coulter’s new terms – for what she regards as a brand new concept – are merely different ways of saying the same thing: illogical – the very term she says “it’s not even!”

Illogical means “devoid of logic.” If it’s “devoid of logic,” it’s …

- “counter-logic”
- “the opposite of logic”
- “anti-logic”

Another dictionary definition of illogical: “contradicting or disregarding the principles of logic”

Sounds anti-logic to me.

Strikingly, Coulter does not “recall encountering [this concept] before.” How is that possible? It’s illogical.

**Ann Coulter’s “anti-logic”**

A striking comment in Ann Coulter’s latest column deserves comment. Coulter wrote, “This is something I don’t recall encountering before. It’s anti-logic.”

![Image of Ann Coulter’s “anti-logic”]

“More than any of their other hate speech, the left’s attacks on women for being ugly tell you everything. There is nothing so irredeemably cruel as an attack on a woman for her looks. Attacking a female for being ugly is a hideous thing, always inherently vicious.” – Slander

A blind man in America would think the ugliest women ever to darken the planet are Paula Jones, Linda Tripp, and Katherine Harris. This from the party of Bella Abzug.” – Slander

“Miss Landolph, to put it as charitably as possible, is physically repulsive in appearance.” – Godless

 “[Bella Abzug is] physically repulsive.” – Guilty

Yet, in Demonic, Coulter wrote: “Liberal logic is exactly backwards. They think: How do I know Lebron James just made a great shot? Answer: Because the cheerleaders cheered him. They have no capacity to
reason in the absence of thunderous applause or booing from the bleachers indicating what they should think.”

Wouldn’t that be anti-logic?

On Tuesday, I urged Coulter, “Let’s be Logical, Ann.” The next day, she claimed to have encountered for the very first time something she calls “anti-logic.”

Let’s be logical. Coulter employs anti-logic all the time.

**Repulsive Women**

In *Slander* (2002), Coulter asserted, “More than any of their other hate speech, the left’s attacks on women for being ugly tell you everything. There is nothing so irredeemably cruel as an attack on a woman for her looks. Attacking a female for being ugly is a hideous thing, always inherently vicious.”

Yet, in that very book, Coulter repeatedly attacked the looks of liberal women. Bella Abzug is high on her list. She wrote, “A blind man in America would think the ugliest women ever to darken the planet are Paula Jones, Linda Tripp, and Katherine Harris. This from the party of Bella Abzug.”

In *Guilty* (2009), Coulter explicitly called Abzug “physically repulsive.” In *Godless* (2006), Coulter wrote, “Miss Landolph, to put it as charitably as possible, is physically repulsive in appearance.”

Is it logical to condemn attacks on women’s looks – calling it “irredeemably cruel,” a “hideous thing,” and “inherently vicious” – while doing so yourself? Frequently. As occasion permits?

**Stupid Liberals**

Is it logical to condemn attacks on the intelligence of people – calling it childish – while doing so yourself? Frequently. As occasion permits?

---

If liberals were prevented from ever again calling Republicans dumb, they would be robbed of half their arguments. To be sure, they would still have “racist,” “fascist,” “homophobe,” “ugly,” and a few other highly nuanced arguments in the quiver. But the loss of “dumb” would nearly cripple them.

---

In *Slander* (2002), Coulter wrote, “This is how six-year-olds argue: They call everything ‘stupid.’” But, also in *Slander*, Coulter asserted, “If a conservative says you’re stupid, you’re stupid.” And, in that very same book, she proceeded to identify all those she regards as stupid.

During her *Slander* book tour, Coulter spoke of liberalism’s big lie, saying, “The big [lie] and the one I, I, that is really all the same lie is – don’t listen to conservatives. They are stupid or they’re nuts.”

---

Coulter charged, “This is how liberals respond to arguments, to principled arguments, to facts, to figures, to studies. They respond by calling the conservatives stupid, mean.”

Continuing to elaborate on her point, Coulter said, “This is one of, I think, the biggest lies. Liberals are incredibly vicious.”

Having accused the Left of viciousness in their lies – just as she had accused them of viciousness in their attacks on women’s looks – Coulter claimed, “They accuse Republicans and conservatives of every malfeasance imaginable and then they sit back and say, ‘Oh, both sides do it.’ Both sides don’t do it, as I demonstrate in my book.”

Here again, Coulter is wrong. Both sides do “do it.” Coulter does it.

