



Godless: The Church of Liberalism

Ann Coulter

Download now

Read Online ➔

Godless: The Church of Liberalism

Ann Coulter

Godless: The Church of Liberalism Ann Coulter

"If a martian landed in America and set out to determine the nation's official state religion, he would have to conclude it is liberalism, while Christianity and Judaism are prohibited by law.

Many Americans are outraged by liberal hostility to traditional religion. But as Ann Coulter reveals in this, her most explosive book yet, to focus solely on the Left's attacks on our Judeo-Christian tradition is to miss a larger point: liberalism "is" a religion--a godless one.

And it is now entrenched as the state religion of this county.

Though liberalism rejects the idea of God and reviles people of faith, it bears all the attributes of a religion.

In "Godless," Coulter throws open the doors of the Church of Liberalism, showing us its sacraments (abortion), its holy writ ("Roe v. Wade"), its martyrs (from Soviet spy Alger Hiss to cop-killer Mumia Abu-Jamal), its clergy (public school teachers), its churches (government schools, where prayer is prohibited but condoms are free), its doctrine of infallibility (as manifest in the "absolute moral authority" of spokesmen from Cindy Sheehan to Max Cleland), and its cosmology (in which mankind is an inconsequential accident). Then, of course, there's the liberal creation myth: Charles Darwin's theory of evolution.

For liberals, evolution is the touchstone that separates the enlightened from the benighted. But Coulter neatly reverses the pretense that liberals are rationalists guided by the ideals of free inquiry and the scientific method. She exposes the essential truth about Darwinian evolution that liberals refuse to confront: "it is bogus science."

Writing with a keen appreciation for genuine science, Coulter reveals that the so-called gaps in the theory of evolution are all there is--Darwinism is nothing but a gap. After 150 years of dedicated searching into the fossil record, evolution's proponents have failed utterly to substantiate its claims. And a long line of supposed evidence, from the infamous Piltdown Man to the "evolving" peppered moths of England, has been exposed as hoaxes. Still, liberals treat those who question evolution as religious heretics and prohibit students from hearing about real science when it contradicts Darwinism. And these are the people who say they want to keep faith out of the classroom?

Liberals' absolute devotion to Darwinism, Coulter shows, has nothing to do with evolution's scientific validity and everything to do with its refusal to admit the possibility of God as a guiding force. They will brook no challenges to the official religion.

Fearlessly confronting the high priests of the Church of Liberalism and ringing with Coulter's razor-sharp wit, "Godless" is the most important and riveting book yet from one of today's most lively and impassioned conservative voices. "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.'" --From Godless

Godless: The Church of Liberalism Details

Date : Published 2006 by Crown Forum

ISBN : 9781400054206

Author : Ann Coulter

Format : Hardcover 310 pages

Genre : Politics, Nonfiction, Humor

 [Download](#) Godless: The Church of Liberalism ...pdf

 [Read Online](#) Godless: The Church of Liberalism ...pdf

Download and Read Free Online Godless: The Church of Liberalism Ann Coulter

From Reader Review **Godless: The Church of Liberalism** for online ebook

Justin says

Same old same old from our favorite horse faced ultra conservative Ann Coulter. When she's not shrieking the usual conservative rhetoric (liberal want to kill babies, outlaw Christianity, force mass gay marriages etc...) she's accusing liberal of betraying the nation, colluding with Communists and plotting the downfall of the USA. I'm not sure what's worse, that people actually like this garbage or having to look at that grotesquery on the cover.

David Simonetti says

If you like unbridled opinion with a nasty and sarcastic twist this is the book to read. After hearing all the denunciations of the book, I had to read it and I thoroughly enjoyed, particularly the attack on the New Jersey widows. But not only that, Ann clearly makes a strong argument that liberals have created their own religion, which is why they are so hostile towards other form of organized religion. If there is anything that bothers the Left more than anything is when the masses turn to organized religion for moral guidance rather than their policies. In a nutshell, the Left, like the Marxists, are intolerant of organized religion since they view it as a competing form of mind control.

I don't care how offensive some of Ann's statements are. I'm just glad she is not afraid to make them and find it funny how the Left only helps her sell her books with all their hysterical denunciations of her statements and writings.

