

Original review of Sollecito's book

11 of 27 people found the following review helpful

★★★★★ **Fanciful lies don't make for a good read**, October 16, 2012

This review is from: Honor Bound: My Journey to Hell and Back with Amanda Knox (Hardcover)

This book is a good example of the dictum, don't believe everything that you read!

Sollecito insists that there is no solid evidence implicating the him and his ex-girlfriend in the crime, but that is simply untrue. Google "Massei Report pdf" to find the English translation of the massive judge's report that outlines the substantial forensic and circumstantial evidence against Knox and Sollecito. You also might like to Google "email Amanda Knox sent family and friends in the days after the murder." It is suspiciously detailed---rather like something one might write if they were trying to establish an alibi. And she was not under police pressure when she wrote it.

Sollecito and Knox have had five years to get their stories straight (and their alibis STILL don't match up) and yet there are too many unanswered questions. I mean, even Katie Couric could barely conceal her disgust when she interviewed Sollecito, and Ann Coulter, Nancy Grace, Jane Velez Mitchell, Barbie Nadeau, and John Follain have all hinted or outright stated that Knox and Sollecito just might have blood on their hands.

Sollecito tries to explain each item of evidence away in his book but he gets caught in numerous contradictions. It's highly unlikely that TWO sets of judges (from both the Knox/Sollecito first trial and Guede's trial), TWO different juries, TWO different prosecutors, the TWELVE judges who had to review the case independently at different phases of the pretrial, numerous detectives, several forensic experts, Meredith's roommates, Meredith's friends, and Meredith's own family all erred in the case.

Even TWO OF SOLLECITO'S OWN LAWYERS, by his own admission, became suspicious of his guilt. This based on his and Amanda's suspicious behavior after the murder, their attempts to throw off the investigation, their changing alibis, the accusation of an innocent man, mismatched timelines, and forensic and circumstantial evidence that implicated them in the crime (all laid out in the Massei report...Google it to judge for yourself). Now, at a certain point, the preponderance of evidence becomes too big to explain away. Anyone who views the case as a whole can see that the prosecution in the original trial built a very strong case as to Sollecito's and Knox's guilt.

Which makes this book into an entertaining piece of fiction.

By the way, Sollecito's book was not released Italy, let alone translated into Italian. Why wouldn't Sollecito want to tell his story in his home country? Could it be that he wrote the book hoping that publicity and public pressure would influence Italian authorities? If so, this would be an attempt to subvert justice in the the automatic third level appeal scheduled for 2013. Or could he be sowing the seeds to come to the US since he is persona non grata in his own country? One does have to wonder.

Sollecito tries to convince the reader that he's a victim in this case.
MEREDITH KERCHER is the victim.

* I have to wonder why: *

Sollecito didn't include Meredith Kercher's photo in his book, and in fact, barely mentions her....Knox had written two short stories about sexual violence against women--drugging and raping--well before this crime occurred....Knox and Sollecito didn't attend Kercher's memorial service in the days before their arrest, even though Knox claimed to be "friends" with Meredith. (They went out for pizza instead.)

Comments

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 3:55:22 AM PDT

Thomas Mininger says:

The burglar's blood transfer and DNA evidence were all over the crime scene. Nobody else could levitate above a bloody floor or keep their DNA from being deposited.

Meredith arrived home and went to her bedroom. Guede attacked her. He got behind her. In the horrific struggle, there were two non-fatal stab wounds. Then came the fatal carving wound. He positioned her with a pillow as she was dying. He went to the bathroom to partially clean up. He came back to the bedroom to rob her purse. Then he left through the front door.

Never surprise a burglar when you arrive home, and never let your kids be interrogated without a lawyer present.

The prosecution has had a good four years to get their story straight, but their motive, modus operendi, and time of death have changed so often it makes your head spin.

If there's so little evidence against Knox and Sollecito, then why did 12 different judges who had to review the case at every step along the way (part of Italy's pro-defendant trial system) find enough evidence to not only allow the court case to proceed but also to keep the suspects in prison rather than under house arrest, as might otherwise have been done?

Also, all evidence points to more than one attacker (Meredith had few defensive wounds because she had been held down by more than one person and more than one knife was used...are you telling us that Guede switched knives mid-attack?).

Also, I guess mixed DNA samples, footprints, a bra strap with Sollecito's DNA (speaking of levitating, where would this have come from?) and a knife with victim's DNA on it as well as Amanda Knox's don't constitute evidence? And what about the numerous changed alibis, an innocent man accused and timelines that don't match up? What about the numerous people involved, like Meredith's friends and Amanda's other roommates being suspicious of their involvement?

Sorry but there is plenty of evidence.

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 12:49:37 PM PDT

I. Morris says:

...When Amanda was in prison, she was told by officials she was HIV positive. She wrote a list of her sexual partners. This list was leaked to the media by the prosecution to create the idea Amanda was a sex maniac. Amanda did not have HIV....

Amanda Knox was told (and wrote so in her prison diary) that she had a positive HIV test BUT THAT THIS TEST COULD BE FALSE POSITIVE. Anyone who has had an HIV test is counseled on the possibility of obtaining a false positive result.

Amanda was correctly counseled on this possibility, as she herself stated in her diary. No one forced Amanda to list her sexual partners, although she chose to do so. Google "Amanda Knox diary" to see for yourself. It's true. But her PR team won't tell you that!

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 8:23:09 PM PDT

Pixie says:

...Amanda and Raffaele's Innocence was proven in court actually; through their lawyers, through experts and the application of rational thinking and common sense.

You don't list any piece of convincing evidence for their guilt. Anybody can claim that there is supposed to be tons of good evidence against somebody which then swiftly vanishes when scrutinized. Exactly as it happened in court ...

In every case of a wrongful conviction the prosecution builds a pile of meaningless or weak evidence. It's not the quantity but the quality of the evidence that counts. In Rudy Guede's case for example; nobody needs inconsistencies, non-telling e-mails he wrote, ambiguous phrases he uttered, dubious eye-witnesses or unscientific forensic evidence to prove his guilt, because there is real, convincing, hard evidence.

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 9:21:22 PM PDT

Pixie says:

Your and your fellow guilters outlook on this case is a dwindling view. Most people absolutely realize their innocence...

It's not a dwindling view, it's a growing view. We didn't exactly see numerous supporters on Raffaele's book tour, did we? Even Knox knew better than to show her face, especially considering how Sollecito's book cast doubt on her and didn't exactly portray her in a positive light.

The final verdict has not been decided so you can cast aspersions all you want, but you and I both know that Interpol might be calling for Knox to come back to her good old home away from home (Capanne)!

Since Sollecito lives in Italy he'll be back in jail in a hot second if justice is served.

Regarding Guede's trial, the court's statement about the guilty verdict clearly outlined that he committed the crime with TWO other people. So the ruling on the Knox/Sollecito appeal is in direct contradiction with the evidence presented in Guede's trial as well as the court ruling in Guede's trial. This is an independent ruling with different judges and a different prosecutor.

And FYI, Meredith Kercher's family have clearly indicated, in their reserved and respectful way, that they believe Knox and Sollecito were involved. Not that all that much time is spent thinking about the true victim or her family.

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 9:28:38 PM PDT

Pixie says:

"P.S. If there's simply "no evidence" then why would victim's advocate and former prosecutor Nancy Grace say she thinks Knox and Sollecito were involved?"

Here your argumentations goes completely bankrupt. Nancy Grace considers everybody to be guilty, she doesn't even accept it if the innocence of somebody is established and widely accepted.

And you seriously think that if ONE person with legal background considers somebody to be guilty they can't possibly be innocent? That's really the logic of the Salam witch trials.

The point is not that Nancy Grace's stance proves anything. The point is that supporters of Knox and Sollecito keep insisting that there is no evidence in the case. In fact, there are MOUNTAINS of evidence pointing to Knox and Sollecito's guilt. Nancy Grace happens to be a former prosecutor and is in a better position to judge the evidence than Donald Trump is, that's for sure.

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 9:39:32 PM PDT

Pixie says:

Regarding Guede's trial, the court's statement about the guilty verdict clearly outlined that he committed the crime with TWO other people. So the ruling on the appeal is in direct contradiction with the evidence presented in Guede's trial as well as the court ruling in Guede's trial."

So, what? I didn't say that the judges in Guede's case were capable, rational judges. I said the evidence in his case was good, hard evidence. Every court in the world would have convicted him. Even incapable, irrational judges would get it.

Nobody at Guede's trial had an interest in a lone wolf theory, not the prosecution, and definitely not the defense, so no "one-man-theory" was ever even presented at said trial, everyone had an interest in multiple attackers.

