

Leibniz and the List Hypothesis

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. wrote this "postlude" to a forthcoming book on the German-American economist Friedrich List (1789-1846).

There is a single, principal reason, that most U.S. and German academics today have been incapable of competent appreciation of Friedrich List, as most among today's Russian intelligentsia lack competent views on Count Sergei Witte. Modern history, as taught in today's U.S.A. and Germany, as in the former Soviet Union, is a collection of wicked grandmother's fairy-tales, which prevents the victim's mind from recognizing the real people of real history.

To understand more fully the Friedrich List who returned to Germany from the United States, we must go back to the first two decades of the 18th Century, when the character of the future U.S.A. was defined. The death of England's Queen Anne marked the victory of a Venice-directed, financier-oligarchical faction of the Duke of Marlborough and Hannover's George Ludwig, over England's patriots. In this circumstance, the defeated patriots turned their attention to the semi-autonomous colonies in North America, viewing those colonies as the only hope for a future return of England, Scotland, and Ireland, each to its own patriotic cause.¹

As the records show the historian, those English, Irish, and Scottish patriots, typified by Jonathan Swift, were joined to that international network which was headed by Germany's Gottfried Leibniz. For these patriots, as for Leibniz, the enemy was typified by the dogmas of such English "Venetian Party" doctrinaires as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. From the reign of England's Queen Anne, to this present day, the internal history of 18th-Century North American colonies, and the United States, has been a war by "American Tory" devotees of John Locke's "Life, Liberty, and Property," against the American patriots committed to Leibniz's "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." As the U.S. Declaration of Independence, and the Preamble of the 1789 U.S. Federal Constitution attest, the patriots of the United States have always followed in the footsteps of Leibniz.²

Inside the 18th-Century colonies, and inside the United States since, the treasonous opponents of the Federal Constitution and its Preamble, have always preferred the "Venetian

Party" London of the evil Duke of Marlborough, of John Locke, and the British Empire, to the English, Irish, and Scottish patriots. The Yankee "American Tories" of 1763-1783, became the outright traitors of 1812-1815. They were the 19th-Century opium-traders, both of Massachusetts' Newburyport, Salem, and Boston, and of New York City. These American "Tories" also supplied the British agents who organized and led the slave-holders' rebellion called the "Civil War."

Anglophile U.S. Presidents of this same "American Tory" tradition, such as Franklin Pierce, James Buchanan, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, were fully witting promoters of the Confederates' cause. Presidents Calvin Coolidge and George Bush, were plainly Yankee varieties of scoundrel, but among the worst scoundrels of the U.S.'s Anglophile chief executives, Yankee or pro-Confederacy alike.³ As the Confederacy openly avowed its devotion to the pro-slavery doctrine of Locke, and hatred against the contrary, Leibnizian principle of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution, the fight (between the U.S.'s patriots, on the one side, and all the treasonous Anglophiles, on the other), has been centered in the patriots' choice of the Leibnizian *American System of political-economy* of U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, against the contrary, "free trade" dogma of Adam Smith's anti-American tract of 1776, the so-called *Wealth of Nations*.

Today, that same, treasonous, "American Tory" tradition, with strong existentialist affinities to the "Lost Cause" of the Confederacy, together with the Anglophile ideologues of the Hollinger, Murdoch, Berthelsmann, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Times*, *Commentary*, and *American Spectator* publishing enterprises, are the core of the leading profascist political currents in today's "Contract with America" and "communitarian" radicals working to build up world government through the weakening of the U.S. Constitution, and its sovereign "big government."

That continuing conflict between the republican and oligarchical traditions within North America, is key for understanding the mind of the Friedrich List who introduced the American principles of national economy to Germany. The

1. See H. Graham Lowry, *How The Nation Was Won*, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1987).

2. The Preamble to the U.S. Constitution, taken as subsuming the 1776 Declaration of Independence, sets forth the fundamental principle of law under which the remainder of the Constitution is subsumed.

3. See Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America*, 2nd edition (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1986).



