

Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Log/2011

January 29

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
< Wikipedia:Articles for deletion | Log

< 28 January

30 January >

Guide to deletion

Contents

- 1 Gitanjali Mathur
- 2 UK Airsoft Wiki
- 3 TJ Fredette
- 4 African Unification
- 5 Paul B. Gennaro
- 6 Heath Totten
- 7 Melqui Torres
- 8 Mirka De Arellano
- 9 Dear God (Boyz II Men song)
- 10 Prometheus (film project)
- 11 List of business failures
- 12 Restoring the Lost Constitution
- 13 The Best of The Velvet Underground: The Millennium Collection
- 14 Estrella Lin
- 15 List of legislation sponsored by Ron Paul
- 16 Binais Begović
- 17 Edwin Markham Elementary School
- 18 Kidsdaily
- 19 C.O.D. (album)
- 20 Sima Yari
- 21 Ringo Ma
- 22 History of the BattleTech universe
- 23 Jamal Hashemi
- 24 Historical development of Ganesha
- 25 St. Andrew's Episcopal School (Amarillo, Texas)
- 26 Airline Employees Association
- 27 Emsworth Cricket Club
- 28 Punjab Juvenile Justice System Rules 2002
- 29 Randy Raney
- 30 Edwaard Liang
- 31 Kung-Hao Liang
- 32 Tze-Chiang Chen
- 33 Chen Ing Hau
- 34 Hsiao-Lan Wang
- 35 Pan Shiji
- 36 Catalina Island Marine Institute
- 37 Mike Emmett
- 38 Chen Shi-hui
- 39 Bryan Meredith (soccer)

Centralized discussion



Proposals

Discussions

Recurring proposals

- RFCs on the use of flagicons in lists and in infoboxes
- Proposal to promote **Notability (video games)** to SNG.
- Proposal for the creation of a "greylist" to flag material from dubious sources in BLPs
- RfC on recent removals of images from currency articles.
- RfC on adding a criterion to RevisionDelete, and removing one.
- RfC on streamlining noticeboards

Note: inactive discussions, closed or not, should be archived.

archive • talk • edit • history • watch

- 40 Gale E. Krouse
- 41 August Ferdinand Black
- 42 Ishpeck's Law
- 43 Portal of Evil
- 44 Summit Learning Services
- 45 11/11/11
- 46 Green Police
- 47 Water and the environment
- 48 -ton
- 49 Dolphin safe label
- 50 Sangeeta sethi
- 51 Live '11
- 52 Deichstraße
- 53 Rushi Tai Chi Chuan
- 54 Norazia
- 55 RobApps
- 56 Nigina Abduraimova
- 57 Illegal eagle
- 58 Country subdivision
- 59 John Roberts (actor)
- 60 William Vickers (fiddler)
- 61 Taylor Ellington
- 62 Delhi Belgian Club
- 63 John Driffill
- 64 Sabar Koti
- 65 Marc Scaringi
- 66 Digital transform
- 67 Merging Technologies
- 68 Donna M. Marbach
- 69 Semaphore (song)
- 70 Hugh Allison
- 71 Bondage rope harness
- 72 Doku

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **speedy delete** as a copyvio by Sphilbrick (talk · contribs). —David Eppstein (talk) 04:26, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Gitanjali Mathur

Gitanjali Mathur (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "Gitanjali Mathur" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Gitanjali+Mathur%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=newswire+wire+presswire+PR+release+wikipedia&q=%22Gitanjali+Mathur%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Gitanjali+Mathur%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?

q=%22Gitanjali+Mathur%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7cc_attribute%7cc_sharealike%7cc_noncommercial%7cc_nonderived)&q=%22Gitanjali+Mathur%22))

Subject of article does not meet the notability standards for WP:MUSICBIO. The article seems to have been created by her or her agent as a promotional device. There are no independent secondary sources (books, magazine articles, documentaries, etc.) about her. Although her voice does appear on a Grammy-nominated CD, it is as part of a large choir ensemble (named "Conspirare"). This might qualify the ensemble as notable, but not any of the individual choir members. Quonset84 (talk) 23:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Delete per nominator. Shyamsunder (talk) 01:08, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of India-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:09, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:09, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per WP:ENTERTAINER. Qworthy (talk) 02:31, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy delete** as a copyvio from http://gitanjalimathur.com/about.php -- Whpq (talk) 17:02, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Sorry, Paul Firmin, I have to disregard your opinion per WP:COI. Sandstein 09:33, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] UK Airsoft Wiki

UK Airsoft Wiki (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "UK Airsoft Wiki" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22UK+Airsoft+Wiki%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22UK+Airsoft+Wiki%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22UK+Airsoft+Wiki%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22UK+Airsoft+Wiki%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7cc_attribute%7cc_sharealike%7cc_noncommercial%7cc_nonderived)&q=%22UK+Airsoft+Wiki%22))

There's no indication of notability and it seems to simply be a promotional page for the site. Yaksar (let's chat) 23:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Websites-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:08, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 02:59, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

If you looked at the page it clearly states that its in Beta Testing. I know wikipedia has a dislike for all things airsoft but this page will have refs from other sources once it is live and the have it nominated for deletion is just plain stupid. -- Paul Firmin 08:58, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Honestly, Wikipedia has nothing against airsoft. Your wiki, however, is not something that belongs in an encyclopedia. I encourage you to keep editing Wikipedia, and I'm sure most of your contributions are very helpful. But Wikipedia is not just a compendium of everything. I'd suggest checking out Wikipedia:Notability. If you've got any more questions, you're welcome to ask on my talk page. --Yaksar (let's chat) 09:47, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** - No coverage in reliable sources to establish notability. -- Whpq (talk) 17:04, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - There are loads of pages on wikipedia with no reliable sources on them and they simply have the Template:Refimprove template added to it. In fact there is well over 500 (<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/Template:Refimprove&limit=500>) pages on wikipedia that have this template on it. If this page is deleted can it be added again once it has reliable sources? I do understand that articles on wikipedia need to be sourced but as the site is still in testing and not live it has not such sources yet but it is due to have two once live. -- Paul Firmin 22:37, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** I'm sorry Paul but I'm not finding anything in google or google news that satisfies WP:GNG or WP:WEB. --Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:50, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:51, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] TJ Fredette

TJ Fredette (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "TJ Fredette" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22TJ+Fredette%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22TJ+Fredette%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22TJ+Fredette%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22TJ+Fredette%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22TJ+Fredette%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22TJ+Fredette%22)))

Delete - Does not appear to meet Wikipedia standards for notability -Porlob (talk) 23:18, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** Seems to fail WP:GNG as well as WP:NMUSIC. ~~ Lothar von Richthofen (talk) 01:06, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:07, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:00, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** -- He's the equivalent of George Clinton, who got famous solely on the basis of being Bill Clinton's brother. Secondhand fame is still notoriety]]. User:LonnieM (talk) 22:21:00, 02 February 2011 (UTC)

The preceding comment was by IP user 70.57.101.229. User:LonnieM is an unregistered username.

- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. Shamelessly self-promoting. drm (talk) 03:00, 3 February 2011 (UTC) —Preceding unsigned comment added by 75.162.122.191 (talk)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Redirect to Pan-Africanism is an editorial decision. Sandstein 09:22, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] African Unification

African Unification (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "African Unification" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22African+Unification%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22African+Unification%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22African+Unification%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22African+Unification%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22African+Unification%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22African+Unification%22)))

This article is a POV fork of Pan-Africanism it does not exist as a concept in the real world and has no life outside of Pan-Africanism. Motives for creating it are seriously unclear.--Halqh حَلَقَة הלכה (talk) 22:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Africa-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:04, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Politics-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:05, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** to Pan-Africanism. Nyttend (talk) 19:51, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability of the specific concept "Africal Unification" is not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:03, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** pretty obviously a silly idea someone made up and not something with a reliable history. Shii (tock) 11:14, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:52, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Paul B. Gennaro

Paul B. Gennaro (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "Paul B. Gennaro" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22) • books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22) • scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22) • free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22))

Non-notable individual lacking GHits and GNEWS of substance. Appears to fail WP:Bio. *ttonyb* (talk) 22:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Non notable, fails WP:Bio. *Paste* *Let's have a chat.* 00:38, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Actors and filmmakers-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:04, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** for failing WP:Bio. Regent of the Seatopians (talk) 02:15, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per WP:TOOSOON, for much the same reasons as was the article on his production company[1] (http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:LoGkwoEHIAgJ:en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autonomous_Entertainment+%22Paul+B.+Gennaro%22&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&source=www.google.com) was deleted. While both might merit a return in the future... they currently fail applicable notability criteria. *Schmidt, MICHAEL Q.* 02:43, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. (non-admin closure) Logan Talk^{Contributions} 00:29, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Heath Totten

Heath Totten (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Heath Totten" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Heath+Totten%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Heath+Totten%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Heath+Totten%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Heath+Totten%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Heath+Totten%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Heath+Totten%22)))

Non-notable, 32-year old, free agent, minor league baseball pitcher who hasn't played since 2008. His 66-73 record is far from stellar and, in my opinion, does not merit an article. Alex (talk) 22:13, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** "hasn't played since 2008" His page at the official Minor League Baseball website [2] (http://web.minorleaguebaseball.com/milb/stats/stats.jsp?n=Heath%20Totten&pos=P&sid=1112&t=p_pbp&pid=456726) states that his status is "Active". It also states that he has pitched as recently as December 29, 2010. He is playing for Bravos de Margarita in the Venezuelan League - the highest professional league in the country of Venezuela. Some of his teammates this past year are major league players. The second guideline of the baseball notability guidelines: "Have appeared in at least one game in ... any other top-level national league." Having played in the top professional league of Venezuela, I feel he qualifies. Kinston eagle (talk) 22:38, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

I would also note that he participated in the 2010 Caribbean Series. Wikipedia:Notability (sports) states that "Sports figures are presumed notable (except as noted within a specific section) if they: 1. have participated in a major international ... professional competition at the highest level" Kinston eagle (talk) 22:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

The Olympics are "major." The Caribbean Series is not. Alex (talk) 18:38, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

The Olympics are a major amateur competition. The Caribbean Series is professionals only. Regardless, there were no Summer Olympics in 2010, so one could argue that this was the most important international baseball tournament of that year - professional or amateur. Kinston eagle (talk) 19:31, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** per Kinston. Spanneraol (talk) 23:07, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:03, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** That rule really needs tweaking then. There is no way a person who plays in a relatively unknown (and meaningless) "top-tier level" league in a country like Venezuela is as notable and noteworthy as someone who plays in the major leagues. I hate to go all WP:WAX-y

on us, but that opens up the door to a lot of REALLY obscure people that are really not deserving of an article. For example, there are "top level" leagues in countries like Colombia that don't even have websites, and are akin to sandlot or at best independent or A-ball quality in the United States. However, as the rules are written, they are just as deserving of an article as Babe Ruth. That seems a bit wrong. If Player X plays in Venezuela, he is article worthy, even though the competition is not much better than the United States' minor leagues. However, if Player Y plays in the U.S. minors and does just as well as Player X, he doesn't get an article because he didn't play in a de facto "top league." That is off. Players like this maybe deserve articles on the Baseball Reference Bullpen, not Wikipedia. Alex (talk) 05:26, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

Well, if someone plays for some obscure team in a country that has no websites then it would be very difficult to acquire sourcing about them.. In Totten's place, his appearance in the Caribbean series carries more weight with me than his playing in the Venezuelan league. Spanneraol (talk) 16:07, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

The guideline was written that way for a reason. Within the context of Venezuelan athletics, Venezuelan professional baseball is notable, as are the participants at the top level of that sport. If we're going to have articles on Venezuela at all, then we need to cover Venezuela regardless of whether or not Venezuelan things would be notable outside the particular context of that country. As to B-R bullpen, why should we care what they do or don't cover? They're a separate organization operated by a separate set of people. -Hit bull, win steak^(Moo!) 17:06, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Which entirely sets aside, of course, the matter of Totten being notable purely for his minor league accomplishments. He was a two-time minor league all-star who set a record in the Southern League. That's a pretty good case in and of itself. -Hit bull, win steak^(Moo!) 17:11, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

You are insinuating then that being a minor league All-Star is inherently notable, which it too is not. Is every Purple Heart winner deserving of an article? Is every member of a rotary club Hall of Fame worthy of an article? The notability of those accomplishments are akin to the notability of being a minor league All-Star. His record is nothing more than a random, unsourced tidbit, meaningless trivia. Most innings pitched without a walk is hardly anything that would merit an article, especially from a minor league. Alex (talk) 18:37, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

There are a hell of a lot more Rotarians and Purple Heart winners than there are minor league All-Stars, and in my experience a player generally is the subject of enough profiles and interviews to meet GNG once he wins a spot on a minor league all-star team at A+ or above. Whether or not people at AFD feel like actually looking for those sources is another matter, of course. As for the record, you'd do well to keep in mind that others may disagree with your interpretation of its prestige. -Hit bull, win steak^(Moo!) 22:16, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** per Kinston eagle. Rlendog (talk) 21:43, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. **Tone** 21:16, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Melqui Torres

Melqui Torres (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Melqui Torres" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Melqui+Torres%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22)))

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Melqui+Torres%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Melqui+Torres%22)))

Non-notable, 33-year old, free agent minor league baseball pitcher who hasn't played since 2008. He is 48-52 with a 4.54 ERA, which are far-from-stellar statistics. He doesn't merit an article. Alex (talk) 22:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Baseball-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:01, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 01:02, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Played for the Hyundai Unicorns in the highest professional league in Korea. The second guideline of the baseball notability guidelines: "Baseball figures are presumed notable if they ... Have appeared in at least one game in ... any other top-level national league." Having played in the top professional league of Korea, I feel he qualifies. Kinston eagle (talk) 02:12, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per Kinston eagle. -Hit bull, win steak^(Moo!) 16:59, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per Kinston eagle. --Muboshgu (talk) 22:59, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Tone 21:16, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Mirka De Arellano

Mirka De Arellano (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Mirka De Arellano" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22)))

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22)))

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Mirka+De+Arellano%22)))