**Ann Coulter Screws Up Again**

**Blunders!**

How can someone who is so intelligent, so gifted, so quick-witted, so linguistically adroit, and so accomplished, say and do so many things that are so foolish, so often, and so consistently?

---

20 In full disclosure, a recent message board thread was headlined “Ann Coulter Screws Up Again.”
Desperate for both attention and acclaim, and to reinvigorate her career and stature, *Coulter’s antics only serve to further erode her already tarnished credibility*, exacerbate her vastly diminished books sales, and enervate her flagging speaking engagements.

Coulter grows increasingly irrelevant as she becomes more and more self-absorbed. As a consequence, her arrogance damages herself, Christianity, Conservatism, and the nation.

**“Don’t Do Stupid Stuff”**

Coulter seems to have inversely adopted Obama’s “don’t do stupid stuff” strategy by, well, *doing stupid stuff*. So far this summer we’ve seen:

- 6/25/14 Essay: Coulter’s first soccer diatribe
- 7/02/14 Essay: Coulter’s second soccer diatribe
- 7/09/14 Essay: Coulter’s first defamation of Chris McDaniel
- 7/11/14 Interview: Coulter’s first discovery of “anti-logic”
- 7/11/14 Interview: Coulter claimed all other nations “suck”
- 7/11/14 Website: Coulter falsely accused journalist of plagiarism
- 7/16/14 Essay: Coulter’s second “discovery” of “anti-logic”
- 7/23/14 Essay: Coulter’s second defamation of Chris McDaniel
- 7/23/14 Twitter: Coulter condemned compassionate Christians as “moral show-offs”
- 7/30/14 Essay: Coulter discovery of grand conspiracy over a nonexistent (in her eyes) loophole
- 8/06/14 Essay: Coulter’s first Christian missionary diatribe
- 8/12/14 Interview: Coulter demands conservatives elect crap-ass Republicans
- 8/13/14 Essay: Coulter’s second Christian missionary diatribe

One could call it Coulter’s summer of stupidity. (My prediction: we’re see more.)

**Patterns of Behavior**

Displayed before us are dizzying arrangements of behavioral patterns which Coulter has exhibited for well over a decade. But now, those patterns appear to be *intensifying* and they seem virtually *uncontrollable* on Coulter’s part. Ironically, *the person who wants to control every aspect of her life – and the lives of others, the political process, etc. – seems to be incapable of controlling the one thing she is responsible for controlling: herself*. As the apostle Paul, instructed, we are to “take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ (2 Cor. 10:5, NIV).”

Proverbs 16:32 says, “He who is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he who rules his spirit than he who takes a city.” Proverbs 25:28 makes it even clearer, “Whoever has no rule over his own spirit is like a city broken down, without walls.”

Ann Coulter is breaking down before our eyes.

Consider these patterns observed in recent weeks:

**Nativism and xenophobia.** Coulter repeatedly denigrated soccer as foreign, said that every other nations “sucks,” and chastised missionaries for going to foreign lands. Indeed, to her, helping people overseas is treason.
Defamation. Coulter repeatedly defamed Chris McDaniel, falsely accused another journalist of plagiarism, and impugned the motives of missionaries and other Christians. Indeed, to her, those Christians are really “atheists.”

Narcissism. Coulter “discovered” something she illogically claimed to have never seen before (“anti-logic”) and then discovered that an immigration loophole really doesn’t exist when it really does. Her explanation for the latter is a massive conspiracy by all political parties and the entirety of the press for the purpose of achieving open borders. All things revolve around her.

Impenitence. When confronted with her errors and foolishness on a whole range of matters, Coulter reasserted her accuracy and upheld her own righteousness. From soccer, to McDaniel, to the concept of anti-logic, to Christian missionaries, Coulter heralds her preeminence in these matters. She will not acknowledge error or issue an apology.

Why So Foolish?

Why has Ann Coulter’s foolishness run amok? Because Coulter has turned her back on God. Although she claims to be “an extraordinarily good Christian,” she rejects the basic doctrines of the Christian faith. Coulter eschews love and embraces enmity. Coulter refuses to either repent or forgive. Coulter elevates her own will over that of God.

The apostle Paul shared a spiritual principle with the Thessalonian congregation, writing, “And for this reason God will send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie, that they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness (2 Thess. 2:11-12).”

