Pure Mathematics vs Applied Bullshit

Daniel Henry Gottlieb Professor Emeritus Purdue University

March 9, 2013

Abstract

A definition of Pure Mathematics is the study of well-defined concepts. Based on Frankfurt's essay, "On Bullshit", the meaning of Applied Bullshit is given as a document written with no regard for the truth. This is the opposite of a Pure Mathematical document. Unfortunately, Applied Bullshit is rife in government and financial and legal documents. We will examine Frankfurt's ideas, and show examples of several examples of Applied Bullshit in the financial markets, the Law, and in Zoning and Environmental issues. We propose a simple idea to remedy the recent explosion of Applied Bullshit in our country.

1 Introduction

During my sabbatical in Paris about 1987, I asked myself a question. Is there a definition of Mathematics which describes mathematics in a mathematical way, instead of the usual description which lists the sub areas such as arithmetic, algebra, calculus, etc., or abstract ideas such as number, space, quantity, etc.? I found an answer: Mathematics is the study of well-defined concepts. My argument is found in an essay on my Purdue University home page, [Gottlieb 2004]. A quick version of my argument is: First define the subject X consisting of all well defined concepts. Then observe that mathematics is contained in it. Then, note that any other well defined concept, such as chess, could also be included in mathematics, since well defined problems could be posed and solved. So, I would assert that $X = MATH$. But then it occurred to me, that that definition, leaves out non well defined notions as interesting and useful. And also I was hijacking a name for my subject X. So I decided to hijack Pure Mathematics as the name for X. (And then Applied Mathematics would be Pure Mathematics applied to the real, and not well defined, world).

About the same time, Professor Harry G. Frankfurt was writing an essay about the core meaning of Bullshit. It was published as a small book entitled "On Bullshit".

What I propose to do is list the main points of Frankfurt's work comparing bullshitting to lying, the bullshitter to the liar. Whereas lying under oath rises to the level of a crime, bullshitting does not. However, if it leads to profits when used in a legal setting, it should be regarded as an object, like a house, or windows, which can be taxed. It would be a way of clawing back some of the profits of those people or institutions who have profited from from the misinformation their bullshit created.

2 Frankfurt "On Bullshit" page 55 - 56

"It is impossible for someone to lie unless he *thinks* he knows the truth. Producing bullshit requires no such conviction. A person who lies is thereby responding to the truth, and he is to that extent respectful of it. When an honest man speaks, he says only what he believes to be true; and for the liar, it is correspondingly indispensable that he considers his statements to be false. For the bullshitter, however, all these bets are off: he is neither on the side of the true nor on the side of the false. His eye is not on the facts at all, as the eyes of the honest man and of the liar are, except insofar as they may be pertinent to his interest in getting away with what he says. He does not care whether the things he says describe reality correctly. He just picks them out, or makes them up, to suit his purpose."

2.1 Axiom

To convict the liar of lying, we must show that he knew he was speaking a lie. (If he thought his lie were false, but if it were in fact true, then like a would be murderer who misses his target, he would probably get a reduced sentence.)

2.2 Axiom

The bullshitter does not care about the truth. He is only interested in getting away with what he says. He is trying to hide his intentions by means of misleading statements, introducing ambiguities, misusing words, misapplying laws, etc. His words, though reprehensible, do not rise to the level of a crime. But if they are put in writing in documents used to misinform decision makers as to the truth, then after the fact, it is clear that the documents are bullshit.

2.3 Axiom

The bullshitter is more the enemy of the truth than the liar is.

2.4 Axiom

Bullshit is much more common than lying. (One reason is that many people are forced to speak about things they don't know well. Another is that they have too much work to do and will save time at the expense of clarity and accuracy.) Even though bullshit is more the enemy of the truth than lying is, calling it a crime is probably not the right remedy. But bullshit in the public record is easy to prove. It exists as concretely as a house. So it should be taxed. The producers of the bullshit should be assessed a tax according to how much damage was done to other people and based on the amount of profit someone involved with producing the bullshit or from the existence of the bullshit.

