



# Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox

*Barbie Latza Nadeau*

Download now

Read Online →

# Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox

*Barbie Latza Nadeau*

## Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox Barbie Latza Nadeau

Despite all the airtime devoted to Amanda Knox, it's still hard to reconcile the fresh-faced honor student from Seattle with the sexually rapacious killer convicted of the November 2007 murder of her British roommate. Few Americans have heard all of the powerful evidence that convinced a jury that Knox was one of three people to sexually assault Meredith Kercher, brutalize her body, and cut her throat. In *Angel Face*, Rome-based *Daily Beast* senior writer Barbie Latza Nadeau – who cultivated personal relationships with the key figures in both the prosecution and the defense – describes how the Knox family's heavy-handed efforts to control media coverage distorted the facts, inflamed an American audience, and painted an offensive, inaccurate picture of Italy's justice system. An eye-opener for any parent considering sending a child away to study, *Angel Face* reveals what really went on in this incomprehensible crime.

## Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox Details

Date : Published April 6th 2010 by Beast Books (first published 2010)

ISBN : 9780984295135

Author : Barbie Latza Nadeau

Format : Paperback 224 pages

Genre : Crime, True Crime, Nonfiction, Mystery, Biography

 [Download Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Kno ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda K ...pdf](#)

**Download and Read Free Online Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox Barbie Latza Nadeau**

---

## From Reader Review Angel Face: The Real Story of Student Killer Amanda Knox for online ebook

### Katie Muriel says

I guess I should know better than to read a true crime book by a reporter as opposed to just a random true crime writer or researcher. Where a book by any run of the mill writer might contain some bias relating to the crime, in a book by a reporter, there's a metric shit ton of bias and sensationalism to the point of annoyance. I understand that this particular writer had inside access to the case and went to all the hearings and read the entire 10k+ page dossier on the case, but that doesn't make her any less prone to the 'oh my god, how mysterious and awful, look at this dreadful crime!' kind of thing that you would expect from people clustered outside crime scene tape, gawking and gossiping.

While the writing here isn't bad in terms of prose, the sensationalising of the case put me on the edge of boredom the entire time I was reading it because I'd rather just have the straight facts about the crime as opposed to what the writer feels about the case (and it's clear here that Nadeau would hang Amanda Knox herself if given the chance). Right around the time the author started spouting her own theory about what happened is when I was ready to give up. Luckily, it wasn't that much further to the end so I pushed on. What she thinks happened may be true, but as with all fatal crimes, the exact details always die with the victims, or remain unspoken by perpetrators and witnesses and I'm more interested in what is known as opposed to what the author, a random travel writer who just happened to get involved in reporting on this one case, thinks.

---

### Bridget says

This book is total tabloid trashy fun. It's also written in a completely narcissistic fashion and the author spends the entire book telling us how villainized she was during the trial. Yeah, Barbie? I don't actually care about YOU in this story. I wanted to read the details of the Amanda Knox story, not the Barbie Latza Nadeau story. It's quite clear she thinks Amanda is guilty, but she does also seem to make it clear that the shoddy police work by the Italians compared with the bad defense team of Amanda led to a very strange trial. All in all, it's pretty much exactly what I expected and the Lifetime movie follows the details almost to a T!

---

### Sarah says

Let's be clear: I am intentionally giving this book 0 stars. Everyone associated with this book should be embarrassed. I'm looking at you, Marcia Clark, for letting yourself be quoted praising this book on the back cover. I am also now going to cancel my Newsweek subscription after 20 years because the woman behind publishing this book is the chief editor of that magazine.

For the love of all that is good and pure, do not read this book if you want to understand the case of Amanda Knox. This book is thin, superficial, and oddly over-sexualized. What is there is not well written. The author clearly had an ax to grind with the Knox family and all of those who have criticized her reporting throughout this case. (Her reporting has deserved criticism.) She actually mentions her grudges and has a few moments where she really says "so there" to those who dispute her take on things.

I only read this book because it is presented as the bible for those who insist Amanda Knox is guilty so I wanted to understand the fuss.