Unable to find coverage in any reliable sources, only Wikimirrors. Does not meet WP:GNG or WP:BASIC. J04n(talk page) 21:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Cuba-related deletion discussions. — J04n(talk page) 21:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Television-related deletion discussions. — J04n(talk page) 21:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:19, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - I have no idea what programs this person is supposedly presenting. The only hint of her existence that I could uncover was this blog entry (<http://rushkoff.com/2006/03/>) by Douglas Rushkoff. There is simply no coverage in reliable sources to establish notability. -- Whpq (talk) 17:21, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Fails WP:GNG. Tooga - BØRK! 09:45, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Can't find reliable sources, fails GNG. --j*ë decker^{talk to me} 06:57, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - not worth keeping. article started in spanish in 2004 and never went anywhere. no prejudice to recreation in future if notability could be shown.--Milowent • ^{talk}_{blp-r} 18:13, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:52, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Dear God (Boyz II Men song)

Dear God (Boyz II Men song) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Dear God (Boyz II Men song)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Dear+God+%28Boyz+II+Men+song%29%22)))

Doesn't indicate importance or explanation for why this *particular* song by Boyz II Men should have an article. Jrcla2 (talk) 21:11, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- Delete, not notiable--Halqh حَلَقَة הלכה (talk) 00:06, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Albums and songs-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k

(talk) 00:57, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Merge to Evolution (Boyz II Men album)**: **Delete** more information about the Evolution Album then the song itself. Song itself is not notable. Copritch (talk) 16:43, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. --GHcool (talk) 23:23, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**: Fails WP:NSONGS.—Kww(talk) 00:58, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep** and redirect to Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel. *lifebaka*++ 01:15, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Prometheus (film project)

Prometheus (film) (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Prometheus (film)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Prometheus+%28film%29%22)))

Film has not yet entered production. Too soon for a page likely to be littered with rumour and speculation. magnius (talk) 20:50, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak keep**. Although the film is in the future, and could even be potentially cancelled, it's will be filmed by a major film studio by a major director, and seems to be a lock to be produced. I would *definitely* remove all rumors in the article though.--Esprit15d • talk • contribs 23:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

If the film is cancelled, THEN delete the page? This, to me, makes more sense. Anthony of the Desert (talk) 16:45, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

If the film is *made*, THEN *create* the page. This, to me, makes the most sense. -- IllaZilla (talk) 01:32, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Film-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 00:56, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Science fiction-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 00:57, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** for now to Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel where this topic is already far better covered and better sourced. As we do not treat "film projects" as films until principle filming actually begins, we might allow a return only if/when filming begins OR when coverage

increases to the point where the topic of the project might merit an independent article as one of those rare exceptions to WP:NFF. **Schmidt**,^{MICHAEL Q.} 02:17, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Redirect** per MichaelQSchmidt. This project has generated enough buzz that it has acquired a certain notability, but the Alien (franchise) already provides enough coverage for now.—RJH (*talk*) 17:06, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **keep** there are 3 sources that is enough for notabilityThisbites (*talk*) 05:51, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Yes and no. While WP:NFF does allow that occasional exceptions might occur, the topic is currently far better covered and sourced at Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel. If the nominated article were far more comprehensive, it might merit independence... but it currently is not.. and so does not... for now. **Schmidt**,^{MICHAEL Q.} 21:58, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Strong keep:** The article is in its embryonic stage and will expand as the film goes into production and more details are released. I never understand the willingness to delete pages which are obviously of interest to the public in general, especially with a franchise such as that of **Alien**. As long as there are references to any news releases and the quality maintained, there is no reasoning for getting rid of the article. If there is a redirect, any fears of quality will just be much of an issue on that page, so that point has no merit. Anthony of the Desert (*talk*) 16:38, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

With the greatest of respect, and though I do agree that as the film approaches production coverage will quite likely increase, the topic of the prequel IS currently far better covered over at Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel, and it is only in **very** rare cases that an unmade film is allowed to have its own separate article. As you do wish to improve this one as more comes forward, why not simply request of the closer that the current one be userfied to you in a workspace at User:Anthony of the Desert/Prometheus (film) so that it can be expanded and better sourced. I would be glad to advise on how to prepare the article for an eventual return to mainspace. **Schmidt**,^{MICHAEL Q.} 08:29, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete & redirect the title** to Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel, per WP:NFF & the fact that the topic is already better covered there. --IllaZilla (*talk*) 05:02, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep.** Film project by major director. Polisher of Cobwebs (*talk*) 23:31, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

This does not address the concerns of the nomination, nor is notability inherited from the director. The director being highly notable is an *indicator* that the topic may receive significant coverage in reliable secondary sources, but as this is a future film that has not yet even begun filming (and appears to still be in the embryonic stages), comprehensive coverage does not yet exist. Thus far the source coverage that has popped up is mostly of the bottom-of-the-barrel internet rumor variety. --IllaZilla (*talk*) 01:00, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

I really can't understand the problem with this article - when the film does enter production, it almost certainly will receive significant coverage, so if we delete it now, it will very likely be recreated again eventually. What, then, is the point of deletion? Polisher of Cobwebs (*talk*) 01:05, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

The film *may* enter production, it may not. It hasn't yet. WP:NFF exists primarily because so many film projects never see completion (I believe, in fact, that more films die in the idea stages than actually get made). WP:V and WP:N rely on the topic *already having received* significant coverage, not on the assumption that it *may receive* such coverage at some unknown point in the future. Wikipedia isn't the news, so it isn't really within our scope to cover topics that *might be notable at some point in the future*. If the film actually

gets made, significant coverage will probably appear and yes, at that point we'll want an article on it. But that's no reason for keeping it around in the hope that it actually gets made. The point of deletion is to remove an article that is guaranteed to be full of rumor and speculation as, by its nature, it is about an item that does not yet exist and may never come to exist. Deletion now is not an impediment to a new article being created in the future if, in fact, the film comes to fruition, especially given that the project is *already covered more thoroughly* in one of our other articles. --IllaZilla (talk) 01:17, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

Thanks for directing me to the guideline, however, there is at least one reason for keeping the article for now - it would save anyone the trouble of having to recreate it from scratch. Polisher of Cobwebs (talk) 03:01, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

I think that's a very weak reason. It's a stub: The thing is 9 sentences, an IMDb link, and a navbox. Since most of it is speculative, future-tense material, it'd wind up totally rewritten anyway. --IllaZilla (talk) 03:15, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

Any of the material there is potentially helpful to future editors, including the IMDb link. Polisher of Cobwebs (talk) 03:20, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

Like I said, all of the material is already presented better at Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel, so nothing useful to future editors is lost if we redirect this there. An IMDb link takes literally seconds to find. -
-IllaZilla (talk) 03:24, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

That would be true if you're already familiar with IMDb, but not everyone is. Frankly, the basis of my disagreement with you here is that I don't agree with the WP:NFF guideline; it seems to me always better to keep an article on projects like this if there's a reasonable chance they will be significantly covered in future. I don't expect my saying that to alter the outcome of this AfD, but I will say it for the record. Polisher of Cobwebs (talk) 05:20, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

You don't need to be familiar at all with IMDb. You literally just go to imdb.com and type "prometheus" in the search box, just like you would at Google or any other searchable website (including Wikipedia). Anyhoo...I think we just have fundamental differences of opinion here regarding articles on future topics. You think we should keep such articles on the possibility of their future coverage, while I take the opposite tack: I believe that our standards require us to judge article

topics based on *existing* coverage, not on uncertain future coverage. With a few notable exceptions (*Chinese Democracy* had a well-written and well-sourced article well before its release, having been in production & thoroughly reported on for 13 years...but again, the coverage already existed), this weeds out most articles about future films/albums/games that have not yet begun principal development and about which we inevitably wind up reporting mostly on rumors and speculation. --IllaZilla (talk) 05:33, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak Keep**. Sources look ok so its not crystal ball, but still a bit too sketchy. Szzuk (talk) 21:25, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

WP:CRYSTAL isn't the central issue here. It's WP:NFF and the fact that the topic is already better covered at Alien (franchise)#Alien Prequel. --IllaZilla (talk) 21:50, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** and **mergefrom** Alien_(franchise)#Alien_Prequel. I see notability and RS to support the article's existence. --Brunswick Dude (talk) 18:49, 7 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**. Appears to have sufficient prominent coverage to satisfy the GNG and justify an exception to the SNG. Since the project is no longer categorized as a prequel to Alien, the section there should be truncated, with relevant material merged into this article. Obviously standard deletin is inappropriate; the choices should be limited to keep andmerge/redirect. Hullabaloo Wolfowitz (talk) 21:53, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Regrettably, as this is a rather poor list. Stifle (talk) 10:47, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] List of business failures

List of business failures
([edit](#) | [talk](#) | [history](#) | [links](#) | [watch](#) | [logs](#)) –
([View AfD](#))
(*Find sources*: "List of business failures"
(<http://www.google.com/search?>

AfDs for this article:

- [Articles for deletion/List of business failures](#)
- [Articles for deletion/List of business failures \(2nd nomination\)](#)

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22List+of+business+failures%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22List+of+business+failures%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22List+of+business+failures%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22List+of+business+failures%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22List+of+business+failures%22))

Way too vague a criterion. Businesses go out of business all the time. No definition for what constitutes a "failure"; we have everything from the Dixie Square Mall to redlinked businesses of dubious notability. Last AFD closed as keep because nominator was a sockpuppet. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 20:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** or **split up**. There are several more focused lists crying to be freed from this one's carcass, but the current list is a mess. It's got everything from Newton Heath, which turned into Manchester United, to Debbie Reynold's Hollywood Hotel and Casino, which was sold and later shut down under a different name and owner, and Maria's Bakery, hardly a notable disaster. Clarityfiend (talk) 23:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Business-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 00:55, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Lists-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 00:55, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The scope of the article seems clear enough. If there are problems with particular entries or if the list grows large then these matters may be dealt with by ordinary editing. It is not our editing policy to use wholesale deletion for such reasons. Colonel Warden (talk) 08:38, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - **Comment**. How do you determine which businesses are "notable for their financial impact in the economy"? Where's the dividing line? Clarityfiend (talk) 22:52, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Notability is determined by the availability of good sources. This then divides notable failures from the non-notable ones. Colonel Warden (talk) 10:05, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- no notability criteria for which business failures would be sufficiently notable to merit inclusion; and no criteria have been offered that come from a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:18, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** TenPoundHammer, you claim the last one closed because the nominator was a sockpuppet, not because everyone else there, including yourself, said Keep. That is an odd claim. Seems like it'd be a snow keep no matter what. Anyway, there is nothing wrong with the list. If you want to read about a business that failed, this is a good place to find one. Almost all the links are blue, aiding in navigation by linking to other Wikipedia articles, with the few red ones have citations to them strangely enough. Business failures are always mentioned in the news media, and also this is something clearly notable, something an encyclopedia should have, something people can and should learn from. What did they do wrong? Why did they fail? **Dream Focus 12:10, 31 January 2011 (UTC)**

Note: I contacted everyone who participated in the last AFD, who wasn't here already and wasn't banned for being a sock-puppet, since they should be aware of reruns. **Dream Focus 12:15, 31 January 2011 (UTC)**

- **Keep** - The criteria for inclusion in this list is sufficient for editors to determine if a company belongs. Is there any serious doubt that Enron was a spectacular example of a business failure? And that it was documented as such in reliable sources? Inclusion of companies that are

borderline cases can be discussed on the article's talk page but do not invalidate the premise of the list. -- Whpq (talk) 17:27, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** The article under discussion here has been {{rescue}} flagged by an editor for review by the Article Rescue Squadron. SNOTTYWONG^{express} 19:15, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Depends** - The inclusion criteria for the list is overly vague, and produces a list that can never be practically completed. If someone wants to take the time to define what a notable business failure is, and then cull the list of non-notable business failures, then I would say we should **Keep** it. If no one will take the time to do this and the article will sit for a few more years in this state, then I would say we should **Delete** it until such time that the inclusion criteria can be properly defined. The ARS have already been notified, perhaps they can devote some time to tightening up this list. SNOTTYWONG^{express} 19:15, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

The inclusion is defined as "This list of business failures collects significant companies who met eventual demise of their well known brand. The causes include criminal proceedings, simple insolvency and are notable for their financial impact in the economy." **Dream Focus 21:36, 31 January 2011 (UTC)**

Define "significant", "demise", and "well known" in this context. SNOTTYWONG^{prattle} 15:18, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Neutral** how does one define a business failure? You can't really define a business failure as such, for that reason I'm neutral. IJA (talk) 21:09, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

See business failure **Dream Focus 21:36, 31 January 2011 (UTC)**

So why are A.F.C. Bournemouth, Crystal Palace F.C. and Portsmouth F.C. in the list? IJA (talk) 02:21, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

If you see something that doesn't belong remove it, and discuss on the talk page. If someone came along and added something incorrectly or as vandalism, that doesn't mean the entire article should be deleted. Normal editing will fix any problems. **Dream Focus 10:13, 1 February 2011 (UTC)**

I just took these football clubs out. They still exist as going concerns and brands and so have no business being in this list. This is how such particular entries should be dealt with. Deleting the entire article for the sake of a handful of incorrect entries would be absurd. Colonel Warden (talk) 10:18, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** A definition of "business failure" would be an improvement, but not having a precise definition is no reason to delete this list. Any particular company included incorrectly can be challenged or removed, or rescued with reliable secondary sources. So, keep, but discuss a definition on the article talk page. --DThomsen8 (talk) 22:43, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Perhaps in the future the list will be split into List of companies that declared bankruptcy, List of companies that were placed in receivership, and others, but in the meantime this is a perfectly acceptable list. Would not have a problem removing the redlinks, but I don't agree with TPH's assertion that the presence of a few redlinks is a reason to delete a list. UnitedStatesian (talk) 03:53, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** I think this article is notable, however I do suggest that there should be some sort of criteria to define what is classed as a business failure. However I can't see any strong reasons as to why this article should be deleted, therefore I think we should Keep this article. IJA (talk) 03:55, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Microscopic fragment of an unreasonably vast list, with insufficiently coherent inclusion criteria. The same information is accessible through the articles on the firms in question and via

the "(YEAR) Disestablishments" categories. Carrite (talk) 20:07, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak keep** and even then, *only* because it's been flagged for rescue and the subject would be notable enough to rate encyclopedic treatment. If it's not an indiscriminate list, then I'd call it a barely discriminate one-- the only distinguishing info seems to be the year of "failure", which isn't that useful. If details were to be added, such as what the business was (I shopped at Montgomery Ward and flew on TWA, so I know what those were, but we can't assume that everyone does), then I agree with the person above that this would eventually be broken down into other lists. If not, I think the outcome next time around will be a delete. Mandsford 14:14, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Merge/redirect discussions can continue on the article's talk page. (non-admin closure) Logan ^{Talk}Contributions 00:38, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Restoring the Lost Constitution

