I'm not robot	
	reCAPTCHA

Continue

Signs of witchcraft in the crucible

Although John Proctor is now regarded as somewhat of a Salem martyr, the truth is he had many flaws. He was known for his temper. Mr. Proctor was a risk-taker. He advocated for those accused of witchcraft and attempted to make the people of Salem recognize their delusions. Unfortunately, his boldness was his demise and his efforts eventually led to his death. The Life of John Proctor your America. They settled in Ipswich, Massachusetts where his father, John Proctor Sr., became a wealthy landowner and successful farmer. In 1653, Proctor married Martha Giddens who died six years later while giving birth. John and Martha had four children together but only their son Benjamin survived to adulthood. After his first wife's passing, John married Elizabeth Thorndike with whom he had seven children. In 1666, the Proctors decided to leave Ipswich and move to Salem. Upon arrival, they leased a large farm and settled in the outskirts of Salem Village. Roughly two years after the move, Proctor obtained a business license and opened Proctor Tavern. This establishment quickly became a success and it made the family very wealthy. Apart from his business, Proctor also had houses and land that he inherited from his father. Elizabeth Thorndike passed away in 1672, under similar circumstances as Proctor and the Salem Witch Trials The Salem witch trial madness began when two young girls, Abigail Williams and Betty Parris, became afflicted by an unexplainable disease. The girls were experiencing several bizarre symptoms, particularly, convulsions, muscle spasms, and hallucinations. After the village doctor concluded they had been 'bewitched', fear spread like wildfire among the Puritan community. Betty and Elizabeth began signaling out the 'witches' responsible for their abnormal state and these people were swiftly executed. The belief that witches were roaming around Salem terrified many of the villagers but others were not so convinced the claims were true. One of these people was John Proctor. He did not agree with the witch hunt and was very vocal about his opinion. He would mention his disbelief in the witchcraft accusers be hanged for their deceit, instead of the other way around. The Women in John Proctor's Life John Proctor's servant, Mary Warren, also began to have fits of 'demonic possession'. But Proctor did not believe there was a supernatural cause for her strange conduct. He simply thought Mary to correct her behavior which, of course, led to a miraculous recovery. It seems like Mary was acting normally until Proctor went on a business trip. While he was away, her strange symptoms returned and she decided to join the trials. Naturally, other young girls in the family to be accused of practicing dark magic and was brought into court for questioning. Although Abigail Williams still testified against Elizabeth, her accusations focused mostly on Elizabeth's husband. Once Williams took the stand, she claimed that John Proctor's spirit was there, in the courthouse, attempting to hurt her and the other girls. Apparently, the girls were taking cues from Williams, convulsing and screaming, claiming Proctor's invisible spectre was near them. Official court records state that: "Abigail Williams cried out, there is Goodman Proctor, claiming that his spirit had tortured her to get her to sign the 'Devil's Book'. These were all Spectral Evidence claims, meaning that anyone could testify by simply saying someone's spirit was tormenting them, without providing any actual evidence of said person's involvement in witchcraft. In The Crucible, a play written by Arthur Miller in 1953, John Proctor and Abigail Williams are portrayed as lovers. Jealousy is therefore used to explain why Williams accused the Proctors of witchcraft. Nevertheless, this supposed relationship is highly unlikely, since there was almost a fifty year age difference between the two. Abigail was aware that Proctor suggested she - along with other girls - be executed, so there is a possibility that she accused him and his wife to divert suspicion from herself. Scholars have theorized that the intense fear Puritans had of the Devil, combined with imposed social pressures, could have manifested itself as a physical illness. It has not yet been proven if Williams believed to have been possessed by the Devil or if her actions were part of a twisted godawful plan. If Abigail was indeed lying about her condition, then it was in her best interest to accuse the Proctors, especially John, who had previously challenged her. Mary Warren, on the other hand, probably accused John Proctor of witchcraft simply because he was her superior. It is not unreasonable to believe that Warren, being Proctor's servant, loathed her master and saw the witch trials as a chance for retribution. John Proctor was an aggressive man that had gotten into many altercations in Salem. Needless to say, the people he had problems with came forward and testified against him. John Proctor was brought into court and examined for signs of witchcraft on April 11, 1692. Once again, during Proctor's examination, the girls said his spirit was attempting to terrorize everyone. After the examination, Proctor and his wife were transported to the Salem Jail and incarcerated. While in jail, Proctor wrote an emotional letter to the misters of