

**Narratives of Persuasion:
Filmic Texts
Literary Texts and Legal Texts**

Wimal Dissanayake

ABSTRACT

It is commonly believed that law is objective, neutral, dispassionate, fair and constitutes an impersonal way of arriving at the truth. However, in this paper, the author argues that legal texts in fact are no less subjective, partial and indeterminate than literary or filmic texts. To prove his points, the author examines closely a modern Japanese film *Death by Hanging*, in which a Korean descendant is charged with murder and brought to trial in a Japanese courthouse and novels of Piyadasa Sirisena, a Sri Lankan novelist who writes his novels like legal texts, to contend that literary texts and filmic texts are not much different from legal texts; they all share the common similarity as narratives of persuasion, in which incidents, episodes and tropes are selected and manipulated to emphasize a particular point of view, displaying a high degree of affinity to a legal narrative where a lawyer is pleading his case. Likewise, similar to a literary text, a legal text, whether a narrative constructed by a prosecutor, a defence lawyer or a judge, is a form of writing, a form of rhetoric constructed to persuade potential audiences. Therefore, it is argued cogently that literary texts, filmic texts and legal texts in general can all be grouped usefully as narratives of persuasion, "textualization that submit to a sense of coherence and closure, but never with any success."

KEY WORDS

narrative of persuasion
law
legal text
filmic text

Piyadasa Sirisena
*A Commotion in a Manor
House* (Valvavvaka
Palahilavva)

literal text
Oshima Nagisa
Death by Hanging (Koshikei)

form of rhetoric
model of communication

The objective of this paper is to examine the commonalities among filmic texts, literary texts and legal texts as a way of enforcing the point that all of these texts are essentially narratives of persuasion. It is the general and widely-held belief that legal texts are the polar opposite of literary and filmic texts. Although there are some significant differences among these texts, it is my view that the similarities among them far outweigh the dissimilarities and that they all can usefully be brought under the general category of narratives of persuasion. I propose to this by examining a filmic text and a literary text from two widely different Asian cultures.

Oshima Nagisa is one of the most important modern Japanese filmmakers. His film *Death by Hanging* (Koshikei) made in 1968 generated a great deal of interest and comment both inside and outside Japan. This film is based on a true case that took place some ten years before Oshima decided to make the film. Lin Jin Wu is of Korean descent. He was born in Tokyo, and was the third child in his family. He had two older and two younger siblings. He was charged with the murder of Ota Yoshie, a student at the Komatsugawa High School. This case engendered a great deal of public attention and outrage. Four years after Lin Jin Wu was arrested, he was put to death by hanging at the Miyagi prison. The prosecutors of this case painted a picture of a brutal and hard-hearted murderer. They structured their legal narrative in such a way as to convince the jury of the brutality, savagery of the killing by portraying Lin Jin Wu as a callous murderer and a despicable character.

Oshima Nagisa saw inscribed in this case some of the thematics that has preoccupied him—plight of minorities in Japan, the hegemony of nationalist metanarratives and the counterproductivity of capital punishment. He constructed a different narrative and brought into focus some of the discursive tensions associated with these issues. Lin Jin Wu came from a poor social background, and was subject to numerous hardships and privations from his earliest days. His father was a poor laborer seeking to make ends meet, and his mother was a deaf mute. As a child, Li displayed a great intelligence and a capacity for hard work. However, the circumambient social conditions

worked against him. He was of Korean descent and given the plight of the Koreans in Japan at the time and the low esteem in which they were held, he was unable to make much headway either economically or socially. Indeed, the lawyers defending him constructed an alternative narrative, foregrounding his social disadvantages and disenfranchisements. They emphasized repeatedly the denial of full citizenship to Li because of his ethnicity and the ensuing frustrations, disappointments and resentments.