So what, you ask? I'll tell you what. I'll tell you that you can say ONE judge was biased. You can say ONE jury was biased. You can say ONE set of roommates was wrong in their suspicions (although your argument is starting to look weaker now). You can say ONE prosecutor was "crazy." But are you really going to say that TWO sets of judges, TWO different juries, TWO different prosecutors are all completely biased and completely wrong in their examinations of the evidence and their theories about the case?

Sounds a little farfetched, doesn't it?

And let's not forget about the TWELVE judges who had to review the Knox/Sollecito case at different phases of the pretrial and each independently determined that there was enough evidence to allow the trial to move forward. Any one of them could have dismissed the case--but they didn't because there was enough evidence to not only warrant moving forward, but to keep the suspect in jail rather than put them under house arrest. I guess they were biased too?

In fact, maybe the whole of Italy was biased against (Italian citizen) Raffaele Sollecito and Amanda Knox, right? And also everyone else involved in the case (Meredith's roommates and friends, the detectives, the crime lab, the falsely accused, etc.)?

Posted on Oct 17, 2012 9:54:15 PM PDT

Pixie says:

You think it is not possible that two juries and two set of judges could err? Seriously? No wonder you consider them guilty with that kind of logic and method of elimination you're conducting.

This is easily possible. Easily!

Amanda and Raffaele's defense wasn't even presented at Guede's trial! It was only his guilt debated.

It goes completely against the rule of law, against human rights, to claim that a court where

you weren't even defended or present, where your guilt wasn't even debated, that this court could actually decide or detect your guilt.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 4:07:32 AM PDT

Thomas Mininger says:

The big turning point in this case came when non-Perugian judges were assigned to run the appeals trial.

They finally ordered the independent review which exposed the hoax.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 8:14:55 AM PDT

CatsForever1960 says:

There is no credible evidence implicating Knox and Sollecito. None. Zero. Hellman said it and it's the truth. And if this idiot thinks the supreme court will overturn that ruling and order a new 2nd level trial, he/she is setting himself up for an monumental disappointment. One he/she will thoroughly deserve, of course.

Oh, and maybe trying actually first reading the next book you (weakly) attempt to review. Sollecito writes a moving and brutally honest account of the injustice thrust upon him and Amanda. And she is cast in a VERY positive light overall as she well should be.

One more thing - Couric had no trouble concealing her "disgust". Not hard, since there wasn't any.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 8:50:22 AM PDT

Pixie says:

....And with that deficiency in the rational thinking department it then doesn't surprise you'd argue for the pair's guilt. As anything is enormously persuasive of guilt in your mind that in reality is complete nonsense and can easily be explained away.

See above your "MOUNTAINS of evidence" claim.

There was only a desperately piled up "mountain" of ridiculously bad, lousy evidence which completely collapsed in court. But you won't acknowledge that because of the biasedness and reasoning deficiencies you revealed earlier.

First of all, I'm not an idiot. As a matter of fact, I have a Master's degree from an acclaimed university. To me, it is idiotic to resort to name calling of strangers on the Internet when your arguments fail to convince.

Second, I DID read Sollecito's book (which I purchased used so as not to enrich someone I believe committed murder). I am basing my opinions about the case on all of the evidence I am aware of, including his book, which leaves the reader with many more questions than answers.

Third, I do think it's quite possible the ruling on the second trial will be overturned on appeal, although I don't purport to have a crystal ball. Whether it is overturned or not, a court ruling doesn't make a guilty person innocent. After all, rulings can either be "guilty" or "not guilty"; they are not "guilty" or "innocent." Is Casey Anthony innocent? As Sollecito quoted in his book (which I have been accused of not reading but in fact have read and have right in front of me):

"...It may be that half the sentences handed down are unjust...and therefore half of those in prison are innocent; but by the same reasoning half of those acquitted and set free are in fact guilty and should be in prison...' (Piero Calamandrei)."

A telling quote, isn't it? I think I know which camp Knox and Sollecito fit into.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 2:30:20 PM PDT

I. Morris says:

She boasts about the overwhelming evidence against Amanda and Raffaele. I raised the question in an earlier post if there was such a mountain of evidence against Amanda and Raffaele and the prosecution had a watertight case against them, why did the prosecution have to resort to withholding evidence, destroying evidence and telling numerous lies? She has refused to answer this question. This is typical of the guilters. They viciously attack Amanda, Raffaele, their families and supporters. The accuse Amanda and Raffaele of being guilty of murdering Meredith despite the total lack of credible evidence against them. However, when you ask questions the guilters regarding flaws in the prosecution's case, they can not answer them.

This poster claims there is a mountain of evidence against Amanda and Raffaele but does not say what this evidence is.

The guilters argue that Amanda and Raffaele must be guilty because police and prosecutors in Perugia thought they were guilty. We are expected to accept that Amanda and Raffaele are guilty because of bunch of corrupt scumbags who broke the law by refusing Raffaele and Amanda access to lawyers during their interrogations, fabricated evidence, withheld evidence, destroyed evidence and lied about the nature of the evidence against Amanda and Raffaele say so.

Read pages 23-34, the summary of the grounds for the verdict of the Massei Report (English translation is downloadable in PDF format at http://www.beforeyoutakethatpill.com/2011/3/Massei_Report.pdf or Google it) and 388-396, the conclusion. If that's not good enough for you, read all 396 pages.

Can you really STILL purport that there is no evidence? There are 396 PAGES OF EVIDENCE.

Here is a summary of the prosecution's evidence that only hits the tip of the iceberg:

The simulated break in; the behaviour of Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito on the morning after the murder; depositions by Nara Capezzali and Antonella; the survey and evaluation of the forensic results; the evaluation of what has been set forth by the experts and forensic consultants; the cause of death and the means by which it was occasioned; the genetic investigations; eyewitness testimony; the double-DNA knife; the bra-clasp; the mixed DNA traces in the small bathroom; latent traces revealed by Luminol; the non-existent web-browsing activity; cellular tower activity and telephone usage patterns; the print on the mat in the small bathroom; the prints highlighted by Luminol; the injuries, which indicate more than one attacker was present; biological traces found in the small bathroom used by Meredith and Amanda. Et cetera.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 3:59:24 PM PDT

Pixie says:

Whether it is overturned or not, a court ruling doesn't make a guilty person innocent. After all, rulings can either be "guilty" or "not guilty"; they are not "guilty" or "innocent." "

A court ruling "not guilty" says that guilt was not proven, that you don't have the right to call that person guilty.

In Amanda and Raffaele's case the court went further and said; "Acquitted because they haven't committed the act".

To the general public out there. Don't just take my word for it or even Pixie's word. Seriously, I encourage everyone to go out there and read the the summary of the grounds for the verdict and the conclusion of the Massei Report (English translation is downloadable in PDF format at <http://truejustice.org/ee/documents/perugia/TheMasseiReport.pdf> or Google it). This is the document explaining the grounds for judge Massei's conviction of the accused in the first trial. Then you can decide for yourself what you think of the evidence in the case. The real evidence, not as it was reported in the media.

I wholeheartedly encourage you to decide for yourselves whether the media and a certain Seattle PR agency (Gogerty Marriott) have been telling the truth or whether they've been doing something else entirely.

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 6:29:52 PM PDT

MichaelB says:

lol. The case is over and the general public has moved on.

You can tweet or facebook Raffaele and ask him any questions you might have.

If everybody is so over it, why am I getting a response to my posts every hour on the hour? It couldn't be that you guys want to bury my link where no one will see the 396 pages of "non evidence" that the Knox/Sollecito clans try to keep out of the news. Oh, and I just visited the True Justice for Meredith Kercher website, truejustice.org. How many people are online five years after Kercher's murder? Total # of visitors reading at this exact moment on a random Thursday night: 81.

You can't fool all of the people all of the time. Eighty-one people right are right now educating themselves about the truth of this case.

And as much as you all insist that it is not so, it is the final appeal that will decide this case. Knox and Sollecito's teams obviously managed to wield their political and media pressure to determine the outcome of the appeal. But since Hellman was not there, he is unable to say with any certainty that the two are "innocent" as opposed to no proof of guilt, or "not guilty," since he was not there and there is NO incontrovertible evidence that the two were not there. In fact, in Amanda's own words, she WAS there.

I mean, Casey Anthony was found "not guilty"...does that mean that she's innocent??? By your logic, she would be.