Restoring the Lost Constitution (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Restoring the Lost Constitution" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:l&q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Restoring+the+Lost+Constitution%22)))

Read likes an WP:OR book report, only two citations, no content about why book is notable. Rillian (talk) 19:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- Agreed; I have trouble thinking that any singular book/project of Randy Barnett is particularly notable, to be honest. Also somewhat biased in tone. **Merge and Redirect** ThatOtherMike (talk) 21:24, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Literature-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**. This article has been in existence since 2004. It is not some little stub article, either. If you don't like the way the article is written, then **fix it**. Lack of citations is not part of WP:DEL#REASON. Regarding WP:OR, the standard is "all material added to articles must be *attributable* to a reliable published source, even if not actually attributed." You are arguing based on the fact that material is not *attributed* to reliable sources, but that is not the standard. Here's some material for you: [3] (<http://old.nationalreview.com/books/ponnuru200406171542.asp>), [4] (<http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0501h.asp>), [5] (http://mises.org/journals/jls/19_2/19_2_6.pdf), [6] (<http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/lpbr/subpages/reviews/barnett1104.htm>). Regarding notability,

I'll simply point out that a Google search for "Restoring the Lost Constitution" (in quotes) turns up over 28,000 results. Wikipedia is not a paper encyclopedia. It does not have a limit on how much information it can hold. What is the benefit of deleting information that people may actually want to read? On a personal note, in the past I have found this article to be a useful source of information. --JHP (talk) 08:32, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

The claim of WP:OR is related to the inclusion of editor commentary and POV opinion about the book's content and the claimed impact of the content. Rillian (talk) 15:14, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

Also, a merge and redirect does not mean the content will be deleted, just included with the Randy Barnett article. The question at hand is whether the book is worthy of a stand-alone article. Rillian (talk) 15:16, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Merge and redirect** Wikipedia is not a book report. If this book received media coverage and commentary, write an article about that. Shii (tock) 02:09, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** -- this book been much discussed in U.S. constitutional scholarship in recent years, and has won awards, per existing source. The article clearly needs more sources for it's claims, but article deletion is inappropriate; rather, the unsourced material should be deleted if it is not sourced in a reasonable period of time. N2e (talk) 03:11, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Procedural Close** - AfD is not the venue for discussing article merges. -- Whpq (talk) 17:29, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment:** AfD is indeed the venue for discussing the fate of any article where its status is unclear and a community decision is required. *Merge and redirect* is an extremely common outcome. Kudpung (talk) 01:45, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
 - **Reply** - the nominator altered his nomination statement rather than striking through (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia%3AArticles_for_deletion%2FRestoring_the_Lost_Constitution&action=historysubmit&diff=411215939&oldid=411196810). The nomination to which I responded, did not advocate deleting the article. -- Whpq (talk) 20:18, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Merge and redirect** : The entire 'theory' section is unsourced original research and/or point of view, and should be deleted immediately. There are no sources on the page that assert notability for the book even if it is an award winner. Verifiability, not truth, is the core policy of Wikipedia. Kudpung (talk) 01:55, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep:** Barnett's a bit kooky, but i see indications of notability that shouldn't be ignored. Book review in a major law review journal: [7] (http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4425077/Restoring-the-Lost-Constitution-The); book review in American Prospect: [8] (<http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?articleId=7628>); review in washington times [9] (http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-2367680/Constitutional-rights-Preserving-the-Founders.html); mention in passing by Jeffrey Rosen (leading legal writer) at NYT[10] (<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/17/magazine/17CONSTITUTION.html?pagewanted=print&position>) called it a "provocative book". From most of these sources you can predict Barnett's political leaning, but these aren't petty sources.--Milowent ^{talk}_{blp-r} 05:06, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion*

page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

The result was **keep**. Stifle (talk) 10:47, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] The Best of The Velvet Underground: The Millennium Collection

The Best of The Velvet Underground:
The Millennium Collection
(edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) –
(View AfD)
(Find sources: "The Best of The Velvet
Underground: The Millennium
Collection"
(<http://www.google.com/search?>

AfDs for this article:

- Articles for deletion/The Best of The Velvet Underground: The Millennium Collection
- Articles for deletion/The Best of The Velvet Underground: The Millennium Collection (2nd nomination)

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22The+Best+of+The+Velvet+Underground%3A+The+Millennium+Collection%22))

Still unsourced beyond Allmusic. Article is very extensive on OR but very short on sources. Last AFD was closed as no consensus, but I feel that many !voters were misinterpreting my rationale as WP:OTHERSTUFFEXISTS. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 19:36, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Albums and songs-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- Delete**, WP:NALBUMS requires coverage in reliable sources (emphasis mine). All we have here is a single Allmusic review. J04n(talk page) 21:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- Speedy Keep**, disruptive nomination, and severely trout slap the nominator for misrepresenting the character of the original AFD. The original AFD was closed *earlier this month*, and absolutely nothing has changed. No one in the first AFD had any confusion about the deletion rationale, and no one in that discussion said anything resembling what the nominator somehow now "feels" was said there. The nominator has removed at least one plainly reliable source from the article, making his complaint about sourcing defects rather hollow. The Velvet Underground is a group of singular importance in the history of contemporary popular music, and punching holes in their otherwise comprehensive discography simply damages Wikipedia as an encyclopedic resource. As I pointed out in the previous AFD, WP:OSE declares that "that "In categories of items with a finite number of entries where most are notable, it serves no useful purpose to endlessly argue over the notability of a minority of these items" and points out that providing entries/articles for full sets of such items "serves the purpose of Wikipedia being a comprehensive reference," a point that stands unrefuted (indeed, pretty much stands without disagreement.) There are scores of print resources about the Velvets -- Amazon.com alone lists nearly 150 books, including a "Rough Guide" volume which, given the nature of the series, includes a full discography/analysis which would cover this release -- but such texts are not conveniently available online, and googling for generic titles on GBooks is time-consuming and

unproductive. Hasty deletion of such presumptively valid content is inappropriate and destructive
Hullaballoo Wolfowitz (talk) 19:46, 30 January 2011 (UTC) speedy keep, disruptive nomination

- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:07, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per Hullaballoo Wolfowitz. — Malik Shabazz ^{Talk}/_{Stalk} 03:29, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**: Non-charting non-notable compilation. Almost non-existent coverage. JacksOrion (talk) 03:58, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - While I am sympathetic to the cause of stamping out pages on obscure compilation albums such as those found in the bins at truck stops, the seminal status of this band combined with the fact that this is a major label release would seem to indicate that this page is best left alone. Carrite (talk) 20:12, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per Hullaballoo Wolfowitz and Carrite, who provide good reasons why we shouldn't mechanically apply notability guidelines in this instance, where it would "[punch a] hole in their otherwise comprehensive discography." And one of the key meanings of "encyclopedic" is "comprehensive"; Hullaballoo's quote above is hard to counter here, and has not been countered. Basic information about this album at a minimum is certainly verifiable, it's a major label release, and a highly notable band. Consequently, deletion would not yield any concrete benefit or further any policy. **postdlf** (talk) 00:23, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. The article was substantially expanded and sourced during the AfD discussion.

Sandstein 09:35, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Estrella Lin

Estrella Lin (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Estrella Lin" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Estrella+Lin%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Estrella+Lin%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Estrella+Lin%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Estrella+Lin%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Estrella+Lin%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Estrella+Lin%22)))

No real assertion of notability here, although the book appears to be interesting — but I don't think it gives her enough notability still. **Delete**. --Nlu (talk) 19:29, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Taiwan-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:57, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Korea-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k

(talk) 19:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Poorly written article but quality of writing is not a criteria for keep or delete, notability is. This person is notable and reasonably famous an actress. Spevw (talk) 20:10, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** and ban User:Nlu from nominating any more articles for deletion until he can be bothered to follow WP:BEFORE, as has *been requested multiple times beginning FOUR years ago*. AfD is not about "Assertion of notability", it is about whether sources exist which cover the topic in a non-trivial fashion. Nominator reads Chinese perfectly well but is mysteriously unable to copy and paste a Chinese name into the Google search box and note the dozens of newspaper articles written about her. Article expanded with a small fraction of those available sources (https://secure.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/w/index.php?title=Estrella_Lin&action=historysubmit&diff=410903476&oldid=410809125). Quit wasting our time. cab (call) 05:18, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Of course, I did exactly that; did you? What I saw was a short spurt of coverage that, to me, suggested WP:15M and didn't suggest actual notability.[11] (<http://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=林韋伶&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8>) If she actually has notability, well, I was hoping that someone would come up with evidence of it. And of course, you can't be bothered to actually clean up the mess that the Category:Taiwanese people category tree that I was trying to clean up — which is how I came across this article in the first place. Without my spending the time to do that, I would not have, in a number of years, have heard of anything involving this allegedly very notable actress. Perhaps I just don't spend enough time watching Taiwanese soaps. (Talking of wasting time...) If you know of this person's notability, speak up (and I do acknowledge that you've been cleaning up the article since it was nominated for deletion). It's not my job to, while trying to clean up the category tree for hundreds of articles — which I had been doing the last several days[12] (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:Contributions/Nlu>) — to spend hours in addition to that trying to verify the notability of people that don't appear obvious from a Google search. If you don't want to waste your time, don't bother looking at these. --Nlu (talk) 05:49, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Google News archive has a very helpful time bar visualisation box on time which shows you what months the coverage comes from on any given search term. Why don't you look at it? Her book came out in August. She has coverage from January of last year up until the present. You don't need to watch Taiwanese soap operas to be able to read newspaper articles and summarise their contents. I've never heard of 99.9% of the places, people, and works making up English Wikipedia's millions of articles either. If you want to fix categorization errors, then fix categorization errors.. Being a Wikignome is not an excuse for poor AfD nominations. The rest of us revert vandalism, fix formatting errors, and apply categories too. cab (call) 06:06, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - You really meant to suggest to me that this search[13] (<http://news.google.com/news/search?aq=f&pz=1&cf=all&ned=us&hl=en&q=林韋伶>) is enough to suggest that she's anything more than a trashy starlet getting a short spurt of coverage? You are welcome to your opinion that she's notable. You want to insist not only that everyone has to consider her notable, but consider her not notable based on these searches is so unreasonable as to deserve a ban? I really find this logic surreal. --Nlu (talk) 06:13, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - And I'll add this comment: while I appreciate your work in cleaning up the article and adding references, nothing you have added so far shows *any* real notability as far as I am concerned. Her romantic life and her breasts don't

exactly make her notable. Not unless, of course, we've added a WP:BREAST guideline on notability while I wasn't looking. --Nlu (talk) 06:16, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- WP:N: *If a topic has received significant coverage in reliable sources that are independent of the subject, it is presumed to satisfy the inclusion criteria for a stand-alone article ... significant coverage means that sources address the subject directly in detail, so no original research is needed to extract the content. Significant coverage is more than a trivial mention but it need not be the main topic of the source material.* The sources address the subject in detail. There are dozens of them. They run over a period of more than a year and are not just about WP:ONEEVENT such as her book release. Your only argument left is that the details are distasteful and stupid. This has nothing to do with deletion policy. It does not distinguish you from those of us voting "keep", your snide comments to the contrary notwithstanding. And it doesn't excuse you for AfDs on award-winning novelists and professors and pilots where other editors repeatedly admonished you that your understanding of "notability" and "significant coverage" deviated so far from the consensus definition as to constitute a nuisance at AfD. cab (call) 08:14, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - You obviously don't consider the coverage of her to be trivial. I believe otherwise. --Nlu (talk) 15:17, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Weak Keep** Subject has achieved a level of notability across a number of years, in what look to me like reliable sources. Could use a good edit. Punkrocker1991 (talk) 13:21, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Sandstein 09:31, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] List of legislation sponsored by Ron Paul

Legislation sponsored by Ron Paul
([edit](#) | [talk](#) | [history](#) | [links](#) | [watch](#) | [logs](#))
([delete](#))
(<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?>

AfDs for this article:

- [Articles for deletion/Legislation sponsored by Ron Paul](#)
- [Articles for deletion/Legislation sponsored by Ron Paul \(2nd nomination\)](#)

[title=Legislation_sponsored_by_Ron_Paul&wpReason=AfD+discussion%3A+%5B%5BWikipedia%3AArticles+for+deletion%2FLegislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul+%282nd+nomination%29%5D%5D&action=delete](#)) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources:* "List of legislation sponsored by Ron Paul" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22) · books
(<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22>) · scholar
(<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22List+of+legislation+sponsored+by+Ron+Paul%22))