Nandakishore Varma says

It should be titled "Brainless" - more apt in the case of Ann Coulter.

Whew! I didn't think I would survive the ordeal of reading this book.

Ann Coulter is a prominent right-wing media personality in America. However, it is not her conservative views which get her attention: it is the outright hatred she has for the "other", and the purposefully rude way in which she expresses her opinion, that does it. Liberals hate her, and she revels in it.

I read this book to see whether Ann is as black as she's painted. Well, she's blacker. I did not think a human being could spew so much hate and still remain sane (unless it's all an act to gain media attention, as some of her detractors say, which is quite possible).

Ann Coulter's main argument in this book is against the separation of the Church and the State. As a conservative Christian, she would like to see the USA become a theocracy; however, this is effectively prevented by the constitution which is secular. So she goes on to attack secularism itself as a godless religion, rather than a logical frame work where all kinds of thoughts can coexist side by side.

The book is very badly written, with plenty of her pet peeves surfacing time and again, interspersed with snide remarks and name-calling, so there is no coherent central argument. However, the main points Ms. Coulter tries to make can be summarised as:

1. Liberal thought is a godless religion, less logical than Christianity, which is being forced on Americans through public institutions and state schools.
2. Liberals want to live a life free of any moral code.
3. Liberals are hell-bent on supporting criminals who have done heinous crimes against humanity, and time and again have sent prisoners out on parole who have again committed more serious crimes.
4. Liberals are in favour of abortion, just because they don't mind killing babies to enjoy indiscriminate sex.
5. Muslims are a danger to the world. President George Bush is right in attacking Iraq and killing Saddam Hussein. However, Liberals support Islamic terrorists.
6. Liberals support public school teachers who (in her opinion) are a bunch of overpaid slackers, responsible for Americans' decline in the intellectual field.
7. Liberal science has no evidential support: the deleterious effects of pesticides, global warming, the fact that AIDS attacks heterosexuals as well as gays, the benefits of embryonic stem cell research... these are all myths created by liberals to further their political agenda. Anybody who speaks out against these is hounded out of the scientific establishment.
8. And most importantly – the theory of evolution (which she calls “Darwinism”) – is absolute nonsense.

Most of the “arguments” (if they can be called that) the author presents for each of the above are pretty shaky – most of them are straw men, and will convince only the already converted. She is in fact preaching to the choir. However, she purposefully misrepresents facts. These half-truths are more dangerous than outright lies; even those who dislike her rhetoric may fall for the veneer of truth in her analysis.

(I did a quick research on two cases which Ann Coulter presented as proof of the liberal penchant for loosening inhuman criminals on society. The first, the case of the anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti in the 1920's who purportedly murdered two payroll carriers, she presents as an open-and-shut case. What is more, she says that their liberal supporters were aware that they were guilty, but still lied to the authorities and public. However, it seems that there is plenty of evidence to believe that Vanzetti was innocent; and Sacco's guilt is not proved beyond doubt. More importantly, there is every reason to believe that the defendants were not given a fair trial.

The second case is more distressing. Dennis Dechaine was convicted of kidnapping, sexually assaulting and murdering 12-year-old Sarah Cherry in Maine. The way Coulter describes it, the case is airtight: Dechaine is another monster that the liberals are trying to save. But a quick search on the net will bring out the full facts – there were at least two other people who could be guilty. Dechaine's supporters are asking only for a retrial, not an acquittal, with newly acquired DNA evidence: however, the state is adamant that it will not budge. It seems more of a case of government obstinacy than a conspiracy to free a convicted criminal.)

If Ann had her way, lynch mobs would replace trial courts. She is angry with the drawn-out trials, the pleas for leniency, and the mounting pressure to ban capital punishment. In her opinion, harsh punishment is the

only deterrent for violent crime: for all her hatred of Sharia law, one feels that Saudi Arabia would be her ideal country.

(Ironically, for a person hell-bent on the death penalty, she considers herself “pro-life”, which means against abortion. It seems that the conservatives value human life only when in the foetal stage!)

Ms. Coulter singles out some individuals for special treatment – one of the main recipients of her venom is Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis. Dukakis is the ultra-liberal: a card-carrying member of the American Civil Liberties Union (something akin to a witches’ coven in Ann’s view), he advocated furloughs for even convicted first-degree murderers during his term in office. (Dukakis also declared August 23, 1977 as “Sacco and Vanzetti Memorial Day”, to atone for their “unfair trial and conviction” – sacrilege according to Ms. Coulter.)

