

# Re: infinity

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-10/msg00141.html>

---

- *From:* "Jonathan Hoyle" <[jonhoyle@xxxxxxx](mailto:jonhoyle@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 2 Oct 2005 21:51:41 -0700
- 

>> Jonathan, have you read the extent of Martin's work? What do  
>> you really know about it, besides brief descriptions that get  
>> poopooed here automatically?

I know nothing about Martin's work, other than what he has posted here. I believe that his work could be revamped into something the mathematical community would accept, and I outlined such a path in a previous post. Essentially, begin with ZFC and remove the Axiom of Infinity, and replace it with another axiom related to his area of study. Such an approach would require Martin to be much more rigorous in his arguments than he has so far. But the moment you begin this whole silly "Cantorian" fight, you will not be taken very seriously. It would be similar to say an astrologer attempting to publish "the effect of Mars on Pisces" in a astro-physics journal.

I think Martin could contribute something mathematically. My point was merely that his current thesis would not be taken seriously by mathematicians. So, I provided places that could take it seriously.

>> I am not sure you are in a position to judge, are you?

Judge? I am not a editor on submissions at a mathematics journal, if that's what you mean. However, any Mathematics grad student (and many undergrads for that matter) would see what I see. Anyone posting on the web is essentially submitting their ideas for public peer review. Instilling false hope is not doing a kindness.

>> He should expect resistance, but should he expect failure?

If his thesis remains unmodified, yes, he should expect failure from mathematics journal. There are places where he will not find failure. However, a modified (ie more mathematically rigorous) approach could granted him success.

>> Yes, position yourself against the mathematical community,  
>> then they will embrace you.

No they will not, that's my point. Crank physicists who wish to "battle Einstinian theory" have the same problem. So do crank

Re: infinity

geologists who believe in a Flat Earth. And so it goes.

>> Oh nice. Go join the crank club. Pretty condescending,  
>> if you ask me.

I was merely pointing out a resource in which other like minded individuals can be found. In particular, the Cantor page at <http://www.crank.net/cantor.html> has a link to an article by Professor Wilfrid Hodges talking about the two dozen papers submitted him by people who try to disprove Cantor, and why such papers are unpublishable.

I'm sorry that you view that as condescending, but the reality is: papers such as these will not be accepted by the mathematics community. They are dismissed, NOT because they are contraversial, but rather because they are not mathematics.

Hope that helps,

Jonathan

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: infinity*

◇ *From:* Ross A. Finlayson

• Prev by Date: *Re: Group generated by two elements*

• Next by Date: *Re: Complex analysis question.,*

• Previous by thread: *Re: infinity*

• Next by thread: *Re: infinity*

• Index(es):

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*