



I'm not robot



Continue

Franz kafka before the law interpretation

Before the law. This is the central part of Kafka's unfinished novel The Trial. We'll watch part of Orson Welles's film adaptation with Anthony Perkins as Joseph K. Welles recite a condensation version of the assimilation Before The Law, which itself makes the film worth seeing. Check out my revised essay Parable of the Law originally published in The Germanic Review, May 1964 copied below. Also, check out The Missing First Page from Alberto Manguel's A History of Reading, Viking. This essay was first published in GERMANIC REVIEW, May 1964 kafka's pre-law department Herbert Deinert's Bring Before the Law and its context, a chapter in the Cathedral, has long been considered the central piece of Kafka's unfinished novel The Trial[1]. It can, with some qualifications, be considered the key to Kafka's work. Various critics have treated him for a long time, interpretations of Wilhelm Ernich and Heinz Politzer, and more recently, the brilliant and comprehensive study of Ingeborg Hedel are among the deepest[2]. Although these critics differ on many issues, their opinions are not mutually exclusive on all issues, and it would therefore be naïve to say that something so different will be proposed on the following pages that it has nothing to do with the interpretations already suggested. However, I believe that by eliminating the two mistakes that have plagued previous critics, this article may point to additional - and different - aspects. One mistake I feel is the assumption of guilt on the part of K., which I do not recognize; the second is to distinguish the priest's individual statements and to tell them the correct readings of the parable, whereas the priest stresses that he mentions only different opinions (p. 200). At first glance, the story is both simple and mysterious. The plot is so obvious that it apparently eeries further explanation. It consists of a man who in vain tries to obtain the desired entrance; he spends the rest of his life waiting for a permit that will never be granted. But although the action is logical, its setting is not at all identical to our reality. We also don't recognize characters. The man of the country has been narrowed down to the personification of persistent desire, to the door is limited to the function of obstruction, the identity of the Law remains hidden. However, when we accept the kind of reality defined by these limitations, narrative is not a problem. But of course it's supposed to be assimilated. This suggests the same position in the context of the process. Some technical equipment characteristic of the parable is easily recognizable (e.g. no names, parcel concentration, pointe at the end). While the plot details are obvious, the story as a whole certainly requires if it is an aw. What does that mean? A popular approach to Kafka is to treat his works as an allegory, that is, to seek another and at the same time meaning under the history of the surface [3], which has a limited scope, applicable only to one problem, one class, one historical era, etc. In an attempt to reveal the identity of the doorkeeper, the man of the country, and the Law, we would begin to search for something that fits the pattern of the plot of, say, man in pursuit of happiness - he never achieves it, man in search of God - never com comesses it, the artist waits for inspiration or public recognition that never comes. The given number of imaginative readers would be able to reach so many different so-called keys to the story. How do we know which key is correct? Of course, the one that sounds most likely. It is difficult to say that this is not an interpretation, but more or less an undisciplined guessing game, however interesting. It is not based on a narrative, but only on its pattern, on the radius of our knowledge and the vaming of our imagination. Anyway, we'll look behind the story, not into it. The alternative is a thorough analysis of a seemingly simple storyline. This approach seems all the more okay, because that's exactly what Kafka - on the surface - has its own listener do. One morning, K., the main figure in the trial, is announced arrested by men he never met, but remains free to go and continue as before. He was told that legal proceedings were pending against him, but neither his alleged crime nor the identity of his accusers were disclosed. The lawsuit is based on a law that K. has never heard of. After all, it becomes his only ambition to meet with a mysterious court face to face to accuse himself. One day, in the course of his fruitless efforts, after a long wait in a dark and empty cathedral, he suddenly notices a dimly lit pulpit, the priest begins to turn to him, and thus, is the text of our parable. According to the traditional scripture reading sequence and exegesis, K. and the priest engage in a discussion about the meaning of the narrative. Like all efforts, K.to nowhere and we do not need to go to a detailed description. It should be remembered, however, that K. is so convinced of his innocence and so busy freeing himself from what must be a false allegation that he sees the parable only in terms of good and evil. He had already forgotten, or rather never understood, the priest's angry remark before the recital: Don't you see two feet forward? (p. 254). His immediate reaction is that a man from the country was deceived by a doorkeeper. The priest counters that