



Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America

Ann Coulter

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) 

Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America

Ann Coulter

Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America Ann Coulter

"Liberals seem to have hit upon a reverse Christ story as their belief system. He suffered and died for our sins; liberals make the rest of us suffer for sins we didn't commit."

Who are the victims here? To hear liberals tell it, you'd think they do nothing but suffer at the hands of ruthless entities like the "Republican Attack Machine" and Fox News.

Really?

It's just another instance of the Big Lie, of course, told so often that some people have actually started to believe it. In *Guilty*, Ann Coulter explodes this myth to reveal that when it comes to bullying, no one outdoes the Left. Citing case after case, ranging from the hilariously absurd to the shockingly vicious, Coulter dissects these so-called victims who are invariably the oppressors. For instance:

- Single mothers: Getting pregnant isn't like catching the flu. There are volitional acts involved—someone else explain it to Dennis Kucinich. By this purposeful act, single mothers cause irreparable harm to other human beings—their own children—as countless studies on the subject make clear.

- The myth of the Republican Attack Machine: The most amazing thing liberals have done is create the myth of a compliant right-wing media with Republicans badgering baffled reporters into attacking Democrats. It's so mad, it's brilliant. It's one kind of lie to say the Holocaust occurred when the Swedes killed the Jews. But it's another kind of lie entirely to say the Holocaust occurred when the Jews killed the Nazis.

- "Brave" liberals: In addition to being beautiful, compassionate tribunes of the downtrodden, liberals are brave. I know that because they're always telling me how brave they are. Why, five nights a week, MSNBC's Keith Olbermann courageously books guests who completely agree with him. It doesn't get much braver than that.

- Obambi's luck: While B. Hussein Obama piously condemned attacks on candidates' families, his media and campaign surrogates ripped open the court-sealed divorce records of his two principal opponents in his Senate race in Illinois.

- The offenders are offended!: Republican senator George Allen's career was destroyed when he made a joking remark to a privileged Indian American harassing him at campaign stops. When did rich kids become a new protected category that must be shielded from words that are insulting in other languages? How did Sidarth become a specially anointed victim? What did we ever do to India? And why didn't we ever hear about the far more offensive anti-Semitic flyers of Allen's opponent Jim Webb?

One essential and recurring truth about self-righteous liberals, says Coulter, is that "they viciously attack all while wailing that they are the true victims." With *Guilty*—a mordantly witty and shockingly specific catalog of offenses that liberals would rather we ignore and forget—Ann Coulter presents exhibits A through Z.

From the Hardcover edition.

Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America Details

Date : Published January 6th 2009 by Random House Large Print (first published 2008)

ISBN : 9780739328064

Author : Ann Coulter

Format : Paperback 496 pages

Genre : Politics, Nonfiction, History

 [Download Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on Americ ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America Ann Coulter

From Reader Review Guilty: Liberal "Victims" and Their Assault on America for online ebook

Bonnie says

When I picked up this book at the library (I wouldn't actually spend money on any book she writes) I was determined to read it with an objective focus, despite the hateful titles which one could judge by the cover. I just wanted to see what kind of arguments she presented. Yet I knew full well there'd be a lot of eye rolling. Obviously I skimmed most of it but it didn't take long for me to surmise that very few people would actually take her seriously. She's there for shock value and the amusement of extreme conservatives. Oh, yeah, and she's hot. I'm sure most of her fan base are men who hear nothing but "blah blah blah" while waiting for her to bend over so they can get a glimpse of her cleavage.

See? Her attitude just taunts a person to retaliate in a nasty way. I'd never normally put someone down like that.

She likens politics to bullies on the play ground, which is actually quite accurate. Her use of the name B. Hussein Obama is a direct example of how bullies would act; make fun of the person, make personal attacks. It's like calling the kid with glasses "four-eyes." My favorite description of the President is "jug-eared clodhopper".

However, she seems to use insults as support for her arguments, presents opinion as fact, such as, racism doesn't exist and Watergate was a boring story. Yes, there are facts that she points out about liberals screwing up and how they've wasted vast amounts of money following their hearts. But aside from annoying behavior she fails to prove how liberals and their "wolf pack" media actually negatively affect America as a whole, such as wild swings in the stock market, extensive environmental damage or widespread health complications.

It's nit-picking, indulgence of cutting people down. She's in the same ball field as the Westboro Baptist Church - representing very few opinions.