Coulter, who in 2000 said that she would deny God’s personal revelation to her if it conflicted with her own political beliefs (“If God himself came down from heaven and told me … I would not believe it”) has made a habit of elevating her own preferred opinions to God’s divine truth. Quoting Proverbs 14:12 (Coulter’s favorite proverb), “There is a way that seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death.”

Many psychological factors mirror and mesh with the spiritual ones already addressed. Additionally, matters of character and integrity grow out of all of these forces, resulting in the observed patterns of behavior we have addressed.

Let’s Pray for Ann

My dear readers, please indulge me.

Please lift up Ann before the throne of heaven and pray that God pierce her heart with His love, prick her conscience with His righteousness, open her mind with His truth, give her understanding with His Spirit, and topple her pride with the humility of Jesus.

---

22 Ann Coulter, “A liberal lynching,” 2/16/00.
24 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. Coulter’s foolishness exposes her desertion from God and the things of God, her narcissistic quest for self-glory and repudiation of basic Christian morality and conservative principles, and her consequent lack of character and integrity, which are discussed in Never Trust Ann Coulter – at ANY Age at www.coulterwatch.com/never.pdf.
Coulter’s CPAC Sobs

Although Coulter claims she hasn’t cried since she was a child, Radley Balko disagrees: “I’ve seen her cry.”

Coulter, at the age of 37, cried at CPAC in 1999.

I attended that CPAC conference as a member of the press and witnessed what Balko would later describe. Coulter was part of a panel, but when the moderator asked her his first question, she got up, went to the podium, and started giving a speech. After a few minutes, she was asked to sit down.

An embarrassed and angry Coulter later got testy with several of the audience members who asked questions.

Gary Nolan, President of Capitol Watch, introduced the event as a panel discussion and introduced Ralph Hallow as the moderator, who, in turn, introduced the panel, and then asked Coulter a question to start things off.

Coulter got up, walked around the moderator to the podium, and began a speech: “I’m going to keep talking until a light goes on.”

In the midst of her soliloquy, she was interrupted by the moderator. Surprised at the interruption, she asked, “Sorry, what do you want me to do?” Puzzled, she asked, “You didn’t want a speech?”

Balko observed, “the panel concluded with Ann struggling to choke back tears. I snuck back behind the panel after the session, of course, hoping to witness more drama. And that’s when I saw Cold-Blooded Coulter in sobbing hysterics. She’d been bullied. And now she was crying.”

Don’t take Balko’s word for it. The *Washington Post* made a similar observation. Coulter lamented, “‘The moderator cut me off! I was humiliated in front of 600 people!’ Between sobs, she sucked on a cigarette.”

A minor faux pas became a newspaper headline and a window into Ann Coulter’s heart.

During the panel discussion, it was not long before Coulter griped that she had been pulled off the stage and she was later cross with audience questioners. Coulter – *while still on the panel* – sniveled:

> Well, I’m already worried about the extent of the White House spin when I get hooked off the stage.

In what I’m sure the audience originally perceived as a non-event, Coulter turned it into a big deal, even accusing the coordinators of skullduggery and the moderator of conspiracy. Since Ann Coulter turned this into an event and leveled accusations against others to cover her own faux pas, let’s look at what really happened.

After reviewing a tape of Ann’s CPAC panel, recalling conversations, and reading the *Washington Post*, this is what happened.

1. Coulter was part of a *panel* discussion which was *promoted as a panel* discussion.
2. Coulter was introduced as part of a *panel*.
3. The moderator asked Coulter a *question for discussion*.
4. Coulter went to the podium and started to give a *speech*.
5. The moderator passed a *note* to Coulter to cut it short. Coulter ignored the note.
6. The moderator went up to Coulter to *tell* her to stop. Coulter said, “Oh, you don’t want a speech? OK.” and returned to her seat.
7. Later in the discussion, Coulter rebuked the moderator for “hooking” her. He had become part of the Clinton manipulation team.
8. Later in the discussion, Coulter was snippy with Reed Irvine, suggesting he was a nobody she’d never heard of.
9. Shortly after her panel, Coulter was overheard on the phone offering a “myriad of theories” to the listener in an angry voice.
10. Coulter complained to the CPAC organizers about her humiliation by the moderator.

Coulter’s self-absorption and obsession with her image remains to this day.

*Warning*: Don’t – *ever* – mock Coulter.