2.5 Applied Bullshit

Frankfurt's description does not apply to all bullshit. For example, I would say that writing the word bullsh–t instead of bullhshit is in itself a form of bullshit, but it doesn't arise from the writer having any purpose except to avoid using a crude word. When the Bullshit is written in a form which causes one party to profit at the expense of another, then I will call that Applied Bullshit. I don't offer a meaning for Pure Bullshit. NOTE: For all mentions of Bullshit below, I mean Applied Bullshit.

3 Examples of how the Applied Bullshit tax might work

3.1 Merrill Lynch CDO's

An example of bullshit is given by Sal Khan in a video on You Tube entitled: Bailout 12: Lone Star Transaction. It involves Merrill Lynch trying to hide a tremendous loss on bad CDO's while reporting it in a report to its investors. The writer of the words should be taxed on the existence of this bullshit, as well as those employees who gave the order to confuse the disclosure and those employees of Merrill Lynch who signed the contract, etc. Also, the employees who set up the Lone Star special purpose company, could also own the Bullshit and be taxed.

3.2 Mortgage shops

The mortgage shops which made up mortgages for banks using false signatures and false notary publics and the employees of the banks who approved it and foreclosed on mortgagees who were given false papers. There must be Bullshit in those papers. The employees own that Bullshit and must pay a tax on it.

3.3 AIG's Credit Default Swaps

Insured bets without money set aside for payment. There must be Bullshit in some documents. The employees that profited and and produced the Bullshit own it, and can be taxed.

3.4 Standard & Poor's civil suit

The civil suit just filed against S&P is welcome news. But it took too long. Also, there is a good chance that most of S&P' employees did not know they were selling crappy stuff. No matter what, there must have been Bullshit somewhere in their process. TAX it!!

4 Assessment Proposals

The above examples are of a serious nature, and most Americans would be happy to see some of the authors of our financial woes participate in the general income loss by being taxed on their Bullshit creation and/or propagation which led to the general collapse of our economy, instead of keeping their large profits from the use of the Bullshit. To consider assessment, I will concentrate on less cosmic Bullshit. The Bullshit found in building permits and local Environmental Impact Reports (EIR's). Also the Bullshit found in State Bars and in applying inappropriate laws. Most of the examples will come from a small area of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey, which is what I am familiar with.

4.1 Shadows on Neighbors

One developer wanted to build a five story apartment house next to small two story condominiums. Their consultant produced a satellite view of the area which showed that the condos' property was impacted by the shadow at 9AM on the winter solstice. But the representative of the developer said the condos were never impacted by shadows under oath. I wouldn't like to see the representative accused of perjury. But he could be taxed for Bullshit because his consultants had the shadow too long in length for the date and time, and had an azimuth which implied that the time was about 2 o'clock in the morning, so there should have been no shadows because it was completely dark.

The consultants wrote in the EIR that there were two jurisdictions involved. So they had the right to choose which law applied. They chose the more "precise" law, which said that the new construction should not cut off more that 3 hours of the sun which fell on the condos on the *Summer* Solstice. Given the observed sunrise on the summer solstice and the angle of the sun from the announced height of the new buildings, the condos would lose about 3 hours and 40 minutes. However, the original promise was that the buildings would have two levels of parking submerged below grade. But after their first draft EIR, they admitted they could only submerge one level "partially". Partially turned out to be zero, so that the buildings rise 7 stories high. And the summer solstice sun will be absent for much longer than 3 hours and 40 minutes. I recommend assessing the rent of the top offending floors as the perpetual tax on the bullshit of the height.

Epilogue: The shadow consultant later worked for a developer who wanted to build a ten story hotel. The shadow study covered the entire year, except for March. The excuse for omitting March had something to do with the *October Solstice*. The tax should be heavy enough to drive this consulting firm out of business.