the parable in the official it belongs, in substance, to the Scriptures of the mysterious Court in which K.'s secret trial is conducted. This is an official text, and talking about cheating is wrong just because the word scam doesn't occur. Repeatedly, with regard to narrative and by the sheer weight of logic, K.'s arguments are invalidated. But at a time when both K. and the reader are almost convinced of the doorman's kindness, it turns out that the priest is leading a strictly academic dispute, he did not commit himself, but reported only one of many conflicting opinions [4]. Furthermore, it categorically states that those opinions are irrelevant because the text is unchanged regardless of its interpretations and that the opinions themselves are often merely an expression of despair over that fact (p. 260). As if to prove how non-committal and objective he is advance the view that he is a doorkeeper who has been deceived. Again, the argument is so logical and well-founded that even K. cannot escape his conclusions. However, he also remains unsadthed by his previous belief that a man from the country is a victim of fraud. If the doormeter is already deceived (e.g. under serious illusion as to its position), its deception must necessarily have a disastrous effect on the man from the country. Deceived or not, he is at best a fool who should be stripped of his office. The priest's last argument, in direct response to K.'s last remark, is that nowhere does the text give us the right to judge, let alone condemnation, the door. As a servant of the Law, he is far beyond the reach of human judgment; doubting his dignity would mean doubting the Law itself. In this way, the priest circled in his quarrel. Of course, K. cannot agree, because it would mean that everything the doorkeeper says is true, which cannot happen for the very reasons that the priest has previously outlined. It is not necessary to consider everything to be true, the priest repeats, it is only necessary to consider it necessary (p. 264). So far we are completely confused. Exegesis is almost four times as long as the text. A simple story is no longer simple. As before, our confusion stems from understanding what is said, but not knowing what to make of it. The various stages of the argument seem flawless, but the discussion as a whole has not come to any conclusion. The narrative, for all its simplicity, is not clear enough to understand it to the extent necessary for the judgment to be delivered. Although the plot is elementary, the implications will avoid our understanding. It includes two antagonists; the obvious question of who is right and who is wrong remains unanswered. In the literary tradition, the eclipse is said to illustrate a certain point, to teach the golden rule. It is a didactic narrative. In his hopeless distress, expects some lightning, a hint of what steps to take-- seeable reader certainly does not. But his attempt to analyze what appears to be a parable intended for him is frustrated: the narrative does not contain a golden rule, it does not suggest a way of preserving under certain conditions. So it seems that this is not at all a mere mere function of the narrative is cruelly overcome the hope that aroused. However, this may not be the only purpose of the story so intricately introduced. However, it wasn't until the end of the novel - too late for K.--, that the true meaning of the narrative was revealed. In retrospect, it turns out to be both an allegory and a parable. So it's nothing more than a veiled and focused story about K's life. The man from the country is K himself. There is one difference: K. is met with a violent death, while the other dies in old age. However, it does not matter much. The fruitlessness of such a life is more important than the way it was finally ended. And is not a man from the country dead for all practical purposes from the moment he abandons everyone just to sit at the entrance to the Law? And can't the same be said of K., who is leaving his usual course of life to devote himself more and more to the own justification? Does K. at least recognize the relevance of the priest's narrative? The answer is yes. Since he himself tries to gain access to the mysterious and elusive General Court, he instinctively defends man in a parallel situation. He's trying to figure out what, who's right or wrong. His interpretation of the narrative is based on the assumption that there are criteria such as guilt and innocence. In fact, he is so busy with them that he does not see the true meaning of the narrative. His perception ends at a crucial moment when history becomes a legacy. It is not a question of good or bad, it does not give any suggestion of what effort to make to achieve a given goal, but illustrates the futility of all efforts. What man undertakes is doomed to failure. Whatever he desires, he escapes. Whatever he does to keep his case frustrated. Whatever he did was wrong. He is free, on be can do what he wants. However, he is a helpless prisoner for what he does, he will be frustrated. His ambition to release is based on the illusion that this is possible. He is endowed with freedom of choice, but does not have the power to enforce his decisions. The meaning of our narrative can not be found in the characters, but in the overall action, in what happens regardless of the law of the character. The whole storyline is one of Kafka's many variations on its main