Lynn says

so sorry, but i must admit to a guilty pleasure. i love to read ann. she is witty and brilliant in her assessments of the people and times we live with and in. while one may not always agree with her analyses, she always tells it as she sees it. great fun to get a different perspective on the current culture. she knows it too. folks should just learn to take her statements and enjoy her refreshingly candid pronouncements and go with the flow. she is the conservative response to bill maher who makes his same kinds of statements to great liberal acclaim. if camille paglia likes her, how can anyone object? you go, girl.

Mike (the Paladin) says

Okay...going out on a limb here. Some will read this and be very.....disillusioned to say the least. Please think before you block me, okay?

I like Ms. Coulter. She is admittedly a bomb thrower and agitator, but there is the proverbial "method to her madness". This book in particular lays out the absurdity of our political and media world.

Okay some of you won't find this an enjoyable read, but some will love it.

Ger says

Ann, in her usual pointed way, makes a forceful case that those who claim to be victims are often the ones who have created havoc on others. There is plenty examples of liberal hypocrisy which should make any fair thinking person angry at the unfairness of it all. The main stream media is a rich target at which Ann takes deadly aim.

Brian says

This would be my favorite of her books because she really slams the double standard and silliness of the liberal position. The classless slander and debasement of anything to do with republicans or conservatives.

She over and over again shows the complete breakdown of the liberal logic, which is a brand of insanity rather than any form of logic. She clearly explains how liberals find a victim of some supposed atrocity that the right has done and then goes to work to either ruin the supposed perpetrator of injustice or at least make them run and hide because of the shame they bring down on them. I nearly needed a barf bag to read this book because of the many well documented cases she writes about with her usual wit and sarcasm that her fans so enjoy.

Chapter two really opened my eyes to the mess created by single mothers, I was shocked to see the ramifications of this movement, she documents the statistics, the cases, the liberal bafoons that promote this lifestyle as it tears our country down day by day. Its clear that the liberals aren't for america, they are for doing whatever keeps them in power.

Chapter three she points out the silliness of the claim that there is a republican attack machine, all the while it's really a Democratic Attack machine, and of course backs it up with all the newspaper reports that show the bias on the search engine nexus, again the insanity caused my stomach to burn with disgust.

Chapter four describes the lefts desire to go to great lengths to show the failings of the Republican party and its members by the kiss and tell books by members of the Rep. party who switched sides write, it is always the morons of the republican party that leave to join the party of change, she goes over the countless examples of the Dems inability to reasonably look at History or its own mistakes and judge soundly, instead they name call, point fingers and throw tantrums whenever their side is held to the same standard as Repubs. Too many details to give account but eye opening to say the least.

Chapter five is about sex and scandal, the left has innaproprate sex and it's no big deal, hetero or homosexual sex, the right has innaproprate sex in or out of marriage, hetero or homosexual sex and its a scandalous hailstorm of negative press, there could be identical instances and the right would be raked over the coals, while the left would get a pass, again countless sightings by Ann makes you wonder if you are really living in a dream sequence.

Chapter six was more of the same but its what I fear is the chapter that defines our time, the lefts need for domination of power, humans have a propensity toward that, they (democrats) are the power-mad do nothings that are a commercial for this brand of wickedness.

They held control of congress for near 50 years, and I suspect their goal is to try again to gain that power, they have destroyed the ability to think critically with the educational system they employ, laws are made to

shut people up so they can't dissent, they have most of the lawyers, the schools, the judges, the supreme court possibly, so the last thing is capitalism which is teetering, with countless regulations and will topple if they have their way. They received a gift wrapped control of the U.S. by more than 50% of Americans in November. Scary stuff this chapter so read with a tissue to wipe the tears as you see the best country in the history of this world being swallowed by those who think they can help by doing the very same things they accuse the right of doing, fascism, dictatorial power, jihad against our constitution and a loss of liberty that has never been seen in America nor expected by the utopian liberals who don't get it.