---

27 Ann Coulter, CPAC, 1/21/99.
**Jesus Wept**

Whereas Coulter regards crying as “womanly” (fearing the appearance of imperfection), Jesus – as the perfect human – transparently expressed sorrow and wept for the lost and broken. The shortest verse in the Bible – “Jesus wept (John 11:35)” – reveals the selfless heart of Jesus.

As He was preparing for the Passion, Jesus mourned (wait, is that “womanly?”) for Jerusalem: “Now as He drew near, He saw the city and wept over it (Luke 19:41).”

And as He prepared for His ultimate sacrifice, Jesus obediently poured himself out as a living sacrifice on the altar of the cross. As the writer of Hebrews reported, “[Jesus,] who, in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications, with vehement cries and tears to Him who was able to save Him from death, and was heard because of His godly fear (Heb. 5:7).”

Jesus – both fully human and fully divine – did not fear being human. He fully experienced joy and sorrow, hunger and thirst. And Jesus’ example shows that *shedding tears is a normal life experience.*

King David, a man after God’s own heart, and the shepherd boy who slew the giant Goliath, wept.

Indeed, *David and his fellow warriors wept:* “Then David and the people who were with him lifted up their voices and wept, until they had no more power to weep (1 Sam. 30:4).”

David fasted and wept for his dying son (2 Sam. 12:21) and, much later, for another dead son, in a famous poetic lament: “Then the king was deeply moved, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept. And as he went, he said thus: ‘O my son Absalom – my son, my son Absalom – if only I had died in your place! O Absalom my son, my son (2 Sam. 18:33)!’”

David’s heart – for all its flaws – reflected the heart of God. Though an outstanding warrior, David did not fear tears. Rather, he sought God’s will and desired that his heart be purified.

Jesus – in His perfection – unashamedly exhibited joy and sorrow. Tears were (and are) a part of human existence.
Epilog
Ann Coulter’s Journey to Damascus

During the summer of 2014, Coulter’s commentary was raw and, one could say, wretched. Her thoughts and expressed emotions were unfiltered and often objectionable. Filled with hubris, Coulter even rebelled against God and attacked the people of God.

But then, in a startling manner, Coulter’s commentary and conduct abruptly changed for the better. It was as if the hand of God had reached down to lift her up out of her own self-made pit.

[The remainder of this epilog was originally published as a series of essays on my blog. – DB]

Part 1: Coulter Hates White Liberals
Part 2: Ann Coulter Takes on the Racial Grievance Industry
Part 3: Ann Coulter at Her Best
Part 4: Ann Coulter’s Journey to Damascus

Coulter Hates White Liberals

This week, in a beautifully titled column (“No Facts, No Peace”), Ann Coulter brought some much needed perspective to the turmoil taking place in Ferguson, Missouri. (Her laudable column was marred, however, by a foolish posting on her website.)

Drawing from her best-selling book, Mugged, Coulter accurately attacked the default media narrative – “Racist until proved innocent” – and she provided numerous examples of the media’s jihad against white America and local authorities.

Coulter also offered up a rationale for this deplorable dynamic: “Stirring up racial hatred is how journalists make up for sending their own kids to lily-white private schools.” (Personally, I suspect the Sixties counter-cultural mindset pervades the mainstream media.)

She further noted the necessarily changing media narrative as actual facts emerged. (Though the minds of many still remain committed to the false narrative.)

My one criticism has to do, not with her column, but with a website posting she made around the time she posted her column. (This morning I stumbled upon Ann’s posting, and I find I must address it.)

On Wednesday, Coulter announced the posting of her column via twitter. Eighteen minutes earlier, on her website, she had posted remarks related to that column with the caption “I hate white liberals.”

---

1 Why does Coulter single out “white liberals?” Coulter provides an excerpt from Mugged (see graphic). Her excerpt is extremely disingenuous. Coulter cites a poll concerning the 1992 Los Angeles riots and compares those who disapproved of the riots with white liberals who thought “the riots were great TV.” Her citation does not say those liberals approved of the riots or thought they were justified. One could reasonably suspect that most people – whether liberal or conservative, black or white, male or female – thought “the riots were great TV,” irrespective of whether they approved of them or not. After all, the riots were a major story and most people watched. Sort of the definition of “great TV.”

205
“I hate white liberals.”

Really? Racism is bad, phony charges of racism are bad, riots are bad, but hatred is good?

Coulter only hates “white” liberals? Black liberals and race hucksters like Sharpton and Jackson create this strife, but Coulter doesn’t hate them?