For some time, Oshima had been preoccupied with the plight of the Koreans in Japan and wanted to call attention of the public to their misfortunes. He had textualized this issue in some of his earlier films. In the trial of Lin Jin Wu, and the sequence of events culminating in his death by hanging, Oshima perceived a metaphORIZATION of the predicament of Koreans living in Japan. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that he elected to make a narrative film based on this case, but with his own distinctive vision of it. In reflecting on his film *Death by Hanging*, Oshima observed, "It is true, however, that *Death by Hanging* had as its starting point the events set in motion by the criminal Ri Chin'u, perpetrator of the Komatsugawa High School incident. In my opinion, Ri Chin'u was the most intelligent and sensitive youth produced by postwar Japan, as demonstrated by the collection of Ri's letters edited by Boku Junan, *Punishment, Death and Love*. Ri's prose ought to be included in high school text books. Ri, however, committed a crime and was sentenced to the death penalty."¹ Oshima goes on to remark that he had been contemplating devoting a work to Ri ever since he committed his crime in 1958. In 1963, one year after Ri's execution, Oshima wrote a script based on this incident. During this period he pursued his interest of exploring cinematically issues dealing with youth, crime, minorities, rhetorics of nationhood in such films as *The Tomb of Youth*, *The Diary of Yunbogi*, *A Study of Japanese Bawdy Songs*. He remarked that, "both crime and the Korean problem are ultimately national concerns."² Commenting on the filmic text and the social text, Oshima Nagisa observed, "The two contexts in which the nation believes it is permissible to kill people are the death penalty and war. We say no to death penalty and war. We object strenuously to their existence. However, our objection will carry no weight unless articulated by an ideological level that transcends the nation. Based on Ri Chin'u, who came close to achieving that, we created R, a character who did not die after execution."³

In keeping with his deeply held convictions and cherished beliefs, Oshima created an alternative narrative of the life and crime of Lin Jin Wu. He challenged the original narrative constructed by the prosecutors in order to produce his critical and oppositional discourse on the themes mentioned

above. He speculated on a course of events that would have been set in motion had Lin Jin Wu not died by hanging. Indeed, the film constitutes an interweaving of fantasy and realism in an interesting and provocative way. In *Death by Hanging*, the protagonist refuses to die and so the death by hanging does not transpire. And he cannot be hanged again until he regains consciousness and is made aware of the crime he has committed and for which he is being tried. The officials responsible for the enforcement of the law seek to restore R to his original self, and the filmic diegesis is constructed around these efforts. The film progresses through seven stages, with each of them being introduced through written titles.

The film opens with a direct question to the audience regarding the morality of capital punishment. And with this question resonating in our mind, we move on to the prison compound. We are shown the prison and its location, the execution chamber and its inside. The narrative voice tells us that there is a trapdoor in the middle of the execution chamber, and that it is about three feet square. And above it hangs the noose. The camera shows us the trapdoor and the noose hanging from the ceiling. The first section of the film is titled, *R's Body Rejected Capital Punishment*. The execution of R takes place as decreed, but to their utter surprise and dismay, the officials in charge of the execution realize that he has not died and has only lost consciousness. This unanticipated turn of events plunges the law enforcement officers, the education officer and the pastor into utter confusion.

The second section is titled, *R Does Not Accept Being R*. The law enforcement officers manage to revive R, but he cannot recount anything that took place prior to his execution. This section is given over to a replay of R's criminal act by the law enforcement officers; the entire reenactment has an air of absurdity as the various officers seek to impersonate the different characters associated with R's life. This is a remarkably imaginative and cogent way of destabilizing the putatively unified narrative of capital punishment with its chain of causes and effects, and offering alternative subjectivities. The third section titled, *R Acknowledges the Existence of R as Stranger*, and stages how the law officers proceed with their replaying of the crime. R is pulled into this illusory world. R is questioned rigorously, and through this process we begin to gather information about his history of marginalization and victimization as a Korean living in Japan. The ideological interpellation and the ascribed subjectivity are crucial to the meaning of this section. Interestingly, in this section, it is a law enforcement officer who depicts the childhood miseries of R.

The fourth section of *R Tries to be R*. Here the focus is on the power of imagination of R as an enabling means of liberating himself from the misery,

the oppressive atmosphere around him. And as Oshima sees it, the overlap between appearance and reality is overwhelming. It is against this background that R reenacts his murder. The power of R assumes a metonymic valence in this section signifying Oshima's attempts to discursively produce a different R through his narrative. *R Was Proven to be a Korean*, with all its connotative force, is the heading of the fifth section of the film. This section operates at the level of the imaginary, and the nature and magnitude of the problem of being Korean in Japan is given persuasive figurality. What this section allegorizes is the predicament of minorities in any society who are desubjectified. The next section is called, *R Finally Becomes R* and reconfigures contrastive juxtaposition between R and the government officers. R is thoughtful, reflective and rational while the officers appear to be frivolous. As we enter more deeply into the inward space of R's imagination, we begin to understand more clearly his motivations and wellsprings of behavior.