Her presentation of the "facts" is, to put it kindly, exceedingly biased. She takes certain prosecution points as absolute givens without ever mentioning the very real reasons to question those points. Like stating as fact that the police arrived at Amanda's apartment at 12:35 the day after the murder even though Raffaele didn't call for another 10 minutes. But not once does she ever mention that the 12:35 arrival time is based on a time stamp from a camera at a parking garage that was off by about 12 minutes! And she presents it as a given that a witness saw Amanda and Raffaele on the night of the murder without any mention that he was so thoroughly proven at trial to have the wrong day that court members actually laughed at him.

I believe this author did not write a book to present an unbiased, thorough view of the case but rather to justify all of her reporting in the lead up to the trial. True crime, this is not. To qualify for that label, well, it at least has to be true. And an author who goes into a true crime book with such a personal agenda is almost necessarily going to fail. This author certainly did.

---

### **Rob Timlin says**

Poorly written, self pitying recap of a journalists time covering the Meredith Kercher murder trial. 30% trial recap, 30% complaining about the American Media, 30% personal attack on Amanda and the Knox family and 10% opinion.

Easy read since it's so short, but it's more of a recap of the media coverage of the trial than it is a recap of the trial itself. Also I find the authors theory on how the murder happened laughable....I'm not gonna to go into detail for those that may read the book but I'll just say baseless, wild, speculation.

---

### **M says**

Obviously the author took offense to some words thrown at her during the trial and so published this book to prove she isn't a failed writer. It didn't work. There's no real details and nothing that makes the book memorable. For somebody who apparently knows everything about the case, one would think the book would be better.

There was more about what the fan clubs and media said than anything else. While that could be an interesting subject of a book, it's not what one would expect from this and still doesn't have anything substantial in it. It would've been better if the author had chosen to go in depth on one thing but instead it's a bunch of random notes thrown together that don't give a full story.

Skip it. Find a different book to read.

---

### **Ellen May says**

Bloody terrible (excuse the pun). I read this out of curiosity for the plot, but the writing was painful at best. Far from being impartial, written from a journalist perspective rather than author- there was an entire section speculating on what happened, which summed it up... It was one long opinion laced with a few facts.

Reading this in 2015, after the couple were acquitted, was just a bit bizarre.

Not great, a trashy read.

---

### **Michelle says**

Nadeau thinks Knox is guilty, that much is clear, but she still does a great job of being fair -- especially in acknowledging weaknesses in the prosecution's case which are, in some instances, extreme. She also really digs into explicit testimony and doesn't just choose the parts that support her view, which I appreciate.

There are some factual errors (based on what I read in the Italian court's original opinion) and there were a few unnecessary digs at Knox, but overall, this is a fairly straightforward book that builds the case of Knox's guilt. The style is much less novel-like than Candace Dempsey's book (not to knock Candace's book, which I also gave four stars) and it's also much shorter. They come to opposite conclusions, but both are worth reading if you're interested in this case, IMHO.

---

### **Suzie Flohr says**

I loved this book. It was short and straight to the point.

---

### **Ruth Turner says**

Some reviewers of this book claim that the author is biased against Knox. While she obviously believes Knox and Sollecito to be guilty, I didn't find this to be so.

A refreshing, objective read after "Waiting To Be Heard" by Amanda Knox and "Honor Bound" by Raffaele Sollecito.

Well worth the read if you haven't already made up your mind which side of the fence you're on.

---

### **Whitney says**

It has been several years since I've read this, but I do recall the completely biased nature of the author. For something pegged as "The Real Story" there were a lot of the authors opinions and theory and very little evidence to support said theories. I was very disappointed with this book.

---

### **Alen says**

I really don't like this book. The journalist traded access to local big shots in exchange for their favourite description. Equally, she tried to dupe Knox's family to get more access there, only to describe them as unsophisticated and dumb. While not a direct hatchet job, this is rather a benevolent, easy-to-blame, reckless journalism, with minimum care for a truth or consequences.