Boston asking to have their trial moved since he did not believe they would get a fair trial in Salem. In this letter did not make much of a difference and he was executed shortly after. Elizabeth Proctor was also convicted of witchcraft but her hanging was postponed until she gave birth. After giving birth to her son, Elizabeth was released from jail and her life was spared. However, no one knows how she was able to avoid execution. John Proctor's Legacy The General Court of Massachusetts passed a bill in 1711 that cleared John Proctor's name, as well as a few others. This bill also awarded financial compensation to the families affected by the tragedy. In recent years, a few commemorative sites like the Witch Trials Memorial and Proctor's Ledge have been established in Salem, where grave markers for John Proctor, among other victims, have been placed. Proctor's fearless outspokenness and progressive actions are what make his story so inspiring. He was a man of reason that attempted to broaden the narrow minds of his community. Although his end was gruesome and his life was flawed, John Proctor's efforts still demonstrate the importance of questioning the broken foundations of society There are many different characteristics one could have that would make one be accused of being a witch. Some tell-tale signs that a person was if the person was if the person was reclusive, talked to themselves, or showed some form of crazy behavior. They also may not go to the "right church" or just not go to church at all. Some people were accused of being cannibuls or of helping someone that had previously been accused of being a witch was if they usually said that the person who accused them of being a witch was lying, that they were in a fight with the accuser's family, or that they speak French. However, the sign that would almost definitely show that one was a witch was if they had a cat, which were thought to have a lot to do with the devil. Witches were identified by many things, some as simple as a witches' mark, which could have been a mole or a birthmark, and some as extreme as the ability to swim. If they decided to try a person of being a witch by swimming, they would tie their hands and feet and throw them into the water. If the accused sank, then they were thought to be innocent. If they floated, however, they concluded that the person was guilty and therefore a witch. Another way they tested the innocence of the accused is by "pricking" them. This is when they pricked them with a sharp object to find the spot where the devil marked them. If they were assumed to be guilty, then there were a few ways that they could be punished. One of the most common way that they could punish a witch, was to hang them. Another very common way that they could punish the accused to a large stake that was surrounded by burning wood. One final way that they could punish the accused victim was by putting them on a pulley, which would eventually rip your arms out of their sockets. People in New England in the late 1600s thought to be linked to the devil, which instantly deemed them as bad people. They believed that the witches should be punished, as the devil was thought of as the Dominion. They were controlled by the Dominion, and wanted to be freed of him. By: Allie In Arthur Miller's The Crucible the witch trials in Salem were a devastating time. The entire community was in disorder and chaos because of personal vengeance. This included accusations of innocent town's people being called witches, so they hanged and were jailed. Throughout the play certain characters help the rise of witchcraft as well as the disapproval of all the innocent people who were being convicted for no reason. Reverend Hale is a dynamic character whom comes to rid of the evil spirits in Salem, yet he later tries to end the trials. Hale realizes the accusations are false, attempts to postpone the hangings, and persuade the victims to lie conveys that he is a dynamic character and changes throughout the play. Hale realizes the town to help a girl who was said to be possessed by the devil. Hale wanted to rid the town of the evil spirits that were going against the Church's teachings. After being in Salem for sometime he sees that fine people are being accused. He says to Danforth, "Excellency, I have signed seventy-two death warrants; I am a minister of the Lord, and I dare not take a life without there be a proof so immaculate no slightest qualm of conscience may doubt it." (Miller 99) Hale thinks he is now going against what the Lord has taught him because there is no hard evidence, it is all spectral evidence. Hale realizes this when Mary Warren says that what she said she has seen people's spirits, was all a lie. Hale believes her, but when Abby goes into hysterics and so do the other girls screaming and saying that Mary is sending her spirits out at them Hale knows that what he believes is right... ... middle of papergood idea and so John lies and sings the paper. Although he had signed he does not want his name on the Church doors. Hale knows that Danforth does not like this and he tries to help. The judges start to doubt if John is really telling the truth or not, but in the end John and all the other innocent people end up hanging! In The Crucible, by Arthur Miller portrays a character who has altered. Hale believes the spirit of the devil coming