Dukakis lost the 1988 election to George H. W. Bush, helped in a large part due to a racist campaign focussing on the convicted murderer Willie Horton. Dukakis allowed to go on furlough, and who committed a vicious assault and rape during his time outside the prison. Ann Coulter however, glosses over the campaign itself, playing down the racist angle. According to her, Dukakis lost because his liberal views, especially the ones regarding the treatment of criminals, were rejected by the public (even so, Ann’s racial bias is evident throughout: at one point, she calls him the “Greek midget”).

Ms. Coulter uses gutter language to criticise many prominent Democrats including Bill Clinton and Al Gore (her sexual innuendos about Clinton are nauseating), and fawns over Republicans, especially George W. Bush, who in her opinion is a sort of divine incarnation come to rescue America. Needless to say, she considers America’s invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq legitimate – it is “protecting America”. From the hindsight of 2014, when the USA is crawling back from the Middle East with its tail between its legs, her contention that America would have won the Vietnam War had not protests at home forced the government to abandon it seems laughably silly. She writes at a point of time when Republicans are still waiting for the imminent discovery of “Weapons of Mass Destruction” hoarded by Saddam! One could feel pity for her, if she were not so contemptuous of the mothers who have lost sons in Iraq.

According to Ann, all liberals are anti-science: they use the scientific method just to push their agenda on abortion, gay rights, global warming, etc. No wonder, as the conservatives view science as a tool just to help them exploit nature and other human beings. She favours the indiscriminate use of pesticides and the uncontrolled burning of fossil fuels: the protection of environment is anathema to her, as she views it from the biblical perspective as man’s natural bounty, to be consumed at will. The view that man is part of nature will sound like common sense to most normal human beings, but not to conservatives of Ms. Coulter’s ilk. To quote an example: “We believe in populating the Earth until there’s standing room only and then colonizing Mars; they believe humans are in the twilight of their existence.” – I rest my case.

But it is when it comes to the theory of evolution that Ann Coulter really outdoes herself. According to her, evolution is only a theory, having absolutely no basis in fact that the liberals are “forcing” on Americans, by making it mandatory in schools. Creation theory is much more solid in her opinion. Ann is clever enough not to argue for the Biblical creation myth as science: she knows that she will be laughed out of court. Her theory of choice Intelligent Design (ID) as propounded by the biologist Michael Behe, which posits a supernatural intelligence behind the development of various life-forms. Ms. Coulter says despite many scientists favouring this theory, liberals are using their hold on the scientific establishment and academia to keep it out of schools.

As a person who followed the ID debate with interest, I know most of what Ann Coulter says is contrary to

facts. ID was thrown out of the science curriculum in schools because it was not science: it did not present any alternative to evolution; rather, it only argued that there was a divine will behind the process. As any college student knows, such a theory can never be refuted as it is not falsifiable. The *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District* judgement has become famous not without reason.

This does not deter the creationists, however: they try to sneak ID into schools every now and then. The case of Roger DeHart is a classic example. This is what Ann Coulter has to say about it:

Roger DeHart used to teach biology at Burlington-Edison High School in Washington State, where he supplemented his curriculum with newspaper stories on the Chinese fossils from newspapers like the Boston Globe and the New York Times. He never mentioned God. The ACLU threatened to sue and the school removed DeHart from his class, replacing him with a recent teachers' college graduate who had majored in physical education. Thus were the students of Burlington-Edison High School saved from having to hear scientific facts that might cause them to question their faith in the official state religion.

This is what Wikipedia says:

In 1997 it became known to the public that longtime biology teacher Roger DeHart had been teaching intelligent design in his curriculum through excerpts of Of Pandas and People and Inherit the Wind. This event brought forth national attention and controversy. From 1986 to 1997, Roger DeHart had subtly posed the intelligent design theory in the classroom. After parents of one of DeHart's students notified the American Civil Liberties Union, the group threatened to sue the Burlington-Edison School District if DeHart didn't stop teaching intelligent design. The event sparked large debate, and support groups for both sides were formed. DeHart was later reassigned to earth sciences, and in 2001 he resigned and took a teaching job at Marysville-Pilchuck High School. He taught there for one year before transferring to a Christian school in California.