5 The HUD Papers

The developers won their permit from the County, but they needed investors. So they applied to HUD (Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development) for a loan. WeAreMarinaDelRey (WAMdR) asked for the public records (PRA) of the application. The records were sent and we

found that the developers failed to mention the high water table, the oil wells on the property (for the first half of the procedure), and a former bankruptcy. Soon after, WAMdR received a letter from HUD demanding that WAMdR return the papers and recover and destroy any copies given out to other people. The condo association's former lawyer stated in a video that this sounded like a coverup and he pointed out he had been a Federal Prosecutor . So soon after, another letter came changing the reason they wanted in papers back. They said they didn't give WAMdR exactly what was asked for. Eventually WAMdR sent back their originals and received a refund and a smaller set of papers which was devoid of any information. But the original papers are still out on the web.

How would I Tax the Bullshit in this situation? The Developer provided false and untimely information to HUD. This may be illegal. But it is complicated to prove who actually provided the false information. They may have been given it. But it is false, it shows no regard for the truth, so it is Bullshit and the tax should be assessed on those that profited from HUD's loan guarantee. The developers and their lawyers who approached HUD for the loan guarantee.

6 Mapping Bullshit: Oil wells; right of ways; water frontage; appeals; wetlands; view corridors;

The use of maps without enough information is an effective use of Bullshit.

6.1 Oil Wells

A developer hid the existence of oil wells on his parcel The EIR did not report any. A letter from DOGGR said there were two on the property and they would have to be re abandoned. At the last moment, the developer decided not to use DOGGR's procedure. A map was given out by the County which showed an oil well not built over. But there was enough information left on the map to see that this was not the case after the construction was nearly completed. Pay enough taxes to equal neighbor's earthquake insurance.

6.2 Right of Way

A misleading notice of a public meeting did not disclose the loss of Right of Way. A map clearly shows part of the Right of Way going through storage units. Make the developer pay taxes on the extra area of his storage units.

6.3 Water Frontage

The width of View Corridors is based on the length of the water frontage of a parcel. Some maps don't give enough information to independently calculate the frontage. Pay the tax equal to the

rent of those units blocking the view which should have existed if the view corridors were properly installed.

6.4 Appeals

If the appealable area is falsely represented, then pay triple rent on the area within the Appeal Zone.

6.5 Wetlands

If a wetland is encroached upon, by means of a map on which the wetland's boundary is not crystal clear, the tax is 60% of the project's revenue.

6.6 View Corridors

For each mandated View Corridor which is less than 20% of the frontage, the tax will be an additional 20% of the revenue.

7 The Coastal Improvement Fund

The Coastal Improvement Fund (CIF) was founded in 1995 to build a park for recreation in a MdR neighborhood where the density increases by a certain amount. Up to this time, it has not been spent for its purpose. When the public found out about it, they requested documents. The accounting seemed strange and contradictory. We asked the County but got no clear answers. Half of the CIF was not collecting interest, contrary to its defining ordinance. As a response to public concern, the funds are being transferred and united, and the part that collected no interest is being given interest from some County fund. We are concerned that it will be used for some different project which will have the name park attached to it, such as view park or wetlands park. The context of the fund was a park for recreation, where children can play basket ball, tennis, etc. Attempts to queer the word recreation to stand for shopping and other such things could be regarded as Bullshit. This should be taxed by a higher jurisdiction, the state of California. If the CIF is spent on a wetlands park, the sum would be taxed at twice its value.F a recreational shopping mall it should be be taxed at 4 times its value. If it is not taxed at all, the money should revert to the State.

8 Legal Bullshit

Bullshit is most destructive when our legal system employs it.