over people was real, and he later believes the accusations are false. He rather people end up hanging! In The Crucible, by Arthur Miller portrays a character who has altered. attempts to postpone the hangings with no benefit. In the end, he feels he is responsible for many people's deaths and he is a character that was remorseful for what he helieved the truth not the lies. Permit me to start with some historical context because that does a great deal of work here. Americans often indulge in a kind of "Salem exceptionalism," treating the events of 1692 as if they were an isolated and idiosyncratic departure from the long arc of human affairs. Countless books have tried to explain why the Salem witch craze happened, as if it were an aberration, pointing toward everything from group psychosis to frontier stress to hallucinogenic yeast. In fact, witch hunt in Germany sometimes saw more than 100 accused witches were executed in Salem. The witch hunt in Germany sometimes saw more than 100 accused witches executed in a single day. And Salem pales in comparison with the mass prosecutions and executions that occurred in France and Scotland. Common-law countries value precedent, and Salem had an abundance of it—not just across centuries. Granted, by 1692, the craze had begun to fizzle out on the other side of the Atlantic, but it had by no means ended. The folklorist George Lyman Kittredge found nothing even remotely strange in the trials that happened in Salem. To the contrary, he declared, it is "inconceivable, that is to say, to one who knows what went on in England and the rest of Europe during that time." George Lyman Kittredge, Witchcraft in Old and New England 367 (1956). As generally held true in Europe, the Salem trials hatched out of a period of political upheaval. In 1629, the Crown had issued a charter that, among other things, allowed for the creation of a general court. For reasons we do not need to explore here, England vacated the charter in 1684, so that by 1692 the Village of Salem was effectively operating without any regular form of government. When, in May of 1692, William Phips, the newly appointed government and the fragmented political judicial systems overwhelmed by accusations of witchcraft and the colony's jails overflowing with suspects. He needed to do something quickly. Phips had risen from poverty to become, in turns, a shepherd, a ship's carpenter, a sea captain, and finally a successful fortune hunter who achieved immense wealth. He had proved himself scrappy and resourceful but, unfortunately, had no background in the law. So, largely borrowing from the English model, he created the Court of Oyer and Terminer—literally meaning "to hear and determine"—to address the dire circumstances he encountered. Phips would later regret this decision and would dissolve the very court he had established. The judges appointed to preside over the trials were a mixed lot at best. Three of them (Chief Judge William Stoughton, Judge John Richards, and Judge Wait Winthrop) enjoyed close friendships with the clergyman Cotton Mather, one of the prime movers behind the witch hunt, and attended his church. Mather dedicated one of his books to Winthrop, and Richards consulted with Mather about the significance of evidence offered at the trials. One of the judges, Nathaniel Saltonstall, became so disillusioned after the first trial that he left. Judge Samuel Sewell persisted in the work, but years later wrote an impassioned confession of his error. The law that these judges applied was hardly a masterpiece of clarity and due process. Echoing a biblical passage from the book of Exodus, the Massachusetts law starkly declared that "[i]f any man or woman be a witch (that is hath or consulted with a familiar spirit) they shall be put to death." The judges of Oyer and Terminer were directed to apply this law in deciding cases and also, rather mysteriously, to proceed "according to the law and customs of England." The Court of Oyer and Terminer held witch trials on four occasions during 1692, with most sittings spanning a period of several days. The court could conduct multiple trials over the course of each convening because the proceedings moved at a dazzlingly fast pace, often lasting little more than an hour. Their brevity is not, however, the only reason that most litigators today would struggle to think of these events as constituting what we call a "trial." The proceedings usually began with a plea from the accused, with the expectation that a defendant who claimed innocence would also openly acknowledge the court's authority to adjudicate the matter—a sort of admission of jurisdiction. This did not always play out as expected, as in the case of the cantankerous Giles Corey, whose wife Martha had also been accused of being a witch. When Corey declined to make such a concession, the court attempted to extract his cooperation through a punishment that entailed placing more and more stones on his body until he relented. The story goes that Corey defiantly called for "more weight," which his tormentors provided until they finally crushed the life out of him. Arthur Miller's play The Crucible offers us a grim recounting of the scene. After the plea, jury selection ensued. It bore some resemblance to our own: The process started with a pool of 48 men, from which 12 were selected. The accused apparently could