Chapter seven was the last and my favorite because it shows the emotional makeup of liberals better than anything I've read. They seem to remind me of the last kid picked in kick ball in grade school, and they are now going to show the world that they can't be kicked around now that they are senators, they are important, they are sticking up for the little guy, they care, they will be there for the down trodden of society, yet all their programs fail, because they instill laziness. Ann communicates again and again that if people want to do nothing they should suffer the consequences not be fed funds from others who are doing something. They don't mind making laws that hurt the average person because they don't effect their (Congress)standard of living, their safety, their education, they shield themselves from those woes because of money, power and connections. Liberals have bought into the idea of questioning authority, as long as the authority is conservative, they have bought into the idea of stopping racism even if they become racists in doing so, they save one child from scorn while scorning another, Ann points these things out page after page, and I have shaken my head in disgust so many times I have a neck brace now. If you are liberal read this and be open to the possibility that the smoke that has entered you from your posterior has clouded your judgment, and if you are conservative read this for knowledge of the leftist agenda and to make the NY Times mad for having it on the best sellers list for a long time...well at least for the few more months of their existence anyway.

Bethany says

I used to like Ann Coulter's stuff, especially Treason, which I think is her best book... but this one was just irrational screaming. I only made it through about a chapter and promptly returned it to the library. She does bring up some interesting points, but she does it in such an unnecessarily inflammatory way, it undermines her credibility severely. She needs a good editor to tone down the crap.

Katie says

This book was AMAZING! Ann Coulter speaks the uncomfortable truths that many of us want to ignore. She seamlessly blends the serious nature of the topics with her "Coultertarian" humor that made me feel at some points like I was laughing at a funeral. It was the comic relief that helped Coulter transcend the issues and bring to light those things in our society that, unless controlled at the root, will eventually lead to our demise.

Regardless of your feelings, this book will get your blood flowing. You'll either be outrageously angry at Coulter and her "nutty right-wing" conspiracy theories, or you'll feel pumped and ready to hop on the bandwagon. I felt the latter, but don't jump to assume your feelings about it until you've read it.

Garbo says

The only people who read Coulter are Extremists; she fuels their political conviction. There is nothing moderate about Guilty. It doesn't persuade, argue or take stance. It is a blatant venomous rant against the Left. It is too obvious to be humorous, too predictable to be exciting. Her research department is a handful of college conservatives running Lexis-Nexis searches for articles she can assault. Her proof of Liberal media bias consists of out of context quotes from obscure politicians and anorexic young starlets. I can forgive her rabid shtick; she's just making a living working a niche. I can't forgive her complete lack of wit and talent. Guilty is an unbook. It is a collection of quotes and acidic refutations that could be rearranged randomly without anyone noticing.

Leo Walsh says

Shrill, opinionated, one-sided and poorly argued: Personal versus substantive attacks. If this book was researched like her other books, a lot to the "facts" about the "Liberal Media" are based on misleading Nexus/Lexus search results. Takes offense at the mainstream, and calls it Liberal. Bunches together all sorts of groups into an amorphous mass of undifferentiated "Liberal."

And, she is wildly inaccurate in a lot of places. Take, for instance, her scoffing at the Obama campaign's fears of the "Right-Wing Attack Machine." Yet this machine actually does appear to exist, just below the radar.

Here's an example from "W's" 2004 bid: In the SC Primary, ads suddenly "appeared" hinting that John McCain had a love child w/ a black woman. Asinine. Unfounded. But the target audience is clear: either overtly or covertly racist white people. Follow that up with the Swift Boating of Kerry in the general election.

Twice, the same thing happened: An unfounded, hearsay attack, running counter to established facts appeared at the right time to push W into office. Plausible deniability from the campaign. Empirically, such strongly correlated phenomena point towards one conclusion: Something is likely happening. I doubt it is a conspiracy. But it does smack of a well run marketing campaign.

So, here's the net result of W's election and the "Right-Wing/ Republican (Rove's ?) Attack Machine:" Two Vietnam vets who served with honor are dragged through the public square. A half informed public running around, trying to distinguish the real from the false--If they have the time or energy after school and soccer practice and laundry and dishes and home improvement projects. Is that the America we want? Is it ethical for political wonks, who know the facts, to willfully deceive? Is there no decency left in this country? Think of that when you listen to claims of Right-Wing patriotism.

The likely reason why the attacks did not take place in 2008 is that A) Democratic strategists, by mentioning the attacks before they actually happened effectively "inoculated" the masses against spurious, viral smears; and B) McCain was, at base level, a man of extreme honor. Not perfect, but a man worthy of respect.