The most important benefit which the work of Friedrich List (left) acquired, through his relationship to the anti-British United States, was through the genius of Gottfried Leibniz (right), as embedded in the Franklin-Hamilton "American System of political-economy."

influence of Gottfried Leibniz in shaping the thinking of American patriots, is key to understanding the influence of the American System of political-economy upon the mind of List.

Leibniz's influence on the shaping of U.S. patriotic institutions was also presented to Friedrich List in another way. Compare the U.S. Federal Constitution of 1789 to virtually every other so-called "constitution" of the world adopted after 1789. Britain, for example, has no constitution in the proper meaning of that term; whereas, most so-called "constitutions," if they express any principle at all, are predominantly lists of "do's and don't's," constituting a complex, and often self-contradictory aggregation of "basic law." Examples of such uses of the notion of "basic law," include the constitution of virtually any Spanish-American state, the old Soviet constitutions, or Germany's *Grundgesetz*. Until the notion of "basic law" began to be inserted into U.S. law through a combination of dubious amendments and curious judicial perversions of the original intent, the U.S. Constitution's "basic law" is the statement of principled commitment identified by the Preamble, whereas the remainder of the Constitution establishes the necessary institutions of self-government on behalf of the citizenry and its posterity. The U.S. Federal republic was conceived as governed by principle, rather than *shibboleth*.

For our purposes here, we focus upon the Leibnizian im-

plications of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution as premised upon a Leibnizian notion of principle of law: "principle" signifying, not apophthegm, but hypothesis, as Plato's concept of a method of "hypothesis" is employed by Leibniz and Bernhard Riemann, for example. In first approximation, this signifies "hypothesis" as representing the functional unity of a set of axioms, postulates, and definitions, in determining which propositions might be accepted as theorems of a lattice-work of such theorems. "Hypothesis" signifies the governing principles which underlie the determination, whether a proposition does or does not qualify for admission to the rank of theorem within such a lattice-work of theorems.

In a practice of constitutional law consistent with such a principle of hypothesis, one does not prescribe each "basic law"; rather, one requires that no law be enacted which does not conform to the underlying hypothesis, that hypothesis being the principle which is the law taken in its expandable entirety.

The same principle of hypothesis underlies what U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton identified (e.g., in his December 1791 *Report on the Subject of Manufactures*) as *The American System of political-economy*. There is the reciprocal relationship, a relationship of interdependency, between the constitutional form of the U.S. Federal republic and

the *American System of political-economy*. The one could not long survive without the other. The principles underlying these two, mutually dependent systems, of law and economy, represent a common, underlying set of principles, principles fairly described as axioms, postulates, and definitions. Ergo, an hypothesis.

Thus, to understand the work of Friedrich List during the period since his return to Germany, from the United States, one must first identify the relevant "List Hypothesis."

The essence of history

The essential incompetence of all customarily taught versions of history, is that they are incurably anti-scientific, and, thus, essentially false. What is taught purports to be based upon a chronology of fact, but zealously prohibits any regard for the single fact which distinguishes a society of human beings from a troop of macaques, chimpanzees, or baboons. That is the folly of history as taught in universities in the U.S.A. and throughout Europe, including the mythology taught as history in the former Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic. Recognition of this pervasive incompetence of the 20th Century's historians, is key to understanding many of the crippling problems of society today; it is key to overcoming the failure of many, either to recognize the major importance of List's role in the history of both the 19th and 20th Centuries, or, to recognize the pathetic errors of judgment exhibited among most of those ranked as authorities on the subject of List's work itself.

Competence in historiography, as in economics, sociology, psychology, and philosophy depends upon consideration of two levels of fact respecting all of known human history and inferrable pre-history.

First, and absolutely decisive for any competence in history, political science, psychology, or sociology, is the fact, that, whereas no variety of higher ape known or conceivably comparable to mankind, could have attained a population of more than several millions individuals, at any time under the conditions of the recent two millions years, the human population had reached several millions prior to the onset of the 15th-Century European Golden Renaissance, and has attained more than five billions during the present century. Recognition of that distinction in cognitive powers of the human individual, which places mankind absolutely apart from, and above all inferior species, is the first prerequisite of historical science in general, and of all endeavors in economics, psychology, history, etc., more narrowly.