Does not warrant its own article. No other legislator has an article for legislation they have sponsored, as far as I can tell. Notable legislation already discussed in depth at [Ron Paul#Legislation](#).
NYyankees51 (talk) 19:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC) This is what we have THOMAS for.
NYyankees51 (talk) 17:06, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** per NYyankees51. Also, there's way too much Ron Paul-worship here already. --Nlu (talk) 19:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Politics-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:54, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Law-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Lists-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Ron Paul is an odd politician so there is interest in the legislation he sponsored. The level of worship is not a Wikipedia criteria for delete or keep; witness the worship of video game articles that the average adult has no interest or knowledge of. For most politicians, this article is not right but Paul is a weirdo. The other possibility is merge but merge would just result in delete of the information...that's the way Wikipedia is. Spevw (talk) 20:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Oddness is not a Wikipedia criteria for delete or keep either.—Chris!_c/t 20:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** per consensus established in the two previous Afd's (This is the same article, it was retitled "List of...." (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Legislation_sponsored_by_Ron_Paul&action=history) in July 2008). Article hasn't significantly changed since previous discussions. Also, WP:OTHERSTUFFDOESNTEXIST is not a valid argument for deletion.--JayJasper (talk) 20:19, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** Why don't we have articles like this for Ted Kennedy or Charlie Rangel or Nancy Pelosi or all the other wingnuts who have been around for decades? NYyankees51 (talk) 22:03, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** A lot of work has gone in to creating this article. If it's possible to merge it in to another existing Ron Paul article then that should be done. But I think that there's too much content to merge in to another article. Nipsonanomhmata ^(Talk) 01:46, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - **Comment** I know a lot of work has gone into the article and I hate dumping people's stuff out the window but unfortunately that doesn't give it notability. Most of it is non-notable so it wouldn't be too much to merge the notable stuff. NYyankees51 (talk) 04:35, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** The majority of Paul's proposed legislation was never passed into law, nor did it ever impact the political environment in Washington, so where is the notability? Regent of the Seatopians (talk) 02:09, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy keep** Did anyone besides JayJasper read the prior two AFDs, after which a third nomination for the same reasons is questionable at minimum? NYyankees51, this article is a breakout of the WP:SUMMARY in [Ron Paul#Legislation](#), as agreed since 2007 to manage this degree of notable content. To your argument from WP:OTHERSTUFF, the previous AFD mentioned similar still-extant articles for Clinton, Romney, Giuliani, and Kerry; the folks you

mention would also be good candidates for such articles. Notability is demonstrated by the number of sources, both those in the header that affirm notability of Paul's body of work generally, and those that discuss specific accomplishments. To Nlu, I affirm Spevw. To Regent, the notability of proposed legislation has long been judged by WP:GNG and found sufficient in many many cases. Incidentally, due to the 112th, many of the numbers will need updating (and Audit the Fed, both 111th and 112th, is still insufficiently covered per new sources), but that's a fixit need and should not affect anyone's views. JJB 21:28, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Reluctant keep** although I think this article skirts WP:NOTADIR. It would be better cast as a general subarticle on Paul's congressional career, akin to those in Category:Tenures in political office by individual. The only really similar article to this that I know of is Sponsorship of legislation by John Kerry, which was created during the 2004 presidential election and has been thoroughly ignored ever since (averages about four page views a day; the Ron Paul one does a bit better). Wasted Time R (talk) 02:56, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Turns out I was wrong, there are two others: List of bills sponsored by Barack Obama in the United States Senate, List of bills sponsored by John McCain in the United States Senate. So, I've created a new category for them, Category:Lists of United States federal legislation by sponsor, and placed this one in it. Wasted Time R (talk) 01:21, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep**. Just because other politicians don't have lists doesn't make such lists a bad thing, per WP:OTHERSTUFF. The point is that this section, if incorporated (as the nominator suggests) into the main Ron Paul article, would make said article inaccessible and worse for it. Per WP:SPINOUT, separating to another article is the right thing to do. Hence, this article must be kept. Bastin 00:02, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** I would venture to say that all lists of sponsorships should be deleted/merged, except maybe for Obama since he is the president. This is what we have THOMAS for; Wikipedia does not need these lists. NYyankees51 (talk) 01:57, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
 - Yank, THOMAS is for bare lists, WP is for encyclopedic weighting and discussion of the listed items. Several of these items are terrifically notable enough to have their own articles (more could), while others are merely legislative suggestions Paul reinvokes every two years that never get covered (e.g., raw milk), which are instead appropriate for list inclusion. Reliable sources cover much more information on legislation lists than would fit in most bio articles, this is what we have WP:SPINOUT for. JJB 02:58, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - per WP:OTHERSTUFF. just because this might be a list which is unusual doesn't make it worthy for deletion.--BabbaQ (talk) 00:26, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Binaiš Begović

Binais Begović (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Binais Begović" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Binais+Begovi%C4%87%22)))

This article reads like an advertisement for a non-notable bodybuilder/entrepreneur. Does not fit WP:ATHLETE or WP:BIO standards. Regent of the Seatopians (talk) 05:44, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- -- **Cirt** (talk) 09:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Businesspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:43, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:43, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** If it had been new I'd have speedy tagged it as spam or non-notable. No indication of notability for the person or the company. --*bonadea* contributions talk 22:09, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 18:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment.** This article has been significantly "spammed up" since it's creation. Here is the last version (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Binais_Begovi%C4%87&oldid=270534512) that actually resembled an article. --Ron Ritzman (talk) 18:46, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** Fails WP:ATHLETE looks like a WP:COI and possible WP:AUTO. Qworthy (talk) 03:02, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:22, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **redirect to Hayward Unified School District**. Stifle (talk) 10:47, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Edwin Markham Elementary School

Edwin Markham Elementary School (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Edwin Markham Elementary School" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Edwin+Markham+Elementary+School%22)))

This article does not meet requirements for WP:NOTE OpenInfoForAll (talk) 18:35, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of California-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Schools-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete** if it were Markham High School, it would be an automatic keep according to Wikipedia custom but elementary schools really have to prove strong notability to be kept. This school is not notable. Spevw (talk) 20:13, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** to Hayward Unified School District as is usually done for elementary schools. Edison (talk) 21:13, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- 'According to the article, this school is closed.OpenInfoForAll (talk) 00:45, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** No claim of notability is asserted for this closed elementary school. Cullen328 (talk) 01:32, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** per Edison--Kintetsubuffalo (talk) 02:52, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:23, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - normally I would say 'merge and redirect', but as this school is defunct, has neither special notability nor historical importance, and as the article is a stub, there is little reason for it to be kept. Kudpung (talk) 18:29, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Rename** to Edwin Markham Elementary School (Hayward, California), redirect that page to Hayward Unified School District, and convert Edwin Markham Elementary School to a disambiguation page that points to the various school district and city articles that list elementary schools with this same name: Hayward Unified School District, Pasco School District (Washington), Vacaville, California#Elementary schools, Mt. Lebanon School District, and any others that I have overlooked.

A quick look at the Google search results doesn't show any good hits on this school (if such hits exist, it would require a more focused search to find them, since cruft like greatschools.org, city-data.com, and various Wikipedia mirrors gets top billing in the search results lists for school names -- and fills many pages of results). However, the Google results show the existence of several schools by this same name, including Wikipedia articles that list individual schools. Edwin Markham#Legacy indicates that a total of 5 schools in California were named for him; I also noticed one in Florida.

Eliminating the link to the school district would not be appropriate; many school district articles mention or discuss defunct schools because there often is a lot of historical or alumni interest in the defunct schools. --Orlady (talk) 15:44, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Merge & Redirect** - Since it doesn't meet WP:GNG on its own, in the pasts the general consensus has been to take useful information and place it into the parent article of the school district and redirect it to that parent article until which time sufficient information is found to establish notability and thus the article can be recreated as a WP:SPINOUT. Although it is not currently active, I don't believe that should have any bearing as to whether it can meet notability

guidelines or that it shouldn't be mentioned in the parent article. If that were the case, there are many articles about relatively non-notable ships that have long since meet the scrappers torches that shouldn't have articles. The fact that several hundred (if not thousand) individuals have passed through those institutions should be enough to meet WP:LOCAL. --RightCowLeftCoast (talk) 23:26, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete and Merge** to the district article. There is no current indication that this school meets notability requirements. LonelyBeacon (talk) 23:28, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Rename and Redirect**After reading several of the arguments, I support Orlday's idea.OpenInfoForAll (talk) 02:47, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **speedy deleted** per G11 (spam). Deleted twice before. User who created is apparently the presenter. -- **Y not?** 17:14, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Kidsdaily

Kidsdaily (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Kidsdaily" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Kidsdaily%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Kidsdaily%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Kidsdaily%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Kidsdaily%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Kidsdaily%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Kidsdaily%22)))

Self published web-based children's TV show. No indication that this is show is notable per WP:GNG or WP:WEB. VQuakr (talk) 17:27, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Television-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Internet-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:27, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below.

***Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Stifle (talk) 10:47, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] C.O.D. (album)

C.O.D. (album) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "C.O.D. (album)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22C.O.D.+%28album%29%22)))

Album with no evidence of notability. Albacore (talk) 17:24, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** A notable album by a notable band. Plenty of sources here (<http://www.google.co.uk/search?num=20&hl=en&safe=off&biw=1024&bih=605&q=%22Saint+Vitus%22+%22C.O.D.%22+review+-wiki&aq=f&aqi=&aql=f&oq=>). Per #10 BEFORE "If the article can be fixed through normal editing, then it is not a good candidate for AfD". **Lugnuts** (talk) 17:41, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Weak keep**. I don't see anything in that Google search from reliable sources, just the usual fansites. The Allmusic review is fairly substantial, however, and is enough for me to err on the side of keeping.--Michig (talk) 18:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Albums and songs-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:48, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:26, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**: It is a notable album by a notable band with plenty of sources. -Ret.Prof (talk) 03:13, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** This article is notable because it's about an album released by Saint Vitus. Mr. Metal Head (talk) 01:23, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. The article's creator moved this article into his userspace during this AFD. Therefore, I'm going to close this discussion as "delete" to reflect the consensus. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:17, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Sima Yari

Sima Yari

([edit](#) | [talk](#) | [history](#) | [links](#) | [watch](#) | [logs](#)) –

([View AfD](#))

(*Find sources*: "Sima Yari"

([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sima+Yari%22&num=50)

[as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sima+Yari%22&num=50](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sima+Yari%22&num=50)) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Sima+Yari%22) · books ([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sima+Yari%22)

[tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sima+Yari%22](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sima+Yari%22)) · scholar ([http://scholar.google.com/scholar?](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Sima+Yari%22)

[q=%22Sima+Yari%22](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Sima+Yari%22)) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Sima+Yari%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Sima+Yari%22))

AfDs for this article:

- [Articles for deletion/Sima Yari](#)
- [Articles for deletion/Sima Yari \(2nd nomination\)](#)

Previously deleted through AfD. Sources provided is not sufficient to establish notability. Farhikht (talk) 16:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Iran-related deletion discussions. —Farhikht (talk) 16:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Poetry-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. And it is impossible to tell what, if any, of the existing claims are covered by the so-called references at the bottom as there are no inline citations. N2e (talk) 03:30, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete:** Per nom and N2e. Spada II ♪♪ (talk) 09:24, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:56, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Ringo Ma

Ringo Ma ([edit](#) | [talk](#) | [history](#) | [links](#) | [watch](#) | [logs](#)) – ([View AfD](#))

(*Find sources*: "Ringo Ma" ([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22&num=50)

[as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22&num=50](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22&num=50)) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22) · books ([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22)

[tbs=bks:1&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22)) · scholar ([http://scholar.google.com/scholar?](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Ringo+Ma%22)

[q=%22Ringo+Ma%22](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Ringo+Ma%22)) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Ringo+Ma%22))

Is this professor sufficiently notable? I don't think so, but I'm not sure. **Delete** unless notability shown. -Nlu (talk) 16:28, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**, citations are insufficient, no sign of any other basis for notability. Nomoskedasticity (talk) 19:48, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** Like Nomoskedasticity, I don't think the citation record is enough for a convincing pass of WP:PROF#C1, and his administrative role isn't significant enough for a pass that way either. —David Eppstein (talk) 03:37, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Tone 21:17, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] History of the BattleTech universe

History of the BattleTech universe (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "History of the BattleTech universe" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22History+of+the+BattleTech+universe%22)))

The article is almost exclusively a plot-only description of a fictional work and lacks references independent of the subject from third-party sources which means it doesn't meet verifiability to check notability. The article relies on primary sources and it appears to be original research by synthesis. Also, it is written with an in-universe perspective that lacks real-world perspective. It's an unneeded content fork that doesn't meet the criteria of the general notability guideline and falls into the criteria of reasons for deletion. Jfgslo (talk) 15:42, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Literature-related deletion discussions. —Jfgslo (talk) 15:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Comics and animation-related deletion discussions. —Jfgslo (talk) 15:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Fictional elements-related deletion discussions. —Jfgslo (talk) 15:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Science fiction-related deletion discussions. —Jfgslo (talk) 15:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Games-related deletion discussions. —Jfgslo (talk) 15:52, 29

January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** Can't understand such a massively popular series, without being able to read through its fictional history. Very encyclopedic. I believe we had this same debate for the histories of other universes/series, from Star Wars, Star Trek, Harry Potter, and others. Sometimes they are called timelines. **Dream Focus 16:10, 29 January 2011 (UTC)**
- **Strong delete:** WP:NOTPLOT: "Plot-only description of fictional works." Pure "fictional histories" are thus *never* encyclopaedic, by *explicit* policy. Complete lack of third-party sourcing is independently highly problematical. *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 16:38, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Strong delete** per NOTPLOT, this belongs on a wiki dedicated to BattleTech not Wikipedia, this is way too much detail, Sadads (talk) 18:29, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete or transwiki somewhere that can use this** per NOTPLOT. Way, way, way too much detail. OSborn^{arf}^{contribs.} 18:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** you can understand this series without a WP:CONTENTFORK by referring to the WP:DUE and concise summary at the main series article. We've had this same debate for numerous timelines... including Harry Potter. And they're all deleted... barring some heroic reason that the main article isn't enough and that sources can justify an entirely separate article. There's a consensus that timelines aren't inherently notable and there are policies such as WP:NOT that represent what the actual consensus is. Precedents:
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Dragonlance timeline (2nd nomination)
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Chronology of the Harry Potter series (5th nomination)
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Honorverse timeline
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Neon Genesis Evangelion timeline (2nd nomination)
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Shadowrun timeline (3rd nomination)
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/The Sopranos timeline
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Thurian Age
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Historical Wheel of Time events
 - Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/World of Greyhawk timeline

Shooterwalker (talk) 23:34, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

I would think that shows that if you keep nominating something long enough, you'll get people who agree with you to end it your way. **Dream Focus 01:05, 30 January 2011 (UTC)**

Remember to assume good faith. The few re-nominations involved articles that were deleted then re-created, or found themselves at "no consensus" as people tried to argue about whether the articles had any potential to meet consensus policies and guidelines. The best way to rescue an article is help it meet consensus policies and guidelines... not baldly asserting it's fine the way it is. Shooterwalker (talk) 01:35, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- I transwikied the entire history of the article to http://battletech.wikia.com/wiki/History_of_the_BattleTech_universe to save all the work of the editors who have worked on in since it was created on October 4 2004. **Dream Focus 19:27, 3 February 2011 (UTC)**

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to*

this page.