Also, by saying that the two are innocent (as opposed to "not guilty"), and that no staged break in occurred (a fanciful notion since it was obvious to the very first investigators on the case as well as the roommate in whose room the staging occurred) just shows the degree to which Hellman was biased in his verdict. This suggests a political motivation to his verdict. And I'm only one of millions who believe so. No amount of money or PR will change that.

If that's not the case, and I'm only a single voice speaking untruths that are obvious to anyone and everyone, then why do you all even bother to respond? It's because the truths that I speak represent a threat to your case and your cause, because much as you try you cannot explain EVERYTHING away. There are too many things that need explaining! Who knows your personal involvement in the case? If it's so true that everyone has moved on and no one cares about this case any more, then why exactly do you care? Why do you need so badly to convince everyone that your story of what happened in the case is true?

Don't forget everyone, the link to the Massei report containing 398 pages of all of the "non evidence" everyone keeps talking about can be found in the above thread. Although I gather many people would prefer that you don't read it! What are they hiding?...

FYI, Sollecito might be tried for slander in Italy for the things he wrote in his book. So it might behoove his team and his acolytes as well as Amanda Knox and Co. to lay low and avoid angering more people than they already have. And push Guede enough (watch the video on youtube...Sollecito CERTAINLY avoided passing judgment on him when he spoke to Katie Couric! He played it smart and tread the Guede issue very carefully indeed.) and he just might come out singing like a bird. This could happen at any time. Although I'd imagine he has probably been threatened in jail in an attempt to keep his mouth shut. Knox/Sollecito/PR/and Co. would want to cover all of their bases, wouldn't they?

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 8:14:57 PM PDT

MichaelB says:

I see what's going on here now. Someone posted on pervert Pete's hate site (truejustice.org) a request to post negative reviews about Raffaele's book on Amazon. Did you post (there)?

Posted on Oct 18, 2012 8:19:02 PM PDT

MichaelB says:

You've got about 3 or 4 people talking to you. I just think it's funny you believe in Massei. None of the 15-20 guilters left on the hate sites still believe in Massei. They've all come up with their own crazy theories and can't even agree on a time of death. Anyways, carry on....

Now we are perverts and idiots, huh? And Mignini is, according to the innocent, mentally ill? And I guess the police and 14-plus judges are corrupt too? And Meredith's other roommates and friends are all crazy or deluded?

Could all of this name calling be a sign of desperation by those whose arguments fail to convince? Everyone out there, read the report for yourself. Don't you want to determine whether there is any evidence in the case or not? I mean, 396 pages...where did they come up with all of that stuff?!

Also, you might want to Google "email Amanda Knox sent friends after murder" or you can view it at <http://adeathinperugia.wordpress.com/2011/11/16/analysis-of-the-email-written-and-sent-by-amanda-knox-before-her-arrest-in-her-own-time-and-not-when-under-any-pressure-by-the-police-being-in-her-presence/>. Does this sound to you like the email of an innocent roommate, or someone who was trying to outline an alibi, carefully explaining in tedious and minute detail her movements moment by moment--except for the time of night when the murder occurred, at which point her recollections got much more vague? Also, Knox was not exactly effusive in her description of her newly murdered roommate, who she described in clipped language using all of four words "22, english, beautiful, funny..."

Folks, judge for yourselves! Read the facts of the case.

Also, Pixie and MichaelB, each of you only have reviews for a single product--Sollecito's book. How is that? Are you the same person posting positive reviews under different names? Are you Sollecito himself? If you click on MY name, you can see that I have had a presence on Amazon for a long time and have written 22 reviews. What about you? Why are you so new to this site? Could it be that you are just promoting this book?

In fact, it took only a couple of minutes of research to determine that most of the reviews for this book were written by people who either ONLY reviewed this book or only reviewed books

pertaining to the Kercher case, which calls into question whether these are even legitimate reviewers or might even be the same person posting under different screen names. For example, Katody, Samadian, mrussell, Jerry Alexander (to name only a few) each only wrote a review for Sollecito's book, nothing else. Reviewers CC, Richard Bonin, Janet S, KayPea and others only have reviews of books on the Kercher case; nothing else!

In each case, the pro-Knox books are given high marks, and the "anti Knox" books are given low marks. Even the book about victim Meredith Kercher (penned by her father) is given low marks. The pattern makes these reviews look like a scam.

I wonder if this anomaly should be reported to Amazon?

I would question the validity of the reviews and commentary of new members to Amazon since they don't have a proven online presence. And regarding those who have only reviewed books on the Kercher case--they clearly have a personal interest in the case (FOA, anyone?).

I'm sure I'll hear radio silence on this issue.

Posted on Oct 19, 2012 11:59:45 AM PDT

I. Morris says: There are some questions I would like to ask about the flaws in the prosecution's case. These questions relate to forensic evidence....When Amanda and Raffaele were arrested, only three days had passed since the murder and the forensic evidence had not been analysed. How were the police in a position to decide that Amanda and Raffaele were guilty before the forensic evidence had been analysed? The dodgy forensic evidence used against Amanda and Raffaele was collected after their arrests.

The police were not in a position to decide that Amanda and Raffaele were guilty. They WERE, however, like any detectives researching a murder, in the position to conduct an investigation and to observe people's behavior and conduct interviews. Meredith's other friends and other roommates were not suspected because their answers to the police questioning did not arouse suspicion. Meredith's boyfriend and other roommates were out of town (an airtight alibi). However, Raffaele's and Amanda's behavior, as well as their answers to police questions, their access to the apartment where a staged break in took place, their shoddy and changing alibis, mismatched timelines, and odd and inappropriate behavior aroused suspicion from early on in the investigation. After all, inconsistent behavior following a murder from people in close contact with a victim is likely to arouse suspicion, as it should.

Regarding the odd behavior, we KNOW you will tell us what a kooky girl Amanda is! You don't have to repeat that now because we have heard all about it. But kooky behavior is ONE thing; combined with shoddy and changing alibis and accusing an innocent man, it's damning.

I. Morris says: The murder of Meredith occurred in a small room. Amanda and Raffaele were supposed to have engaged in a violent struggle with Meredith and then stabbed her. If this scenario is correct, they were in close physical contact with Meredith. Why did Amanda and Raffaele leave no forensic evidence such as hair, DNA, footprints,

fingerprints, palm prints, saliva and DNA. Why was there no forensic trace of Amanda and Raffaele on Meredith's clothing or body when they were supposed to have been in close physical contact with her?

Oftentimes in a stabbing there is not a lot of DNA evidence from an attacker. This is a well known fact in forensic cases, although it may not be well known by armchair analysts whose knowledge of DNA is derived from television. After all, GUEDE'S DNA wasn't on the clasp...but the clasp WAS cut off during the attack. How do you explain this??

There is evidence that a thorough clean up was conducted in the apartment. After all, there was a bloody footprint ON the bathmat, but none leading UP TO the bath mat. Did those prints magically erase themselves? No, they were cleaned. What about the countertops and basin in the bathroom, which appeared relatively clean to the naked eye even though this was where the cleanup of a bloody murder took place? Luminol testing revealed numerous blood evidence that had been cleaned up. Guede couldn't have cleaned up because he was spotted out shortly after the murder.

I. Morris says: During the attack on Meredith, Meredith lost vast amounts of blood and when Meredith was stabbed in the throat, her wounds sprayed blood and there was blood all over Meredith's room. Amanda was supposed to have stabbed Meredith with Raffaele holding her down. If this was true blood should have been sprayed on Amanda and Raffaele's clothing and there should have been bloody footprints and palm prints belonging to 3 people not just one. If Amanda and Raffaele had blood on their clothing they would have to remove blood stained clothing at Raffaele's apartment which would have created blood transfer. If Amanda and Raffaele murdered Meredith, why was there no blood on their clothing, no handprints or palmprints belonging to 3 people and no blood belonging to Meredith in Raffaele's apartment?

You are making numerous assumptions here. Who says that Knox and Sollecito removed their bloodstained clothing at Raffaele's apartment? Where, after all, is RUDY'S bloodstained clothing? (By your logic, I take it Rudy couldn't have been involved either because his blood stained clothing wasn't found.) Perhaps Amanda and Raffaele washed their clothes in the washing machine. Perhaps they discarded them. I guess they probably disposed of them in a manner typical of murderers who are trying to cover their tracks.

In addition, there IS evidence that a thorough cleanup was conducted overnight (If you look at the pictures of them the following day, Knox and Sollecito do look exhausted, don't they? Knox also displays a mark on her neck that wasn't there the day before, which is rather concerning when you consider that her roommate was viciously murdered the night before). Additionally, Amanda's lamp was found on the floor of Meredith's room. What on earth was it doing there????? Could it have been placed there to provide additional light to assist in a cleanup? And newly washed laundry was found in the dryer. Who put it there?