8.1 State Bar

Richard I. Fine represented two different clients in the MdR opposed to the same developer. Fine was twice investigated by the Bar within two weeks of taking each case. In both cases the president of the State Bar represented the developer. What is the probability of that? If it is high, then something is very wrong with the California State Bar. If it is very low, then it reflects badly on the developer and the two presidents of the Bar. (Furthermore, I know that in Arizona it is a common tactic for Insurance companies to complain to the Bar about the opposing lawyer so the he has to defend himself while he is representing his client.) Fine settled the first Bar complaint, but when he took the MSCII Homeowners Association as a client against the County and a Developer, the Bar persecuted him much harder. Fine didn't realize that the Bar's process did not follow the usual methods which safeguarded a defendant's rights. When he was accused of some misbehavior in some earlier case, which he had lost, he was blocked from explaining his actions by Collateral Estopple. That means you can't retry old cases again and again. But he was being accused of some breach in these old cases. It struck me as very unfair Bullshit. He was convicted of filing frivolous law suits, but was not convicted of any count of lying. Most of the frivolous lawsuits involved judges who were receiving money from the County, in violation of the State Constitution. It seemed to me that it was a straight forward application of elementary legal principals that Fine was right and the judges were wrong. Then the California court of appeals found that the judges were wrong. So the Bar's Review Panel changed the rulings on the frivolous counts but then found him guilty of lying on the counts where the trial court found him innocent. (later on, the Appeals Court of California reversed its decision and found the extra payment to the Judges were legal.) A strong whiff of Bullshit occurred when Fine tried to find out who it was that complained and initiated the Bar's action. A person walked into the courtroom and said he was the complainant. he never testified under oath. Fine pointed out that there were people in the courtroom who could testify as to the origins of the case. The judge refused to call them, saying it would not effect the way he would decide the case. So MSCII as well as Fine were left in the dark.

What I would recommend is a hefty Bullshit tax on the Bar. Also a tax on the Bullshit of the judges receiving extra money somewhat less than the amount they got, but eventually , since the Bullshit tax lasts forever the money would be clawed back. This could be done without worrying about the legal consequences to the judges other cases, since they are merely being taxed and not branded as criminals.

8.2 Judge Yaffe

When Fine was actually disbarred, it occurred at a delicate moment in MSCII's case against the developer. Fine had missed a filing by one day. So the developer's lawyers moved to have the MSCII case thrown out. Fine saved the case by admitting he had erred. Then the Judge ruled that Fine had to pay the Developer's legal fees. The judge had chosen the wrong law and refused to let Fine argue the point. It is as if you left your car parked and the meter ran down, and the ticket you got said reckless driving. Fine held out against Yaffe's ruling, and disqualified Yaffe. Finally, Yaffe sent him to jail for contempt. Fine spent one and a half years in jail before Yaffe finally released him.

I don't know if taxing Yaffe for Bullshit would be a satisfying end to this horrible miscarriage of justice.

8.3 Taxes vs Fees

California's Proposition 13 was a Constitutional Amendment, voted in by a voter initiative, which demanded that 2/3 of the local tax payers were needed to approve a local tax increase. The County wants to tax the local property owners to fund clean water storm runoff projects to protect the beaches and ocean. They were trying to use State Constitution Article 13D Section 6(b) to justify taxing property owners based on the idea that polluted storm runoff was just dependent on the size of the property owned by property owner as opposed to the runoff arising from paved streets used by the entire population.

The County Counsel wrote a report on the possibility of taxing the Property Owners. The possibility was opened by Proposition 218. The key sections are printed below.

The County Counsel's analysis [County Counsel] never discussed the services which the property owners were to receive, but which the public would not. The only benefits the public would receive different from those of the public is that the non property owner would not have to pay for the benefits. But the key word is services. And if the property owners services are substantially the same as the public services, then 6b(5) says no fees can be imposed.

From: State Constitution Article 13 D Section 6(b)

(2) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the fee or charge was imposed.

(4) *No fee or charge may be imposed for a service* unless that service is *actually used by, or immediately available to, the* **owner** *of the property in question.* Fees or charges based on potential or future use of a service are not permitted. Standby charges, whether characterized as charges or assessments, shall be classified as assessments and shall not be imposed without compliance with Section 4.