There was a time when Coulter was equal opportunity in her hatred, hating everyone on the Left (as well as some on the Right).

Perhaps this is really a sign of spiritual growth. Perhaps next week she will only hate white male liberals.

It’s a start.

Once again, I don’t have any criticisms of her column, or her evaluation of the situation at Ferguson. (Rich Lowry might not like her jab at him in her opening paragraph, but, since he’s not a girly-boy, I’m sure he can take it.)

It is only Coulter’s profession of hatred that I address here.
Ann Coulter Takes on the Racial Grievance Industry

In a surprising series on race relations, Ann Coulter takes on the racial grievance industry and, in the process, exposes a number of hoaxes, from white racism, to white killer cops, to racial profiling.

Ferguson Fallout

As I reported in my last column, in a beautifully titled piece (“No Facts, No Peace”), Ann Coulter brought some much needed perspective to the turmoil taking place in Ferguson, Missouri.

Drawing from her best-selling book, Mugged, Coulter accurately attacked the default media narrative – “Racist until proved innocent” – and she provided numerous examples of the media’s jihad against white America and local authorities.

She further noted the necessarily changing media narrative as actual facts emerged. (Though the minds of many still remain committed to the false narrative.)

As Coulter pointed out in 1996, about another event, “We keep talking about how it’s racially-charged. It’s only racially-charged because we’re making it that way.”

The injection of race into events which take place between people of different races often obscures the truth of what actually happened. Inserting a racial dynamic immediately inflames emotions and clouds reason. Indeed, injecting race into a situation typically confers guilt upon the white person, whoever it might be.

---

3 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 10/13/96.
It’s not about *race*, but *reality*. (See “Race Does Not Matter.”)

In 1997, Coulter again raised concerns over the false narrative of widespread white racism oppressing blacks, saying, “I think probably the worst things white people in American society do to blacks is compelling them to savor the experience of racism.”

Coulter is correct. It is the race hustlers – and the entire racial grievance industry – which is limiting the ability of many blacks to overcome the obstacles in life and be the best that they can be.

Coulter continued,

> When you talk about a racial dialogue and healing, the underlying message is ‘whites are racist, whites are racist, whites are racist,’ and I don’t think it’s true and I think it’s time we put that aside and move on. I think it’s not healthy for people to be constantly feeling like whites really are racist because they keep saying they’re racist so they really must be. (See “Guilty of Being White.”)

**More Black Cops!**

Last week, Coulter addressed the clamor for more black cops in response to the already-identified false narrative in Ferguson.

The prevalence of white killer cops is a favorite meme of Al Sharpton, Eric Holder, and other race hustlers. Naturally, the remedy they propose is to employ more black police officers. *But their solution – premised upon a false paradigm of institutional racism – employs racism to solve it.* Quotas, racial set-asides, race-norming, the welfare state – these have all hurt the black community far, far, far more than they have helped it.

According to Coulter, “If the Ferguson police are forced to hire more minorities and women for the sake of diversity, the one thing we can be sure of is that more black people will be murdered, raped and assaulted.” Facts support her claim.

Coulter discovered “a massive, detailed 2000 study of the effect of court-ordered affirmative action plans on police departments” which “found that the more minorities on a police force, the higher the rates of murder, manslaughter, violent crime, robbery and aggravated assault will be.”

She points out that the “problem was not with black cops … but rather with the lowering of standards across the board, resulting in less-qualified officers of every race.” (Her stats and examples are worth checking out.)

As Coulter put it, “I'm against more black people being murdered, raped and assaulted.” (How about Sharpton and Holder? Oh, that’s right, they haven’t been to Chicago yet.)

---

4 Ann Coulter, MSNBC, 6/14/97.
Racial Profiling

The racial grievance industry is hell-bent on portraying white Americans as racist and police officers as potential killers of blacks. The utter myth of America as a racist nation is continually propounded as fact by those who would profit from its proliferation.

Race hustlers are wealthy, powerful, and famous.

Yesterday, Coulter again used facts to expose yet another racial grievance industry hoax — the myth of racial profiling.¹⁶ Coulter traced the origins of this myth and offered compelling evidence for discarding it.

Coulter wrote, “Throughout the 1990s, the nation was fixated on tales of jack-booted New Jersey state troopers who were stopping speeders on the turnpike just because they were black!”

