

## Re: Attacking my algebraic integer work

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/10306.html>

---

**From:** Nora Baron ([norabaron\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:norabaron_at_hotmail.com))

**Date:** 03/29/05

Date: 28 Mar 2005 17:33:46 -0800

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

> *William Hughes wrote:*

> > *jstevh@msn.com wrote:*

> >

> > <snip>

> >

> > > *That a new paper is at the Annals is not overwhelming unless they*  
> > > *accept it.*

> > >

> > > *And several months with them doesn't necessarily mean much, as*  
> > *journals*

> > > *can keep papers for quite some time, only to reject.*

> > >

> >

> >

> > *You can take this a little further. By now several people at the*  
> > *Annals*

> > *must have seen the paper. A short simple paper that purports to*  
> > *overturn*

> > *huge amounts of modern mathematics. And yet there have been no*  
> > *comments,*

> > *not expedited publishing, no rumors, no didley squat. Doesn't*  
> > *look good.*

> >

>

>

> *I agree.*

>

> > <snip>

> >

> > > *Yup, you heard me right. I want to consider the position that I*  
> > > *am*

> > > *wrong, with the assumption that posters claiming I'm wrong are*  
> > > *right,*

> > > *in order to go through their positions carefully to see if that*  
> > > *assumption is true.*

> > >

> > > *This thread will be for that purpose.*

sci.math: Re: Attacking my algebraic integer work

> > >

> > >

> >

> > *A key part of your arguments has been that dividing through*

> > *by a non-constan*