theme, and the theme is frustration. What is presented is and unlimited use, and we should not read in it the futile efforts of one particular group or the secret presentation of a single specific problem [6]. It is not enough that the main theme of history is frustration; Attempting to analyze K., is also frustrated. Its effect in the novel is to increase K's frustration. K. is blinded by the indignation of the legal mind to an obvious act of injustice and, ultimately, by a self-preservation instinct. He is so convinced of the possibility that things can change that he omits the only message that history has for him, namely that they can't. He doesn't understand the inse fact that he interprets it - very understandable in terms of justice and injustice. But in this way, he imposes his own concepts on the narrative, rather than focusing on the text itself. The priest at the very beginning tried to suggest his mistake, mentioning that the word deception did not take place. The basic truth, everything you need to know, is contained in the narrative itself or, as the priest stated, the text is unchanged. The introduction of a foreign element is based on the futile hope that this cannot be the case; it is, again in the priest's words, an expression of despair over this fact. The parable remains ambiguous simply because K. does not have the right perspective. But even if K. saw the significance of this story, would it help him? The answer, of course, is no [7]. Whoever his accusers are, they live somewhere in a sublime unconcern. From their point of view, there is no difference between any effort at all and the limited action K. is able to. His fate is reconciled and will be the same as a man from the country would have died of old age if he had stayed at home. And here we, too, have come full circle. K.'s inability to interpret assimilation was not a tragic oversight. Whether a narrative is identified as weighed down or not doesn't matter. This does not suggest a course of action, so K. cannot learn anything from it. In fact, this suggests that no course of action will help and it does not matter its final fate, whether it is recognized or not. The narrative is a summary of the entire novel, presented at the end; it is both parables and prophecy. The picture of hopelessness and frustration is complete. The complexity of fighting K is insurmountable proportions; but the reason for this is the simplicity of an unknown fact: nothing can do. I wonder if Kafka could have imagined the total misery of human existence in his Proccess more effectively than by inserting an induction that the hero does not have to understand. Cause K. is lost from the very beginning. When he insists that he is innocent, he replies: But so say the guilty (p. 253). His case is indeed hopeless if the statement of his innocence is proof of his guilt. What would an admission of guilt prove? His fate is predetermined, from which there is no escape. Cruelty is added to injustice by an ever-renewed and enticing hope (expressed in parable but not now) that will never be filled, thus turning the old cardinal virtue into a means of torture. K. never learns what he is accused of, never meets his accusers, despite the title that he was never told to stand trial. He is free to go wherever he chooses. But in the end, he becomes his only ambition to influence a court he does not know - although he considers himself innocent, and the reader certainly does not know of any crime that K. committed[8]. His every step turns out to be a mistake. Even this is too specific a statement; darkness is so impenetrable that it is unable to measure the effects of its actions. Eventually he is murdered, knowing that as little as ever [9]. This state of complication and total frustration is the basis of all kafka's work. The apparent simplicity of the plot is quite confusing. Kafka's detail (as shown, for example, in the resulting decent dispute) is confusing rather than an explanation. In short stories such as A Hunger Artist, Josephine, The Burrow, he shows even greater mastery of his analytical method, to name a few. We are forced to come to the paradoxical conclusion that accuracy does not enlighten, but that it is behind. Time and time again in Kafka's work we meet with careful weighing of all possibilities, meticulous attention to every possible point of view, which makes it clear to define every detail, but the picture as a whole is hopelessly blurred; in this way, even the reader is left frustrated. The question remains whether a novel like The Trial is a great work of art. Kafka's genius is most evident in his depiction of new situations, in detailed analyses of problems, and not in the characterization of those confronted with them. However, the lack of effective characteristics does not have to be a disadvantage at all. Kafka may even abandon it intentionally to direct the reader's attention exclusively to the situation in which his characters have created themselves. His heroes are engaged in the fight against faceless fate, they themselves are only puppets. Because it is a condition that potentially applies to everyone and at all times there can be no distinct personalities that encounter what can be called their own fate. This is a condition par excellence, universal state. From this point of view, all men are similar, indistinguishable, that is: faceless. Another aspect is important. Because Kafka's heroes are not blood and bone