See the subtle twisting of facts? Goebbels would have been envious! Of course, it is possible that Wikipedia is wrong or controlled by scheming liberals, but I find it much more believable than Ann Coulter.

Richard Sternberg is another example, who as an unpaid research associate at the Smithsonian, published a controversial article about Intelligent Design by Stephen C. Meyer in *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, a journal of which he was the editor. There was a doubt as to whether the article may not have undergone the normal peer-review procedure, so the magazine disowned it. Subsequent to this turn of events, Sternberg filed a complaint against the Smithsonian for harassment; a complaint which did not stick as he had no locus standi since he was unpaid. Sternberg's impartial credentials are also doubtful since he is an open proponent of ID. However, in Ms. Coulter's version of the narrative, he is a martyred scientist tortured by the big, bad liberal establishment.

It is also interesting to note that most of the "scientists" quoted in the book belong to the Discovery Institute,

which

...is a non-profit public policy think tank based in Seattle, Washington, best known for its advocacy of the pseudoscience “intelligent design” (ID). Its “Teach the Controversy” campaign aims to teach creationist anti-evolution beliefs in United States public high school science courses alongside accepted scientific theories, positing a scientific controversy exists over these subjects.

-Wikipedia.

The Discovery Institute, by their own admission as set forth in their manifesto, follows the “Wedge Strategy”.

The wedge strategy is a political and social action plan authored by the Discovery Institute, the hub of the intelligent design movement. The strategy was put forth in a Discovery Institute manifesto known as the Wedge Document, which describes a broad social, political, and academic agenda whose ultimate goal is to defeat materialism, naturalism, evolution, and “reverse the stifling materialist world view and replace it with a science consonant with Christian and theistic convictions.” The strategy also aims to affirm what it calls “God’s reality.” Its goal is to change American culture by shaping public policy to reflect conservative Christian, namely evangelical Protestant, values. The wedge metaphor is attributed to Phillip E. Johnson and depicts a metal wedge splitting a log to represent an aggressive public relations program to create an opening for the supernatural in the public’s understanding of science.

It is hardly surprising that scientists resist the Discovery Institute’s attempts to gate-crash the science party. It has nothing to do with science, and plenty to do with religion. It is religious dogma’s last-gasp attempt to enter the science classroom through the backdoor, after reason has pushed it out of the front door. Please note that this has nothing to do with religious freedom: it is the attempt to teach religious belief as science which is being resisted. Ironically, as Ms. Coulter bemoans all these true scientists being persecuted by liberals, she is resoundingly silent about the history of the persecution of scientists by the religious establishment.

To sum up: the book is nothing but a polemic. It will delight the conservatives and disgust the liberals. However, I see one danger: any neutral person reading the book might believe the “facts” presented by Ms. Coulter, because of the superficial semblance to truth they carry. I would advise such readers with “open” minds to read the other side of the debate also. To balance Ann, I suggest Michael Moore!

Robert Beveridge says

Ann Coulter, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* (Crown, 2006)

I would like to be able to review Ann Coulter's newest tome, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism*, fairly. However, I find myself unable to do so because Coulter's entire premise is a ludicrous, but increasingly common, fallacy: the equation of conservatism with orthodox religion (specifically, in this case, Christianity, though I've often heard Joe Lieberman, an orthodox Jew, described as conservative as well). I'm not sure how this odd distortion of reality came about, but let me set the record straight here: anyone whose opinions on any given topic come from a solely religious viewpoint is not a conservative. They are, without doubt, a wholly different stripe of liberal than, say, the Warren Court that Coulter so despises, but trust me-- conservatives don't want them either. Where do you think the term "neocon" came from? That's right-- us. The conservatives.

To use an example that's obviously near and dear to Ann's heart, given how much she brings it up, let's talk abortion. Ann's premise is that liberals (because, obviously, all liberals feel the same on every subject; liberals are a monolith like one might find in a Kubrick film) support a government-guaranteed right to abortion on demand, while conservatives of Coulter's stripe (see above about monolithism) support a government mandate that abortion be illegal. Any true conservative knows that neither of those options is the correct answer (despite how we may feel personally; I am virulently pro-choice, myself)-- the only conservative option is "abortion falls under the ninth and tenth amendments." In other words, let the states decide. It's all right there in black and white, for anyone who cares to read the constitution.

