

Ann Coulter's Groupies and Useful Idiots

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,¹ which goes into great detail.

The writer of *Conservative American*'s first essay defending Coulter, Peter Andrew, falsely claimed:²

Politifact 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 *Politifact*'s analysis and conclusions were correct – *based upon the information provided by Coulter*, who knew exactly what she was saying when she said it. *Politifact* 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.



¹ Daniel Borchers, "Ann Coulter Exploits Death of Friend's Sister," 3/1/14, 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.

² Peter Andrew, "Death by Obamacare – The Real Story of Julie Stovall, The Woman Ann Coulter Spoke About," *Conservative American*, 3/1/14, <http://conservativeamerican.org/death-by-obamacare-the-real-story-of-julie-stovall-the-woman-ann-coulter-spoke-about/>.

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.³ (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.

 Daniel Borchers commented on a link.

 **Dan Borchers Hates Ann Coulter - Criticizes us for Defending Her!**
conservativeamerican.org
You have inferred a hatred of Ms. Coulter which I have NEVER implied! Please correct your piece.

Message Sent ([go back](#))

Name: Daniel Borchers
Email: coulterwatch@yahoo.com
Website: <http://www.coulterwatch.com>
Comment: You have inferred a hatred of Ms. Coulter which I have NEVER implied! Please correct your piece.

To date, there have been no changes or retractions to his story.

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.”

³ David Kraemer, “Dan Borchers Hates Ann Coulter – Criticizes us for Defending Her!,” *Conservative American*, 4/5/14, <http://conservativeamerican.org/dan-borchers-hates-ann-coulter-criticizes-us-for-defending-her/>.

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 ...”⁴

(Borchers’ Version)	(Kraemer’s Version)
“She had been thrown off her insurance plan, you know Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California.”	“She had been thrown off her insurance plan. Ya know Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California.”

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.

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.

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.”

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.



⁶ Politifact, 2/5/14, <http://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2014/feb/05/ann-coulter/ann-coulter-says-friends-sister-died/>.

For fully a month, Coulter did not correct her statements regarding Blue Shield and California even though those statements *tainted her testimony* and detracted from the point that someone had died from Obamacare.⁷ 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!

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]:⁸

[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.”

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.

⁸ Ann Coulter, *Fox & Friends*, FNC, 2/2/14. This abbreviated transcript excludes the hosts' comments.

[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.
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.
11. I published my essay, "Ann Coulter Exploits Death of Friend's Sister," which, among other things, corrected *Conservative American's* errors.
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.

March 3, 2014, 9:15 PM

First Obamacare Death of the Year ... -

Except for the fact I did not post Doug Graham's original piece in response to any "criticism" -- he wrote it and I posted it -- and that I also never communicated with Kraemer, other an open tweet telling him to READ MY WEBPAGE for Doug Graham's story, this is a good piece on my friend's sister who died of Obamacare.

[Death by Obamacare – The Real Story of Julie Stovall, The Woman Ann Coulter Spoke About](#)

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 ...”⁹

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.¹⁰ 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.



⁹ Ann Coulter, “First Obamacare Death of the Year ...,” www.anncoulter.com, 3/3/14.

¹⁰ See Daniel Borchers, *Vanity: Ann Coulter’s Quest for Glory*, Citizens for Principled Conservatism, 2012, available as a free PDF download at www.coulterwatch.com/vanity.pdf.