

world-system position is a combination of different dimensions of integration, which might counteract each other in relationship to warfare patterns. I will illustrate this by arguing, that even when considering exclusively trading relationships, a differential impact on warfare patterns can be expected.

Trading is a multidimensional phenomenon, varying along the dimensions of who is trading, what is being traded, etc. The relationship of trade with warfare patterns is far from clear. As Pryor (1977) notes:

"The interrelations between trade and war are complex and require sensitive treatment: Some of the complexity is due to the ambivalent motives of market exchange – the benevolent motive of exchange in order to obtain a better trade deal or to cheat the other person." (121)

In addition to the motives addressed by Pryor, I assume that the actual involvement in trade, for example participation in trading relationships through middle men, as opposed to directly trading with the producers, as well as the products being traded are important variables to consider when inquiring into the relationship between trade and war.

Trade as a way of securing subsistence should have a different effect on warfare patterns than trade in luxury goods. It is very hard to make predictions about the expected direction of the relationships though. For example, it can be argued, that where trade as food source is important, this should have a negative effect on the frequency of warfare with the trading partners. Equally plausible is the assumption, that a society depending on external sources for subsistence, will go to war to secure it, if need be.

Trade in luxury items, on the other hand, has to be viewed differently. Luxury goods are very often used as a symbol of status and serve to secure relationships of domination by redistributing them among one's inferiors (Schneider 1976: 23). Goods become preciosities by their non-availability or scarceness in a particular region and are mainly traded via long-distance trade networks. Local engagement in these trading networks presupposes the availability of equally precious goods to be offered in exchange for the inflowing preciosities. If these are not readily available, or of limited quantity, raiding would be one way for obtaining them.

Variables defined by Whyte (1978) and Murdock and Morrow (1980) measuring the importance of trade in subsistence, intercommunity trade as food source, and food import acquisition were correlated with the warfare variables (see above). Only the correlation of the variable "food import acquisition" with "internal warfare" (Ross's variable) yielded a significant result. Societies obtaining imported food by direct or indirect individual exchange tend to have less internal warfare than those distributing imported foods through markets, middlemen, or a combination of methods ( $n=59$ , Pearson's  $r = .32$ ,  $p = .007$ ). The relationship between trade in preciosities and warfare could not be tested statistically, since no adequate variables were available. Nevertheless examples can be found for a connection between trade in preciosities and raiding.

The already mentioned Chagga were engaged in the trading network linking the East African coast with the interior. Ivory and captives were exchanged for the incom-