Not that "constitutional law expert" Ann Coulter isn't above bending the laws a little. While she talks up the first amendment on a number of occasions here, it's pretty obvious that she'd like to see the first amendment (and a couple of others, notably the fifth, which she attacks over and over again while spewing invective against Miranda) go the way of the great auk. A pretty funny position for a "conservative", someone for whom the Constitution holds the same mystic power as the Bible does for the "liberals in wolves' clothing", as I've taken to calling the neocons in the past few years.

While I'd actually planned to make Coulter's unsurprising lack of actual conservative views the real substantive body of my non-review, as I was actually reading the book, I found my qualms about the sand upon which her arguments were founded taking a back seat to the woman's writing style (which, and this is surprising, Joe Maguire goes out of his way to praise numerous times in *Brainless: The Lies and Lunacy of Ann Coulter*). Simply put, Coulter is one of the shrieking haridans she's constantly attacking. Her writing style is based on unfunny, borderline-offensive "jokes" and ad hominem attacks rather than anything at all of substance. This isn't political writing, it's ranting, much of it unsubstantiated. That's all well and good when it's billed as ranting. I rant quite often myself, though I do at least attempt to back it up with facts sometimes, and I always clearly label ranting as ranting, and don't expect people to take it seriously. After all, it is ranting. Coulter, on the other hand, does seem to expect to be taken seriously. But whatever her views on the subject, it's obvious given her sales figures-- *Godless* debuted at number one on the New York Times bestseller list (a liberal rag she hates, by the by)-- that people do take her seriously. Which says a great deal more about the average Ann Coulter reader's lack of ability to think critically than it does about Ann Coulter, I guess. But then, Coulter subscribes to a belief system that considers it a sin to think critically, so I guess I shouldn't be surprised at that, either.

I wondered, when I was putting myself through the torture of attempting to read Ben Shapiro's worthless

Porn Generation, where he'd gotten his writing style. Well, now I know, and I can safely avoid ever having to read trip like this again. Unless, that is, another drooling sycophant like Shapiro decides to ape Ann Coulter's barely-competent writing. (zero)

Kate says

This is quite possibly the most disgusting work ever written or published.

Republicans should be ashamed to even have someone like Ann Coulter in their party. The book makes nothing but personal attacks to demean the Democratic Party and make Liberalism look like devil worship. If being liberal is that bad and wanting freedom from religion is so terrible, maybe Ann is the one who doesn't belong in America: the nation built on Religious freedom and choice.

Georgia says

If I could punch one person in the world right in the face, it would definitely be Ann Coulter. She is a crazy, racist bitch. Also, the book sucked in case you were wondering.

Kelly says

This one is pretty simple: If you are conservative, Republican, or extremely open-minded, you MIGHT like it...If you're Democrat or a liberal, you're going to hate it...but for God's sake, I hate reading reviews where someone didn't even READ the entire book. I read it from cover to cover.

Ann Coulter has a really snarky sense of humor that can come off as condescending and annoying, sometimes. The reason why some conservatives tolerate her is because when she's funny, she's hysterical, but when she's off, she's unbearable to listen to. Here, she's funny...But more than that, she's got good things to say.

The most controversial part of this book was where she called a small group of about four 9/11 widows "harpies". I BOUGHT this book because of that controversy and because, on this subject, I happened to agree with Coulter, even though I don't agree with her on some of her other points. She was not bashing all widows - just the ones who wanted to sue our government for millions when they already received large life insurance settlements and who also received government-funded compensation from a fund created for 9/11 families of victims. These women also had husband's with high-paying jobs and were already living the charmed life.

To ask WHY this enraged me, you must look at where I'm coming from. My husband is a Marine. He puts himself in harm's way for our country and is a two-time Iraq war veteran. If something should happen to him, his family gets \$450,000. I think that's an enormous amount of money and I sure as hell would not complain about it. The husbands of these women just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

They weren't on the front lines of our nation's defense. I'm appalled that these women bit the hand that fed them and had no problem with Coulter calling them out on it.

