African Traditions
and Humanitarian Law

by Yolande Diallo

Mrs Diallo went recently to Africa at the request of the ICRC for which she drew up a report, which it gives us pleasure to publish, in view of the interest of the Red Cross in demonstrating that the profound idea which inspired it, the idea of respect for human dignity and of unselfish help for those who suffer, is an inseparable part of man's heritage.[1]

Introduction

The purpose of our mission was to show similarities and differences which might exist between African traditional humanism and the basic principles of humanitarian law as expressed in the Geneva Conventions.

This research consisted mainly in the study of rules governing:

— personal behaviour during armed conflicts;
— the treatment of defeated enemies;
— the means of settling conflicts.

The mission took place in February and March 1976. It involved contacting various African universities and, more particularly, seeking out in the field the custodians of tradition in order to interview them.

We accordingly went to Senegal, Ivory Coast, Togo, Upper Volta, Niger and Ghana; these are the only countries, therefore, to which this report relates.

The results of the mission are presented in four chapters:

  I. Main causes of conflict in traditional Africa;
 II. How conflict was waged;
III. Cessation of conflict;
 IV. An attempt to compare with the principles of the Geneva Conventions.

---

[1] An article on this subject by the same author appeared in our February issue.

387

Most of the people interviewed related the history of wars in pre-colonial West Africa. However, in this report, we have preferred to ignore the historical aspect in favour of the humanitarian aspect, although the two are fairly closely linked.

Chapter I — Main causes of conflict in traditional Africa (West Africa)

In traditional Africa most conflicts arise from disputes about property, power and honour.

SENEGAL

The main causes of conflict in the region of Senegal resided in:

— the land (belonging to the community, problems related to usufruct);

— livestock (due to the traditional discord between nomads and settled peoples);

— slave trade (following exchange of slaves for goods);

— power: the kingdoms of Senegal have known many wars caused by opposition to power within kingdoms (e.g., in 1590, the Kayor refused to pay tribute to his sovereign);

— again, Lat Dior clashed with his father in claiming his rights over the Kayor in addition to Saloum, for although his name was Diop by his father, his mother's name was Fall, which gave him grounds to pretend to the throne of the Kayor.

MALI

In the Mali of today, covering only part of what was once the Mali Empire comprising in the XIIIth century the Mandingos territory between upper Senegal and upper Niger, the main causes of conflicts were: sex; honour or order of precedence; possession or fortune.

It is interesting at this point to mention a remark by one of the people interviewed: African tradition in Mandingos country does not recognize the idea of "holy war".

According to Hampaté Bâ, nothing justifies resort to violence. In this respect, he underlined the fact that throughout Africa, from north to south, greetings are always words of peace. A Toucouleur proverb says:

« war does not kill grass », which means that it does kill man: anybody intending to declare war, therefore, must think about it twice.

TOGO

In Togo, where there were never well structured kingdoms as had been the case in neighbouring Benin, the main disputes between various races took place when the slave trade appeared on the west coast of Africa. Traffic in slaves was to South America and many foreign slavers did business from Anecho (47 km. from Lomé).

In 1860 such a conflict broke out in the old city of Agnadjiko (50 km. east of Lomé) between the Ewés and the people of Anecho, descendants of the Mina royal family (north of Ghana) who came to Anecho in the XVIIIth century and founded a chieftainery.

The cause of the conflict was a dispute concerning the sale of slaves on credit from one locality to the other.

UPPER VOLTA

In Upper Volta, the Mossis were in former times warlike and waged war for nothing. Foreigners in the country that they now occupy, the Mossis had to conquer it by force. The Tarik el Sudan relates that the Mossis of Yatenga, in the XIVth century, seized Tombouctou, and even pushed their invasion as far as Oualata (the Algeria of today). The final wars preceding the French conquest of Koupela were civil wars either between Tenkodogo and Koupela or between Mossis and Gourmantché or Gourounsi (the true autochtones of Upper Volta).

Civil wars between Mossis used generally to follow the death of a "Naba" whose succession was claimed by several pretenders. But the usual theatre of war was the Bousanga areas. If any Bousanga women enslaved by the Naba of Koupela escaped he claimed her back. If his demand was not met he waged war.