I. Morris says: Meredith's room was small. How did four people manage carry out a violent struggle in such a confined space?

You guys are really reaching if your argument for why there was only a single attacker (something Knox and Sollecito's own lawyers didn't argue too strongly) is that the room was too small to fit more people. Because it wasn't. The space was easily large enough to easily accommodate four people in an attack of this manner. The jury found that out when they visited the home and stood in the room that easily fit them all.

I. Morris says: The only forensic evidence against Amanda and Raffaele were the following items a knife and a bra clasp.

First of all, that is not the only forensic evidence against them. There are other items of forensic evidence, including numerous mixed blood traces as well as traces of Amanda in the room where the fake break in took place....There is also overwhelming circumstantial evidence linking them to the crime.

I. Morris says: The knife had the following characteristics: It was too big to have caused Meredith's wounds. Basic common sense says that a knife which is used to stab someone should match the wounds....No blood was detected on the knife. If the knife was used to murder Meredith, this means the blood was washed off the knife. If the blood was washed off, how did the DNA stay on the knife?....It did not match a bloody imprint on Meredith's bed....In view of the above, how can it be claimed the knife from Raffaele's apartment was used to kill Meredith?

Most of what you say is untrue or purposely worded to cause confusion. MORE THAN ONE KNIFE was used in the attack by MORE THAN ONE ATTACKER. Different attackers will wield different weapons, won't they? The knife found at Raffaele's matched ONE of the THREE major wounds on Meredith, and if I'm not mistaken, it matched THE FATAL ONE. So it's not true that Raffaele's knife was not a match and that a lone wolf killed Meredith. Not even the defense's own lawyer argued that the attack was carried out by a single person acting alone because overwhelming evidence points to multiple attackers.

In addition, Meredith's DNA was found on the blade of the knife and Knox's DNA was found on the handle. Raffaele even tried to create a story of accidentally pricking Meredith's hand whilst cooking (patently false; he admits so in his book) to explain away this DNA evidence. IF THE DNA WAS NOT THERE, WHAT WAS THERE TO EXPLAIN???

I. Morris says: How can the tests on the knife be regarded as reliable when the police lab was not qualified to do low copy DNA testing and did not have the facilities to carry out low copy DNA.

Untrue. The forensic lab that conducted the testing is one of the top labs in Italy, and the person conducting the testing is one of the most renowned DNA experts in the country

I. Morris says:Raffaele's knife was the first and only knife to be tested. There were large numbers of knives in the cottage in addition to the knives in Raffaele's apartment. Is it not a bit strange the first knife which was taken to be tested was the knife used in the murder.

What are the odds of this happening?....The police officer who took the knife said he choose the knife because of police intuition. How can you possible determine a knife has been used to murder someone just by looking at it?

I don't have to explain the odds to you; nor do the police. Numerous decisions are made in the context of an investigation that may be questioned afterwards; **however, this doesn't prove wrongdoing, carelessness, or framing.** The choices that seem interesting or unusual now probably made perfect sense in context. The defense it always going to try to take them out of context in order to cast doubt.

The officer stated that the knife looked like it had been carefully scrubbed and in fact had marks on it from being scrubbed. That might be the reason for the intuition that you describe. Regardless of why the knife was selected, Meredith's DNA was found on the blade and Knox's DNA was found on the handle. Raffaele even tried to create a story of accidentally pricking Meredith's hand whilst cooking (A BALD FACED LIE) to explain away this DNA evidence. IF THE DNA WAS NOT THERE, WHAT WAS THERE TO EXPLAIN???

Why didn't Raffaele discard the knife? We can't know for sure, but it could be because his landlord would have recognized that the knife was missing, since it was included in the apartment rental. He might have cleaned it so thoroughly that he did not even imagine there could be any evidence left. Some sick individual might even want to keep it as a trophy (NOT FOR NOTHING, BUT RAFFAELE HAD A LIFE LONG HOBBY OF COLLECTING KNIFES).

I. Morris says: **The bra clasp....If the Raffaele's DNA on the bra clasp did not come through contamination, why did the clasp have the profiles of other people on it?....The metal clasp on the bra was very small. Why was Raffaele's DNA only on the clasp but not the bra itself?....Why was the clasp not collected for six weeks?**

It is possible other persons (for example in Meredith's personal life) had touched the bra clasp, is it not? Maybe one of the roommates helped take her laundry out of the dryer? Maybe her boyfriend touched it?

During the perpetuation of the crime, is it obviously possible that Raffaele only touched the clasp. Maybe he was careful about not touching the bra, which was removed AFTER Meredith was mortally wounded, because he was aware of forensic evidence and was trying to minimize items he touched. Maybe he touched the clasp and cut it off assuming he would remove it from the premises and then it got lost among the disorder and he forgot. Maybe there was additional DNA on the bra but it was washed away by all the blood on the bra. Maybe the bra was cleaned somehow. The point is that you cannot say there is "no" DNA evidence because in fact there was.

Also, the investigation required thousands of man hours. The apartment was sealed for months after Meredith was found. The forensic investigation took several months. The clasp was recovered during the active investigation, not afterwards. It takes time for investigators to process a crime scene; it does not happen overnight. Items have to be identified, photographed,

logged, bagged, tagged, tested, and analyzed. But since you are so certain there was DNA transfer, where exactly would the DNA have jumped from? Since Raffaele's DNA was not found ANYWHERE else in the apartment--even though he spent numerous hours there (more evidence of a cleanup)--you can't easily explain how his DNA got there, can you? And this was a sizable DNA sample containing MANY cells, as would happen during a transfer when sweaty hands make significant contact with an object, thus transferring numerous skin cells. It was not only a few cells; man of Raffaele's cells were found on the strap. HOW COULD SO MANY CELLS BE TRANSFERRED AND WHERE WOULD THEY HAVE COME FROM?

You can't have it both ways...you complain that Raffaele's DNA wasn't anywhere in the room. Yet if DNA rubs off SO easily why wasn't it found elsewhere in the apartment where Raffaele spent so much time? Why wasn't GUEDE'S DNA found on the strap?

Either DNA samples are left less frequently than you claim, or there was an effective cleanup that removed a lot of DNA from places where it should have been.

Probably both statements are true.

But let's not forget that it's difficult to do a PERFECT cleanup, and this crime scene was no exception. Numerous traces of Amanda's DNA mixed with Kercher's DNA WERE located in several different places in the apartment. It's all there in the Massei Report written by the court that you so definitively dismiss.

You can go around and around with the same arguments that have been debated back and forth numerous times. I wonder if they will convince the third level court? I wonder if they will convince the public? I wonder if Knox and Co. are shaking in their boots and that's why they continue an online campaign of sliming and maligning anyone who expresses an alternative viewpoint? I have already been called a lunatic and an idiot; you folks have branded the owner of truejustice.org a pervert, and other Knox supporters have said Mignini is crazy. Is that the way to wage an effective campaign to gain public support?

The public seems awfully skeptical about these same tired claims and the bullying behavior of those who make them, don't they? Could that be why the tide is turning on public opinion?

CatsForever1960 says:

Oh, I see, so Knox and Sollecito were arrested because their answers to questions "aroused suspicion". Brilliant. BTW, that's sarcasm. As for the bedroom, it may be "large enough" for even more than four people to "stand" in. Carrying out a bloody attack is a little different than standing. Somebody with a masters degree should be able to figure that out, though. Ah well, I'll take back what I said earlier about this poster being an idiot. She's really a lunatic. The rest of the garbage she puts forth directly above - well maybe someone else has the time to correct her.

CatsForever1960, I see that you gave a one-star review to the book written by Meredith Kercher's father. Lovely. You appear to be deeply intrigued by this case--enough to read page 7 of the comments on a single review of the book--but you HATED the book written in memorium for the victim by her father????????

And I'm the lunatic?

Posted on Oct 20, 2012 9:51:30 AM PDT

CatsForever1960 says:

Yes I did give a one-star review to "Meredith". The book deserved no more stars than that for the reasons I made perfectly clear in my review. While I did not state that I "hated" the book - that's your childishness coming through yet again - I stand by what I wrote 100%. As for being "deeply intrigued" by this case - well, enough to be able to think critically and see it for what it is - one in which two innocents were rightly exonerated. And if you think that's changing in late March '13, keep dreaming.

In answer to your last question directed to me, yes.