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:56, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Jamal Hashemi

Jamal Hashemi (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Jamal Hashemi" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Jamal+Hashemi%22)))
(*Find sources:* "جمال هاشمی" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%84+%D9%87%D8%A7%D8%B4%D9%85%DB%8C%22)))

Fails WP:AUTHOR. All of the references are works by the subject and not the articles on him.
Farhikht (talk) 14:41, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Iran-related deletion discussions. —Farhikht (talk) 14:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete:** per nom, the article has notability problem since 2008! Spada II 🎵🎵 (talk) 15:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. We need third-party sources. -- **Joaquin008** (talk) 15:35, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:31, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to*

this page.

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 19:44, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Historical development of Ganesha

Historical development of Ganesha (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD) (*Find sources:* "Historical development of Ganesha" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:l&q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Historical+development+of+Ganesha%22)))

Since the text is copy-paste of "Rise to prominence" in Ganesha and Ganesha became a FA with that text, the article is redundant. Though there was a consensus for the formation on Talk:Ganesha/Archive_5#What_this_article_needs_–imo for it's formation and the article was created on 29 September 2007. There has no major expansions since then. I raised this issue once on Talk:Historical development of Ganesha long back in 2008. **Redtigerxyz**^{Talk} 14:19, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Hinduism-related deletion discussions. —**Redtigerxyz**^{Talk} 14:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of India-related deletion discussions. —**Redtigerxyz**^{Talk} 14:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete** per nom. this is virtually identical with the original article and i dont see how this can be expanded further--Sodabottle (talk) 15:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete** per nom. Duplicate article. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 15:29, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. Thanks. Ism schism (talk) 01:30, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**, a great example of why speedy criterion A10 was introduced. This is too old for A10, but it should be deleted for the same reasons. Nyttend (talk) 19:53, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Delete** - or per nom. **Wikid**^{as}[©] 07:39, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. --Shruti14^{talk} • ^{sign} 12:43, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **no consensus**. There is liberty to redirect or merge to a school district if desired; such a proposal can be discussed on the talk page. Stifle (talk) 10:48, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] St. Andrew's Episcopal School (Amarillo, Texas)

St. Andrew's Episcopal School (Amarillo, Texas) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "St. Andrew's Episcopal School (Amarillo, Texas)"

([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22&num=50)

[as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22&num=50](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22&num=50)) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22) ·

books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22>) ·

scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22>) · free images

([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22))

([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22St.+Andrew%27s+Episcopal+School+%28Amarillo%2C+Texas%29%22))

This primary school fails the WP:GNG, and, as it is not a high school, is not inherently notable.

Contested PROD. Prod removed without comment/reason. Ravendrop (talk) 14:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Texas-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:42, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Schools-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - Although this is not a primary school (which usually ends at grade 2 or 3), it's not a high school. However, the school's performance in the national middle school science bowl is a distinctive that would make this school notable. I'd like to see some third-party reliable sources (and less promotional language in the article), though, to establish general notability. --Orlady (talk) 15:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC) I see that the Middle School Science Bowl information was added to the article after this AfD was started. --Orlady (talk) 15:42, 29 January 2011 (UTC) PS - Since the above comment was posted, I and others have added several third-party reliable sources to the article. I'm no longer concerned about the absence of sources. --Orlady (talk) 05:40, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Not notable. If sufficient third party sources are found to establish notability, then the article can be reinstated. Until then, it's of little encyclopedic value. Disagree that the "school's performance in the national middle school science bowl" is reason enough to make it notable. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 15:38, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
 - The article now cites several third-party sources that tell about the school's participation and success in the National Middle School Science Bowl. Although there has never been agreement on notability guidelines for schools, past outcomes at AfD and the various failed proposals listed at Wikipedia:Schools all indicate a presumption of notability for pre-secondary schools that have received various awards deemed to be significant, such as the Blue Ribbon School designation. Since it is more common to be a Blue Ribbon School than it is to consistently placing near the top in in a national competition (because there are many more Blue Ribbon Schools each year than there are finalists in these competitions), it seems to me that this achievement is an indication of notability. --Orlady (talk) 20:42, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
 - It may be notable enough for your local newspaper, but not for WP, in my opinion. Sorry, you haven't convinced me, and I stand by my vote for "Delete". Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 20:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- It's not in my local newspaper, since I don't live anywhere near Amarillo. Regardless -- in addition to coverage in Amarillo, the school's success is documented on US Department of Energy websites about the science bowl. --Orlady (talk) 20:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

You are aware that the Science Bowl is HOSTED by the US Department of Energy. Of course one would expect to see the winners listed there. Does very little to boost notability, I'm sorry to say.

I'm not being nasty about this. I've looked at your sources and read through WP:SCHOOLS, WP:OUTCOMES, and the most recent guideline proposals, and I honestly can't find anything that can possibly justify the existence of this page on WP by a long shot. Of course, I have nothing against the school (I've never heard about it before), and am glad the kids excel in science because I'm a biologist myself. I wish them all the luck in the world, but giving the school a page on WP is going too far, even if it probably would be one of the schools I'd check out for my kids to attend should fortune ever bring me to Amarillo. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 21:35, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Don't you think this addition was a *teensy* bit over the top: "in 2008 a team from the school placed third overall", sourced to the... St. Andrew's Episcopal School website? Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 21:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

The other SEVEN sources cited in that section of the article are all third-party reliable sources. That one little factoid, sourced to the school website, helped to "fill in a blank" in the article. Since those other sources verify that the school placed first in the fuel-cell car competition and third in academics, it's highly credible that they were third place overall. --Orlady (talk) 15:56, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

The reliability of the sources is not being questioned, nor is it an issue as far as this AfD is concerned. The issue is, and remains, notability. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 21:16, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Typical elementary school. The consensus has been to delete such articles or to redirect them to the school district, which this independent school does not seem to have. Most schools win some kind of award from time to time. Edison (talk) 21:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Maybe most schools win awards from time to time, but how many schools won the regionals to advance to a national competition 5 out of the 9 times the national competition has been held, then finished in the top 3 slots in 6 out of the 10 national competitions they were in? If I were a middle school science teacher somewhere else, I'd be looking at St. Andrews' record and asking "Who are those guys?" --Orlady (talk) 15:56, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - If I were a Christian, I'd be looking at the following edits and wonder "Who are those guys?": 1 (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Lindeneau_Elementary_School&diff=prev&oldid=410906813), 2 (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Lindeneau_Elementary_School&diff=prev&oldid=410906813) and 3 (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=St._Andrew%27s_Church&diff=410027835&oldid=409566391). The editors in question are the ones who are helping you fix up the article. I've been watching this article to learn more about the AfD process. Unfortunately, what I've learned is

that some Episcopalians apparently believe that using sneaky tactics to promote their congregation and "kicking the cat" are AOK. Tsk, tsk. If you are in contact with these editors, please let them know that they are setting a bad example. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 21:12, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

I have never meet Orlady and I appreciate all the work ~~she~~ the person has put into the article. I just graduate from the school and goto the church. I love my church and my school and thought they deserved a wiki page. If they get deleted for not being WP valuable them so be it. Maybe it's in bad taste but if my school does not meet WP standards then why should others?? Copritch (talk) —Preceding undated comment added 00:08, 31 January 2011 (UTC).

To be honest it's been a real turn off adding articles to WP and I don't think I will add articles again. So smile and enjoy. Copritch (talk) 00:58, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

If your goal is to support your school, Copritch, adding PROD templates to articles about other middle schools and elementary schools is not a particularly effective way of achieving that goal. A more effective way to pursue your objective would be to add third-party sources to the article (apparently the 10 sources cited already aren't enough for some people) and !vote in this AfD -- including information on why you think this school is notable. --Orlady (talk) 04:35, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- More then an elementary school. It has has up to eighth grade. Copritch (talk) 05:34, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The school was founded by a very influential family (Bivins), granted not notable outside of Amarillo, but the school did produce a US Texas Senator and a US Ambassador. Most importantly the school has won the National Middle School Science Bowl, organized and sponsored by the United States Department of Energy, in hydrogen fuel cell cars challenge three times. Most high schools cannot accomplish this and even less middle schools. As a previous voter put it "Most schools win some kind of award from time to time.". This is true at a local and regional level but not at a national level sponsored by the US Government. Ask most middle school and high school students how do you make car run on hydrogen instead of gas. Most probably won't get it right but these students are build and racing hydrogen cars in middle school. One day the list of notable alumni on the page will be long. Copritch (talk) 05:24, 31 January 2011 (UTC) According to Wikipedia:Notability (high_schools) high schools are generally considered notable. So a middle school academically outperforming a notable high school makes the school notable, in my opinion. Copritch (talk) 13:28, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**, or **Merge** (with redirect) the essentials to the school district or locality, as per standard procedure. This school has not demonstrated sufficient notability for its own Wikipedia page. Kudpung (talk) 21:09, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Could you elaborate upon what it is you consider to be necessary to establish notability of a school? The article cites several different third-party sources that I consider to be reliable, thus addressing the general notability guideline. Apparently you see things differently. Have you found that the Amarillo daily newspaper, the US Department of Energy, and United Press International are unreliable sources, or do you have evidence that these sources are affiliated with this school (and thus not independent sources)? Or is your concern about something else? Please clarify your reasoning. --Orlady (talk) 02:43, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Per Edison and Dominus Vobisdu. This just a WP:ROTM. Sources don't *make* notability, they confirm it. If Copritch, who claims to be a member of the Schools Project but isn't and didn't read the guidelines before writing their first article, it's

really not our fault if we have to delete or merge it. It could have been merged and redirected uncontentiously with a friendly note to the creator to explain why. So before I get branded as a deletionist, I'm here to uphold a practice that has been established for over three years and implemented on thousands of primary and middle school pages: I'm offering a **merge and redirect** and I've saved hundreds of schools from deletion this way. If at some time in the future, the school becomes truly notable for something really exceptional, other than a student telling us they love it because they went to it, the redirect can be reverted to an article again, if and when that student has learned with our help, not to do copyvios, and how to write correct articles. I've already !voted here, and personally I don't mind what happens to the school as long as a clear consensus is reached based on standard practice and the quality of the comments, and properly closed by an uninvolved admin. -- Kudpung (talk) 09:48, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

I am find with a merge or something similar. So what is the proper way to fix this situation? Do I merge create a new section in Amarillo? Create a page called Schools in Amarillo, Texas? The school does not really have a school district to merge to. Give me some direction. Copritch (talk) 13:14, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Proposed solution** to AfD. Merge document to Teel Bivins under family background because his family did start the school and it seems to me to be a reasonable place for it on WP. Then redirect St. Andrew's Episcopal School (Amarillo, Texas) to it. Does that sound like a solution to all invoked? I don't want to something wrong or create a new article that ends back in AfD. Copritch (talk) 13:39, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
 - Bad proposed solution, IMO. The biographical article about a US Ambassador to Sweden is not exactly a logical place for an encyclopedia reader to expect to find information about a private school in Amarillo, Texas. Moreover, Teel Bivins was not the school's founder, and I have yet to see a reliably sourced indication that he attended the school. (I do, however, infer that the school was actually started on his behalf and that he went to kindergarten there. His parents started the school as a kindergarten, apparently because no kindergarten was offered in Amarillo, and he was the right age to be a member of the very first class. His attendance would have been limited to kindergarten, since the school didn't expand to higher grades until some time later.) --Orlady (talk) 15:47, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** - Re-reading the foregoing, I am distressed to see this discussion taking on some aspects of a personal attack on the user who created the article, who (although the account was registered several years ago) is a new contributor who seems to be getting bitten hard for his first article contributions. Focus should be on the article, not on the motives or inferred motives of the article's creator. As for the assertions made regarding WP:OUTCOMES#Education, I must say that discussion participants are holding this article to a far higher standard than I have seen in past outcomes of many school-related AfDs I participated in over the last few years. For example, Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Blountville Middle School (one that I nominated) was closed as a keep, although both at the time it was closed (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Blountville_Middle_School&oldid=229493177) and as it now exists I see no more credible a claim of notability there (and far less sourcing) than exists currently for St. Andrew's. "Run of the mill" is an excellent descriptor of many school-related articles I've dealt with that did get "merged and redirected" (e.g. this one in New York (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Columbus_Elementary_School&oldid=234736098), this one in Tennessee (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Brainerd_Baptist_School&oldid=252064266), and this one in England (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Langtoft_Primary_School&oldid=265476808)), but in my experience any school that makes are credible claim at some sort of notability gets retained. Please look at the article and

evaluate it on its merits, not at the user who created it. --Orlady (talk) 23:26, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak keep** This is tough one, really. Normally I don't support keeping elementary and most middle school articles, but the performances at the Middle School Science Bowl are notable, even if very low on notability, IMO. If it was merged, it would either need to go to the article on Amarillo, Texas (education section) or an "Education in Amarillo, Texas" article yet to be created. The notable alumni needs a source, though. There would also need to be an extensive article cleanup, however, particularly the section about the Middle School Science Bowl, which is more about the bowl than about the school. --JonRidinger (talk) 18:04, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Weak keep.** Given that its entire history is documented and only one sentence in the article is unsourced, I see no pressing policy-based reason to delete this article. That leaves us with notability guidelines to argue over, and in this case they can be interpreted either way. This particular school does appear to have received a slightly higher-than-average level of coverage for sporting and scientific achievements, and semi-significant coverage in pieces on other topics like this one (http://amarillo.com/stories/011908/obi_obit1.shtml). Maybe - just maybe - enough to meet WP:GNG. I don't envy the admin who has to close this. Alzarian16 (talk) 11:51, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 19:44, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Airline Employees Association

Airline Employees Association (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Airline Employees Association" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Airline+Employees+Association%22)))
(*Find sources:* "Australia Employees Association" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Australia+Employees+Association%22)))