The seventh section is given the headline, *R Accepts Being R for the Sake of All R's*. This section opens with R shown against the Japanese flag, as he says that he understands that he is not R. We are made to understand that capital punishment is a form of social justice championed by the nation-state of Japan. In view of the fact that R has accepted himself as R, the prosecutors seek to go through the process of execution once again. However, R asserts defiantly that although he is R, he is not the R they take him to be. He says that the R they now see before themselves is not the R who committed the crime, clearly making things more complicated for the prosecution. Interestingly, the exchange between R and the prosecutors transpires against the backdrop of the Japanese flag, which functions as a dominant trope in the filmic text. The prosecution maintains that the concept of nation is clearly in R's mind and that as long as it exists as a reality for him, he should feel guilty and be punished for his heinous crime. R retorts that as long as there is this nation that is bent on making him appear guilty, he will proclaim his innocence. He will boldly face his death by accepting R for the sake of all R's.

What Oshima has done, then, is to construct an entirely different narrative of the sequence of events, and the image of the protagonist that emerges is very different from that constructed by the prosecutors. Both are narratives of persuasion. Both seek, through the power of the narrativization, to sway the intended audience, in one case the jury, and in the other the general public.

Let us now consider a literary narrative from an entirely different culture, that of Sri Lanka. Piyadasa Sirisena is generally referred to as the "father of Sinhalese fiction." He was an ardent nationalist who sought to use

the medium of fiction to fight off colonial influences and establish the glory of the Sinhalese race and Buddhist culture. All his novels are characterized by the same narrative format that bears an uncanny resemblance to a lawyer presenting his case. In other words, his literary narratives and legal narratives can be brought under the same rubric. Piyadasa Sirisena's novels are very much like legal texts, in that he constructs his narratives to plead a case. His heroes are ardent nationalists, who are deeply influenced by Buddhist culture and emblemize what is best in tradition; they are anti-Western, anti-imperialist and their inevitable victories signify the triumph of good over evil. In all his novels, whether they were romances or detective stories, the structure of the narrative was the same, displaying a high degree of affinity to a legal narrative where a lawyer is pleading his case.

Let us for example consider his novel, *A Commotion in a Manor House* (Valavvaka Palahilavva). This is ostensibly a detective story; the detective is the famous Kongoda Wickramapala who has displayed his forensic skills and ingenuities in some of his Sirisena's earlier novels as well. This novel, as with most of his other novels, is crowded with people and episodes. But the central focus of the novel is on Kongoda Wickramapala. His mission to find Navaratna Bandara and Leelawathie Menike who have been abducted by some cruel noblemen and their allies. As a detective Wickramapala shares a number of characteristics with other protagonists of Piyadasa Sirisena. He incarnates all the virtues valorized by Buddhist culture. He is upright, courageous, values the Buddhist way of life, fights injustice, enlightens people on the right way to live and avoid sin and misery. He has great powers of persuasion, of convincing people of his convictions; he is ever willing to engage people in debate and win them over. In this novel, Kongoda Wickramapala encounters a series of hair-raising adventures, and at the end triumphs—his triumph signifies a larger victory of the forces of good over evil.

This novel, like all his other novels, are constructed along the lines of a legal text. His ultimate aim is to convince the reading public through his narrative of the rightness of his views. He selects incidents, emphasizes episodes, uses tropes, with the sole purpose of constructing a narrative of persuasion. In this regard, Piyadasa Sirisena's novels, Oshima Nagisa's film and legal texts (narratives offered by prosecutors, defence lawyers and judges) in general can all be grouped usefully as narratives of persuasion sharing a multitude of features in common. All these narratives are textualizations that submit to a sense of coherence and closure, but never with any success.