Coulter considered the source and discovered, “As is usually the case with bogus race studies, the pivotal 1993 survey compared speed stops on the New Jersey turnpike to the population of all drivers on the turnpike – not with the population of all speeders on the turnpike.”

She noted the nonsensical nature of its conclusion: “Such meaningless studies are popular on the left, where it is assumed that people of different races, genders and ethnicities will always behave identically in all respects.”

Coulter also observed what proponents of that study should have grasped: “Any study purporting to show that too many blacks are stopped for speeding must first determine how many speeders are black.”

But race hustlers often miss the obvious and their disciples are often all too caught up in their emotions to even question the “facts” being given to them.

As Coulter noted, the Public Services Research Institute conducted a study “of nearly 40,000 drivers” to confirm the flawed 1993 survey and it reached its own conclusion: “No racial profiling.”

Ann Coulter at Her Best

Yesterday’s Ebola column by Ann Coulter was priceless.⁷ Factual, well-reasoned, incisive, witty, non-polemical. (I wouldn’t change a word.)

Coulter also wrote a literary gem⁸ a few weeks ago which I would like to share with you.⁹

---

⁷ Ann Coulter, “We’ll tell you how dangerous Ebola is after the election,” 10/15/14.
⁹ While I disagree with some of her conclusions, her presentation was excellent. It was a thoroughly enjoyable read, except for the elimination rhetoric in the very last phrase. (Some habits die hard.) (I would also have chosen words other than “insane” and “idiots,” though, perhaps I am getting too picky.) But for a nuts-and-bolts let’s-get-down-to-the-details election analysis, it was top notch, and, again, an enjoyable read. Consider it an unpolished diamond.
Entitled “Your ‘to do’ list to save America,” Ann addressed the upcoming elections with insight, wit, and vigor. I thoroughly enjoyed her literary style (while disagreeing with a few of her points). It was well written and engaging, with a good overall structure, and it adroitly expressed her intended message with flair. Forceful, yet restrained.

Coulter opened with the need to “swing the Senate to Republican control,” then, in her second paragraph, wrote my favorite sentence in this column: “Turn that into a mnemonic, sew it on needlepoint pillows, include it in your wedding vows, right-wingers. ... All that matters is winning.”

Beautiful imagery, quaint, to the point, with a cascading effect which lends a subtle sense of mounting urgency.

Coulter concluded her paragraph:

For the next six weeks, nothing matters more to the country than Republicans taking a majority in the Senate. When it comes to politics, conservatives need to learn one thing from liberals: All that matters is winning.

Next, she handily handicapped key Senate races in a straightforward, yet interesting and compelling way.  

---

10 My dear readers, you are urged to read the entirety of her column. Her analysis of each race is informative and her writing style is very appealing, making what some might regard as a boring, inside-the-beltway subject actually interesting.
Below, Coulter’s parenthetical (restrained) rebuke of Republicans was an “I told you so” without saying “I told you so.” She wrote:

(Take a moment to notice something, Republicans: No incumbent Democrat had to deal with a primary challenger this year. That's one reason why Democrats win more elections than their insane ideas would seem to dictate. Liberals understand that you can't do anything if you don't win, so Democrats don't stage primary fights against other Democrats.)

Ann next gave us all “assignments.” The first was for Sen. Pat Roberts to campaign nonstop to victory. In another dig at the GOP, she again chided, “I don't know why Roberts got a primary challenge at all. Please stop doing that, Republicans.”

Coulter emphasized the need to flip enough “Democratic seats to take a majority in the Senate,” then, beautifully added, “Hopefully, the GOP will take more than three, and store them like chestnuts for a long, cold winter.”

Her second assignment was for all Americans to support Scott Brown’s candidacy (twice linking to his website): “Donate. Right now!” A sense of urgency conveyed in brevity.

“The biggest current danger for Republicans,” Coulter correctly cautioned, is that Libertarians will jeopardize key elections by wasting their votes on Libertarian candidates who cannot win. As she put it, “When we're all dying from lack of health care across the United States of Mexico, we'll be deeply impressed with your integrity, libertarians.”

Though not “priceless” like yesterday’s column, this one – despite its imperfections – is eminently commendable.

**Ann Coulter’s Journey to Damascus**

After a bizarre summer of exceptionally objectionable commentary and extraordinarily foolish statements, Ann Coulter abruptly about-faced, seemingly changing her spots.