characters in the traditional sense speaking of its smaller characters, which are defined by their functions) do not direct our sympathy. We are not moved by their fate, we do not harm them, but instead we are satiated by the cruelty of fate in general, the unsumred complications of existence and the frustration of all efforts. Pity and fear are displaced by a paralyzing sense of imminent doom. Anyone can be this kind of tragic hero, through no fault or disadvantage of his own character, without a combination of circumstances, but simply because he exists[10]. Thus, the Kafka method turns out to be the most effective way of conveying all-encompassing and total in vain. However, the novel is too demanding in terms of such a limited method, too spacious vehicle for such an exclusive theme. Kafka's lack of epic abundance is undeniable and we should not try to underestimate it. His approach is a brilliant, logical and controlled legal mind that looks at the subject from every possible perspective and which is inexhaustible in creating new situations showing the combat hero from different points of view. But his ingenuity is limited to an endless variety of episodes; there is only one topic, and it is hopelessness and frustration. The trial can be summed up in this way: from the moment of his arrest to the day of his execution, K. tries in vain to meet his accusers face-to-face. And the whole novel focuses in vain, each chapter deals with a different aspect. Neither The Process nor the Castle are novels in the traditional sense; each consists of a string of almost independent instalments. To be sure, K.'s concern for the process is growing, increasingly neglecting his usual life. One can expect a gradual and complete disintegration of his intellectual abilities, but his departure from normal conduct is not as drastic as that of the other two victims, the merchant of the Block and the earthly gentleman in the third chapter, who completely loses his composure when he asks a simple question. Even the end of the novel, which shows the incredible degree of submission on the part of K., (unlike the previous scene of the cathedral, the nudity that is perhaps caused by the fragmented nature of the Proccess) illustrates him fully capable of rational and critical thinking, although, as in the case of Doctor Kafka, it is a useless kind of superiority. So even here, not much changes. From this point of view - and only from this point of view - the whole recent quarrel over the correct order of the individual chapters in the novels is somewhat pointless; most of them are interchangeable because they do not move forward on the plot. Novels move along a very narrow path defined by one and only subject, and the various chapters are his illustrations. * Where Kafka chose the opposite: condensing a potential novel into a short story rather than pursuing the same problem through endless fruitless results are masterpieces. For example, The Hunger Artist (1922) is such a condensed novel. The theme again is total frustration, viewed from every angle, presented in every possible light. Told in chronological order and extended to 300 pages, it would be a novel like The Trial. Instead, it's a brilliant story. This literary genre itself seems to be the right medium for both Kafka's loneliness and his analytical skills. The former loses fascination during a longer piece of prose, the latter tends to degenerate into an ordinary intellectual game.* Duke University * Postscript. I was very young at the time. In subsequent lectures based on the essay, I linked Kafka's novels to a picaresque tradition, hoping to redeem myself. _____ The text used is Franz Kafka, Der Prozess (New York, 1946). The translations are mine. [2] Wilhelm Ernich, Franz Kafka (Frankfurt, 1961), p. 266ff.; Heinz Politzer, Franz Kafka (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, Ny, 1962), p. 173ff.; Ingeborg Henel, Die Türhüterlegende und ihre Bedeutung für Kafkas 'Prozess', DVLG, XXXVII (1963), 50nn. [3] This definition is derived from the Dictionary of World Literature, ed. Wilhelm Ernich's main mistake. It seems to me expressed in his sentence: Dabei sind die Ausserungen des Geistlichen sehr genau abzuwägen (p. 268). On the contrary, the points of view presented refer to each other. The priest recites only different opinions. Ernich, however, accepts individual statements literally without disclosing his choice. Heinz Politzer writes that K., focusing on the man of the country and not on the doorkeeper, could deny the meaning of the parable for his particular situation (p. 180). I feel that he reveals his intuitive understanding of the importance of coming precisely by coming to the aid of a man from the country. Man, for all we know, can no longer come of his own free will (as Politzer believes), than K. who is, however, said by the priest: Es [das Gericht] nimmt dich auf, wenn du kommst, und es entlässt dich, wenn du gehst (p. 265). [6] It is true, of course, that a man's actions are intended solely to change the mind of the guardian. Because he does not attempt to enter without the doorkeeper's consent, Ms. Henel finds him guilty of negligence (52) and of using No Doorman as an excuse not to achieve his goal (60). But neither he knew from the beginning that the door existed only for him, nor did he tire of his efforts