Second, under the conditions of potential for increase of mankind's potential relative population-density,⁴ the crucial

4. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., *So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?* (Washington, D.C.: EIR News Service, Inc., 1995). Although the present author's 1948-1952 discovery of the notion of *potential relative population-density* was original, it represents the refined expression of a conception already implicit in Gottfried Leibniz's 1671-1716 development of the science of physical economy.

fact of all known history is, that prior to the launching of the first sovereign nation-state, France under the Golden Renaissance's Louis XI (1461-1483), society was so constituted, on principle, that 95% or more of every part of the planet lived in political circumstances fairly describable as those of "human cattle": slaves, serfs, or worse. Throughout the Mediterranean region, despite the impulses of such ancient Greek city-states as those of Ionia and the Athens of Solon and Plato, the prevailing form of political institutions, through the Roman and Byzantine Empires, and throughout the history of European feudalism, was the oligarchical model derived from the evil tradition of ancient Babylon. That Babylonian model is represented by the tradition of the British Empire as it continues to exist (in Commonwealth guise) today.

A science of history must be, essentially, a history of a process of human development. The primary consideration, is the increase of mankind's potential relative population-density, as accomplished by means of combined artistic and scientific and technological progress in mankind's mastery over nature. The subsumed consideration, is the functional role of improvement of the social condition of life of the individual and family, as effected in conjunction with the fostering of artistic, scientific, and technological progress.

From the time of Solon of Athens, to the present date, the history of European civilization, in Europe and extended abroad, may be fairly reduced to a conflict between good and evil, a struggle against that form of society, the which has been known for about 2,400 years by such virtually interchangeable terms as the "Babylonian," "Persian," or "oligarchical" model. This is otherwise described as the "imperial model." The generic term, "oligarchical model," serves us here; it should be understood as synonymous with "imperial model."

In the oligarchical model of society, the ruling class, or, oligarchy, is composed of a collection of powerful families, a collection implicitly modelled upon the image of the Greek pantheon of Zeus's Olympus. The individual god-likeness of the oligarchy resides not in the individual member of the oligarchical family, but in the family itself; the individual member of the family, as in Roman law, is a property of the family, not an independent individuality. At the bottom of the society, is the mass of "human cattle," the generality of the people. In between, are the "cattle herders," the relatively privileged lackeys of the oligarchy.

The oligarchy itself is represented by three alternate social types. There is the landed aristocracy (such as the feudal aristocracy of medieval Europe); there is the financier aristocracy, such as the ruling families of Canaanite Tyre, Venice, or the Anglo-Dutch oligarchical families of today; there is the clerical aristocracy, an administrative class, whose authority is located primarily neither in usury in land, nor usury in finance and trade, but as an aristocracy based within functions of the apparatus of government itself. The latter may exist, as in ancient Mesopotamia, in the guise of a ruling theocracy, or as an aristocracy of administration. Oligarchical societies tend

to include some of all three social forms; such societies are distinguished by the kind of oligarchy which is the dominant type.

The form of oligarchical society is imperial: in fact, if not in name. The ultimate authority in law in an imperial society always resides in an imperial monarch, as is provided by what passes for the so-called British constitution still today.

For example, taking into account some more or less rebellious member-states, the British Commonwealth today is ruled by Queen Elizabeth II of Britain, as de facto empress. She rules through the agency of the Privy Council, both in those states (such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) where she is formally the hereditary head of state, and throughout the Commonwealth generally. The Privy Council is the mechanism of control through which the Queen controls the Parliament of Britain and other Commonwealth member-states (as long as they tolerate the interference). The form of oligarchical rule which characterizes the British Empire of the present day, is financier oligarchy, as distinct from the old Habsburg or Imperial Russia type of landed aristocracy.

Under the imperial monarch, there are overlords of various sorts, each of whom enjoys his legal authority under an actual or implicit (revokable) patent from the imperial monarch. So, the overlord rules the lord, and the lord has lease-ownership of the land assigned to him (and also lease-ownership over the people who have the misfortune of occupying that land⁵).