It was as if a hand from heaven reached down, deep down into the bottomless pit that Ann was digging herself deeper and deeper into, and grasped her hand, stopping her descent into oblivion; a hand that lifted her out of her own Ann-crafted prison of a pit and granted her freedom; a hand that granted grace to a person whose name means grace.

---

11 Here’s why, Ann. Coulter’s supreme reluctance to primary less conservative GOP candidates – which has caused a rift between Coulter and the Tea Party – stems from a somewhat flawed grasp of the dynamics involved. Ann seems to think that all Republicans will actually vote Republican (or conservative, which is not the same thing), when history shows that recent Republican congresses have raised taxes, increased spending, enacted new entitlement programs, and toyed with amnesty. We need more conservatives (not more Republicans) in office. Hence the need to challenge recalcitrant incumbents.

12 Another well-worded nugget, accurate in this instance. It is noteworthy that Ann criticizes Libertarians for holding on to their “integrity” in the face of defeat (and thus squandering their votes), just as she has in the past blamed electoral defeat on pro-lifers who were “too” pro-life (integrity, again) or Tea Party candidates for being too principled (again, integrity).

13 “Ann Coulter Screws Up Again” at http://t.co/IfJD3YVG3o.


15 “Ann Coulter at Her Best” at http://wp.me/p4iHFr-2u.
Ann on Her Road to Damascus

What happened? Did Ann experience a conversion on her own personal road to Damascus? Did God grant Ann an epiphany? Was Ann able to see herself, her circumstances, and the world from a different (heavenly) vantage point. Is the new and improved Ann Coulter the result of a paradigm shift, a change in attitude and perspective, with a consequent change in behavior?

In a series of comments and commentaries over the past two decades, Coulter has previously dismissed Road to Damascus conversions as liberal propaganda devices. Coulter regularly contests those who claim “lifelong conservative” status but then dare to criticize her and she denies that conservatives can ever become liberals. (She must think it’s easier to become a faithful follower of Christ than to become a godless liberal, as she would put it.) Here are three examples from her writings:

- “But liberals think they can fool normal people with their road-to-Damascus I used to be a Republican!’ conversion stories.”16
- “[Supreme Court Justice John Paul] Stevens is more like a pre-road to Damascus Saul. Or maybe the late Justice William Brennan.”17
- “I did not know the road to Damascus was this long, with so many opportunities for conversion.”18

Is Coulter on the very road she once pooh-poohed? If so, she should thank the hand that grasped hers and lifted her out of her self-made pit.

---

16 Ann Coulter, “The Devil is Out of Details,” 5/5/05.
Analysis of Most Recent Ann Coulter Columns

Having seen Ann at her worst this summer, examining her ten most recent columns may give us insight into her current intellectual, emotional, and spiritual state of being. (My critique concentrates more on the literary quality of her writing than on the accuracy of her claims or the cogency of her analysis.)

8/20/14. 19 ****½. This was Coulter’s first laudable column this past summer. It was an abrupt departure from her previous columns going back months. It was non-polemical, factual, and very tame for a Coulter column. Prompted by the Ferguson firestorm, Coulter decried “the old media’s standard for any police shooting of a black person is: ‘Racist until proved innocent.’” Coulter went point-by-point through the known facts of the Ferguson case and also encapsulated the long history of race hoaxes in America. 20

8/27/14. 21 ****. Another non-polemical, factual column. As a Ferguson follow-up, Coulter explained how racial quotas in hiring police officers can be lethal. Her claim – “If the Ferguson police are forced to hire more minorities and women for the sake of diversity, the one thing we can be sure of is that more black people will be murdered, raped and assaulted” – is backed up by ample evidence. In lowering standards, everyone is accepted, regardless of how unqualified they may actually be.

9/3/14. 22 ****. Coulter debunks the myth of racial profiling for traffic stops, pointing out the flawed methodology in an oft-cited study: “As is usually the case with bogus race studies, the pivotal 1993 survey compared speed stops on the New Jersey turnpike to the population of all drivers on the turnpike – not with the population of all speeders on the turnpike.”

9/10/14. 23 ****½. Somewhat polemical, Coulter effectively makes her point: “Getting Obama to postpone a rancid idea [executive amnesty] isn’t something to celebrate. Yay! We did it! We forced him to delay doing something the country doesn’t want for SIX WEEKS! Every Republican candidate better be jamming Obama’s threat down the throats of their Democratic opponents.”