(5) *No fee or charge may be imposed for general governmental services* including, but not limited to, police, fire, ambulance or library services, *where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners.* Reliance by an agency on any parcel map, including, but not limited to, an assessor's parcel map, may be considered a significant factor in determining whether a fee or charge is imposed as an incident of property ownership for purposes of this article. In any legal action contesting the validity of a fee or charge, the burden shall be on the agency to demonstrate compliance with this article.

Bullshit Paragraphs of the County Counsel's legal argument:

As stated above, section 6(b)(5) of article XIIID prohibits the use of a fee "for general governmental services ...where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner

as it is to property owners." This does not mean, however, that the general public cannot *benefit* from services funded by a property-related fee. Indeed; uses of the Clean-Water Fee are expected to - provide benefits to the public at large from less trash and bacteria at public beaches, fewer toxic materials in rivers containing fish or used for recreational purposes, and more polluted water diverted from storm drains and allowed to percolate and increase groundwater supplies. But the purpose of the service is to reduce the pollution contained in water that flows from the properties subject to the fee, and that is a service that is clearly not available to the public at large in the same manner as it is available to the properties in the District.

(NOTE how the words 'benefit' and 'service' are mixed, leading to an inappropriate list of benefits, disallowed because services should have been listed.)

AND

The proposed uses of the revenues from the fees are *set forth in Part IV of the Engineer's Report*, and are generally described as services to enhance water quality and protect water bodies and ecosystems that receive pollutants carried by stormwater and urban runoff in the District. Fee revenues maybe used to partially fund *projects designed to achieve multiple objectives* but such projects "shall have as their primary purpose, to improve water quality and reduce stormwater and urban runoff pollution in the District." (Engineer's Report, page 25.)

(NOTE: Part IV does not contain a list of uses)

AND

Second, the Legal Concerns Statement asserts that the threshold for voter approval is lower for a fee than for a tax or assessment and, therefore, a fee is less protective of property owners' rights. Whether or not this statement is accurate, it is irrelevant to the legality of the Clean Water Fee. The California Constitution sets forth different processes for the imposition of taxes, fees, and assessments. While Propositions 13 and 218 require a two-thirds vote of the electorate to impose a special tax, Proposition 218 authorizes assessments subject to a majority protest by the property owners, and a property-related fee under Proposition 218 must be approved by *either* a majority vote of property owners or a two-thirds vote of the electorate. Moreover, unlike a tax or an assessment, a property-related fee requires a public hearing and majority protest procedure as well as an election.

(NOTE: There is no **either** in 13D Section 6a (1) - (2). If the majority of the identified property owners disapprove, the fee is killed, even if a subsequent election is held and 2/3 of the electorate votes for it. The majority of property owners have veto power. (The protests at the January 15, 2013 Board of Supervisors meeting proves that the mail ballot has not been given to enough property owners.)

Thus the County Counsel failed to provide a list of Services, which means that he failed to satisfy the hypotheses of sections 6b (4) and (5), and hence cannot apply the conclusions of the law. Instead, he refers to a nonexistent list in the Engineers Report and uses an inappropriate argument concerning a list of Benefits, which is the same for both the property owners and the public. So If the meaning of Services is Bullshit, then trying to use a previous rule on benefits fails because the

benefits are the same for the Property Owners and the Public. So the County Counsel has initiated an insufficient notice of election costing $3 million without showing that the election, if correctly done, satisfies the conditions of the law!

9 The Coast of Bullshit

The California Coastal Commission (CCC) was established to protect the beautiful California Coast's environment, scenic beauty and water recreation, from excessive development. It has the duty to review coastal permits by local jurisdictions and reject them or accept them. In 1995 the Coastal Commission accepted a new Local Coastal Plan (LCP), for MdR, proposed by Los Angeles County. They zoned most of the land for 500 foot tall buildings. But not to worry, they mitigated the density by creating a Coastal Improvement Fund to supply the required recreational parks, they created View Corridors to preserve the panoramic views to mitigate the extra heights above 45' on the waterfront parcels, and they limited amendments to the LCP to 3 per year. This 3 per year was probably so that the complicated cap and trade scheme to protect the coastal values could not be suddenly changed in only one meeting.