---

## Joanna says

While all true crime books certainly tend towards sensational coverage, this book is very clearly the work of Tina Brown's Beast Books imprint. The chapter titles are as lurid as they are ludicrous: "Perugia Is Not For The Weak," "Here is the List of People I've Had Sex With," "I Kicked the Door in, and Then I Heard a Scream."

Barbie Latza Nadeau has been a correspondent for Newsweek for enough years that I really expected her to deliver a more balanced and thorough review of the Amanda Knox case.

Whether you believe that Amanda Knox is guilty, as Nadeau does, or not - her arguments would hold more weight if she, for example, cited her sources at any point. She usually introduces claims with a breezy attribution to a source and a reference to the bar they were at when the quote was given. Claims which I feel would be bolstered if they cited dates or specific interview documentation. Throughout all the 200 padded pages of this book, not a single source is cited clearly enough that it could ever be checked.

It is also difficult to take her arguments seriously when she frequently describes various members of the Italian police force or court system in absurdly sexualized ways. From page 68, "Detective Napoleoni, forty-six, the head of the Perugia homicide squad, would make the perfect sex-flick dominatrix." She goes on to describe her jet black fringe of bangs and her heavy eye make up, as well as her tight blue jeans and stiletto boots. She does not, however, share any relevant information about whether or not this career police woman has experience with high profile homicides, or whether any other suspects have accused her detectives of brutality, or really - any relevant information about her ability as a capable investigator. She also describes many of the men on the case in similar fashion, describing Kercher's lead lawyer as "...Francesco Meresca, a fit, sexy, suave Neapolitan with long brown, wavy hair and blue eyes" and referring to the defense lawyer Carlo Dalla Vedova as, "...easily the most attractive lawyer in court - a tall muscular tennis player with white spiked hair and playful eyes." Really, if she were as descriptive of actual evidence as she is about the physical attributes of those involved in the case, the book would be a much more enlightening read.

The worst thing about the book, in my opinion, is that it reads like a two hundred page slut shaming of Amanda Knox. She is frequently described as promiscuous, and much is made of her tendency to bring men home. Many mentions of her vibrator in the bathroom seem to attempt to bolster her image as a wanton American sex kitten. And yet, in the second chapter of the book, the Italian police lie to Amanda Knox by saying that she has tested positive for HIV for the express purpose of getting her to make a list of people she had had sex with (for, apparently, no real reason other than to leak to the media), that list had seven people on it. For a twenty-two year old college student in 2010, I hardly think that's a number high enough to raise an eyebrow at, much less perpetuate an image of her as a sluttish sex-crazed miscreant. Plus, in this volume, the fact that Amanda Knox enjoys sex is called up so often that it starts to sound like the author expects you to agree that being guilty of liking sex is a short step away from being guilty of a heinous murder. Being written by a female journalist, or really any journalist in the post-Victorian era, I would really have expected better.

The same goes for the descriptions of Amanda's drug use. They are anecdotal at best, and mostly involve smoking pot. There is not a single example of anyone saying they sold her any harder drugs, or ever saw her

take anything else. This book is such a breathless account of Amanda Knox's alleged depravity that I really imagine if any such people could be found, they would have been quoted at length and probably given her some new chapter titles to be getting on with.

Again, I don't really think that every college student who enjoys smoking pot and having sex is on their way to crazed killer status.

The author does discuss various police procedural errors, and a lot of disputed DNA evidence, but does not explain enough about how the Italian justice system works (supposedly one of her areas of expertise) for the reader to understand the implications of her information. For example, she says that the DNA found on the knife that prosecutors determined to be the murder weapon should have been thrown out as it was only a single test sample, but then says that the prosecution used it anyway and built their case around it. Why was this allowed? Is this common in the Italian court system? What are the general rules that they use for evidence? When she describes things like jurors who routinely fall asleep after lunch - again, there is a clear lack of explanation and context. Is this usual? Does the judge not feel like it is necessary for jurors to be awake for any and all information that is presented?