Posted on Oct 20, 2012 10:03:57 AM PDT

Joan C. James says:

YOU question the reviews and comments by members, new or otherwise, to Amazon who have only reviewed this book on the Kercher case?...try mine...and am I supposed to be impressed by your literary taste? Most people who order books from Amazon don't write reviews...most people who read don't write reviews. Probably the only ones who do and do it regularly are those like me...English majors who haven't been able to write their own book so they make up for it by reviewing others. You may have a Masters, but a few letters after your name doesn't automatically grant you a high level IQ and certainly doesn't prove that you are a major intellect, which obviously you are not or we all wouldn't be having this conversation with you.

Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito are completely, utterly and unreservedly innocent of the sexual assault and murder of Meredith Kercher..."per non aver commesso il fatto"...end of story. There are three victims in this case, not just one. You can rant and rage and revile anyone who counters your ridiculous claims, but that doesn't change the reality of their innocence one iota. I'm not going to try to counter your rants with rationality, logic and/or TRUTH. All the misinformation and outright lies (see Mr Scott's "40 Myths" article in Ground Report) that abound in this case and that you continue to attempt to bite everyone with here, & probably elsewhere, have long ago been defanged.

YOU questioning the validity of any of the positive reviews of this book reaches the height of ludicrous. I don't doubt you hear nothing but radio silence. Your own deafening rants

are way too loud for you to hear anything else, i.e., logic, common sense, expert opinion, TRUTH.

Posted on Oct 20, 2012 9:22:03 AM PDT

Joseph P says:

Just one tip for you.

I wince every time i see you citing numbers of pages and numbers of judges to back up your talking points.

To mention those things at all is the mark of an uneducated person.

Posted on Oct 20, 2012 9:41:52 AM PDT

Pixie says:

I second that, following that logic the supreme court would just have to look at the number of pages of the reports of the different judges and support the ones who wrote the longer one. It's kindergarten logic.

Just because you misread doesn't mean you can misquote me. What I stated is that you cannot say there is NO evidence in the case. There is a 396 page report outlining the evidence. Whether you agree with the report or not, you cannot lie and say there is no evidence, because there is a ton of evidence. And it's all right there in the report!

You are all are ranting, raving and name calling, not me. I guess you must feel quite threatened and worried about the appeal case, huh? If you are *so* certain that they will be found innocent, why must you shout and scream to all of the world about how innocent Knox and Sollecito supposedly are?

Could it be that you feel threatened by the reality that, no matter how much you rant and rave, there are millions of people out there who think Knox and Sollecito are well and truly guilty and they will have to live under a cloud of suspicion forever?

Could it be you feel threatened by the very real risk that Knox and Sollecito will be found guilty at the final ruling? If you think it's an impossibility, what are you all shouting and ranting about? If I'm such an idiot, then why don't you just look the other way and silently dismiss everything that I say?

It's because you don't want the general public to read the facts about the case and hear the evidence that you claim does not exist.

So, everyone, read the Massei Report! Better yet—Google “email Amanda Knox sent to friends

days after the murder.” Read truejustice.org. Then decide for yourself. Don't let these bullies tell you what you should think.

CatsForever1960 says:

Yes, I will continue my "insulting" commentary for as long as you continue to post stupid remarks which, based on your latest multiple blatherings, doesn't appear to be ending any time soon. Good, more laughs for everyone else.

I didn't state Time wasn't a legitimate news source. Go back and read what I actually wrote. The article's claim about polls in Italy is meaningless since there's no documentation. It could have been the Perugian police department who paid for the polls for all I know.

Yes, it is easy for me to dismiss that statement made in the Time article. Yes, I am in a strong position to critique the evidence, and that word must be used loosely here, that you "supplied".

Oh, and as for your claim that you "haven't" spent hours of your own time writing about rape. Well, let's just say I'm a little skeptical of that claim. It's just a "feeling" I get, you understand.

The Innocenti have provide no evidence to the contrary, so my reference to polls saying that the vast majority of Italians think Knox and Sollecito are guilty stands.

Furthermore, the Time Magazine article I referenced is pro-Knox, so why would they provide weak or falsified information about the polls when they are clearly taking a stance in Knox's favor? You guys are getting more and more ridiculous in your claims.

In reply to your post on Oct 25, 2012 3:18:04 PM PDT

CatsForever1960 says:

Darles - you perfectly articulated why this reference doesn't "stand" and never has. With her, it isn't a matter of "getting" more ridiculous, she started there and has gone downhill. Sharply. Hellman did in fact clear up the issue re: Sollecito's timeline and his father. Which she would know if she had read Hellman's report. But I can expect nothing more from someone so idiotic that they implore the public to read the Massei report but not the Hellman report which came after it. That kind of idiocy on display is laughable.

In reply to your post on Oct 25, 2012 3:40:27 PM PDT

Pixie says: **Who cares about those polls, they don't prove anything, I assume Italy's population is maybe split at fifty fifty now.**

You have no evidence for this. Your assumption is incorrect. Italy overwhelmingly believe Knox and Sollecito are guilty. This according to the pro-Knox article in Time Magazine, the link for which I have already provided.

CatsForever1960 says:

You really are thick, aren't you. So now 'hundreds' chanting is your proof of the 'vast majority' of Italians. More idiocy....you just keep topping yourself. And btw, according to witnesses, including American media types who were actually present on the scene, it was dozens, not hundreds. Dozens of off-duty cops, to be more specific. As for Italy's "news coverage" having more "access to facts", again, that's just too ridiculous to dignify with a rebuttal. You are simply clueless as to how the real world even works....A little advice...if you don't like "nastiness" then stop behaving in a way that warrants it.

Incorrect again. This from an Australian news outlet.

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/world/amanda-knox-acquitted-of-murder-20111004-115rd.html>

The journalistic piece at the link above states: "Outside the court, meanwhile, an angry crowd of hundreds of residents gathered and there were shouts of 'Shame! Shame!' and 'Murderers!' One man shouted through a loudspeaker: 'They're guilty!'"

None are described as police, or former police. Certainly you aren't going to claim there would have been hundreds of police chanting "Murderers", would you?

In reply to your post on Oct 25, 2012 6:01:29 PM PDT

Crosslands says: **Of course not being described as police does not mean that these few demonstrators were not Perugia policemen. Before these Mignini sponsored demonstrators arrived the crowd was very favorable to Mr. Sollecito and Mr. Knox.**

All of the eyewitness reports and media suggest that these hundreds of protestors were ordinary Italians. There is no evidence to suggest otherwise, but if you have any evidence, by all means please provide it. Otherwise, suggesting that the hundreds of protestors were police is nothing other than conspiracy theory.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 26, 2012 9:47:15 PM PDT

I. Morris says: ...The scenario described by the prosecution has no parallel in criminal history...Can you provide examples where women have helped strangers rape and murder other women?

1) I don't believe Guede was a stranger to Knox or Sollecito. First of all, Knox admitted to meeting Guede several times. Guede lived just doors away from Sollecito, visited Knox's neighbors in their apartment downstairs and had even slept over there, had met Meredith, and played basketball daily at the park that is literally a minute's walk from Knox's apartment and DIRECTLY across from Knox's school in Perugia. Knox would have walked past the park where Guede played ball several times each day since it was along the route to her school, her boyfriend's apartment, the bus stop and the city center. In fact, Knox acknowledged meeting Guede "twice" while Guede claimed they had met many times, including at Knox's cottage.

- Here is a photo showing Knox's school (building in foreground on the right) with the park where Guede played basketball on the left. They are LITERALLY next door to each other. Knox's apartment is less than one minute away:
<http://www.flickr.com/photos/collezionista/4767277154/>
- Here is evidence about why it is quite likely that Knox was quite familiar with Guede. "Why Amanda Knox Might Have Encountered Guede 20 Or More Times Near Her Home:"
http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/report_4_on_perugia_why_amanda_knox_might_have_encountered_guede_20_or/
- Here we see how close Sollecito and Guede lived to each other (literally a 1 minute 15 second walk)
http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/report_2_on_perugia_what_very_very_close_neighbors_sollecito_and_guede/
- Here is a video showing just how short the walk was from the park where Guede hung out and Knox and Kercher's apartment:
http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/report_4_on_perugia_the_walk_from_the_basketball_court_through_the_int/
- Here we see how far Sollecito's flat was from the basketball court & park where Guede was a fixture (and which was just one minute from Knox's flat):
http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/report_3_on_perugia_this_is_the_walk_from_raffaeles_house_to_the_baske/

2) There are many examples where a woman helps a man either rape another women or gain control of another woman or child for these purposes. Knox and Sollecito certainly weren't strangers, and Knox admitted she knew Guede.