When the Mossis did not have enough millet, when their herds were reduced by an epidemic, or when they merely wanted to take slaves, the Naba called his ministers together and compelled them to attack neighbouring races. This form of conflict was more in the nature of isolated raiding than that of an expedition which would generally arise from a dispute about livestock, territory, or the death of a member of a royal family owing to action by someone of another race.

389

As mentioned earlier, the Upper Niger used to be part of the Mali Empire. Its traditions are inseparable from those of the Peulh, who, coming from the west, spread throughout the whole region of Macina and, in the course of the centuries, clashed with the Sonhraï, Bambara and Tuareg empires.

The Djerma people, in the south of Niger, coming from Mandingos (now Guinea) mixed with the Sonhraïs to constitute the Djermas-Sonhraïs and to oppose especially the Peulhs. Here, due to the traditional relations with North Africa across the Sahara, war often took the form of raids, the most frequent of them by the Tuaregs who, to obtain food, regularly looted from the Sonhraïs. Oral tradition in this region contains many narratives of such aggression.

Among the Peulhs and the Djermas we again find that pasture and watering points were the traditional causes of conflict between nomads and settled tribes. As we were told by a group of elders in Kunari (140 km. from Niamey): "we used to make war for two reasons—to prevent others waging it on us, and so that our name would be spoken and heard; for prestige".

GHANA

In Ghana our research was mainly among the Ashantis in the Kumasi region. Their warlike traditions are very well known in West Africa. In the Gold Coast they had a powerful and feared empire which reached the height of its power towards the end of the XVIIIth and the beginning of the XIXth centuries. In this part of Africa war was essentially for conquest and it was in that way that the Ashantis carved out for themselves a kingdom far more extensive than the Ghana of today.

To maintain the kingdom intact, the Ashantis waged war against the Gans and the Fantis. In the XIXth century, the Fantis allied themselves with the English to fight against the Ashanti Kingdom whose defeat marked the beginning of the English occupation of the Gold Coast.

It should be pointed out here that, as everywhere in Africa, war is the final resort. An Ashanti aphorism was often quoted by persons interviewed: "one should never 'take an oath' while there is hope for negotiation" (to "take an oath" is the prelude to war).

Chapter II — How conflict was waged

(1) ATTEMPTED CONCILIATION AND DECLARATION OF WAR

(a) *Attempted conciliation*

Before resorting to force the parties negotiated for a long time to seek a peaceful solution. In *Senegal*, a group of elders from the two villages would meet to try to settle the problem. Discussions might last for days. In *Mali*, recourse would be had to persons related by marriage to the other group because, in Africa, "One does not war against one's in-laws".

If these attempts failed, "the Sanankous" were sent. The Sanankouya is a sacred bond between two individuals, two families or two peoples in such a manner that they never war against each other. In *Togo*, the notabilities of the two groups would meet to try to avoid war by reasoning with the chiefs in both camps. In *Upper Volta*, where most Mossi wars were family feuds, the imperial guards of the Moro Naba intervened to reason with the adversaries.

(b) *Declaration of war*

There is an important rule common to all Africa, except, it must be stated, to the Djermas of Niger whose wars were most frequently plundering forays: attacks should not be without warning. It should be underlined here that the raid type of war is not confined to Black Africa. It was imported from the North. In Black Africa, to attack without warning is considered an act of cowardice.

In all the countries visited, emissaries used to be sent to warn the adversary and to say:

On such and such a month I shall declare war. Get ready. Wherever we meet, there will be war even if there are only two of us.

Or they might say:

Starting from the onset of next winter, or from the next harvest, there will be no peace between our people and yours.

Or *Tomorrow, we shall come to eat your village.*

The responsibility for conveying the declaration of war was assigned to different persons depending on the races involved.

In *Senegal*, the "griot" (witchdoctor-cum-minstrel) went on a bedizened horse to the adversary's camp; he announced himself, stating

his titles and his genealogy. In *Mali*, it was the notables; they might or might not be "griots", i.e. of high caste. Ine *Upper Volta*, the person chosen was either a "griot" or a blacksmith. In *Niger*, the function was assigned to "griots" or "maba". The griot was chosen for his eloquence.