The rest of the book had some witty humor and interesting ideals and it was a good read, even if I don't agree with many of Coulter's views. I'm not quite as fervently religious so in a few parts, I found myself VERY strongly disagreeing with Coulter, but if I were to rate the book honestly, I would rate it a four stars and strongly encourage liberals and Democrats not to touch it with a ten foot pole. It's not worth getting your blood pressure up over. For conservatives and Republicans, though, I think it's a good read with several laugh-out-loud moments of political incorrectness.

Wifey says

This book is about as accurate as The Da Vinci Code, and it would be really offensive if it wasn't so hilarious. Mostly because it's funny when you glimpse the inner workings of the severely mentally handicapped. I heard some strange things when I taught special ed., but nothing comes close to the fantasy world Ann Coulter thinks she lives in. But what do I know, I'm a woman.

Stephen says

When it comes to **politics**...I despise **BOTH** political parties. I'm an **equal opportunity hater**, and I think the whole lot are **terminally infected** with greedy, **contemptible**, hypocritical **scumbagginess**.

About the only thing I **detest more** than the **politicians** themselves, are the self-appointed, idiotic, partisan flamethrowers who have nothing...NOTHING...to contribute to the discussion of real issues facing the country. It's all just vitriol, sound-byte platitudes and ceaseless aggression.

They could all use a good caning as far as I'm concerned.

Therefore, in the spirit of fighting nasty, vicious hypocrisy with lewd gestures, funny pics and a heaping helping of "you all totally suck," I give you, with some assistance from people far better than me, my illustrated review of one of Annie's greatest crimes against literature.

Johnny, any views on Ann Coulter that you feel like sharing with the good people of goodreads?

Ouch...a bit harsh, Mr. Cash. Fair...but harsh. Let's see if we can garner a more cordial response from our well-mannered grandma. Grams, what do you think of Ann and her hate-fueled, one-sided diatribe?

Yikes...I guess trying to gut medical benefits didn't sit well with the older folks.

Maybe we should look at this more philosophically, and petition a wise and ancient sage what advice he would give to Ann on conducting her public discourse in the future?

Ms. Crusty is certainly not popular with the music industry, the elderly or the intellectual elite. How about

we try a more egalitarian approach and leave it to the good, hardworking members of the public to decide how they feel about Ann and her never ending, never cogent, never entertaining bag of wind.

There you have it...the people have spoken.

Oh...and for those who care, I read this book and it well and truly sucked big, salt-crusted, hairy sacks of moose balls. Nothing to learn, nothing to ponder, nothing to take away...except disgust.

Coming soon....the Republican response starring [uh, no spoilers].

Manny says

I once spent about half an hour at a Palo Alto bookstore leafing through this. Friends often tease me about my willingness to read anything, but it literally made me feel ill. I'm trying to recall other things I've come across that have had a similar effect. The only one I can come up with right now is Wikipedia's description of the notorious viral video *2 Girls 1 Cup*. I would guess that I'm less likely to watch that than I am to finish *Godless*, but it's close.

It's very sad to consider that the book was a major bestseller. At the beginning of the 21st century, why is the US so hellbent on destroying itself? Some day, I predict kids will have to answer that question in history essays, and some of the brighter ones will get extra points for mentioning Ann Coulter. If you're a future history student who's somehow reading this, maybe you could compare her with Joseph Goebbels, but say that she didn't appear to be as talented. Just a suggestion.

Michele says

Ann Coulter is the Devil

Ashleigh says

My very first Ann Coulter book...I find her outrageously hilarious. If I had more guts I'd be as outspoken as she is. Her books, including this one, are generally self-absorbed and depreciative of anyone not a conservative, but therein lies the humor. Liberals take themselves way too seriously...Coulter takes advantage of their sensitive feelings and uses their public outrage to fuel her own popularity and book sales. Smart woman.

Richard Derus says

Like her view of gawd isn't the problem with the world today.

Books Ring Mah Bell says

complete and utter poo. the reason she's so damn stupid is that she's obviously undernourished. Get that woman a cheeseburger- STAT!

David Cox says

Coulter's brash, irreverent style would make her a cultural icon if she were on the left. But even liberals ready to bust a gasket over her views will not be able to hold back a laugh now and then.