9/17/14. 24 ****½. One of my favorite columns from a literary perspective. My favorite quote for its imagery: “Turn that into a mnemonic, sew it on needlepoint pillows, include it in your wedding vows, right-wingers. For the next six weeks, nothing matters more to the country than Republicans taking a majority in the Senate.” Second quote: “That means Republicans need to flip three Democratic seats to take a majority in the Senate. Hopefully, the GOP will take more than three, and store them like chestnuts for a long, cold winter.”

9/24/14. 27 ****. A good, factual exhortation. Conclusion: “Republicans can win a Senate majority, take back the presidency, repeal Obamacare, build the Keystone pipeline, slash oppressive government regulations, end special tax deals and government contracts for the Democrats' big donors, restore an honest IRS and nominate serious people to the federal bench. But they'll never do any of those things if they can't learn that mass immigration from the Third World is wildly unpopular with voters.”

---

25 Apart from final sentence which contains elimination rhetoric.
26 “Ann Coulter at Her Best” at http://wp.me/p4iHfp-2u.
10/1/14. **4 1/2.** Engaging and light-hearted, Coulter debunks several liberal myths: guns, domestic violence, Obama death threats. Coulter writes: “The theme of all these liberal fantasies is that the greatest threat to women, minorities and liberals are right-wing white men with guns – especially on a Super Bowl Sunday. (Referees are beheaded at soccer games in Brazil, but liberals are terrified of America’s national sport.) White men are even threats to **themselves,** should they be foolish enough to purchase a gun.”

10/8/14. **3.** Clever (in using other people’s words to speak for her), on point, but minimalist effort. Relies heavily on *Washington Times*’ comment board and incorporates her own witty remarks. Conclusion: “The Republican leadership has got to choose between their voters and their donors. They can’t have both – at least as long as the donors keep big-footing the conservative base on immigration. No amount of money in the world is going to help a candidate who’s allowed to sell only crap.” A minor quibble: “crap” is an unladylike word to use.

10/15/14. **5.** Superb, factual, well-reasoned, incisive, non-polemical. Coulter on Ebola: “It’s becoming increasingly clear this is just another platform for Obama to demonstrate that we are citizens of the world. The entire Ebola issue is being discussed – by our government, not the United Nations – as if Liberians are indistinguishable from Americans, and U.S. taxpayers should be willing to pay whatever it takes to save them.” And: “And now we’re going to have to let in entire families with Ebola, because the important thing is – actually, I don’t know why. It’s some technical, scientific point about fences not working.”

10/22/14. **4 1/2.** Another top-notch column. Coulter on Obamacare: “As we now know, under the ‘Affordable Care Act,’ your only options are: (1) Take the crap-ass, high-priced/no doctor Obamacare plan; or (2) go bare, and risk being bankrupted by an expensive medical problem. Either way, the price will be astronomical.” One minor quibble: “crap-ass” is an unladylike word to use.

**Dramatic Improvement**

Almost overnight, Ann’s commentary dramatically improved. Despite a few rough edges, most of her ten columns were commendable, engaging, edifying, and enjoyable. They represent a much improved literary style and craftsmanship.

The question remains, what of Ann’s underlying character traits. Veracity and integrity are non-negotiable in journalism – and in living a Christian life. Let us pray that the quality of Ann’s character come to match and exceed that of her craft.

**Update:** With the close of the 2014 election cycle and the advent of winter, Coulter appears to have reverted to her old, unconverted self. Beset by delusions of grandeur, Coulter again wants to dictate to the American people whom they can nominate for President.

*The intriguing truth will be revealed in my next book. – DB*

---

30 Ann Coulter, “We’ll Tell You How Dangerous Ebola is After the Election,” 10/15/14.
Appendix

An (Almost) Perfect Piece of Propaganda

An (Almost) Perfect Piece of Propaganda
Anatomy of a False Narrative
(A Primer in Propaganda)

(This feature is available as a free download at www.coulterwatch.com/files/anatomy.pdf. An abbreviated version also appears on my blog at http://coulterwatch.wordpress.com. – DB)

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).

**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. 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. 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?

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.”

---

13 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.

14 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.* (I guess Jesus did not take that into account when He gave the Great Commission.)

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.

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.
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“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.”
Big Lie
Perpetual Warfare
Apocryphal Enemy
Enemy of the Moment
Two Minutes Hate
Hate Week
Newspeak
Groupthink
Doublethink
Memory Hole