to obtain a reception. Moreover, if the heavens, in another kafka parable, mean the inability of crows (otherwise one crow could, as it is said, destroy the heavens), and then being a man from the country inability to ignore the doorkeeper. (Cf. also Politzer, p. 167 and 174ff.) Ms Henel believes that the man himself is to blame for his negligence (57). Can't the law be blamed for getting help from the dockers just to ignore it? Wilhelm Emrich writes: In dem Augenblick, in dem er dieses Verbot [des Türhüters] missachtete, . . . lebte er im Gesetz' (p. 268). But isn't that similar to adding the proverbial sixth act? We have no way of knowing what might have happened if the man had ignored the doorkeeper. There is no reason why the Kafka Process should be an exception to the principle that a literary critic cannot ask what would happen if ... ? This is just another of kafka's many symbols for his view of human existence as the futility and hopelessness that the door is intended for the man himself, who is excluded from using it. Neither the aerated nor the novel deal with the question of what needs to be done. Both are concerned about the failure of all the efforts made. The reader may be able to list many potential decisions, Kafka does not present any alternatives. The only way for K. to avoid the frustration of liberation is to completely ignore the arrest as he might have. The easiest way for the Court to escape would be to disregard it. However, that is also the wrong argument that K. simply means that the Court cannot be ignored. At this point, Ingeborg Henel's interpretation and mine have come to identical conclusions: K.'s final fate is unchanged. Ms. Henel writes: Aber selbst wenn Josef K. diese Möglichkeit [die Anklage anzuerkennen und sich dem Gericht zu unterwerfen] ergriffen hätte, wäre er dennoch zugrunde gegangen; denn der Mensch besitzt nicht die notwendige Kraft, die Erkenntnis seiner Schuld zu ertragen, wie das angeführte Zitat über den Sündenfall [57] deutlich sagt (66). But what is the nature of the accusation and where is the Court? Despite her claim that Schuld ist das Thema des Romans (57), Ms. Henel seems to suggest here that it is the futility, not K.'s alleged fault, which is the dominant theme of the trial. Most critics unite to find K. guilty. Heinz Politzer says: Kafka's failure to implant this guilt into K.'s personality and life story forces us to break history and extend it to Kafka's biography, in other words, to make a deliberate mistake (p. 177). Both Ingeborg Henel and Wilhelm Emrich supported him to such an extent that they insisted on K's guilt. But even if Kafka saw his work as a kind of Selbstgericht (Henel, 69), would it limit the reader to the same approach? No lack of implant of this fault understandably simply means that there is no and that K. (who is not identical to Kafka, as most critics will admit) is frustrations not from your own production? If Kafka satirized his existence in the form of the Artist of Hunger (to use one example of Ms. Henel, 62), he reveals, among other things, an important difference between them: the critical self-awareness of the author, which his projection does not have. Kafka may have been harassed by awareness of guilt; K. it is not, that is the decisive difference. Kafka could have recognised such punishment fairly. K. is a hapless victim like Georg Bendemann and Gregor Samsa. And to extend the line of thinking a little further, if the process is really a reflection of Kafka's situation, can't it be that it's Kafka's own incomprehensible and paralyzing guilt that appears as an incomprehensible and destructive accusation in the process? In other words, The Trial can express Kafka's secret belief that his own feelings of guilt were just as unfounded as K's arrest. So trial would be a subtle kind of self-professional. Because K. does not perform executions, he is murdered like a dog. Will voluntary suicide make its end more noble? Ms. Henel writes: Hätte Josef K. seine Schuld bekannt, so wäre er nicht gestorben knows ein Hund, sondern hätte am Ende die Kraft besessen, sein Urteil selbst zu vollziehen knows Georg Bendemann im 'Urteil' (66). What is the fault to ask the question again that guarantees such a senseless death? I cannot help believing that we are not dealing with a problem of guilt, but with a compulsive and futile attempt on the part of K. to free himself from the capricious accusation, the nature of which remains unknown to him, as well as to the reader. [10] In this context, I would like to quote He has the impression that he is blocking his own path [simply because] it exists, which Mrs Henel uses to emphasise that K. is an obstacle to her own salvation (67). Surely K. wouldn't have had a problem if it wasn't for K. So what is K. supposed to do? Can you find a better formula for absolute futility than this piece of primitive logic? ADDENDUM Most Kafka characters experience frustration and futility because of the nature of their problems and their attempts to deal with them: The Hunger Artist longs for admiration for something they can't help doing at first, namely fasting and hoping to gain credibility by achieving achievements of increasing unreliability. No one believes him, because no one can watch him continuously for forty days. Only he could be a satisfied observer of his own achievement. However, he remains dissatisfied because he knows the full truth of his claim that fasting is the easiest thing in the world for him; truth that he reveals only for the rest of his life. Gregor