(*Find sources*: "Australian Employees Association" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22)))

I cannot find any mention of this organisation anywhere. The article itself doesn't give a consistent name, but Google and Google News searches for "Airline Employees Association", "Australia Employees Association" and "Australian Employees Association" all draw a blank. Trove (<http://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/result?q=%22Australian+Employees+Association%22>) (the National Library of Australia) gives a couple of mentions of an organisation of with a similar name from the 20's but it isn't related. There is no mention in the Australian Trade Union Archive (http://www.atua.org.au/atua_a.htm). It is possible that this was the precursor to another union, but given the complete absence of sources available, I'm inclined to suspect a hoax here. -- *Lear's Fool* 13:24, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Australia-related deletion discussions. -- -- *Lear's Fool* 13:25, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Organizations-related deletion discussions. -- -- *Lear's Fool* 13:26, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - I couldn't find any information about it, either. If indeed it does exist, it is supremely not notable. Dominus Vobisdu (talk) 15:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Fails notability. Phearson (talk) 23:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Delete** definitely a hoax. JDDJS (talk) 17:50, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** fails WP:ORG. LibStar (talk) 01:08, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** no search results, no sources. Unscintillating (talk) 04:10, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. GedUK 12:08, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Emsworth Cricket Club

Emsworth Cricket Club (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Emsworth Cricket Club" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?>

q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22\)\)](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Emsworth+Cricket+Club%22))))
Cold harbour lawn (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs)

Two articles covering an amateur cricket club and its grounds. Apparently very old, but I can't really find any reliable in depth coverage independent from the club's own website showing notability.
Travelbird (talk) 12:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Cricket-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Valid reason as it took a long time to find any information regards to this amateur cricket club, although with some indepth research at libraries and online libraries, I have been able to find many forms of reliable indepth coverage that you seek. If you follow this link to the British Newspaper Library you will find the valid source of information <http://newspapers.bl.uk/blcs/Leegray21> (talk) 15:10, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Delete - Its a village cricket club - the local newspaper cuttings that decorate the article do not show the sort of substantial, coverage that is required to meet notability guidelines.Nigel Ish (talk) 19:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Amateur sports club which got some routine local coverage over the centuries. Does not satisfy WP:ORG. Edison (talk) 21:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** Why should a local cricket club not have it's own page on this website? Obviously a valid club and been established for a while. Nothing offensive or false on the page. All need to do is put in Emsworth Cricket Club into a search engine and information comes up. Why just because it is a small team and not major does it not deserve it's own page on here? It's like saying some individual people even though done something small cannot as not a major celebrity. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 90.215.177.155 (talk) 08:10, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - I've played for this cricket club in the past (for neutrality and privacy I won't mention who I am) and it is not a notable club per WP:CRIN, which states it must play in an ECB Premier League, which currently they play in Hampshire Cricket League County Division Four South, by my reckoning some way away from that level of recreational cricket. AssociateAffiliate (talk) 15:53, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** - also support deletion of Cold harbour lawn, which too fails WP:CRIN in relation to the ground having no historical cricketing importance and having not held major cricket matches. AssociateAffiliate (talk) 15:58, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

I don't think this page should be deleted, after all most local cricket clubs have history and is wikipedia not an encyclopedia of history aswell as other catergories/genres. The club does not state it plays ECB premier league and as such is not lying about being involved with any premier league in the ECB. County Division 4 as I have had a look online is an amateur league but surely still credible as a form of cricket. In regards to matches being played on the pitch Cold Harbour Lawn, could you not consider their first game as being an important match as its was against the original Hambledon Cricket Club and therefore one of the oldest clubs in the history of the game, I think if you've had a bad experience with any cricket or any club why be so damn petty and delete it from a factual source of information available freely online, if thats the case every amateur cricket club or sporting club on this site should be deleted for not having the required information that everyone is moaning about on here. At the end of the day the club has history which being 200 years is just as special as a article on a breed of dog or something similar. I'm just utterly amazed that some people just are so petty and for the sake of having

an article on Wikipedia they are insisting that the club be lost to pages of history that are sadly being burnt by some people that make it their sole purpose to ruin things for others. I think if that the administrators that are dealing with this article deletion should use common sense in regards to this matter, and think what they are doing before completing what i think would be a total and utter petty matter. And I think as i said previously that people should not take to bemoaning if you've had a bad experience with this particular club, think about what you're doing and move on like any credible and proper player for instance in cricket would do when you're out...you're out so deal with it...again its just people being petty in a non important matter. 90.196.35.173 (talk) 22:12, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:32, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** - The original Hambledon Club ceased to exist after 1796. Precisely why it isn't notable, because it **doesn't** play in an ECB Premier League, in this case the Southern Premier Cricket League. County Division 4 is about as non-notable in cricketing terms as they come. CricketArchive doesn't even hold scorecards for the league. All amateur cricket clubs or teams that don't meet WP:CRIN are deleted. The criteria is simple in English cricket terms: Historically notable, have played first-class, List A or Twenty20 or is in an ECB Premier League. If they're none of those, 9/10 times they're not notable. Who has said anything about having bad experiences with this club? I have played for it, but left of my own accord. Please keep it civil. AssociateAffiliate (talk) 17:28, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** -as a completely impartial person, who has stumbled over this article, i think it would be a great shame if this page was deleted.

cricket is an integral part in british culture, in an age where our culture is being slowly diluted and eradicated.

it's amazing that an amateur club that existed BEFORE the battle of waterloo, is still going strong. It's even more amazing that it doesn't warrent a place in an opensource encylopedia, just because they have not played at the top level. it's like saying this amazing piece of english history does not matter.

it's like finding a penny coin from hundreds of years back, and chucking it in the bin, because it had no real monetry value.

Emsworth Cricket Club is one of the oldest cricket clubs in the world, and this really is worth a mention. Especially on a website, where pointless people like say, Katie Price, who has never done anything special, except exposing her genitals, gets a mention.

please reconsider this. Emsworth Cricket Club is a gem of a club, and something that every englishman should be proud of. Clubs like Emsworth are an integrial part of our english village culture. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Malcster2 (talk • contribs) 19:45, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment** Cricket is no part of my culture even though I'm half English. However, I would support the retention of this article if it were better referenced. I don't think 'Jordan' has actually exposed that part of her anatomy, although various other parts have achieved public fame. She has a very good PR man, and the both of them are probably doing quite well out of it. (Why, I don't know as I do not know anyone who gives a tuppenny damn about her or even fancies her.) If you can find enough coverage to show notability, there's a chance. Get digging. Peridon (talk) 21:42, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete:** per AssociateAffiliate. This is an encyclopaedia not a vast resource for everything you can find in real life or on the internet. English cricket/village cricket may have historical merit; every village club ever to have played the game does not.—User:MDCollins (talk) 16:58, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- ~~Keep~~ cricket club. ~~Redirect~~ ground to the club. Read the scans of old newspaper articles, they are reliable sources! . **Delete**.Szzuk (talk) 18:32, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** surely this isn't just about being an average club, but a club that has been around for 200 years, and was around when cricket was in it's infancy. that is what makes it special, and not just another village club.

English Cricket and Village cricket certainly does have it's merit, but without clubs such as emsworth cc starting up all those years ago, or should i say, 2 CENTURYS AGO, there would be no cricket/village cricket. This club really is a piece of living history. —Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.131.76.162 (talk) 20:37, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment:** This speicalness argument is getting lame. **READ WP:CRIN**. AssociateAffiliate (talk) 21:32, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. If anyone wants this userfied to re-work into an more appropriate article ask me and I'll provide a copy. Beeblebrox (talk) 02:49, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Punjab Juvenile Justice System Rules 2002

Punjab Juvenile Justice System Rules 2002 (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD) (*Find sources:* "Punjab Juvenile Justice System Rules 2002" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Punjab+Juvenile+Justice+System+Rules+2002%22)))

I don't believe a set of rules in regards to the Justice System are inherintly "Notable". No sources, references, and contains only Original research. **Dusti**^{*poke*} 10:26, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**, but I don't think it's original research in either a Wikipedia sense or a commonly-understood sense. If it's governmental regulations, it's inherently *not* original research. But I agree with the notability arguments. In addition, this is analogous to Wikipedia's not being a dictionary. --Nlu (talk) 10:38, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Pakistan-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:39, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Crime-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:39, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Law-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep and expand** - What this article needs is an expansion and re-write not deletion.--BabbaQ (talk) 19:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:33, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Punjab Juvenile Justice System Rules 2002 hereinafter referred to as the Rules have been made by the Government of the Punjab, Pakistan in 2002, for protection of juveniles in conflict with the law. The article does not include the original text or any copyrighted material of these Rules that may make this article a candidate for deletion. The article can be expanded by including (e.g.) material about the following:

- What change these Rules have brought about regarding treatment of juvenile delinquents as compared with the adults?
- What are the shortcomings of these Rules?
- What are the international instruments involved e.g. United Nations' conventions on the juvenile justice?
- Comparison of these Rules with similar statutes of other developing and developed countries?
- Have these Rules proved to be helpful to convince the law enforcers to go for Restorative Justice instead of Retributive Justice in case of Juveniles?
- Implementation issues?
- Etc., etc.,

For the above reasons, this article shall not be deleted and indeed expanded in scholarly manner.-182.177.145.81 (talk) 16:16, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment** Copyright is not the issue. (Indeed, it's highly doubtful that governmental works are considered copyrighted in general.) The issue here is that this is the wrong scope for an encyclopedia; this is not the place for what would essentially become a legal treatise. --Nlu (talk) 16:38, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** The points that IP raises above would be sufficient to improve the article, if and only if that information came strictly from reliable sources. My worry, though, is that IP's point is that xe could make this analysis themselves, which would constitute original research. The very last phrase ("expanded in a scholarly manner") directly implies original research on the part of xyrself or other editors. If the article is deleted (as I think it should be unless more sources are provided to show that this law is notable), I would be willing to take a userfied version of this temporarily and work with the IP editor to determine if the article could be expanded into a full article meeting our policies. Qwyrxian (talk) 23:41, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** I just realized that I wasn't clear in my point above that if the article is not improved to demonstrate notability (and it does so in a manner consistent with WP:OR) then it should be deleted and worked on in userspace or the Incubator. Qwyrxian (talk) 23:48, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep and expand** Why an article on Juvenile Justice System Rules prevelant in the largest province of Punjab having population of more than 90 million people including juveniles is not Notable?--Tariq babur (talk) 06:03, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

Because there are probably thousands of such rules. Otherwise, every single law passed in any large country would be Notable. Take a look at the general notability guidelines--you'll see that the main requirement is that there must be multiple instances of coverage in reliable sources to demonstrate notability. Qwyrxian (talk) 06:08, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's*

talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 21:20, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Randy Raney

Randy Raney (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Randy Raney" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Randy+Raney%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Randy+Raney%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Randy+Raney%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Randy+Raney%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Randy+Raney%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Randy+Raney%22)))

Actor that played minor roles in two films. Gets a lot of hits in imdb type databases (as all people ever credited in any movie do) but doesn't really seem to be notable. Travelbird (talk) 10:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** Fails WP:ENTERTAINER. Qworthy (talk) 10:18, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** The entirety of the article is an (ungrammatical) claim that both (!) films he's been in have starred Stallone. EEng (talk) 16:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** While Stallone DID star in both *Over The Top (film)* and *Rambo III*, and Randy Raney was himself in both films,[14] (<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0710003/filmotype>) his simply being in a film with a notable does not make him notable. And as these were the ONLY films Randy Raney has been in, and as he does not have anything more than mentions for being in those films, we have problems with his meeting WP:ENT and WP:GNG. **Schmidt**,^{MICHAEL Q.} 02:58, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Actors and filmmakers-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:38, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Comments by Robertgreer seem to have convinced several people to !vote keep, and seems to have proved criterion #1 of WP:ENT. Because the comments have not been rebutted, I'm closing as keep. – GorillaWarfare talk • contribs 14:51, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Edwaard Liang

Edwaard Liang (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Edwaard Liang" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Edwaard+Liang%22)))

Is this ballet dancer sufficiently notable? Not as far as I can see. **Delete**. --Nlu (talk) 10:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**. Fails WP:ENTERTAINER. Qworthy (talk) 10:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Arts-related deletion discussions. —• Gene93k (talk) 19:37, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. --• Gene93k (talk) 19:37, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:34, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** — Liang was a New York City Ballet soloist, appeared on Broadway and with Morphoses/The Wheeldon Company and is a choreographer with Cedar Lake Contemporary Ballet, The Royal Ballet and elsewhere. — Robert Greer (talk) 18:58, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** As per Robertgreer's comments. An example of his work: [15] (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mh8cyZHycQE>) Thanks. Wallie (talk) 04:30, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Also, as per Robertgreer's comments. Figaro (talk) 11:01, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Weak Keep** - Seems to merit quite a few notable articles online. It needs a massive overhaul though; online citations also needs to be attached to this article. Bottomline, this article is savable but at its current state, needs a lot of improvement. --TitanOne (talk) 06:24, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 21:20, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Kung-Hao Liang

Kung-Hao Liang (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Kung-Hao Liang" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Kung-Hao+Liang%22)))

The most notable facts asserted appear to be an assistant professorship and leadership of a team in a company that doesn't have a Wikipedia article. I don't see where the notability is. **Delete**. --Nlu (talk) 10:00, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**. Fails WP:ACADEMIC and WP:CORP. Qworthy (talk) 10:21, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Science-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Computing-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:34, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** for lack of evidence of passing WP:PROF. Citation counts are too low to convince me of a pass of criterion C1, and what else is there? —David Eppstein (talk) 16:44, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it**. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it**. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. T. Canens (talk) 02:17, 8 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Tze-Chiang Chen

Tze-Chiang Chen (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Tze-Chiang Chen" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Tze-Chiang+Chen%22)))