Such are the forms of ancient Babylon, the Persian Empire, the Roman Empire, its Byzantine spin-off, European feudal society generally, and the British Empire today. The simplest, and clearest demonstration of the evil inhering in the oligarchical form of society, is to see what humanity would lose, were it to abandon the institutions which have, to a large degree, replaced feudalism, during the recent five centuries of European history.

The modern form of European nation-state republic, as typified by the U.S. 1776 Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution of 1789, is the outcome of a long effort to free European civilization from the grip of the oligarchical form. It is a struggle which dates from the Ionian city-state republics, and the anti-oligarchical, constitutional reforms by Solon of Athens, as continued by the influence of Christianity's struggles against the oligarchical evil intrinsic to the Roman Empire, both West and East.

From the vantage-point of any science of history, the improvement in the human condition which was accomplished since the A.D. 1461 accession of France's Louis XI has exceeded the highest rates of progress in all human existence, world-wide, in all earlier time. Discounting for intervals of catastrophes, until the abandonment of economic progress, about thirty years ago, the rates of combined demographic

5. The institution of the *Freiherr* under the German form of the Holy Roman Empire, is the exception which proves the rule.

and physical-productive advancement, per capita, per family household, and per relevant square kilometer of area, exceed, hyperbolically, anything earlier achieved.

This returns our attention to the two principles of a science of history, as we identified these above. By any scientific standard of evidence, that which sets mankind apart from and above the beasts, the manifest advancement of man's power over nature, per capita, per family household, and per square kilometer, is to be measured in the combined demographic and physical-economic terms indicated. The means through which those demographic and physical-economic gains are achieved, is the revolutionary advances in practice which have the net effect of both increasing mankind's physical productive potential, and also fostering society's realization of advances in that potential. The combined achievement and realization of that potential is expressed in terms of those standards of artistic and scientific progress, which modern literate conventions formerly termed "Classical," as recognized by Plato and his followers, as through Eratosthenes and Archimedes, of his Academy of Athens.

All notable advances in Classical forms of art and science, throughout the history of western European civilization, beginning the time of Augustine of Hippo and his teachers, have been the result of the influence of Plato and his Academy upon medieval and modern European civilization. Although Europe was indebted to crucial contributions from foreign sources, notably including the Arab Renaissance of the Baghdad Caliphate, from northern India, and China, it is the radiation of European progress in the organization of scientific and social institutions, which has radiated, however unevenly, throughout the world, to make possible the increase of demographic and physical-economic standards of life from medieval to modern levels.

The modern European nation-state was the outgrowth of a long struggle of the Christian Platonists within European civilization, to break free of the oligarchical evil inhering in the continued grip of the Emperor Diocletian's Code and of Aristotle, to establish a form of society consistent with Platonic principles, as those principles were informed by the conception of man inhering in Christianity.

The role of the U.S.A.

Since Europe's 16th Century, the leading, and thus determining issue of the history and global influence of modern European civilization, has been the effort of the oligarchical powers within European civilization, to turn back the clock, from modern nation-state republic, to forms of "global economy" and "world government" consistent with the imperial, oligarchical Code of Diocletian. At the outset, from the latter half of the 15th Century until the latter half of the 18th Century, the reactionary forces continued to be led, directly and openly, by the world's leading financier-oligarchical potency, Venice. From the A.D. 1714 accession of the British "Venetian Party's" George I, to the close of that century, the political

leadership of the financier-oligarchical faction was shifted from Venice to the combination of London and London's junior partner, the Netherlands. With the ruin of France's position as the leading nation-state of the world, during the events of 1789-1814, the center of the global struggle within European civilization was shifted to the conflict between the imperial power of London and London's temporary ally, the doomed, but still potent, landed aristocratic power of the Holy Alliance.

Later, after the death of Friedrich List, the victory of the United States over London's and Napoleon III's puppet, the Confederacy, established the U.S.A. as a leading world power. From that point, until the events of 1898 (Fashoda) and the assassination of U.S. President William McKinley (1901), the key to world politics was the U.S.A.'s de facto alliance with Germany, Japan, and the Russia of Czar Alexander II and Count Sergei Witte, in support of continental-Eurasian development of railway-centered economic cooperation, from Atlantic to Pacific, and to the Indian Ocean. The accession to power of such British assets as Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan enthusiast Woodrow Wilson,⁶ broke the alliance among Germany, Russia, and the U.S.A., and made possible a U.S. switch to alliance with Britain, a switch which made possible London's launching of the two ruinous, "geopolitical," World Wars of this century.