These various envoys were *inviolable*, because throughout Africa, the "envoy is never insulted or struck", as he is not considered to be involved in the dispute but merely the messenger. He is neutral. Moreover, to attack an envoy is to attack his principal. An envoy, whatever differences exist between groups, is on the same footing as a stranger to whom full consideration is due, a concept to which many proverbs testify:

— *Everything which comes goes.*

— *The stranger is like the dew, if he does not leave in the morning, he leaves in the evening.*

— *Your stranger is your griot.*

— *Your stranger is your god: if he does not make rain fall, he will bring you the dew.*

There seems to be no exception. To act otherwise could not only spark off an immediate attack by the opponent; it could bring down the wrath of the gods. For the Ashantis, the envoy came with two objects, and the choice of one or the other signified a choice of either negotiation or war.

(2) COMBATANTS AND PROTECTED PERSONS

(a) *Who were the combatants ?*

In nearly every country of West Africa, only the nobles fought, for to fight, either to defend the kingdom or to make a name for oneself, was the domain of the higher strata of society because fighting was honourable. In Senegal, there was a class of professional warriors, the "Tiedos", recruited among former slaves. They were always led by "diarafs", princes of the blood.

The idea was that responsibility for defending the kingdom rested, in the first place, on the shoulders of those who constituted the nobility. This explains the existence in the whole sahelian zone of certain codes of honour dictating the behaviour of individuals in war. In Africa, the strong are clement. "If you are strong, you forgive", says a Mossi proverb. A Djerma proverb illustrates particularly well the nobleman's

392

responsibility to defend his group: "One does not lend royalty, one does not lend one's gun, one does not lend one's right to die for the land".

(b) *The protection of non-belligerents*

History gives few examples of participation of women in war. The Amazons of Dahomey are an exception. On the other hand, women were often responsible for supplying fighters with water or for singing to encourage them.

Generally, they remained in the village and as fighting was always outside the village the combatants, in this way, protected the village and the children and old people, or they removed the children and old people to a safe place so that they would not be harmed during the fighting.

In *Senegal*, in the region of Cape Verde, the children and old people were put abroad canoes and taken out to sea. In *Togo*, it is interesting to note, when men were preparing for war, the women used to leave the village shouting: "Do not fight, we are all brothers" or again "If you kill someone, you kill him for yourself". In *Niger*, women and children who remained in the village were protected by a group of warriors. As we were told: "To attack a village where there are only women and children is not war; it is theft—we were not thieves... »

Among the Ashantis of *Ghana*, it was not only the women, the children and the old people who took no part in fighting; the serfs did not either. The serfs bore markings or facial scars to make them recognizable. They too were protected and inviolable as were the women and children. Similarly, in *Upper Volta*, custom forbade the killing of people taking no part in the fighting, including workers in the fields, that is to say the slaves. Morals and rules of honour prohibited attack against someone considered to be weaker, and hence defenceless. The penalty for violating such rules was public opprobrium; in Upper Volta it could be banishment or even death.

Among other races, such as the Peulhs and the Sonhraïs, any such violation, if known, practically always entailed the suicide of the perpetrator, who preferred death to shame. There were also economic reasons for not killing workers, women and children. After the war, life had to go on, and who would have cultivated the land since the nobles did not work ?

(3) THE CONDUCT OF WAR

(a) *The law of war*

In addition to rules protecting non-combatants, there were others, equally strict, which combatants had to observe. This was a sort of law of war which limited the exactions which could be inflicted.

In *Senegal*, there was a genuine ethics of war which was taught to any young nobleman for his future calling as a warrior. He was taught never to kill an enemy on the ground, for, having fallen, the enemy admitted his inferiority; a prince should never fall from his horse for otherwise his enemy would spare him, which would be a profound humiliation. To be killed it was necessary to be mounted. In *Mali*, no one would strike a disarmed enemy. The enemy would be captured. This was so in *Upper Volta* too and, in general, all the countries of the Sahelian zone.

On the other hand, in the forest countries, e.g. *Ghana*, there was not this tradition of mercy. In conflict, the enemy was generally massacred. The country of the Ashanti was the theatre of many massacres of population.

In the Gulf of *Benin* and the *Gold Coast* human sacrifice was made of an enemy not killed in fighting; this was to thank the Ashanti gods for the victory. "The chicken and his intestines", says an Ashanti proverb, "all belong to the hawk."

Another rule of conduct in the Sahelian zone was that it was forbidden to strike an enemy from behind. Fighting had always to be face to face.