Coulter's style throughout the book is more mean spirited than funny. Though I thought that her calling Obama O-Bambi was witty. But not particularly moving.

BTW: I found her take on the potentially destructive impacts single motherhood has on children and society thought-provoking. Even through her insensitive shrillness. But I question whether her data is accurate: Is it coming from peer reviewed sources? Or from rightist think-tanks without the requisite intellectual rigor that peer review entails, like the Cato Institute? Is single motherhood the cause or the symptom of societal ills?

Bojan Tunguz says

Many people, and not just liberal, see red when the name of Ann Coulter is brought up. This has very little to do with the design of her book covers, and everything to do with the perception of her being unduly confrontational and mean-spirited. And yet many of her critics when pressed are seldom able to come up with any particular statement of hers that is outrageous, but rather relay and hearsay and other secondary sources. Granted, she does make many outlandish statements, but they are made as a joke and people who take them too seriously usually don't have very good sense of humor or are unable to appreciate irony. What her critics usually don't hold against her is the factual validity of her writing. Unlike many other pundits with a few books credited to their name, Ann writes and researches all of her books on her own. Despite the healthy dose of humor in her writing, she is not an author of light-reading material. There is a lot of thought-provoking stuff in her books. "Guilty" is no exception. From the opening pages till the end it presents the reader with some of the more outrageous behaviors that have either been neglected or downright praised by the media. The most outrageous of these is the recent cult of single motherhood. As Ann points out, being brought up by a single mother is one of the most significant risk factors for all sorts of problems later on in life. There are many women who with no fault of their own end up raising children on their own, but these are not the women that Ann has an issue with. What's at stake are the women who choose to raise their children with no father around, and these women are increasingly lauded as role models in today's culture. This trend has negative consequences that are already being felt, but are likely only to get worse in the upcoming years. Unfortunately, most of those who criticize Ann for this book miss the point that she was trying to make. This is just one of the examples of the material that is covered in the book. It will inform you, entertain you and outrage you - all at the same time. We are fortunate to have someone like Ann write about these things.

Scott Rhee says

Why?, you may ask. Well, 1) I have never actually read an Ann Coulter book, having only heard her views as one of those conservative talking-heads on news shows as well as some of her early appearances on Bill Maher's Politically Incorrect (remember that show?), and her name seems to come up frequently in some of the books I have read recently, so I figured I would make the attempt; 2) I consider myself a liberal, and I honestly wanted to know why Coulter and fellow conservative Republicans appear to hate me and my fellow liberals so much; and 3) I do not want to contribute anymore to the already-polluted national conversation in which both sides bicker endlessly by trying to out-insult each other without actually listening to what either side has to say, so I sincerely wanted to read and attempt to understand the other side of the argument.

I chose "Guilty" out of her steadily-growing body of work for no apparent reason, completely arbitrarily. Let me start by saying that it is clear that Coulter is an intelligent person, who clearly and passionately cares about politics and its place in the world today. Let me also start by saying that I actually found myself agreeing with some of what she had to say, mostly regarding the media, and probably would have appreciated more of her arguments if it weren't for the way she formulated her arguments.

To explain: It's apparent from reading her book that Coulter may not have taken a college course in debate, speech, or basic rhetoric, or, if she did, may have skipped the day in which it was discussed that one's argument loses credibility when you mock, ridicule, insult, or verbally assault your opponent or the very people whom you are trying to convince. It's also not always wise to interject humor, especially when such humor is inappropriate, insensitive, or just plain mean-spirited.

To exemplify: In Chapter 2: "Victim of a Crime? Thank a Single Mother", Coulter argues that single mothers (women who choose single motherhood, that is, as opposed to widows and divorcees who are involuntary thrust into single motherhood) not only cost taxpayers roughly \$112 billion every year (according to a 2008 study) but place an extra burden on our nation's law enforcement because "of their higher likelihood to neglect or kill their children in order to spend more time with their boyfriends". (This statement, by the way, is NOT supported by any cited study.) She goes on to list several well-publicized murder cases involving single mothers and their children, including Susan Smith and Casey Anthony. Now, while her argument appeals primarily to emotion rather than logic, Coulter's tirade against single mothers is going pretty strong, up until this: "In 1998, twenty-five-year-old single mother Tami Lynn Richards left her two children, three and one and a half years old, alone in their apartment while she went to a bar to drink and listen to a band. One of the boys set a fire when he was playing with matches he found in the apartment. Both boys died. On the other hand, from what I hear, the band was pretty awesome." There is a proper time and place for humor, but I'm pretty sure a discussion of two young boys killed in a fire through a mother's neglect is neither. It's in poor taste and callous.