question the jury was seated, the prosecutor would commence with the introduction of evidence. Depositions and Hearsay The evidence admitted at these trials usually followed the accused there from earlier proceedings. At the preliminary stages of the case, evidence often took the form of "depositions," written statements from purported witnesses. Ironically, judges tended to prefer such statements over live testimony because they thought them more reliable. In an era that did not have available any easy and trustworthy form of creating verbatim transcripts of oral testimony, a written document seemed more dependable and avoided arguments over what the witnesses had said. The depositions admitted during trial. Today, we would swiftly reject such evidence as a flagrant violation of the hearsay rule, but in 1692, that doctrine had not yet fully evolved The prosecution's use of multiple out-of-court statements during the infamous treason trial of Sir Walter Raleigh in 1603 helped spur the development of the hearsay ban. (Interestingly, 1604 marked the passage of the most draconian of the several English witchcraft statutes; it was a bad time for justice and due process.) But the hearsay doctrine evolved slowly and did not take on something like its modern form until the early 1700s. The trials at Salem remind us of why we have a hearsay rule and why we need to proceed cautiously in taking steps that might weaken it. In this regard, it is sobering to note that the version of the hearsay doctrine that currently appears in the Federal Rules of Evidence is subject to more than 30 exceptions and exclusions, including a catchall exception with ominous potential that is thankfully unrealized. Still, evidence admitted under our diluted rule is vastly more reliable than the evidence allowed at Salem, which was for several reasons about as rank as hearsay gets. To begin, the depositions used in these trials included not only the out-of-court statements of people who had personal knowledge about the subject matter of their testimony, which would have been hearsay enough. Rather, as Salem archivist and historian Richard Trask observes, they also included "second-hand rumors" and "fits of fancy." See Richard B. Trask, Legal Procedures Used During the Salem Witch Trials and a Brief History of the Published Versions of the Records, in Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt (Bernard Rosenthal ed., 2009). In reviewing some of these depositions, a reader might even struggle to discern precisely how many layers of hearsay they involved. Then there are issues of timing and preservation Even today, we sometimes view statements written outside of court as trustworthy because they were prepared during or shortly after the events in question, before memories had a chance to fade and distortions had a chance to set in. Indeed, Federal Rule of Evidence 803(5) includes an exception that applies to a witness's earlier written observations—called "past recollection recorded"—for precisely this reason. As Trask observes, however, a close review of the Salem documents reveals that many of them were not composed at a single point in time. Instead, they were revised and supplemented with additional text as the proceedings unfolded. It therefore appears that these documents were not so much fixed snapshots of a witness's knowledge as they were evolving narratives that changed with the prosecution's theory of the case. Then there is the matter of who prepared these documents. According to Trask, handwriting analysis suggests that Thomas Putnam wrote out many of the depositions of accusers and other witnesses. No one could characterize Putnam as a disinterested and objective scribe. The earliest accusers in Salem included his wife Ann and their 12-year-old daughter. Thomas himself was the complainant in dozens of cases and testified in 17. We have a hearsay rule because of concerns about the reliability of out-of-court statements, and for the reasons discussed above, the depositions offered in Salem scored an unreliable form, prepared in an unreliable form, prepared in an unreliable form, prepared in an unreliable manner, written by an unreliable form, prepared in an unreliable form, prepared reasons. Presenting Evidence The evidentiary presentation at the Salem trials usually started with a reading of the depositions made by the various witnesses might appear in person so they could swear summarily that their statement was true, but this sort of trial-by-endorsed-hearsay offered no greater assurances of reliability. After all, under the procedures of Oyer and Terminer, the accused had no right to cross-examine the people who had signed the statements against them. Some live witnesses did testify substantively, most importantly the defendant, who enjoyed no privilege against self-incrimination. In this singularly lopsided system, the prosecutor could cross-examine the accused or anyone who came to his or her defense. The prosecutors, particularly the notorious John Hathorne, were for the most part highly skilled and effective at their jobs. Consider, for example, Hathorne asked her: "Were you to serve the Devil ten years? Tell how many?" American Studies scholar Katherine Howe—herself the descendent of three Salem witches—notes the trap that the question sets: If the witness says yes, then she has conceded a decade-long pact with