(b) *Truces*

Truces were recognized in pre-colonial wars. Even wars which had been waged for generations between two ethnic groups would cease during the harvest and the sowing. Similarly, the winter everywhere in the Sahelian zone was a period of truce. Some races, such as the Mossi of *Upper Volta*, had other periods of truce, such as the "Tinsé", the anniversary of the funeral of the mother of the first emperor and founder of the Mossi empire. On the other hand, the Peulhs never stopped war even for an important celebration. It may be said, in general, that fighting took place only during the dry season.

(c) *Asylum*

There were many places of asylum in West Africa. The nature of these places varied depending on the peoples visited, but their respect and

inviolability during conflict was the same everywhere. No doubt superstitious fears were greater than the fear of an enemy. For instance, in *Senegal*, the sacred baobab, the sacred wood in which the protective fetishes were kept, was used for the construction of the chief's hut, to enter which was equivalent to seeking the shelter of its protection. In *Togo*, asylum could be sought in the hut containing the fetishes, in the places used for initiation, and at the tombs of ancestors. In *Mali*, apart from cemeteries, there were numerous places which, by tradition, were considered to be places of asylum. At Koulikoro for example there is a place named "Nianan", with twin hills called Ninankoulou, or the hills of Nianan. Nianan is the name attributed to the ancestor of all the peoples of the Macina. In the event of conflict, any person in Nianan's domain could not be touched, and even any prisoner who escaped from his master and reached Nianan could become a free man, a "Nianaman". When the French occupied the former Sudan, they set up their camp in the Nianan domain and the alarm never sounded, for, it used to be said: "No one must disturb Nianan". Similarly in the mountain Bandiagara there is the Nando sanctuary. Nando was considered to have come down from heaven. No person entering the sanctuary had need to fear that he might be caught, for no one could go into it without the best of intentions. These places, even today, may still be visited in Mali.

In *Upper Volta*, in every Mossi village there is a Peulh district called « Bagarré ». The chief of the district is the "Bagarré Naba". Any person going to his home is in safety, even if he has committed a crime. The tombs of Nabas (round thatch-covered huts) are places of asylum. In *Niger*, there are other zones which may not be violated, for example the areas for initiation, places held sacred and places where some blood pacts are sealed. In *Ghana*, sacred places are essentially those where certain oaths are taken by reason of the special importance which the Ashanti attach to the taking of an oath in the name of certain ancestors.

These places of asylum were not violated even during religious wars when Islam was introduced south of the Sahara.

Chapter III — Cessation of conflict

The tendency for conflicts to be accompanied by formalities is reflected also in the cessation of hostilities. War in Africa, like everywhere else,

can be stopped in two ways: either by the total defeat of one of the parties, or by negotiation when the two parties are of equal strength.

(1) PEACE NEGOTIATORS

Those who negotiate the peace are those who announced the war: the "griots", the blacksmiths, the notables or perhaps a warrior in his costume of war *but without weapons*. It may also be some individual who is the issue of a marriage between persons of the two villages or two ethnic groups in conflict. The idea is that the blood linking the two races through that individual must serve peace. There is a Djerma proverb: « War pleases neither the strong nor the weak. »

These emissaries of peace were easily recognized for they always carried some object belonging to the chief who had sent them. It could be a ring among the Djermas, a bonnet, a lance or a shoe among the Mossis. For Peulhs, the "Findé" intervened. A Findé was a means of identifying an emissary by recalling some fact or detail known solely to the two parties. For example, the two chiefs in conflict might have met some other time, when certain events known only to them happened. If one of them wishes to send a message to the other he will say to his emissary: "Go and see so-and-so and tell him that on such-and-such a day, at such-a-time, such-a-thing occurred. If he recognizes that to be true, it is proof that it is I who sent you."

Among the Mossi, the emissary, generally a member of the imperial guard, presented himself in fighting kit but without weapons. Similarly, among the Sonhrai: "If an individual without weapons left one group to go to the other, the reason was known". So this emissary came to announce that the other camp wished to negotiate and he would return to convey the reply. His role stopped there, for a distinction was made between the emissary and the negotiator. The emissary belonged to the group, whereas the negotiator was somebody independent of both parties.