Is being an IBM VP (which appears to be the most notable thing mentioned in the article) sufficient for notability? I don't think so. **Delete**. --Nlu (talk) 09:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**. Non-notable company bureaucrat. Qworthy (talk) 10:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - per WP:NOTRESUME. -- Uzma Gamal (talk) 11:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Computing-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:31, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Businesspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - not notable. Taiwantaffy (talk) 14:40, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** as passing WP:PROF criterion 3, where IEEE fellowship is explicitly listed. Phil Bridger (talk) 15:50, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**. I agree that the IEEE Fellowship, rather than the IBM job title, is the most notable thing mentioned in the article. The article describes his contributions to the history of circuit technology and the IEEE Fellowship confirms that those contributions were significant. —David Eppstein (talk) 16:43, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it**. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it**. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **redirect to CIH (computer virus)**. Tone 21:20, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Chen Ing Hau

Chen Ing Hau (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Chen Ing Hau" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Chen+Ing+Hau%22)))

A proposed merger to CIH (computer virus) has been there for a long time, but no one has acted on it. I don't think the article itself contains any real encyclopedic content that should be merged. **Delete** then **redirect** to CIH (computer virus) --Nlu (talk) 09:46, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Computing-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:35, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** and then **redirect** to CIH (computer virus) as per User:Nlu's recommendation. Taiwantaffy (talk) 14:39, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Sandstein 09:28, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Hsiao-Lan Wang

Hsiao-Lan Wang (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "Hsiao-Lan Wang" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Hsiao-Lan+Wang%22)))

While lots of awards are listed, the significance of the awards are not themselves shown, and thus not her notability. As it stands, **delete**. --Nlu (talk) 09:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:29, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- could be, or maybe not; most of the claims are unsourced, and notability is not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. Academic organizations that provide credential buffing for aspiring academics are a dime a dozen; I can't tell if any of this is notable stuff, because no sources tell us. N2e (talk) 03:37, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** I found verification on the two or three awards I looked for right away, plus the listings indicates she's active in competitions and that her music is played internationally. A Google search turns up her name quite often for ensemble and orchestra performances. She looks to be up and coming--books as sources are always several years behind the trends.Pkeets (talk) 21:53, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
 - That much is understood, but is it your opinion that these are legitimate awards? (When I say legitimate I don't mean in opposition to the awards to being "illegitimate"; I mean that these are actually awards of substantial prestige.) --Nlu (talk) 22:24, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
 - Award competitions are set up to produce winners, regardless of the field. Even of some of these are "buff" awards, the competition awards should be taken seriously.Pkeets (talk) 23:03, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Notability in this case would be proven by a couple of reviews of her music in

independent, mainstream publications such as newspapers or magazines. If anyone can find such reviews I will change my view. --*Klein zach* 22:42, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

- Is that a requirement for notability? I don't see anything just for her, but here's a festival review from the LA Times (<http://articles.latimes.com/2003/jan/15/entertainment/et-woodard15>).
- Agree with Kleinzach. **Delete**. Eusebeus (talk) 14:01, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. This subject is a close call. The article in the *International Alliance for Women in Music* does provide some compelling evidence for notability. However, this is just one source and the other references are not substantial. A google news archive search and a google books search has yielded nothing further of note. The *Los Angeles Times* article only mentions her in passing. With the lack of sources available where Hsiao-Lan Wang or her work is the primary subject I don't think notability can be adequately established.4meter4 (talk) 16:28, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. Wikipedia is for the "up and arrived" rather than the "up and coming". She just got her PhD last year and isn't a full professor yet. She wouldn't have to be reviewed or written about in the mainstream press, but there ought to be a least two in-depth articles about her or her work in the specialised journals, and I can't find any. Also without any references, it's hard to tell about these awards. For example, some ASCAP rewards are very prestigious (Deems Taylor Award), but others are really little more than grants to promising young composition students. Even so, I !voted delete in with heavy heart considering the utter schlock that manages to pass AfD's here. Voceditenore (talk) 18:08, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. **Tone** 19:45, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Pan Shiji

Pan Shiji (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Pan Shiji" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Pan+Shiji%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Pan+Shiji%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Pan+Shiji%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Pan+Shiji%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Pan+Shiji%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Pan+Shiji%22)))

Lots of works by this composer are listed, but I see no sign that any of them is notable, or she herself is. **Delete** unless notability established. --Nlu (talk) 09:36, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Taiwan-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:28, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k

(talk) 19:28, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:28, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** -- notability not demonstrated in a reliable secondary source. N2e (talk) 03:38, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** -- The *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* is a reliable secondary source and sufficient indication of notability. Anyone covered by another encyclopedic reference is considered notable enough for inclusion in Wikipedia. A search indicates she's also referenced in a number of other books and articles. Pkeets (talk) 23:52, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per her entry in Grove. If it's good enough for Grove, it's good enough for Wikipedia. Note also that this article is linked from Wikipedia:Music encyclopedia topics. Why not check "What links here" before proposing an article for deletion? Voceditenore (talk) 09:02, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** as above. Groves is authoritative. Eusebeus (talk) 14:02, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Keep** per WP:SNOW. If it's in Grove than it is automatically notable. This was not a well thought out AFD nom.4meter4 (talk) 16:07, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
 - As far as I can see, Grove's online version requires a rather expensive subscription. When the article itself does not assert that the person is listed in Grove, it's impossible for someone who does not have access to it to tell whether if the person is in Grove. --Nlu (talk) 16:11, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
 - I agree with you to the extent that the original reference was very vague. When referencing to Grove, the exact title of the article should be given as well as the article's author, not simply a general reference to the entire 29 volume set or even one volume. If the original editor used the actual paper version, then the page number(s) should be given as well. Ditto for the other work by Mittler cited, who did an entire case study on her work, along with several other Chinese women composers. It should have the page numbers listed. Even so, when I see an article that I'm doubtful about, I always looked to see if it's linked at Wikipedia:Music encyclopedia topics. All the people listed there have their own Music Dictionary or Encyclopedia entries.
- **Keep.** Just one more affirmation that Grove is authoritative and it would very odd for us to delete an article on a topic where they include an article. If you are thinking about proposing deletion of a classical music article and want to know if something is in Grove, the people at Wikipedia talk:WikiProject Composers (I among them) would certainly be willing to help you. Opus33 (talk) 23:37, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. (non-admin closure) Logan ^{Talk}Contributions 00:46, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Catalina Island Marine Institute

Catalina Island Marine Institute (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "Catalina Island Marine Institute" (<http://www.google.com/search?>

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharelike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharelike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22))

- Nominated for deletion based on WP:N and WP:CORP. Two of the sources used are not linked, and the third isn't even used in the article. Searching for Catalina Island Marine Institute reveals nothing noteworthy, and the article reads as if it were lifted from an advertisement. 71.189.152.223 (talk) 07:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Organizations-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:27, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep.** I can appreciate the nominator's concern about the tone of this short article, but this is in fact a well-known non-profit institution on Catalina Island, patronized by generations of school kids from metro Los Angeles and elsewhere. It's part of the Catalina Island Education Consortium in collaboration with the USC Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies and some other island institutions[16] (http://college.usc.edu/wrigley/education/island_sch.cfm)[17] (<http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=771kAAAIBA&sjid=u4QNAAAIBA&pg=1142,1478827&dq=catalina-island-marine-institute&hl=en>)[18] (<http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=251kAAAIBA&sjid=04QNAAAIBA&pg=2598,2039692&dq=catalina-island-marine-institute&hl=en>). Per a 1995 *Los Angeles Times* article: "About 15,000 students a year visit the marine institute, established 15 years ago on a private beach near Avalon. It costs \$131 per student for transportation and three days of instruction. Students travel from as far away as Minnesota to take part in the program." [19] (http://articles.latimes.com/1995-04-09/local/me-52551_1_lincoln-school-students/3) More coverage of the camp is shown at Google News[20] (http://www.google.com/search?q=%22catalina+island+marine+institute%22&hl=en&client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&tbs=nws:1,ar:1&ei=i3hETbKVKY_2swOKpvTdcG&start=0&sa=N). --Arxiloxos (talk) 20:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The Los Angeles Times alone has found it notable enough for it to be prominent in many articles, and mentioned in at least 25.[21] (<http://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22+%22los+angeles+times%22&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8#q=%22Catalina+Island+Marine+Institute%22+%22los+angeles+times%22&hl=en&client=safari&rls=en&tbs=nws:1,ar:1&source=ln&sa=X&ei=HYJETayvAoiqsAPKkvSHCg&ved=0CA8QpwUoBQ&fp=10f6603732373017>) Thus it meets the main test at WP:ORG: "An organization is generally considered notable if it has been the subject of significant coverage in reliable, independent secondary sources." And as an educational institute it is arguably far more notable than many high schools, which are commonly accepted as a default keep. First Light (talk) 21:19, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep:** Notable. - Ret.Prof (talk) 02:30, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion*

page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

The result was **Speedily deleted per G7, NAC.**. ukexpat (talk) 21:23, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Mike Emmett

Mike Emmett (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Mike Emmett" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Mike+Emmett%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Mike+Emmett%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Mike+Emmett%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Mike+Emmett%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Mike+Emmett%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Mike+Emmett%22)))

Insufficiently sourced BLP, and promotional WP:PUFFERY, possibly written by the subject him/herself. No Ghits appear to be available for *this* Mike Emmett other than the usual social networking sites. Kudpung (talk) 09:31, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** Super puff piece lacking in relevant WP:RS, concocted as WP:SPAM by WP:SPA afflicted with WP:COI and WP:AUTO. Qwerty (talk) 10:26, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**, per nom. JohnInDC (talk) 11:18, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Do Not Delete.** michaelwemmett (talk) 11:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC) reliable PUBLISHED sources are now online at <http://www.michaelwemmett.com/emmett1.jpg> and <http://www.michaelwemmett.com/emmett2.jpg> Edits have also been made to the article.
 - Obvious COI is obvious. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 18:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:26, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** As I indicate in the lengthy discussion with the WP:COI author on the talk page of the article, there is little to no sourcing for this article. As indicated there, I find it odd that someone who is touted in the article to be a pioneer of sports journalism on the Internet has little to no WP:RS information about him on said Internet or in any other sources. To be fair, I don't think it's a hoax, but I feel like it's an attempt to build an article out of things that ultimately aren't sourceable and thus do not meet WP:V. The one cited source is the Mulligan book, but (a) one paragraph in one source (see the image provided by the subject above) does not meet the "multiple" and "non-trivial" aspects of WP:GNG, and considering this is a WP:BLP, that's not enough for an article, and (b) also importantly, in a TL;DR comment on said talk page, the subject of the article states "[b]esides myself, the book also spoke with" ... which seems to indicate the included information about the subject in the book is based on information from the subject himself rather than other sourceable information. I'm not questioning the book authors' reliability, but without any other actual source to corroborate the information in and to expand on the one paragraph, the "multiple" aspect of WP:GNG is nowhere near met, and there simply isn't enough here to write an actual encyclopedic article. Ultimately what's left is a resume in prose.-- **Kinu** ^t/_c 19:29, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - per Kinu's excellent discourse. ukexpat (talk) 00:30, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** as per Kinu. Nipsonanomhmata ^(Talk)

The Mulligan book has 15 pages about me and my career and as far as articles online go, if you folks had been around actively working on the Web in 2000, you would know when the Dot Com Bubble burst, many, many companies went out of business. Servers with information about me, as well as Nando.net, were taken off line. And in the past decade, sites such as NASCAR.com (where I was the managing editor), had revamped their sites and cleaned out their servers. Articles that had been written about me were erased. Even New Media Columnist Steve Outing (SteveOuting.com), who had documented my career online and with SportsEditor.com in the 1990s, has a Web site that only goes back to 2006 with articles. The fact is this: I was the first sports editor on the Web. My boss was the first managing editor on the Web. We opened our doors in Raleigh, N.C., to other newspapers in the country because our publisher was also the chairman of AP (I assume, but cannot be sure, you know what The Associated Press is). USA TODAY, The N.Y. Times, and many other newspapers sent people to our offices in Raleigh to learn how we built and kept updating our Web site. They then took back what they learned and built sites on their own. That really did happen whether you like it, or believe it, or not. I suggest you take a look at hundreds of other articles you have about living persons. You will find those links they list are dead, too. —Preceding unsigned comment added by 174.97.234.123 (talk) 14:46, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

- Comment: The author blanked the page, so I've sent to deletion per G7.” T_eLeS (T @ L C S) 17:17, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - That editor has also been blocked for sockpuppetry, violating WP:LEGAL, etc., etc. Another day on Wikipedia. Nothing to see here, people. :P --Kinu ^t/_c 20:12, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Tone 19:45, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Chen Shi-hui

Chen Shi-hui (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "Chen Shi-hui" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Chen+Shi-hui%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Chen+Shi-hui%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Chen+Shi-hui%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Chen+Shi-hui%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Chen+Shi-hui%22))

I see nothing in WP:MUSIC that yells out notability in this case, and the person doesn't seem notable to me. **Delete**. --Nlu (talk) 09:31, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k

(talk) 19:25, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** -- The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians is a reliable secondary source and sufficient indication of notability. Anyone covered by another encyclopedic reference is considered notable enough for inclusion in Wikipedia. The Guggenheim Fellowship and the Rome Prize are considered prestigious awards. Pkeets (talk) 00:04, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per her entry in Grove. If it's good enough for Grove, it's good enough for Wikipedia + the awards, which are very prestigious. Note also that this article is linked from Wikipedia:Music encyclopedia topics. Why not check "What links here" before proposing an article for deletion? Voceditenore (talk) 09:29, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Keep** per WP:SNOW. With two notable award wins and Shi-hui's entry in Grove this subject is clearly notable. This was not a well thought out AFD nom.4meter4 (talk) 16:11, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**. Just one more affirmation that Grove is authoritative and it would very odd for us to delete an article on a topic where they include an article. If you are thinking about proposing deletion of a classical music article and want to know if something is in Grove, the people at Wikipedia talk:WikiProject Composers (I among them) would certainly be willing to help you. Opus33 (talk) 23:39, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **Delete**. Wikipedia does not operate on a process of "if he may be notable in a few weeks, keep". If you wish to install such a policy, do so on a discussion page; do not make up rationales contrary to policy and guidelines on individual AfD. Ironholds (talk) 16:31, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Bryan Meredith (soccer)