We need to explore this concept of legal texts being narratives of persuasion against the background of mainstream thinking on law and literature and cinema. It is widely believed that law is objective, neutral,

dispassionate, fair and constitutes an impersonal way of arriving at the truth. On the other hand literature and film are subjective, partial, and have a high degree of emotional content. It is contended that legal texts deal with determinate meanings where as literary and filmic texts are characterized by indeterminacy of meaning. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that legal texts are no less subjective, partial and indeterminate than literary or filmic texts. Legal texts, whether these are narratives constructed by prosecutors or defence lawyers or the judge are written with words. Hence they are a form of writing. And all forms of writing carry surpluses of meaning and hence ambiguities and ambivalences of meaning. Legal texts, just as much as literary texts, are constructions from a definite standpoint, arguing a specific case. Persuasion is the dominant objective of all these forms of writing.

When one examines the legal philosophical literature, one can identify two main camps—objectivists and subjectivists. Objectivists argue—and they constitute the preponderant majority—that law is an objective and impartial quest for truth and that it deals with a set of determinate meanings. Subjectivists, on the other hand, contend that law is not characterized by any definitiveness of meaning and that it is personal, subjective and political. They maintain that legal texts, like literary texts, are self-referential and that the meanings that they contain are linguistically relative, susceptible of a plurality of interpretations none of which enjoys any privileged status. There is a third group emerging, represented notably in the writings of Stanley Fish, who seek to avoid both these extreme positions by focusing on the idea of an interpretive legal community. This concept grows out of Fish's earlier work on literary interpretation. It gives up on the notion of truth as an objective of the legal enterprise and puts forward the idea that meanings in law are plural, admit of a multiplicity of interpretations and that meanings are determined by the interpretive community. What characterizes this interpretive community is shared frameworks, understandings, normativities, traditions and vocabularies. According to Fish, then, there are interpretive communities that operate in relation to literary texts, cinematic texts as well as legal texts. This idea of interpretive communities is not without its problems and drawbacks; however, it does call attention to a significant ambience in which meaning-making takes place and the inevitable rhetoricity associated with all legal texts. Oshima's film or Piyadasa Sirisena's novels could be best understood and interpreted within these interpretive communities just as much as legal texts could be best engaged within interpretive legal communities.

The concept of representation is central to legal texts just as much as it is central to literary texts and cinematic texts. To represent something through

words or images is to present a particular viewpoint, a particular angle on the world, and to construct or at least lead toward a narrative. And representations are not passive reflections but active re-creations where questions of power and ideology play a vital part. In Piyadasa Sirisena's representation of Sir Lankan society, one sees how the author's vision of the world, his valorizations of history and tradition, his antipathy to Westernization and cultural modernity play a shaping and determining role. Clifford Geertz says that, "The realization that legal facts are made not born, are socially constructed, as an anthropologist would put it, by everything from evidence rules, courtroom etiquette, and law reporting traditions, to advocacy techniques, the rhetoric of judges, and the scholasticism of law school education"⁴ has great implications for the rhetoricity implied in law. He goes on to say, "If the 'fact-configurations' are not merely things found lying about the world and carried bodily into court, show-and-tell style, but close-edited diagrams of reality the matching process itself produces, the whole thing looks a bit like sleight-of-hand."⁵ However, Geertz goes on to explain that it is no sleight-of-hand but rather a more basic phenomenon upon which all cultures rest, namely, that of representation. As he rightly observes, the rendering of fact so that lawyers can plead it, judges can listen to it, juries can arbitrate it is just that—it is a rendering, a representation. If legal texts are representations, just as much as literary texts, then what we need to focus on are the constructedness, provisionality, rhetoricity associated with them.

A distinguishing feature of any narrative is its proclivity to produce knowledge. The sequencing of events, the troping, the representational strategies all contribute to this. It is indeed interesting to observe that the word "narrative" comes from the Latin word "narrare" and has close etymological connections with knowledge as represented by such words as "gnostic" and "gnana" in Sanskrit. This production of knowledge is closely associated with narrative coherence. All narrativizations seek to achieve a sense of coherence; however, as has been repeatedly pointed out, this is an elusive goal. When we examine the narrative of the lawyers who prosecuted Lin Jin Wu, of Oshima in the film *Death by Hanging* and of Piyadasa Sirisena in *A Commotion in a Manor House*, we see this attempt to achieve a sense of narrative coherence and closure, and to produce a distinctive body of knowledge so as to persuade the potential audiences of the validity of the projected viewpoint.