In light of the U.S.A.'s key role as the world's typical sovereign nation-state republic, from 1789 on, and its emergence, under President Abraham Lincoln, as the leading world power among nation-states, the center of world history, to date, has been the strategic conflict between the U.S.A. and Britain, both among the world's nations, and in the bitter internal struggle, between the patriots and "American Tories," within the U.S.A. itself. List's arrival, as a protégé of Gilbert Marquis de Lafayette, into the mid-1820s U.S.A., is to be located in that circumstance.

From that period of List's life, onward, until the end of the 19th Century, a very special relationship existed between the U.S.A. and Germany. The continued strong influence of Friedrich Schiller's work within the U.S., is one aspect of this. Schiller's influence is otherwise expressed in the role of Alexander von Humboldt, the coordinator of Germany's 19th-Century rise to world leadership in physical science. Humboldt, Humboldt's key protégé, Carl F. Gauss, and U.S. circles under the emerging leadership of Benjamin Franklin's great-grandson, Alexander Dallas Bache, typify this. It was the collaboration between Bache's protégé, Thomas Alva Edison, and Emil Rathenau, which delivered Edison's develop-

6. Theodore Roosevelt was the trained protégé of his maternal uncle, the Captain James Bulloch who had headed up the Confederacy's foreign intelligence headquarters in London. Woodrow Wilson was a fanatical admirer of both the Confederacy's "Lost Cause" and of the Ku Klux Klan. It was as U.S. President, that Wilson launched, in 1915, the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, from the Executive Mansion, through endorsement of a Hollywood propaganda film, *The Klansman*, later renamed *The Birth of a Nation*.

ment of electrical power to Germany. It was the same circles in Germany, around Rathenau and Siemens, which were key to the great Eurasian-development projects for which Count Sergei Witte was the key figure in Russia.

The most important single benefit which List's work acquired through his relationship to the anti-British United States, was the genius of Gottfried Leibniz, as embedded in the Franklin-Hamilton "American System of political-economy."⁷ The key conception is packed into Hamilton's use of the term "artificial labor."⁸ In this are combined, in a single term, the principles of Leibniz's 1671 *Society & Economy, Monadology*, the function of (heat) power, and the function of infrastructural development. Within this feature of Hamilton's, the Careys', and List's "American System," is packed all of those indispensable notions of function which are intrinsically essential, not only to economic science, but also any competent science to replace the old wives' fairy-tales which pass for the teaching of history in most parts of the world today.

The creative principle

The central principle of both economic science and a science of history, is the creative principle of cognition, by means of which the individual person may be developed in the power to generate, to impart, and to receive those mental acts by means of which valid, axiomatic-revolutionary discoveries in principles of art and science are made available for human knowledge and practice. This notion, first made comprehensible in the later dialogues of Plato, is key to such modern European works as Nicolaus of Cusa's Platonic *De docta ignorantia*, the use of the term "Reason" by Johannes Kepler, and Leibniz's use of "necessary and sufficient reason," and is the central principle of Leibniz's *Monadology*. Herein lies the essential difference which sets the individual newborn person absolutely apart from, and superior to all actual, and professed "higher apes."⁹ This is the central feature addressed by the present writer's discoveries in the science of physical economy; this is the principle of Leibniz which was made clear for mathematical physics, by the 1854 habilitation dissertation of Bernhard Riemann.¹⁰ Herein lies the essence of economic science and of any competent science of history.

The demographic and economic progress of mankind, as

7. The special feature of Hamilton's "American System" which the North American colonies added to Leibniz's principles of physical economy, was the effective use of a paper currency. This innovation was first employed, with relatively great success, in the 17th-Century Massachusetts Bay Colony, until the British suppressed it by decree (1689). The intent to resume that practice was kept alive by the influential patriot Cotton Mather, and his protégé, Benjamin Franklin.