In another example from Chapter 4: "Witless Witnesses to History", Coulter's argument turns to government insiders who write tell-all books. Specifically, she refers to Scott McClellan's book "What Happened: Inside the Bush White House and Washington's Culture of Deception", a book that I read and, admittedly, found to be rather tame in its accusations, which made Bush out to be less of a monster and more of an easily-suggestible and somewhat incompetent commander-in-chief. Strangely enough, Coulter doesn't attack McClellan's main arguments, which are primarily Bush's misleading if not outright deceptive campaign to start a war in Iraq based on false intelligence, his incompetence and possible (but unprovable) involvement in the Plamegate affair, and his complete snafu from day one of Hurricane Katrina. She doesn't mention these at all. She does, however, mention that McClellan "claimed to have overheard Bush telling someone on the phone that maybe he had done cocaine after all!" Really? Is that seriously the only take-away message she got from the book? Or maybe she was just being sarcastic. It's okay to accuse some of these tell-all writers of just wanting to jump on the anti-Bush bandwagon. I agree with her on that point, but she could have ended her argument there, but, no, she had to go one unnecessary step further and insult McClellan's weight by repeatedly referring to him as a "butterball", at one point referring to him as "a little worm", "a retarded press secretary", and insinuating (several times) that he is probably gay. Huh?

In later chapters, Coulter continues her verbal assault on specific liberals (by name) and liberals in general by referring to most of them as "left-wing zealots" (okay, sure, some of them are), "Communists" (iffy), "anarchists" (not really...), and "pacifistic" (? Surely not all, but since when was pacifism a bad thing anyway?). While some of Coulter's main points about liberals often playing the victim card to score points may be on the money, it's hard to buy much of what she says because most of it is couched in the very same tactics of insult-slinging and unsubstantiated "facts" and statistics that she accuses liberals of using.

I haven't given up on Coulter, because, as I've mentioned, I think she may have some excellent points to make. I just wish she'd make them and quit whining already...

Richard Derus says

Ann Coulter Pushes GOP To Shut Down Government Over Obamacare headline on 8 August 2013.

"You need to win elections, and that's how you actually change stuff. I was working for the U.S. Senate after the 1994 election," Coulter said. "Things were going gangbusters. ... And yet, the government got shut down

in the end of 1995. ... It really, really hurt Republicans." Ann Coulter on *Hannity*, discussing the same topic, on 22 March 2013.

Winnifred says

Wow! After I heard NBC banned Ann Coulter because of this book, I just had to read it. Liberals are just SO sensitive. She has all the names, dates and stats. Ambrose Bierce said "Use emotion when the facts are against you".

Damon Suede says

Less a book than a piece of carefully calibrated propaganda for Ms. Coulter's tweets, GUILTY will find exactly the audience it is intended to, and speaks directly to their prejudices and anxieties, like all good fascism does. So you can expect middle class values enshrined as a kind of self-congratulatory gospel of intolerance. No sense of global politics, no sense of history, and no real grasp of the imaginary statistics that might back up her (un)shocking assertions about the evils of social responsibility, free thought, and political context.

If Coulter's ideas were more original or her wit sharper I would admire her. I cannot even dislike her as a cardboard pundit, because she is a blonde face on a bland machine. As it is I think she is a very lucky lady milking her moment for every shekel she can squeeze out of the moron majority.

Lots of idiots to harvest, so her scythe will stay busy...

Holly Foley (Procida) says

Here are some things about Ann Coulter

1. She's a not a very nice person (at least her "writing" voice is nasty, she may be perfectly lovely in person)
2. She's a hypocrite (she "whines" more than any liberal I've ever met)

But on the other hand

3. She is brilliant
4. She is funny

I read her stuff because it gets me thinking, I always have a visceral reaction and would love to meet this woman in person and argue with her. To be fair and opened minded there are plenty of things I agree with her about as well, but her generalizations force you into an opposing corner as soon as you don't agree with her premises. I don't think she can comprehend that there are independent minded political people who don't "buy into" a particular party's entire platform. She is an extremist to put it mildly.
