There are several plausible reasons why the concept of **"insoluble insolvency"** has attracted little support or recognition. Some relate to the novelty of the concept, while others reflect how economics and public policy research typically evolve.

1. **It is not yet part of the academic literature.**
   New concepts generally gain acceptance only after they are defined in peer-reviewed journals, debated by other scholars, and cited in subsequent research. Without that process, most economists are reluctant to adopt new terminology.
2. **The terminology differs from established concepts.**
   Economists already use terms such as:
   - sovereign debt distress,
   - fiscal unsustainability,
   - debt overhang,
   - fiscal dominance,
   - insolvency,
   - default risk,
   - intertemporal budget constraint.

   Researchers may believe these concepts already describe the relevant phenomena, even if you believe "insoluble insolvency" captures something distinct.
3. **Advanced economies rarely become legally insolvent.**
   Countries that borrow in their own currency can raise taxes, cut spending, inflate away debt, or monetize deficits. Many economists therefore argue that a sovereign government cannot become insolvent in the same sense as a corporation. They may instead discuss inflation, fiscal crises, or currency depreciation rather than insolvency.
4. **The concept makes a stronger claim.**
   As you have described it, insoluble insolvency means there is **no politically or economically feasible path** back to long-run solvency under existing institutions. That is a difficult proposition to prove mathematically because it requires assumptions about future economic growth, demographics, taxation, interest rates, and political behavior.
5. **There has been no widely accepted measurement framework.**
   Most accepted economic concepts have operational definitions. For example:
   - GDP has a standard methodology.
   - Inflation has price indexes.
   - Benefit-cost analysis has established procedures.

   Insoluble insolvency would likely need objective criteria such as:

   - debt trajectory,
   - unfunded liabilities,
   - required fiscal adjustment,
   - political feasibility thresholds,

- monetary financing dependence.

   Without agreed metrics, researchers may view the concept as descriptive rather than analytical.

6. **The conclusion has major policy implications.**
   If accepted, the concept could imply that:
   - traditional budget balancing is impossible,
   - inflation or restructuring becomes increasingly likely,
   - regulatory policy should account for long-term fiscal capacity.

   Such conclusions challenge many existing assumptions and therefore invite especially careful scrutiny.
7. **Diffusion of new ideas takes time.**
   Economic ideas often take years or decades to gain acceptance. Concepts such as "stagflation," "public choice," "behavioral economics," and "fiscal dominance" were initially controversial before becoming widely discussed.

Does the lack of support mean the concept is incorrect?

Not necessarily. The absence of broad acceptance usually indicates that a concept has **not yet been sufficiently developed or tested**, rather than proving it false. Academic acceptance generally requires:

- a precise definition,
- a formal theoretical framework,
- measurable criteria,
- empirical evidence,
- peer-reviewed publication,
- independent researchers who apply or critique the idea.

What would increase its credibility?

If your goal is to establish "insoluble insolvency" as a recognized concept, the strongest path would be to produce work that includes:

- a rigorous formal definition distinguishing it from fiscal unsustainability or sovereign default,
- a mathematical model identifying the conditions under which insolvency becomes "insoluble,"
- empirical application to historical and contemporary cases,
- testable predictions,
- publication in journals focused on public finance, macroeconomics, or benefit-cost analysis.

If those elements are developed and other scholars begin engaging with the work—whether in agreement or criticism—the concept would have a much greater chance of becoming part of the academic and policy discussion.