In fact, in November 2012, the CCC changed all the 12 Development Zones and rearranged them into 3. It changed the shape and names of several parcels. So isn't this more than 3 amendments? No one has shown me that this doesn't violate the 3 amendment law. So I will try to think about it myself:

The word "Amendment" seems to mean to make a *small* change in a law or contract. But thinking about it, I think it would be legal to abolish all of the Amendments of the Bill of Rights and the Congress with only one Amendment to the US Constitution, as long as the Amendment is passed according to the Constitutional procedures. So changing most of the Development zones with one amendment seem to be legal!

What is interesting, is the passage of that humungous Amendment validates that the ordinance requiring only three amendments per year is Bullshit, so I would recommend that all developers or owners be assessed a tax on all the rentals above 45' high, since the 3 amendment rule was mitigation for the zoning for high buildings. It was misleading and dressed up as mathematically precise limitation on the ability to deconstruct the the mitigations of zoning high buildings. The tax should be paid to the State of California.

Below we will study a sequence of appeals to the CCC after the amendment passed. Each appeal had some Bullshit associated with it. The CCC has a hard working staff supplying information to the 12 Commissioners. The Commissioners meet a few days each month, holding session of length and intensity which draws the admiration of any who watch their proceedings. An elaborate exparte rule blocks the Commissioners from having informative contacts with the public. but they seem to talk with consultants even during the meetings. So any Bullshit from the staff is very influential with the Commission's decisions.

9.1 The CCC and the CIF

The CIF was a fund set up for the purpose of providing a recreational park as mitigation for the higher density that the permitted developments brings. WAMdR, knowing there were no parks scheduled in the new development, began investigating the CIF. WAMdR found many inconsistencies with the fund. We mentioned this at the November 2011 meeting on the humungous amendment, and said that $35,000 more suddenly appeared in the Fund in addition to its known balance. Later in the proceedings, a Commissioner asked a member of the staff, Jack, about the Fund. He said that he wasn't sure how much money was in the fund, probably $35,000, well that's too little to build a park. Actually WAMdR knew there was at least about $110,000 in the fund. Later we found out that the amount was nearly $200,000 and probably more since the County was paying in the required interest.

At the appeal on parking lot FF held in Ocean Side the next year, Jack's bullshit was less excusable. Jack said that There were reports to the director of the Coastal Commission and the staff could find nothing wrong with them. WAMdR asked the Coastal Commission in a PRA for a copy of this report. The reply was that there were no such reports yet. They would begin next year. I would recommend a $5 dollar per year tax on Jack and the revenues from 33 acres of the developer's building from the developer, to be paid to the State.

9.2 The CCC and the View Corridors

In order to build buildings along the water front, the developer had to leave View Corridor's at a minimum 20% of the water frontage. These View Corridors were not to contain any view obstacles and were to be open to the sky. At first, the View Corridor rule was not enforced. But as the public discovered the rule, the new projects proposed View Corridors which were considerably thinner than 20%. But the developers made their widths add up to 20% or more. Jack stated in the appeal report that although the singular word corridor was used in the ordinance, nowhere does it state that the plural corridors could not be used. In this case, the ordinance was not changed, but the interpretation was pure Bullshit. The situation is like this. The parking meter says 25 cents per hour, Quarters only. You put in five nickels, get a ticket, and then tell the policeman that nowhere on the meter does it say that you can't use nickels.

The View Corridor issue came up in another appeal later. This time, Jack said that the appellants claimed you couldn't use more than one View Corridor. No, we claimed that every view corridor must be 20% wide. Jack showed a report which stated our appeal was based on not having more than one View Corridor, instead of our assertion that the minimum width of a View Corridor must be 20% The lawyers were more cautious. In the Board of Supervisors Findings (part of the permit) They stated there were only two View Corridors. The CCC staff claimed there were 7 View Corridors. I would recommend the developers pay a Bullshit tax of 140% of their income, where as the lawyers should pay 40% of the the developers income.