Law is basically a form of rhetoric in that the aim of the constructors of legal texts is to persuade the potential audiences. White says that law is a branch of rhetoric, and he sees rhetoric as the central art by which communities and cultures are established, maintained and transformed.⁶ He

remarks that, "The ancient rhetorician Gorgias (in Plato's dialogue of that name) defined rhetoric as the art of persuading the people about matters of justice and injustice in the public places of the state, and one could hardly imagine a more compendious statement of the art of the lawyer than that."⁷ Similarly, the creative writers and filmmakers, in their distinctive ways, are also engaged in the task of persuading the readers and spectators. It is for this reason that we can group them all under the rubric of narratives of persuasion.

The relationship between narrativization and contextualization is a close and complex one; very often they are mutually constitutive. Narrativization, by and large, is a process of recontextualization whether it be in the semantic domain of literature or law. What is interesting about context is that it is not something that is readily given but is actively constructed. Let us for example consider the legal text produced by the prosecutors of Lin Jin Wu and the cinematic text based on the same case produced by Oshima Nagisa. There is a clear difference between these two narratives, and one useful way of understanding these differences is through the recontextualization that they engage in. In this regard, the following observation of Jonathan Culler is most helpful. He says that, "while meaning is context-bound, context is boundless. This is something lawyers know well; context is in principle infinitely expandable, limited only by their resourcefulness, their clients resources, and the patience of the judge."⁸ This point can be illustrated by a case that is generating unprecedented interest in the United States (and in some other countries as well)—the O.J. Simpson murder trial. Here the prosecutors are painting a picture of Simpson as a jealous, possessive and abusive husband who brutally murdered his ex-wife and her friend. The defence, on the other hand, contends that Simpson is the victim of a malicious scheme formulated and put into action by the Los Angeles Police Department, and that he is a lovable and caring man. Both sides construct their respective narratives by a process of recontextualization. It is through the instrumentality of recontextualization that the two widely different images of O.J. Simpson are constructed by the prosecution and the defence.

The idea that legal texts are constructed texts like any other texts and therefore newer approaches to language, discourse, textual understanding that inflect such fields of inquiry as literary studies, film studies, anthropology, history and so on should influence the thinking of legal studies is powerfully argued by some modern legal scholars. The Critical Legal Studies movement (and it is certainly not monolithic) represents a highly visible attempt along these lines. Influential modern thinkers such as Foucault and Derrida, who have greatly influenced the discursivities in such fields as literary studies,

feminist studies, anthropology, history, philosophy have exercised a profound influence on the emergence of such projects as the Critical Legal Studies. The notion that knowledge and power are imbricated and that justice is in effect inseparably linked with the dominant social, political, economic, ideological interests of society at a particular historical conjuncture. The notion the law, like all other forms of writing is a form of rhetoric, and hence ideas of truth, justice, knowledge etc. need to be considered within the space circumscribed by rhetorical frames. What such ideas do is to foreground and put into circulation the concept of narrativity that is crucial to legal texts just as much as it is pivotal to literary texts. It is interesting to observe in this regard that a legal scholar like Ronald Dworkin, who is in effect mainstream legal philosophers, is suggesting that we conceptualize law as a kind of "chain-novel,"⁹ a story which moves forward due to a series of cumulative additions by a chain of contributors like judges and legal philosophers. The idea that law is a form of communal narrative is at the heart of Dworkin's conceptualization.

The three texts that I referred to earlier can all be understood in terms of the narrativities of persuasion. Karl Marx once said that, "Whomever one seeks to persuade, one acknowledges as master of the situation."¹⁰ Therefore, it is very important that narratives of persuasion position the potential persuadees in such way as to make them feel comfortable, and invest them with a sense of authority. The appeal to shared beliefs and values, the positive construction of the identity of the audience, the sense of empowerment of them all play a crucial role in this effort. For example, in the case of Lin Jin Wu's murder trial, the prosecutors positioned the jurors as law abiding citizens who uphold national traditions and are willing to take a stand on matters of morality and public good. On the other hand, Oshima Nagisa positioned his audience as rational, reflective beings who are unafraid to think independently and, if necessary, challenge the hegemony of the state. Coombe makes the point that, "Legal processes... do more than merely reflect and reproduce dominant cultural conceptions of self, personhood, and identity in Western societies. They are, instead, constitutive of subjectivities. By defining and legitimating particular representations of how those in different subject positions or social groups experience their selfhood, adjudicative and legislative processes serve to maintain, reproduce and sometimes transform relations of power."¹¹ Very often, when we talk of subjectivities and subject-positions associated with legal processes, we tend to think only of the accused, or those subject to the hegemony of law. These groups are no doubt important and merit very close study and analysis. However, at the same time, we must also pay close attention to the subjectivities and subject-positionings of those

who decide on cases as well. It is only when we take into consideration these diverse subject-positionings that we will be able to understand the full force of the constructed legal narratives.