In *Senegal*, the negotiator was the "Grand Farbah", that is to say the chief slave (and hence a member of a third ethnic group). Specially dressed (generally a turban and boots), mounted on a horse with a "grigri" hanging at its chest, he went to the other camp to negotiate. He would stop at the entrance of the village waiting for someone to come to meet him. He had full immunity. He had to be treated with the greatest

respect; he had to be given food and drink and then he would be asked to speak. He always began with the words of peace: "The road to peace is never long", thereby indicating that a solution should be found however long it might take.

In *Mali*, we find the same distinction between emissary and negotiator. Emissaries were always people of caste ("griots", blacksmiths, shoemakers) or slaves of the kingdom, that is to say assimilated ("hut slaves"). On the other hand, a negotiator could be an individual who was the issue of marriage between persons of the two groups in conflict, i.e. a "nephew", or some party who was of neither group. We spoke earlier of "Sanankous", i.e. persons or groups united by a sacred alliance. When one group wished to negotiate it would assign the negotiation to a person chosen in a "sanankou" group belonging to the enemy camp, for one sanankou could not refuse another anything. For instance, to negotiate peace between Peulhs and Bambaras, a Marka would be sent for they were Sanankou of the Peulhs. Between Markas and Bozos a Dogon would be sent for they were Sanankou of the Bozos.

In *Upper Volta*, the distinction between emissary and negotiator did not exist. Those who announced the war negotiated peace, i.e. "griots", blacksmiths or "nephews".

In *Niger*, the Djermas entrusted negotiation to the "Sandis", the first occupants of the country. When conflict broke out between Peulhs and Djermas, relentless enemies until 1890, the date of the French conquest, the Sandis, who were of neither party, went to the victor to recover the wounded and the dead against a ransom and he fixed the conditions for peace.

Togo, and more generally the countries of the Benin Gulf, sent as their negotiators witchdoctors who were feared and respected everywhere because of their powers. No one would have dared to incur their displeasure or to be too intransigent. Consequently, they soon reached agreement. Emissaries, on the other hand, were notables respected for their wisdom and knowledge.

The Ashantis of *Ghana* used as negotiator the "Okyeame", whose function was hereditary. The Okyeame knew all the families and all the traditions and consequently could persuade the victor that because of his birth he should be merciful. "The strong forgive", says an Ashanti proverb.

The negotiators tried to arrange an honourable and fair peace. They were entrusted with arranging the ransom of prisoners and dead and especially of people who could not be taken into captivity.

In *Senegal* for instance, the "griot", the blacksmith and members of the royal family, were either killed or ransomed. The ransom consisted of a number of slaves, beasts or the transfer of land. The wounded and the dead were generally returned; for "After death there is no hate". To wreak vengeance on a dead body would have been frowned upon by everybody.

In *Mali*, there is a sense of honour in tradition which encourages mercy after war. For instance, a legend says of one of the sons of El Hadj Omar, Ahmadou, King of Segou (beginning of 18th century), known for his cruelty, that he was covered by human skin but was not a man. To be pitiless with a party seeking to negotiate was deprecated because, as the saying had it, "If God did not kill, the chief should not kill either."

Upper Volta. For the Mossis, whose main objective was to acquire an empire as populated as possible by forcing neighbouring peoples to submit to them, custom demanded that they show mercy. " If the shepherd is too ready with the knife, his flock will not thrive " says a Mossis proverb illustrating particularly well the remarks made by Mr. Balima (annex No. 9, see transcript of his interview), who said that, more than pity, it was practical sense after war not to exterminate the vanquished. This attitude cannot be found in the Gulf of Benin where slaughter of the population, the burning of villages and total destruction was generally the price paid by the losers. Anyone not slaughtered in the fighting was killed as a sacrifice. It should be mentioned here that slavery was infrequent in this part of Africa whereas it was widespread in the Sahelian societies. Many wars were merely to obtain slaves for working in the field to support the essentially warrior societies.

This study would not be complete without a mention of the slavery practiced throughout the Sahelian zone.

The captives, who constituted from one to two-thirds of the entire population had a social function similar to that of "perpetual minors". Most of the time they worked for their masters, but this did not exclude personal relationships and participation in community, family and social life, a situation apparently without its equal in the slavery of ancient

times in the western world. There was a difference between "hut captives" and the manumitted captives. Hut slaves of a single family for three generations could no longer be sold. Often the master would marry the women and the children born of such unions were free and could even reign if the master had no male issue of a free woman. Manumitted captives lived in villages and worked for themselves, but they paid heavy rent in kind or services to the village chief or to the group and were frequently the victims of requisitions; their social status was inferior and was that of a dependent.