9.3 The CCC and the Appeal Zone

A previous appeal doomed the parking lot FF from ever being a park. Only parking lot OT was left. So WeAreMarinaDelRey appealed the OT project. An Analyst for the CCC staff, Al, called WAMdR to say that our appeal was so weak that the CCC was demanding $300 to hear the appeal. I went down to the local CCC office and spoke with Al. I asked for the map which showed the boundaries of the Appeal Zone. it was brought out. It was drawn in 1991. It showed OT in the non appeal zone. It also showed the HUD project mentioned above partially in the appeal zone. I had a Google map which showed a portion of OT in the appeal zone. The the rationale changed. The Amendment changed the basis of the CIF's mission. No. I said, I showed him the same wording in the new amended LCP. Then Al pointed to a nearby phrase which was new, the CIF only applies to *waterfront* parcels. Al said that waterfront parcels touched the water. This is a very strong precedent, The County could eliminate a waterfront parcel restriction by separating a small parcel along the shore from the original waterfront parcel. This precedent could extend the entire length of the Coast. If the staff did not warn the Commissioners of this trick, then that would be a serious dereliction of duty.

Afterwards WAMdR sent a PRA request to the Coastal Commission which revealed that the HUD parcel was indeed partially within the appeal zone. The method of calculation given also showed that OT was almost entirely within the zone.

9.4 The CCC and the Wetland

The last appeal to the CCC concerned the wetland on Parcel 9U in MdR. Wetlands are not supposed to be encroached upon or moved by developments. A hotel was proposed for 9U. There is a wetland on 9U. In the EIR for 9U, the maps for the project were drawn on different sheets. So it was difficult to determine the boundary of the wetlands from the maps. WAMdR wanted me to check if the proposed hotel was encroaching on the boundary. Using Google satellite maps, and noting that the boundary of the hotel corresponded to a certain slip on the water, I was able to draw the boundary with confidence. The County then decided to approve the wetlands separately from the hotel. The maps of the hotel and wetlands given to the CCC staff, no longer clearly showed the slips. Shortly before the appeal, the slips were removed. The appellants also submitted a copy of a letter in which the hotel stated that they needed the area which encroached on the wetlands to make their enterprise profitable. The CCC staff never mentioned the letter. They claimed since the hotel had yet to be approved, the moving of the wetlands was not being done at the behest of the hotel project, so it wasn't violating case law.

I recommend that the Bullshit Tax in this case be assessed on the developers at the cost of construction of the hotel, paid each year to the State. and that the County be assessed the cost of the construction of moving the wetlands for every year, paid to the environmental group which had filed the appeal along with WAMdR.

10 Summary

Applied Bullshit is the opposite of Pure Mathematics. A published pure mathematician would have the ability to spot Bullshit. Since Bullshit is not well defined two such mathematicians may disagree as to whether something is Bullshit or not. But they should be able to define their differences clearly to an average person. A small jury of average Americans should be the assessors of the tax. The appropriate enforcer of the tax should be the relevant jurisdiction, Federal, State, County, City. The country's lawyers should study mathematics: Elementary Set Theory, Euclidean Geometry, Algebra, Calculus in order to build up their intellectual honesty. Care must be taken so that the Bullshit Tax will not be gamed.

REFERENCES

Daniel H. Gottlieb(2004) A Defining Moment in Mathematics and the Gay Marriage Decision http://www.math.purdue.edu/ gottlieb/Law/gaymarriage.html

Harry G. Frankfurt (2005) On Bullshit Princeton University Press Princeton New Jersey See page 55-56

Sal Kahn; Bailout 12: Lone Star Transaction; KahnAcademy; You Tube

LA County Counsel(2012); Letter to Gail Farber; https://www.dropbox.com/s/8c806ezutdc3gf7/Letter%20to%20Gail%20Farber%20-%201-7-13.pdf