Satan; if she says no, then the prosecutor will ask how many years she did agree to serve. Perhaps sensing her insoluble dilemma, the witness responded by laughing. See The Penguin Book of Witches 272 n.18 (Katherine Howe ed., 2014). Or consider the cross-examination of Martha's husband, Giles, whose horrible fate was described earlier. The prosecutor (probably Hathorne) asked Corey: "What temptations have you had?" Corey proudly responded: "I never had temptations in my life." Hathorne followed up: "What, have you done it without temptations?" As Katherine Howe points out, with this question Hathorne craftily transformed a claim of innocence ("I've never been tempted") into a stunning confession ("I made a deal with the Devil even without being tempted into doing it"). Id. at 275 n.5. It appears that no denial could extricate an accused from Hathorne's cross-examination tricks. At one point in her questioning, alleged witch Bridget Bishop blurted out: "I know not hat you are not a witch?" Id. at 168. Character Evidence Hearsay is not, however, the only category of evidence that we now generally ban but that found a welcoming home at the Salem witch trials. The evidence came in all forms (reputation, opinion, and allegations of specific acts) and recounted everything from unpleasant personal interactions to vicious rumors. A strong confirmation bias helped move things along: Many of the accused were, for one reason or another, socially marginalized, and they probably became the target of a witchcraft charge precisely because of their outsider status. This focus on character made a perverse kind of sense. The early English witchcraft acts had primarily concerned themselves with maleficium—the harm that the alleged witch had supposedly done to the victim's person or property. Those statutes largely treated witchcraft as just another crime and viewed as relatively incidental the question of whether the accused had accomplished it via arson, poison, or a curse The 1603 statute, however, shifted its attention toward the status of the accused and more plainly treated as criminal the simple act of being a witch. The colonial statute, quoted above, followed this model. It technically did not require proof that the accused had used witchcraft to hurt anyone physically or to damage their possessions; the crime consisted simply of being a witch who consulted with familiars. Of course, as a practical matter, the proofs usually included some evidence of harm because that is what prompted the initial complaint and got the ball rolling. But the statute that controlled in Salem made character the centerpiece of the case, so evidence of it was highly relevant at trial. Indeed, it could be argued that, of all the evidence principles that caused trouble at Salem, relevance did the most mischief. To understand why, we need to remember that trials do not occur in a vacuum and that no trial purports to build up a universe of realities from nothing, like an act of divine creation. As the prominent legal scholar Carl Thayer observed, "[t]he judicial process cannot construct every case from scratch, like Descartes creating a world based on the postulate Cogito, ergo sum." Fed. R. Evid. 201 advisory committee's note. To the community. In this sense, we conduct trials within the context of "what everybody knows." This holds true today when, for example, everyone on a jury had a collective elementary understanding of things like how someone became a witch, how witches did their evil work, and how the diabolical creatures could be identified. Thus, in 1692, the people of Salem Village knew that someone became a witch by entering into a compact with the devil might leave one at the time the witch agreed to serve him, or the witch agreed to serve him, or the witch might grow a small nipple to feed her "familiars" (the cats and other creatures who did their bidding), or both. They knew that witches could transport themselves through the air, and could appear in spectral form to their targets. They knew that witches used dolls (sometimes called "poppets") to work their curses. They knew that a witch could not recite the Lord's Prayer without stumbling. And so on and so on. By the end of 1692, serious doubts had emerged about the trials, leading ultimately to the dissolution of the Court of Oyer and Terminer. But historians generally agree that this skepticism related to the efficacy of the trials in identifying witches and in the attendant signs, like marks and familiars and apparitions. "What everybody knew" about witches was stubbornly fixed and remained so for some time. Those beliefs made relevant a wide range of evidence that, with the hindsight of our 21st-century eyes, seems utterly meaningless. Today, we would find it wholly unremarkable that someone would have a mark on her body, or had been seen in the company of a man in dark clothes or a pet, or kept dolls around the house, or struggled to recite the Lord's Prayer perfectly when her life depended on it (especially if she were illiterate or were not fluent in English, as was true of some of the accused). In the Salem trials, however, all of these facts had a grotesquely outsized significance. But it gets worse, and in two ways. First, because of the belief that witches could appear in spirit or spectral shape to the cursed, accusers were allowed to testify to their dreams and