- Karla Homolka - Child Rapist, Torturer and Killer:
<http://crime.about.com/od/murder/p/homolka.htm>
- Couple plead guilty in 2006 sex slaying in Clay County: "An Independence couple already convicted in the rape and torture of a 36-year-old woman avoided a death-penalty trial in Clay County by pleading guilty Tuesday to murdering her." Read more here:
<http://www.kansascity.com/2012/08/28/3783451/former-most-wanted-couple-from.html#storylink=cpy>Read more here:
<http://www.kansascity.com/2012/08/28/3783451/former-most-wanted-couple-from.html#storylink=cpy><http://www.kansascity.com/2012/08/28/3783451/former-most-wanted-couple-from.html>
- "Vanessa Coleman (b. June 29, 1988), 18, who was arrested by the Lebanon Police Department in Lebanon, Kentucky. She faces 40 Tennessee state charges. Coleman was indicted on 12 counts of felony murder growing out of the rape, robbery, kidnapping, and theft of Christian and Newsom, 1 count of premeditated murder (of Christian only), 1 count of especially aggravated robbery (of Newsom only), 4 counts of especially aggravated kidnapping, 20 counts of aggravated rape, and 2 counts of theft.[7][8] She was convicted and sentenced to 53 years in prison on July 30, 2010. She described her time in Knoxville as "an adventure."
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murders_of_Channon_Christian_and_Christopher_Newsom#Suspects_and_indictments
- The Moors murders were carried out by Ian Brady and Myra Hindley between July 1963 and October 1965, in and around what is now Greater Manchester, England. The victims were five children aged between 10 and 17-Pauline Reade, John Kilbride, Keith Bennett, Lesley Ann Downey and Edward Evans-at least four of whom were sexually assaulted.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moors_murders
- Couple Allegedly Rape 4-Year-Old & Leave Horrifying Evidence in Walmart:
http://thestir.cafemom.com/in_the_news/139841/couple_allegedly_rape_4yearold_leave
- Final moments of Canadian girl, eight, abducted, raped and murdered on way home from school. "Tori's devastated parents listened, the 21-year-old described how she and Rafferty singled out the little girl because she was on her own - the first day she was allowed to walk back from school alone - and lured her to the car by saying they had a schitzu puppy."
Read more: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2114924/Victoria-Tori-Stafford-trial-2012-Final-moments-girl-8-raped-murdered-Woodstock-Ontario.html#ixzz2ATLnJH69>

Additional information about female sex offenders:

- According to these Canadian statistics, 75% of sexual predators are male and 25% are female. 86% of the victims of female sexual predators aren't believed, so the crimes go unreported and don't get prosecuted. http://www.canadiancrc.com/Female_Sex_Offenders-Female_Sexual_Predators_awareness.aspx
- Two common categories of female sex offenders:
"Predisposed: Histories of incestuous sexual victimization, psychological difficulties and deviant

sexual fantasies were common among these women who generally acted alone in their offending. They tend to victimize their own children or other young children within their families or they are close to.

Male-Coerced: These women tend to be passive and dependent individuals with histories of sexual abuse and relationship difficulties. Fearing abandonment, they were pressured by male partners to commit sex offenses often against their own children."

- “Characteristics of female sex offenders:
 - Women between the ages of 22-33 years of age.
 - They have experienced sexual abuse as children or teens and can have victimization histories twice the rate of men who sexually offend. (?Knox?)
 - History of alcohol and/or drug abuse. (Knox)
 - The majority are not mentally ill, but may experience depression or personality disorders. (?Knox?)
 - A majority are employed in professional jobs. (Knox was a student and employed, though barely)
 - They have difficulties in intimate relationships (Knox); or an absence of intimate relationships."

http://www.momlogic.com/2009/04/female_sex_offenders.php#ixzz2ATKBbU3F)

- Female offenders:

http://www.trutv.com/library/crime/criminal_mind/psychology/female_offenders/6.html

- What Motivates Female Sex Offenders:

http://www.momlogic.com/2009/04/female_sex_offenders.php

- One half of sex offender therapy programs provide services to females:

http://www.momlogic.com/2009/04/female_sex_offenders.php#ixzz2ATJavrF2

3) Even so, you are forgetting that rape was not proven by the medical examiner. It is quite possible the killing was a revenge killing over bad feelings over missing rent money (stolen to pay for drugs, most likely) and jealousy over Kercher's being asked to work at Lumumba's bar when Knox was close to being fired. (Don't forget that Knox later falsely accused Lumumba.) The control and forced submission might have just been a physical expression of anger and revenge, since sexual violence is often more about control than about sex. However, proof of motive is not required for a murder conviction, either in Italy or the United States.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 26, 2012 10:38:57 PM PDT

Thomas Mininger says: Amanda has no history of drug or alcohol abuse. Far less pot or alcohol use than the average college student. Far less than me and my buddies 30 years ago.

- In Knox and Sollecito's own words, their drug use on the night of the murder made their memories hazy and unreliable. Sollecito even said so in his book!....If drug use to the point of blacking out is not "abuse", what is?....If it's not true that they used so many drugs that they can't remember what happened, why did they lie and say they were too intoxicated to remember what happened? What do they have to hide?
- Knox held a party when she was in school in Seattle that became so violent and disorderly (with students throwing rocks at cars on the highway from an overpass) that she was charged and fined for disorderly conduct.
- Sollecito has a history of drug abuse. He also had a prior conviction for possession of narcotics. And he was Knox's boyfriend, after all.
- Knox posted publicly on Facebook about her drug use (smoking marijuana).
- Here's a video of Amanda Knox drunk: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f2m5qSHU88A>

So it seems to me that there's plenty of evidence that both Knox and Sollecito abused drink and drugs.

Thomas Mininger says: **(Amanda has) no problem with intimate relationships. No history of mental illness or depression, or personality disorders....**

I care to disagree. Knox, by all reports (including sworn testimony by Meredith's friends, family and roommates), did not get along with Meredith. Prior to coming to Perugia she abandoned a highly regarded volunteer position in Germany that her uncle had help her obtain with significant trouble without even giving notice (very odd behavior, indeed, and indicative of one who lacks empathy; her explanation was that she was bored in her role). Knox's boss, Lumumba, reported that he was near the point of firing Knox at the time when she falsely accused Lumumba of murder. Amanda didn't have a lot of friends in Perugia; that's why she spent the night of Halloween (the night prior to the murder) out alone. Her roommates described her in sworn testimony as being strange. Knox wrote publicly on Facebook about having sex with a stranger on the train she took into Perugia (not passing judgment but odd behavior indeed and perhaps indicative of mental health issues; writing about it publicly for friends and family to see it is certainly strange and suggests poor judgment and attention seeking).

Amanda certainly seemed to have problems with her personal relationships as well as meeting basic personal responsibilities.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 26, 2012 10:43:33 PM PDT

Thomas Mininger says: **(There is) no evidence that Amanda was sexually abused.**

Correct, not to my knowledge. However, there's no proof that she was not. I'd wager that there's no evidence that of sexual abuse for the majority of individuals who were abused. 1 in 5 girls is a victim of

child sexual abuse. <http://www.victimsofcrime.org/news-center/reporter-resources/child-sexual-abuse/child-sexual-abuse-statistics>

In reply to your post on Oct 26, 2012 11:23:29 PM PDT

Brago Kex says: (Now) you are getting just completely ridiculous. You're the one who is being abusive here, with your obsessive, unsubstantiated, slanderous accusations.

Slander? I'll tell you about slander.

1) Knox was tried and convicted of accusing an innocent man of murder--her boss, Lumumba, testified that was about to fire her and hire Meredith. She spent three years in jail for this crime.

2) Knox and her parents have been charged with slander (calunnia) for repeating false and malicious claims that Knox was abused by police investigators (something that even her lawyers did not claim when she was on trial for murder):

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/10/amanda-knox-slander-court-date-postponed_n_1505494.html

http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/the_curt_knox_and_edda_mellas_calunnia_trial_will_resume_in_perugia_30/

http://truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/a_perugian_media_report_neutral_as_usual_in_italian_on_knoxs_slander_h/

3) And Sollecito has made so many false claims that he may even be subject to a slander (calunnia) charges himself!