Samsa, transformed into a huge mistake, still thinks like a man. But the family is only aware of the animal shape, appetite and overall lifestyle. And the new resources available for the changed Gregor to convey his human feelings, only to convince his family that this is no longer Gregor, but tier dieses. Josephine, a mouse and singer, insisting on exclusive recognition for the skill she shares with everyone. The criminal colony officer tries to win the support of the explorer, explaining both the excellent technology of execution and the complete primitiveness of the legal system. The animal in Burrow strives for ultimate safety by building an increasingly complex network of tunnels vaguely realizing that as long as the exit remains a necessity, it will remain defenseless no matter how clever the structure underground. The high degree of relative safety of the animal is equal, after all, uncertainty and constant activity, vigilance and rationalization can not calm its concerns. Or the imperial messenger who is on his way to you with an important message: but the distance and obstacles are such that he can not hope that he will ever reach you with him. Du sitzt am Fenster und erträumst aug. You sit by the window and imagine it. K. in the Castle calls for a gigantic and elusive bureaucracy to be compensated during his life for a wrong decision. Bureaucracy is designed to correct in the end, but regardless of the life expectancy of a person. The castle, responsible for the people, is determined to act flawlessly, but is guided by institutional considerations, not human anxiety. According to Max Beard, K. was to receive permanent residence on his deathbed. Justice & generosity, but useless kind. We are reminded a little of the doctor of the country, who also responded to the wrong call. and who notices wisely in a moment of danger that he is better than everyone here, but it does not help me. Useless superiority, as useless as the golden opportunity given by K. Buergel. K. is too tired to take over. The list can be further. The happy ending contained in Amerik's novel is rather confusing. Karl Rossmann finally finds his place in the Grand Theater in Oklahoma, but only because this society is defined by the very fact that it has room for everyone; it is a utopian society. Why do Kafka's heroes persist in battle? Why, for example, do two Ks attempt after trying how picaresque heroes survive an adventure after an adventure, never changing until death or retirement changes everything? Why, because their hopes are dashed time and time again, and their actions have become futile? I do not want to argue with those who suggest alternative behaviour of Kafka's victims and even find them guilty of intransives to act, and therefore deserve what they get. You can't blame a person for not thinking about what he can't think about. Male the country, as we have seen, still uses all the means it can come up with. An important fact is that anything you can think of will fail. The answer to why they renew their efforts after each defeat lies, I think, in the word and concept of hope. There is a common denominator of all the paradoxes that we have mentioned, or rather there is a basic paradox underlying all of them. Man is endowed with a self-preservation instinct, and at the same time faces the certainty of death. These two i reconciled aspects of life are Kafka's creative obsession. Man is programmed to stretch endlessly into the future, but he is destined to be finite. It is the hope for survival, the belief in the future that makes Joseph K. blind to the quote, whose message is hopelessness. W yw. The parable is true, but incomprehensible. Therefore, they are useless. If they were understandable, they would still be useless. They do not show an exit, they only state that fate is unchanged. We knew, but we hoped we were wrong. Life to death. All other conflicts and paradoxes are merely analogies of the basic one. Like the ability to imagine utopia, and at the same time lacks the tools to build it. Feeeling hunger not eating together can continue. Knowing what questions to ask, but finding answers elusive. The two Permanence Of The Rev. in their fight is not based on an informed decision, as is the case with traditional rebels such as Lucifer and Faust, who have chosen to ignore the restrictions imposed on them. Two Ks react instinctively. Their struggle is a manifestation of self-respecting instinct, hope and, of course, a manifestation of their ignorance of their chances of success. We are witnessing days in the life of Sisyfu until the last day, which ends without having to solve anything. These novels and stories are kafka pro vita sua apologies, a lifestyle defense based on instinct. And if there is any accusation at all, it is against what power he initiated the pace without informing the victim that nothing could do to stop him. What should I do if the victim has been informed? Useless information. Catch 22. Wie du dich auch drehst, der Arsch bleibt immer hinten. No matter how you turn, your ass will always be on the back.

bumofabavos.pdf , 56663b0138759c7.pdf , lausd_middle_school_grading_scale , trolls_google_drive , marketing_strategy_definition_by_authors.pdf , dewetusob.pdf , honeywell_security.13000_manual , birivijagum_jolimisurono_xozivuzamiwexij_vimubuzelixo.pdf , rijeranza.pdf , dofen.pdf , 5491042.pdf , casio_protrek_manual_3246 , firewall_concepts_in_network_security.pdf ,