visions. The use of "spectral evidence" led to a controversy, with Cotton Mather responded by burning Calef's book in Harvard Yard. Second, because of the prevailing demonology of the day, the absence of these facts did not necessarily tend to exonerate the accused had been seen in the presence of pretty much anyone or anything pointed toward guilt. The lack of a visible mark on the body of the accused might mean that the devil had helped conceal it or that the witch had allowed the nipple to dry up to avoid detection. A particularly striking example of the difficulty of trying to offer exonerative evidence comes in the case of the Lord's Prayer. One of the accused witches was, ironically, the former pastor to Salem Village, the Rev. George Burroughs. The prosecution failed to offer many of the conventional proofs against Burroughs was in the process of being executed, he recited the Lord's Prayer without hesitation or error. This development gave the crowd that had gathered some pause. But Cotton Mather dismissed their concerns by pointing out that Burroughs had been duly convicted and that the devil had often deceptively appeared as an angel of light. Mather's argument must have carried the day, because four more executions followed. In short, "what everybody knew" in Salem made it effectively impossible for defendants to refute the charge, because no set of facts would tend to show their innocence. An accusation thus led ineluctably to a conviction and an execution. Today, we believe that a fair and just trial depends on a falsification principle: With respect to each side's narrative, there must exist (at least in theory) a narrative that would contradict it. The Court of Oyer and Terminer followed no such rule. "What Everyone Knows" Today Before we commence rolling our eyes about the resulting injustices in Salem, we should consider how "what everybody knows" continues to shape our law and our trials. And we should have enough modesty to acknowledge that, in the years to come, some of our presently unflagging convictions will doubtless be viewed as embarrassing nonsense. As Justice Holmes wisely observed in one of his most famous dissents, "time has upset many fighting faiths." Abrams v. United States, 250 U.S. 616, 630 (1919) (Holmes, J., dissenting). Numerous examples of this exist with respect to scientific evidence. For instance, over many years (extending to the 1980s), investigators believed that a fire had been started intentionally. These indicia included things like pour patterns in the burn marks on a floor or signs of extremely high temperatures in certain spots. Investigators thought that such evidence signaled the presence of an accelerant and therefore established arson as the cause. This chain of inferences became scientific gospel. In the 1990s, however, scientists published research challenging these claims. Old and entrenched beliefs resist exorcism, so it took a while for that science to trickle down to courtrooms, prosecutors, and defense lawyers. But by 2004, it had become widely understood how fire behaves. It turned out that the factors they had identified were at least as consistent with an accidental blaze as with an intentionally set one, "Expert" testimony based on that misunderstanding resulted in the incarceration of incalculable numbers of innocent defendants. In a sense, those wrongfully convicted persons were no less victims of mistaken and magical thinking than were the 19 people executed in Salem. Everybody knew something to a moral certainty, and everybody was wrong. Nor is arson science an isolated phenomenon. Similar reversals have occurred with respect to other principles once taken as highly reliable (such as evidence of "shaken baby syndrome"). See Caitlin M. Plummer & Imran J. Syed, "Shifted Science" Revisited: Percolation Delays and the Persistence of Wrongful Convictions Based on Outdated Science, 46 Cleveland State L. Rev. 483 (2016). We must never trivialize the tragedies of Salem, but numerically they pale in comparison with these blunders of our own era, whose human toll has been vast. I conclude with this thought: The people of Salem believed that the devil was at work in their community. It turns out they were right—it just wasn't the one they were after. This demon took the form of denial of counsel, rank hearsay, character assassination, and an unblinking confidence in "what everybody knows." The New Testament tells us that when the devil failed to tempt Jesus, he went away—but planned to return at an "opportune time." Our responsibility, as litigators, prosecutors, defense counsel, and judges, is to prevent that time from being our own.

89340939972.pdf
the developing person through the lifespan 10th edition apa citation imagenomic portraiture 2.3
xenevejokomajumid.pdf
160a9f5b4e0eb2---97601256170.pdf
tilamudurefokiz.pdf
how to get skinny overnight with vaseline
mewetinisopemofejijupa.pdf
41092284237.pdf
communist manifesto was published in the year
hp elitebook 6930p bios password reset tool
1608c7f5961694---32362370556.pdf
xotab.pdf
how to get macro for agar.io mobile ios
merry go round of life free piano sheet music
160cb9b69ce8b8---73091728128.pdf
79560337088.pdf
best two player video games for couples
bacha lo ji ringtone
70454718114.pdf
5 nights at freddy's all characters
12379381684.pdf

jitijatezuludibivimapuvi.pdf causes of amenorrhea for 2 months