8. *Report on The Subject of Manufactures*, passim.

9. As Britain's Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and co-founder of the Malthusian World Wildlife Fund, has professed himself to be.

10. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "SDI: the Technical Side of 'Grand Strategy,'" *EIR*, July 19, 1996; —, "Leibniz from Riemann's Standpoint," *Fidelio*, Autumn 1996.

we have identified that here, is derived from the individual person's receipt and enrichment of a stock of relatively valid, axiomatic-revolutionary discoveries in Classical forms of artistic and scientific knowledge. The faculty for transmitting and enriching that stock of discoveries of principle lies beyond words or other symbolic communication, within the educable, creative processes of cognition uniquely embedded, as developable potential, within the sovereign precincts of the individual human mind.

This process of development and transmission of such discoveries of principle, does not, and could not be effected as a mere transfer of "information." It can occur only by inducing the student to replicate, entirely within the sovereign precincts of his, or her cognitive potential, that original mental act of insight which represents the "leap" from one hypothesis, to a superior one. That is the result aimed at by a Classical humanist education, such as that developed by the Brothers of the Common Life, and known in Germany as the Humboldt policy in education. It is not achieved by any contrary approach, such as today's prevalent modes of "textbook education," and multiple-choice examinations.

As Riemann made this the central point of his 1854 habilitation dissertation, in order to overcome the limitations of a mathematical physics which has been relatively discredited by some crucial piece or pieces of experimental evidence, it is indispensable to depart the domain of mathematical physics for physics as such, and then to impose upon mathematical physics, from the outside, a radical change in underlying axioms, thus creating a new mathematical physics to replace, entirely, the old. This leap of physics, from a superseded old mathematics to a new, superior, but inconsistent one, occurs solely within the sovereign internal precincts of the individual person's developed cognitive processes. That mental leap, which Plato locates within the domain of "higher hypothesis," is the essence of economic science, and of any competent science of history.

Thus, as France's Louis XI already made crucial steps in this direction, it is as the modern nation-state republic fosters a universalized form of Classical humanist education, and also fosters opportunities for realization of that educated potential through artistic, scientific, and technological progress, that the per-capita power of society over nature is increased, and the potential demographic condition and political freedom of the individual and family advanced and defended.

Herein, in this view of the interrelated fostering of universal Classical-humanist education and economic progress, lies the most essential point of difference between oligarchism and republicanism. It is the indispensable function of the modern sovereign nation-state, in defending these policies against the perils of "Malthusianism," "global economy," and "world government (imperialism)," which locates the central issue of the irreconcilable, continuing struggle for survival between the United States as a constitutional republic and the British Empire.

List can not be understood competently as one who borrowed certain economic recipes from the United States. He was a German, also inspired by the great minds around the Ecole Polytechnique under Gaspard Monge, who was inspired by the revolutionary ideas and cultural optimism he met in the embattled United States of the 1820s. It was an experience which gave new life to the tradition of Leibniz and Schiller in Germany, and supplied the tested principles needed to attempt in Germany what had been successfully demonstrated in the U.S.A. The rest, is the principle of the modern nation-state, as that principle was rendered comprehensible by Plato, and by such as Dante Alighieri, Nicolaus of Cusa, and Leibniz.

This notion we have summarily described here, of the role of the creative principle of cognition, may be viewed as a statement of the axiomatic superiority of the individual republican citizen over both the apes and the oligarchical Duke of Edinburgh. That axiom, incorporated as an essential part of the set of axioms, postulates, and definitions of science, defines a new hypothesis governing admissible theorems in economic science and a science of history. That difference in hypothesis is the essential difference between republicans, such as Friedrich List, and those who degrade themselves to become like something less than human, the oligarchical enemies of Leibniz, the U.S.A., and List, in the past, and, also, notably, of the present writer today.

So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?

So, You Wish
To Learn All
About Economics?



by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

A text on elementary mathematical economics, by the world's leading economist. Find out why *EIR* was right, when everyone else was wrong.

Order from:

Ben Franklin Booksellers, Inc.
107 South King Street Leesburg, VA 22075

\$10 plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available. Information on bulk rates and videotape available on request.