Although the status of slaves was hereditary, many groups were reduced to slavery after defeat in war. In that case, they were frequently sold by the victor in the slave markets which were common in Africa. Sometimes, after new wars or relaxation of the authority of the prevailing master, entire groups migrated to new zones of influence or achieved their freedom by conquest.

The slaves of Peulhs of Macina used to sing a lament against their masters:

If all shares are yours
if my share is yours
if your share is yours
then where is my share ?

Chapter IV — Comparison with Geneva Conventions

This study has enabled us to adduce a number of rules which are common in West Africa and we note that these rules, which take the form of proverbs or popular aphorisms, are nothing more than the expression of the same humanitarian principles which inspired the authors of the Geneva Conventions.

It should be borne in mind that West Africa is divisible into two regions: the Sahelian region and the forest region, and the same behaviour is not necessarily found in the two.

— Except for the special case of raids, conflict was always started by an official declaration of war;

— an attack was never launched without warning. Ambush could take place in the course of a conflict. This restricted the means of harming an enemy and is similar to the principle that belligerents have not an unlimited choice in the means of harming an enemy;

— fighting was subject to a genuine code of conduct. For instance, it was forbidden to kill women, children or old people; to strike an enemy from behind; to profane certain places or to kill a disarmed enemy;

— one did not wreak vengeance on the enemy dead who generally were entitled to a decent burial;

— the wounded of both camps were cared for in order that they could be assigned later to work in the fields.

All this is to be found in the Geneva Conventions. Only the wording is different.

It should be pointed out, however, that there is an important difference: depending on their social status or functions in a group, prisoners were reduced to slavery, ransomed or killed. The change to "hut slavery" was only a makeshift evolution, for nothing will ever justify slavery.

As can be seen, many principles expressed in the Geneva Conventions are to be found in the law of war in pre-colonial Africa. It was only after the introduction of slavery and the inroads of colonialism into Africa south of the Sahara that traditional societies began to disintegrate, causing the code of honour to fall into disuse in war. However, the memory of this code of honour is kept alive in the narratives of the storytellers, and the code perhaps could be revived as a means of humanizing present-day conflicts.

Perhaps Africa will remember, now that it is reviving its own cultural values, that this sense of humanity is one of its permanent values and that it must accept the obligation not to let those values be forgotten.

Results and prospects

Transcending the differences observed, there are many common features from which we can deduce humanitarian prospects. In Africa there are many traditions which a brief mission cannot reveal to the full. A more thorough study by groups of research workers in each country would be necessary. In the various countries visited we always found keen interest among those we interviewed; they themselves suggested forming their own research groups on a novel subject such as the law of war. Such research would require considerable knowledge of local languages and customs.

But this mission was not without its use. It has given guidance in the direction to be followed, that is to say, the constitution of teams of research workers to assemble information, and then compile a synopsis of the information, and draw conclusions which might carry on from the initial results achieved by the present mission.

Nevertheless, the whole concept of the work must be considered from a less restricted angle. Due to lack of time, we had to set ourselves limits and narrow the scope of our interviews, a serious impediment when discussing oral traditions. This undoubtedly caused us to overlook interesting information. What we have gathered could therefore be the point of departure for further research, and what was not obtained could be sought if we are to have a complete picture of the law of war in Africa.

What we were unfortunately not able to obtain is what we may call "the reverse side of the coin". The better known aspects of oral tradition consist merely of popular versions (epic events, ancestral adventures) of official history relating to local heroes and powerful groups. Such narratives are related by the "griots", chiefs, and court attendants who may almost be considered as semi-professionals of folklore.

But it must not be forgotten that the past is not only the history of the conquering races, the tribes in power and the privileged classes. It is also the history of the people, of women, of slaves, of peasants. The past is not only a succession of famous events or actions: it is the warp and weft of daily life. That implies that there is not one history but several; a history of official tradition but a history, too, of unfamiliar, underground tradition. Of course, it is not easy to obtain direct access to this other kind of history, to this other past. Ready-made narratives, the most easily revealed, generally prevent an approach to the deeper realities. That is what we must try to record.

<div align="right">**Yolande DIALLO**</div>