"More and more and more wrong facts and libels are being turned up in Sollecito's pathetic book, both by us here and by an irritated officialdom in Rome and Perugia..." It's so bad that "Sollecito's own lawyers (who have in the past threatened to walk) and his own family have already thrown him to the wolves on Italian TV over just one highly libelous claim and there are an estimated two dozen more still to surface."

http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/so_you_wanna_strangle_the_little_toad_too_f_or_making_his_defense_so_mu/

4) These are just some of the false and slanderous statements in Sollecito's book:

<http://truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmksollecitosbook>

In reply to your post on Oct 27, 2012 12:38:47 AM PDT

MichaelB says: **If someone wanted to play silly games like you do, I could ask: Meredith was known to get drunk and smoke marijuana and had met Rudy Guede. Meredith spoke about Amanda behind her back yet Amanda never said a bad word about Meredith. How come Meredith & Rudy didn't kill Amanda?**

A ridiculous argument like this doesn't even warrant a response. But it does show the circular nature of the arguments the Innocenti use as "proof" that Knox and Sollecito are supposedly innocent.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 27, 2012 6:08:20 AM PDT

MichaelB said: **Meredith was known to get drunk and smoke marijuana and had met Rudy Guede. Meredith spoke about Amanda behind her back yet Amanda never said a bad word about Meredith. How come Meredith & Rudy didn't kill Amanda?**

The statement I responded to was Thomas Mininger's, saying: "**Amanda has no history of drug or alcohol abuse.**" I proved that statement incorrect. Drug abuse does not prove their guilt, but it IS consistent with the profile of female sexual predators that I posted earlier:

>>>"Characteristics of female sex offenders:

Women between the ages of 22-33 years of age. (Knox was 20 at the time of her arrest)

They have experienced sexual abuse as children or teens and can have victimization histories twice the rate of men who sexually offend. (?Knox?)

History of alcohol and/or drug abuse. (Knox)

The majority are not mentally ill, but may experience depression or personality disorders. (?Knox?)

A majority are employed in professional jobs. (Knox was a student and employed, though barely)

They have difficulties in intimate relationships (Knox); or an absence of intimate relationships."

Read more: http://www.momlogic.com/2009/04/female_sex_offenders.php#ixzz2ATKBbU3F

In reply to your post on Oct 27, 2012 6:28:24 AM PDT

Pixie says:

You are wrong once again, what is referred to by the term "alcohol / drug abuse" is not the person who is being drunk from time to time or smokes a joint every now and then. It refers to people who can't handle their alcohol / marijuana use, who are severely affected by it and can't function normally anymore, who have health issues, psychological issues, depression, alcohol/drug addiction.

It's not about people who drink wine to their meal, are sometimes drunk/high during festive activities or social situations. Amanda's drinking and marijuana consuming habits were simply those of a normal healthy young person. This is not what is referred to by the term "drug abuse". Amy Winehouse's was an example for what is meant by the term "drug / alcohol abuse".

WIKIPEDIA: Alcohol abuse, as described in the DSM-IV, is a psychiatric diagnosis describing the recurring use of alcoholic beverages despite negative consequences.[1] Alcohol abuse is sometimes referred to by the less specific term alcoholism.

Alcohol abuse is a pattern of drinking that results in harm to one's health, interpersonal relationships, or ability to work. According to Gelder, Mayou & Geddes (2005) alcohol abuse is linked with suicide. They state the risk of suicide is high in older men who have a history of drinking, also if a person is suffering from depression. Certain manifestations of alcohol abuse include failure to fulfill responsibilities at work, school or home; drinking in dangerous situations, such as while driving; legal problems associated with alcohol use; and continued drinking despite problems that are caused or worsened by drinking.

In reply to your post on Oct 27, 2012 10:20:00 AM PDT

Darles Chickens says:

If drug use to the point of blacking out is not "abuse"

Neither have ever said they used drugs 'to the point of blacking out'. Neither have said they can't remember what happened - the only people that suggested total memory loss were the police.

'Hazy' and 'total memory loss/blacking out' are not interchangeable terms. For you to suggest that Knox and Sollecitos drug use constitutes 'drug abuse' is a strong indication that you don't know what you're talking about. Both would have their usage well within the range of normal for students.

Pretty much every statement that comes out of your mouth is either outright wrong or a total distortion of the small grain of truth it does contain. So, why are you such a liar?

In reply to your post on Oct 27, 2012 10:35:51 AM PDT

Darles Chickens says: (Regarding Meredith's relationship with Knox) **(none) of the uk girls mentioned problems prior to Knoxes arrest, Kercher Sr. mentioned no problems on his first day there despite being asked directly, the boyfriend said the relationship was good, and all other contemporaneous accounts failed to mention any problems.**

Only after the arrest did any problems seem to arise, and, as some journalists noted, the reports were so similar as to sound coached.

So, no, all accounts DO NOT say that Knox had problems with Kercher. The most reliable, unfettered, contemporary accounts indicated otherwise. Only Sophie Purton (who got so drunk she had to be helped home - an alcohol abuser according to you - and thusly unreliable) mentioned any problems prior to the arrest, and that was in response to questioning about men meredith knew.

The relationship between the two of them was not fine. Meredith's family testified to tension between Meredith and Knox, as did Meredith's friends. See this post:

http://www.amazon.com/review/R1KYYHT7E79FDT/ref=cm_cr_rev_detmd_pl?ie=UTF8&asin=1451695985&cdForum=Fx1YTLXNK6ZA25M&cdMsgID=Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU&cdMsgNo=224&cdPage=23&cdSort=oldest&cdThread=Tx3KS9CQZJ4BFKP&store=books#Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU

But I'm sure some of you will state that all of these varied parties were biased, as nonsensical as that would be!

As to the English girls not being terribly forthcoming about tension between the roommates, have you ever heard of British reserve?

However, what you say is not fully accurate. Sophie Purton did share her concerns about tensions between roommates Knox and Kercher with the police several days before Knox was arrested.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 27, 2012 3:12:26 PM PDT

Pixie says: **Alcohol abuse is associated with....(related) legal problems (due to) alcohol use. (Wikipedia)**

What do you call Knox's fine for disorderly conduct when a party she hosted became so violent and disorderly (with students throwing rocks at cars)? How many sweet and gentle recreational users have gotten into such trouble?

What do you call Sollecito's prior conviction for possession of narcotics?

Those sound like legal problems to me.

In reply to your post on Oct 27, 2012 3:17:37 PM PDT

Pixie says: There were no tensions, tensions are two-sided, Meredith was indeed annoyed by certain habits of Amanda, yet never told her about it. If anything, this would have motivated Meredith to murder Amanda, only that this is of course not a logical motive.

Amanda and Meredith's basic relationship was friendly. It's relatively seldom that young (or older) people are living with each other and aren't annoyed by anything the others do. The two Italian room mates for example were annoyed that both Amanda and Meredith didn't clean alot. It's human, it's normal. Go to some living communities and ask them about it.

If Meredith had lived with her british friends there likely would have been habits by them who'd have annoyed her as well. We are human, you don't seem to be aware of that, you imagine people behaving like angels without any source of friction.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 27, 2012 3:24:32 PM PDT

You can insist this all you want, but by many sources, including the sworn testimony of numerous individuals (Meredith's friends and roommates as well as Meredith's family), there **was** tension between the roommates. I challenge you to prove that those giving sworn testimony about the tension between the roommates were lying. But don't just take my word for it:

- According to Knox's and Kercher's roommate Filomena Romanelli, 'As of mid-October, for the last two weeks they (Knox and Meredith) weren't on good terms...Before then, they were always together. I mentioned it to Laura (Mezzotti, the other roommate). I said to Laura that I though she (Meredith) was a bit fed up with Amanda.' Darkness Descending, p. 84
- According to Filomena, "the relationship between Amanda Knox and Meredith had deteriorated by October. This was something we knew of from her friends in Perugia, and also from what Meredith had told us." Meredith (by John Kercher), pp. 149-150.
- According to Filomena "...Robyn (Butterworth, Meredith's friend) winced in disbelief when Meredith said the pair had quarreled...Filomena began noticing that Amanda could be odd, even anti-social." Darkness Descending, p. 154
- According to Patrick Lumumba: "...Amanda felt threatened...Amanda was jealous of the little things like that (things Meredith could do well, like making drinks)." Darkness Descending, p. 156

- According to Patrick Lumumba: "(Amanda) smoked, she drank, she flirted...but she wasn't stable, she would fly into a rage and then apologize. She didn't get a lot of sleep. A bit over the top really. I told her I'd asked Meredith to come and work for me and her face dropped and there was a big silence. Then she said, 'Fine', and stopped off. I knew then she was *extremely jealous of Meredith.* She obviously thought she was invading her territory." Darkness Descending, p. 157
- According to Filomena's mother "...Meredith `was always very sociable with our daughter and the other Italian girl in the apartment. The other girl, the American, was always very cold and distracted; she seemed to be in a different world." Darkness Descending (by Russell & Johnson), p. 153
- Of Sophie Purton (friend of Meredith): "She also remembered that Meredith, talking about what was happening at home, my perception of their relationship was that at times Meredith felt a little uneasiness, that at times she had some doubts about Amanda" - Massei Report (judge's report of on the first trial) p. 34
- Of Sophie Purton: "(She) recalled that Meredith used to recount many things about Amanda, things which irritated her..." Massei Report, p. 36

Pixie says: Filomena and Laura and the guys downstairs testified that they had a friendly, normal relationship ...