She also shrugs off the prosecutor's wild theories of satanic rituals due to the fact that there was still some Halloween stuff in the house on November 1st. She indicates that theory was discarded early on, but then mentions that he attempted to bring it up in the closing arguments of the case. The question of whether he believes Amanda Knox is a satanist or that these murders had a satanic element, is never really answered and appears to be contradicted even in her own recounting.

It does seem clear that Amanda Knox was likely involved in the murder of Meredith Kercher, and likely to an extent not really covered by the American media. The fact that she and her boyfriend attempted to clean the house with bleach the morning after the murder, the fact that someone certainly tried to stage a break in after the fact, the fact that she doesn't seem able to accurately account for large portions of time on the night of the crime, and that she attempted to implicate her former boss in the murder - all of those facts certainly lend themselves to a narrative of guilt. And her bizarre behavior in the days after the killing, doing cartwheels in the police station, etc - also seem to paint a portrait of an unbalanced and disturbed / frequently drug enhanced personality.

If the book had focused more on the actual evidence in the case, or the various possible motives for the murder, it would have been much a much more informative and far less speculative read. It would also, perhaps, leave the reader feeling more knowledgeable about the case itself, as opposed to feeling like you have just overdosed on tabloid gossip and junk food.

---

## The Subway Reader says

November 2007. Amanda Knox, an American student in Perugia, is accused of murdering her British roommate Meredith Kercher. She is later convicted to 26 years in prison, a conviction which was overturned on appeal last year. There was no conclusive evidence, nor was there a clear motif. What exactly happened we will probably never know and this book does not reveal that either. The whole trial became a media circus with two camps, the so-called "innocentisti" (she's innocent) and the so-called "colpevolisti" (she's done it). Although there was no firm proof, there are at the same time so many unanswered questions and so many inconsistencies that it is hard to believe that she is completely innocent as well. Amanda Knox

eventually ended up spending 4 years in jail and in the beginning of this year she landed a \$4 million book deal for her memoirs. About the book itself, unfortunately it is pretty disappointing in my opinion. I found it to be pretty superficial, incoherent and badly written.

---

### **Stephanie says**

A quick read and very informative. It fills in a lot of holes of the American media coverage of the case.

---

### **Renee says**

This "book" is deeply unsettling to read - unfortunately it's not due to the sinister details of the crime and characters, but rather the author's total lack of reporting skills on what is a fascinating true crime casefile wasted.

There is very minimal substance to any dialogue contained in the book, a crime in itself when dealing with such a high profile case, and although she boasts her own scoops and her status as "the worst of the worst/most feared/most hated by the family" reporter, I am gobsmacked at how scattered the book is, how badly she covers both defense and prosecution events, how often she she assumes we don't want to know the non-fiction details and instead want to read her theories on how the media is represented. This should have been a book about that, as you will be left feeling sorely ripped off and patronised during this entire reading experience. There is no structure at all, I have just reread Ann Rules "Small Sacrifices" which exemplifies the format true crime works, starting off with putting you smack bang in the action, and then the author takes you on a journey, of the key players, the victim, the perps - all of this is metered out in Angel Face as rationed tidbits, which is not what I expect when I buy a book dedicated to the crime. It's a slap in the face to the genre, and to the victim, and I really wonder how much research was actually done.

Not just sitting around a bar or two, or in the press room, that is part of securing the story, but that's not what I care about, I care about the crime and the characters.

I get the feeling because the case is in Italian, she thinks we can forgive the massive omission of no verbatim dialogue, no opening or closing statements, we get more detail and facts only when she gives her own theory of the events of the fatal night, new evidence is mentioned and it does read well, but I get the feeling that the author is trying to show off, just in another way. If you manage not to fling it away (I finished it out of sheer open mouth disbelief) I get the impression this book was cobbled together whilst she did her other job, as a reporter for Newsweek. In fact, her constant focus on the press battles for access and in job battles, and where she was during the entire story dominate the prose, whereas true crime is meant to put you in the place, be it courtroom, police interrogation, victim perspective, scene of the crime - Barb's sole aim is to inform you that she was there, and she's the one who can tell you what she knows. It ain't much.

---