In literature and cinema the imbrication of narrative and performance are taken for granted, while we often tend to ignore the fact that courts are theatres where equally powerful performances take place. Performances in courts depend upon distinctive costumes—robes, suits etc.—and the allocation of space. The judge sits on an elevated bench, the prosecutors and defence lawyers on different sides, and there is a designated space for the public. Just as in a ritual performance, there is a special and ritualistically inflected language used by the participants in the drama. And this theatre cannot be separated from the networks of power and forms of ideology prevalent in society. Andrew Arno makes the point that the procedures, personnel, and organizations of the court itself enact a drama which communicates messages related to authority, order and social hierarchy.¹² The different narratives constructed and presented in court—those by prosecutors, defence attorneys and judges—have to be understood in terms of the notion of court as theatre, law as performance.

Finally, I wish to consider the notion of legal texts, literary texts and cinematic texts as narratives of persuasion from the point of view of my own discipline of communication. The idea of persuasion is central to communication. One of the earliest models of communication in Western society is to be found in Aristotle's "Rhetoric," and it is essentially a model of persuasive communication. When we examine the evolution of communication models in Western society, for purposes of analysis, we can identify four broad stages. In the first, the focus was clearly on the communicator—how does he communicate, what characteristics should he possess in order to be an effective and persuasive communicator are some of the dominant questions that engaged the interests of early model builders. For example, in Aristotle's model of communication, the focus is clearly on the communicator and his character. In the second stage, the emphasis shifted to the message itself; how do messages get constructed? What are the distinguishing features of carefully constructed messages? What is the structure of the message? The third phase was characterized by an emphasis on the receiver. Until now it was generally believed that the receiver is passive, and the communicator has the power and the capability to manipulate the receiver in a way that is deemed fit by the communicator. Far from being a passive recipient of messages, empirical studies began to point out that receivers actively interpret and construct messages, and that messages are invested with meaning and significance by the receivers in keeping with their

interests, investments and backgrounds. In the fourth stage of communication model building we have begun to see a shift of interest to the contexts within which the interactions between the communicator and receiver takes place. By the context I mean the discursive domain in which communication takes place. The economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and institutional factors that facilitate and impede communication are all part of the context. In other words, the discursive space of communication has begun to receive attention as never before. In exploring the notion of legal texts or literary texts as narratives of persuasion we need to keep in mind the newer approaches to communication; they help us to understand better the constructedness, the social situatedness of these narratives.

In this paper, I chose to focus attention on three narratives of persuasion—a legal text, a filmic text and literary text. All three texts, in their different ways, have sought to persuade their potential audiences and win in the court of opinion. Far from being neutral and dispassionate, as conventional wisdom would have it, legal texts are as subjective, and partial to their preferred viewpoint as literary narratives and cinematic narratives.

Notes

¹ Nagisa Oshima, *Cinema, Censorship and the State: The Writings of Nagisa Oshima, 1956-1978* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992)

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge* (New York: Basic Books, 1983)

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ James Boyd White, *'Heracles' Bow* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985)

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Jonathan Culler, *Framing Signs* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988)

⁹ Ronald Dworkin, "Law as Interpretation" *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 9 (1982)

¹⁰ Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire* (New York: International Publishers, 1963)

¹¹ Rosemary Coombe, "Contesting the Self: Negotiating Subjectivities in the Nineteenth Century Ontario Defamation Trials" in *Studies of Law, Politics, and Society*. (Greenwich: JAI Press, 1991)

¹² Andrew Arno, "Structural Communication and Control Communication: Perspectives on Legal and Customary Procedures for Conflict Management." *American Anthropologist*. Vol-87, 1985.