Wrong. I have provided the evidence from different sources, including sworn testimony, as to the state of their relationship. Their relationship was not "friendly" or "normal," as you claim, but was described as having "deteriorated"; being fraught with tension, irritation, and jealousy (Knox being jealous of Meredith, per Patrick Lumumba, who observed them interact on more than one occasion); and that the two had quarreled.

http://www.amazon.com/review/R1KYYHT7E79FDT/ref=cm_cr_rev_detmd_pl?ie=UTF8&asin=1451695985&cdForum=Fx1YTLXNK6ZA25M&cdMsgID=Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU&cdMsgNo=224&cdPage=23&cdSort=oldest&cdThread=Tx3KS9CQZJ4BFKP&store=books#Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU

Darles Chickens says:

"What do you call Knox's fine for disorderly conduct when a party she hosted became so violent and disorderly (with students throwing rocks at cars on the highway from an overpass)?"

It's a fine for noise violations. If it had become as violent and disorderly as claimed, the attending officer would have said so. He did not.

It is not, and should not, be compared to the repeated, multiple, severe and personal legal problems that are commonly associated with alcohol abuse. To suggest one loud student party constitutes a history of legal problems associated with delinquent behaviour would not meet any clinical criteria for alcohol abuse.

"What do you call Sollecito's prior conviction for possession of narcotics?"

You call it a prior conviction for narcotics. A single caution for a small amount over a period of several years would not constitute a persistent and repeated pattern of legal troubles related to the substance of use.

Your argument is like calling one parking fine in 3 years equivalent to dangerous driving.

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 28, 2012 12:06:58 AM PDT

Francisco says: Oh, and btw, just a word of advice; if you want to have any credibility at all you might want to stop referencing Darkness Descending. That POS book doesn't even have the respect of the guilter community.

Wrong again. You are not in the so-called "guilter" community (we prefer to call it the "pro-victim" or "pro-Meredith" community, btw), yet now you insist that "we" do not respect the book. The book is actually very well respected--fake and biased reviews from the pro-Amanda "Friends of Amanda" (FOA) community notwithstanding!

I wonder if people might be interested to learn about the pattern of such online book reviews pertaining to Meredith Kercher's murder reviews...all pro-defense/FOA books are given 4 and 5 stars, and all pro-victim and pro-prosecution books are given 1 star reviews by people who have no other reviews in their profiles and are obviously very biased. Even the book written in memorial of Meredith (the murder victim who is all too easily forgotten) by her father is given low marks!

One might wonder why is it that you "Innocenti" don't people want to read any books that outline the evidence for Knox and Sollecito's guilt or build sympathy for the victim and her heartbroken family (a family that believes in the overwhelming evidence that Knox and Sollecito are guilty)? Could it be that there is actually a lot of evidence against Knox and Sollecito that you and Knox's family and their PR people don't want the public to read?!

But, don't just take my word for it! I encourage the public to read Darkness Descending for themselves and see what they think! Used copies are available very affordably online.

In reply to your post on Oct 28, 2012 12:55:11 AM PDT

MichaelB says: all you've shown here is that your irrational beliefs are based on trival and false tabloid smears from 4 years ago. You can't present a timeline that works, a time of death that could include the students and match the science ...You're embarassing yourself with this toilet flushing habbits, girl is tipsy in a youtube video, given a ticket for a noisy party etc etc as if that is signs of someone being a murdering rapist. Like I said in my review, it was a tabloid hoax and you fell for it.

Since you are so interested in the timeline and other evidence in the case (although something tells me that facts will have little sway with the Innocenti and FOA), here are some reading materials you and the general public might be interested in:

CRIME TIMELINE:

http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/explaining_the_massei_report_the_timeline_f_or_events_before_during_2/

http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/considering_the_sad_and_sensitive_but_also_crucial_subject_of_meredith/

http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/explaining_the_massei_report_establishing_the_time_when_meredith_passe/

<http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/C441/>

LONE WOLF THEORY DEBUNKED:

http://truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/comments/understanding_micheli_2_why_judge_micheli_rejected_the_lone_wolf_theor/

CRIME HYPOTHESES: <http://www.truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmk/C187/>

WHY KNOX AND SOLLECITO LIKELY KNEW GUEDE:

http://www.amazon.com/review/R1KYYHT7E79FDT/ref=cm_cr_rev_detmd_pl?ie=UTF8&asin=1451695985&cdForum=Fx1YTLXNK6ZA25M&cdMsgID=Mx1AT1U06N8YF3H&cdMsgNo=199&cdPage=20&cdSort=oldest&cdThread=Tx3KS9CQZJ4BFKP&store=books#Mx1AT1U06N8YF3H

JUDGE'S REPORT: <http://truejustice.org/ee/documents/perugia/TheMasseiReport.pdf>

TENSIONS BETWEEN THE ROOMMATES:

http://www.amazon.com/review/R1KYYHT7E79FDT/ref=cm_cr_rev_detmd_pl?ie=UTF8&asin=1451695985&cdForum=Fx1YTLXNK6ZA25M&cdMsgID=Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU&cdMsgNo=224&cdPage=23&cdSort=oldest&cdThread=Tx3KS9CQZJ4BFKP&store=books#Mx3GHU41F6DY3GU

FALSEHOODS IN SOLLECITO'S BOOK: <http://truejustice.org/ee/index.php?/tjmksollecitosbook>

RELEVANT BOOKS: Darkness Descending - the Murder of Meredith Kercher (by Russell & Johnson), Death in Perugia: The Definitive Account of the Meredith Kercher Case (by John Follain), Meredith (by John Kercher), Angel Face (by Barbie Nadeau)

Your post, in reply to an earlier post on Oct 28, 2012 1:31:11 AM PDT

MichaelB says: **None of the links you have provided are from a credible source.**

That is not for you to decide. I am more than happy to direct the public to these sources and let them decide for themselves.

Darles Chickens says: **If you're going to claim a pattern of repeated behaviour, then you need evidence of it.**

You must be joking. I posted numerous evidence, quotes, sources, etc. I even posted the actual citation that I mentioned...the ACTUAL DOCUMENT so folks could read it for themselves! What evidence, quotes, or sources have you posted? None. Your argument is on very weak ground since you don't back anything up with facts. But that does seem to be the pattern here. Scream loud enough and insist that what you say is fact and maybe, just maybe, people will begin to believe it.

One question for you folks. If the evidence I am posting is all incorrect, inaccurate, false, biased, lies, drivel, idiocy, et cetera, then why do you guys get so defensive? Why are my posts worthy of 25 pages of responses? Could it be that the information and facts contained herein are actually a threat to your "story"?

The same thing about the pro-Meredith books and books presenting alternative theories...why do they all receive one-star reviews by obvious Knox sycophants? Could it be that you guys don't want people to read books that detail the evidence incriminating Knox and Sollecito and foster sympathy for the real victim and her family? Could it be that Knox's family and/or PR company is behind the campaign to discredit these books?

I have been posting evidence to the public that presents a contradiction to your story of Knox and Sollecito's supposed innocence. If the evidence I present is clearly BS, the public will just see right through it, won't they? With your repeated tag-team, semi-bullying responses and your attempts to negate every single piece of information I provide with ever more ridiculous and circular arguments, you are only proving that my challenges are valid and that the inconsistencies in Knox's and Sollecito's story

(ahem, stories! They DID have nine different alibis) require explanation. This only reveals the weakness of your stance and strengthens my position.

In other words...

YOU ARE SIMPLY PROVING MY OWN ARGUMENT FOR ME: That there are TOO many things that Knox and Sollecito have to explain away in order for them to be innocent. Truly innocent people wouldn't have to make so many excuses and explain so many things away.

Thomas Mininger says: ...**Please forgive me if I'm repeating something, but I'd like to express my outrage at the guilters' tactic of publishing pictures of pro-innocence people's families, including their children. This is a serious psychological problem.**

It's a serious psychological problem for people to remember the true victim in this case, Meredith Kercher? It seems to me that she is all too often forgotten and we should spend more time remembering her, not less. I think the psychological problem lies within people who try to denigrate the victim, Meredith Kercher, as well as her family, friends, and supporters who want true justice to be achieved in this case.