Bryan Meredith (soccer) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Bryan Meredith (soccer)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Bryan+Meredith+%28soccer%29%22)))

Fails both WP:GNG and WP:NFOOTY. Was only drafted by seattle, in the second round, in 2011, and has never played a pro game. Contested PROD, with claim that he passed a different set of GNG for college athletes, of which I can find no proof. (See talk page for PROD contester's rationale). Ravendrop (talk) 08:54, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Football-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk)

19:24, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:24, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This discussion has been included in WikiProject Football's list of association football-related deletions. GiantSnowman 15:59, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - fails WP:GNG and WP:NFOOTBALL. GiantSnowman 16:01, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Since the only league he has played in is not fully pro, he fails WP:NSPORT. He also fails WP:GNG due to a lack of significant coverage. Sir Sputnik (talk) 03:29, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Wait a few weeks.** I have proposed this each year following the MLS SuperDraft, because this always happens. As I said on his talk page, because of the nature of US sports, drafts, and the nature of college sports and how WP:GNG notability for college players is always contentious, I'm advocating a blanket "hangan" for all articles on newly-drafted players until we get a little way into the 2011 MLS season. If players drafted this year who have articles haven't made their debut by, say, the end of April, then I'll support a mass cull of all articles on such players; waiting a little while allows people interested in these players to see their articles and obtain some information, but still gives us leeway to follow the appropriate notability guidelines later. It also saves editors from having to go through the busy work deleting and re-creating articles which could be time better spent doing other things. I realize that this is technically a violation of the guidelines, but I'm just asking for a little, time-limited concession. --JonBroxton (talk) 20:52, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep, for right now** - I agree with Jon, wait for a while and see if he makes his professional debut. – Michael (talk) 15:50, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Procedural keep** I do not consider the player to be notable enough for an article at this point in time. But Jon's suggestion, if followed through on a league-wide basis, has the potential to give us a relatively drama-free method for deleting those players that don't make the grade once the season is in full flow. So my feeling is to assume good faith on Jon's part, and WP:IAR in the hope that he can turn his vision into an effective annual mechanism for the MLS draft. If it doesn't materialise in the time frame he has proposed, players such as this should be renominated and deleted unless they have established themselves in the first team. —WFC— 21:14, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. The argument that serving on a military appeals court is equivalent to serving in a civilian national appellate court does not seem to be supported by policy or consensus here. Although the court itself and some of the incidents it handled are undeniably notable notability is not inherited. Beeblebrox (talk) 02:56, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Gale E. Krouse

Gale E. Krouse (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "Gale E. Krouse" (<http://www.google.com/search?>

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Gale+E.+Krouse%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Gale+E.+Krouse%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Gale+E.+Krouse%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Gale+E.+Krouse%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Gale+E.+Krouse%22))

Probably a nice guy but does not meet notability requirements for Wikipedia. Simply is just another lawyer who had a case that some remember but many do not. Also not notable as a politician. Just an old lawyer from the last century.

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Military-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:03, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Law-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:03, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:03, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete** Non notable lawyer, no awards, fails WP:N, if we have this article then we should have 100,000 other lawyer biographies. Spevw (talk) 20:15, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep.** The presiding judge of a United States appellate court would seem to qualify as notable under WP:POLITICIAN #1.--Arxiloxos (talk) 06:15, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** just a random person, the same can be said for many thousands of people therefore making wikipedia overcrowded by biographys. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Seasider91 (talk • contribs) 12:24, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per WP:POLITICIAN, as noted by Arxiloxos: this is a type of national judgeship, just like a typical district-level federal judge. Nyttend (talk) 19:59, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

Not "just like". It isn't so it does not qualify. **Delete** Ryan White Jr. (talk) 02:51, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak keep** because the person had an obituary in the Washington Post and presided an appellate court. But that judgeship alone does not suffice for the purposes of WP:POLITICIAN, because the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Criminal Appeals is not a national court of general jurisdiction, but rather a specialized military court. Sandstein 09:47, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** The refs demonstrate he isn't notable. Lawyer, lower level judge, served in the military. A good guy I'm sure. Szzuk (talk) 21:43, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 21:18, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] August Ferdinand Black

August Ferdinand Black (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "August Ferdinand Black" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22August+Ferdinand+Black%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22August+Ferdinand+Black%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22August+Ferdinand+Black%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22August+Ferdinand+Black%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22August+Ferdinand+Black%22))

No apparent significant coverage in WP:RS to satisfy WP:GNG. Vague assertion of "several" written scripts without the ability to verify claims, and the inability to source the statement about his works being "well received by literary critics" indicate the subject does not meet WP:AUTHOR. The lack of any verifiable biographical information (real name? date of birth?) makes this a highly unencyclopedic WP:BLP. **Kinu**^t/_c 07:34, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** Awfully skimpy piece of WP:SPAM created by a WP:SPA afflicted with WP:COI and possible WP:AUTO, insufficient in WP:RS, thus failing WP:AUTHOR and, by virtue of insignificant micro-press publication, WP:BK. Qworthy (talk) 10:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Scotland-related deletion discussions. —Mais oui! (talk) 09:07, 30 January 2011 (UTC)--Mais oui! (talk) 09:07, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 21:19, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Ishpeck's Law

Ishpeck's Law (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Ishpeck's Law" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Ishpeck%27s+Law%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Ishpeck%27s+Law%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Ishpeck%27s+Law%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Ishpeck%27s+Law%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Ishpeck%27s+Law%22))

nn neologism with no wide currency Kintetsubuffalo (talk) 07:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of United States of America-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Politics-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Google search shows 5 hits. NYyankees51 (talk) 19:15, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** I was unable to find in-depth discussion of this "law" in any independent reliable sources. Cullen328 (talk) 02:02, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - still too new for inclusion, per WP:NEO. Bearian (talk) 02:15, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 21:18, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Portal of Evil

Portal of Evil (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "Portal of Evil" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Portal+of+Evil%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Portal+of+Evil%22) • books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Portal+of+Evil%22) • scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Portal+of+Evil%22) • free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Portal+of+Evil%22))

Article appears to fail WP:WEB. Current sourcing consists of one reliable source that's only a trivial mention (only to help identify a person being quoted), and the rest is links to sections within the site. A search online and on Highbeam Research yielded nothing in the way of non-trivial reliable sources to demonstrate sufficient notability to retain the article. SchuminWeb (Talk) 06:50, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**, per nom.--Esprit15d • talk • contribs 07:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Websites-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to*

this page.

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 19:45, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Summit Learning Services

Meritas (education) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Summit Learning Services" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22))

Summit Learning Services (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Summit Learning Services" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Summit+Learning+Services%22))

Promotional material, no sources or verification of notability. **Dusti**^{*poke*} 05:07, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**. **Bluefist**^{talk} 05:18, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**, per nom.--Esprit15d • talk • contribs 07:05, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Business-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. -- **Joaquin008**^(talk) 15:37, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete both**not notable Spevw (talk) 20:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **speedy delete** This is nothing more than promotion. The sources on the article just link to random articles or companies, and not actual articles, reviews, etc. --23 Benson (talk) 00:07, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **redirect to November 11**. **Tone** 21:07, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] 11/11/11

11/11/11 (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(Find sources: "11/11/11" ([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22&num=50)

[as_eq=wikipedia&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22&num=50](http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22&num=50)) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22) · books ([http://www.google.com/search?](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)

[tbs=bks:1&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22](http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)) · scholar ([http://scholar.google.com/scholar?](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)

[q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=)

[safe=off&as_rights=](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=)

[safe=off&as_rights=](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=)

[cc_publicdomain%7cc_attribute%7cc_sharealike%7cc_noncommercial%7cc_nonderived\)](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7cc_attribute%7cc_sharealike%7cc_noncommercial%7cc_nonderived)&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)

[&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7cc_attribute%7cc_sharealike%7cc_noncommercial%7cc_nonderived)&q=%2211%2F11%2F11%22)))

Fails WP:RS and I don't think there are other dates that have an article. I'm sure the number sequence is aesthetically pleasing, but what about 11/11/10? No article for that, and if it did, most the events listed in this article would happen (or did) would appear there, but be redundant if brought to a newer date? Phearson (talk) 05:05, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment:** Might be a violation of WP:CRYSTAL, but this day might gain notability as the date nears or passes based on what peculiar things occur. Also, is there any precedent on wikipedia for other such novelty dates?--Esprit15d • talk • contribs 07:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** It's not a notable date at this time, the article is mostly about 11 November in general.--Pontificalibus (talk) 17:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** and then **redirect** to November 11. --Metropolitan90 (talk) 18:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Merge** in to November 11 to save the work. Probably not worth redirecting to November 11. Nipsonanomhmata ^(Talk) 02:01, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** I have added some reliable sources. These demonstrate that the date is not only notable now but has been in the past too. Colonel Warden (talk) 08:52, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** to November 11. TomCat4680 (talk) 12:25, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Merge** or **Redirect** to November 11. Not notable enough for a standalone article. First Light (talk) 13:22, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The New York Times article linked to gives coverage of this event from 11/11/1911 and states it won't happen again until the distant year 2011 a century away. [22] (<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F70A1EFF355517738DDDA80994D9415B818DF1D3>) It is quite reasonable to assume other newspapers mentioned this as well. **Dream Focus 12:04, 31 January 2011 (UTC)**
- **Note:** The article under discussion here has been {{rescue}} flagged by an editor for review by the Article Rescue Squadron. SNOTTYWONG ^{chat} 18:42, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** and then **redirect** to either November 11 or 2011. Silly number coincidences are not notable enough for their own articles. Should we also have articles for 1/1/01, 2/2/02, 3/3/03 ... 12/12/12? How about 1/2/03, 2/3/04, 3/4/05 ... 12/13/14? In almost exactly 34 years, we'll even be able to celebrate 1/23/45. Note that 10/10/10 is currently a redirect to 2010#October. SNOTTYWONG ^{chat} 18:42, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Its a redirect because there was never an article there, someone just put it there. Nothing to do with this. And articles exist or don't based on having reliable sources mention them, which this does have. Whether you personally like an article or its subject, is totally irrelevant. **Dream Focus 13:09, 1 February 2011 (UTC)**

I only noted the 10/10/10 redirect to show that it might be more consistent to redirect this

article to 2010 instead of November 11, should the consensus be to redirect. And my rationale for redirecting has nothing to do with whether I personally like the article. The sources in this article are not exactly compelling. The first source is from a miniscule 2-paragraph blurb newspaper article from 100 years ago, which lets us know that 11/11/11 only happens once every hundred years, and not much more. The second source is an article about an upcoming movie that is going to be titled "11 11 11". That would be a great source for an article on that movie. If these are the best sources that can be located, then this article is in trouble. SNOTTYWONG spill the beans 17:31, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- These are not necessarily the best sources - they are just what I found in a minute or so of skimming. I make another quick skim and I find that mainstream media have now spotted that, to be born on 11/11/11, a baby should be conceived on Valentine's Day. See ABC (<http://abcnews.go.com/US/thinking-baby-11-11-11-snuggle-lover-valentines/story?id=12808395>), for example. Note also that this article gives lots of reasons why 11/11/11 is a particularly good date to be born. I had no idea of this before I looked, not did I know about the movie until I looked. In such cases, we cannot know how much more can be made of the topic without a thorough and comprehensive search. If you have not made such a search then your carping is unhelpful as it is not informed. Colonel Warden (talk) 18:43, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** to November 11, until and unless more reliable sources can be found to demonstrate notability for this particular date. I've done some searching, but unfortunately the nature of the title format brings up mostly false positives. **Merging** to November 11 would also make sense, except (at this point) there's not much to merge that's not already in the target article. I'm open to changing my !vote if good reliable sources are found and added to the article. 28bytes (talk) 10:29, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** or **Redirect** to November 11. There is only one sentence that says anything unique about the specific day, and that is only that it happens every 100 years. The rest just summarizes what happens every year. I'd suggest redirecting to November 11, but I can see the rationale behind redirecting to 2011 instead, so I'll hold off on that.--Yaksar (let's chat) 06:29, 3 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**: no indication that the eleventh day of the eleventh month of *the eleventh year* has any particular notability (and Armistice Day, etc, already have their own articles, and don't give any particular significance to eleventh year). *Hrafn*^{Talk}_{Stalk}^(P) 11:29, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Whether or not it should be merged to Environmental law#Administration and enforcement is an editorial decision. Sandstein 09:30, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Green Police

Green Police (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Green Police" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Green+Police%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Green+Police%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Green+Police%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Green+Police%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Green+Police%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Green+Police%22)))

none of the article listed on this dab are plausible search targets for "green police" **HJ Mitchell** | **Penny for your thoughts?** 05:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Disambiguations-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The nomination is correct in that the article does not work well as a dab page. All that is needed for that purpose are some hat notes. The substantive topic here is environmental law enforcement agencies and I have rewritten to show this way forward, adding a source which discusses this topic in a general way by this title. Colonel Warden (talk) 09:37, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** This does seem to be a real thing. Don't have time to sort through the ample news results right now, [23] (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?q=%22Green+Police%22+%22environment%22+source%3A%22-newswire%22+source%3A%22-wire%22+source%3A%22-presswire%22+source%3A%22-PR%22+source%3A%22-release%22+source%3A%22-wikipedia%22&btnG=Search+Archives&scoring=a>), but "Green Police" and "Green Police" AND "Environment" together show a lot of results. **Dream Focus 11:55, 30 January 2011 (UTC)**
- - **Note**: The article under discussion here has been flagged for {{rescue}} by the Article Rescue Squadron. SNOTTYWONG^{babble} 19:06, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** but only if the article is renamed to something like Environmental law enforcement. "Green Police" is an amateurish title, and is often used pejoratively to refer to people who are overly enthusiastic or militant about environmentalism. If there isn't consensus to rename the article, then my vote changes to Delete. SNOTTYWONG^{babble} 19:06, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Merge** to Environmental law#Administration and enforcement (which could use the content) until such stage that there is enough content for Environmental law enforcement to exist on its own. I would suspect that the majority of the such enforcement would be by civil rather than criminal enforcement ('police') authorities, so that the current title is misleading (as well as informal). *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 11:12, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

How would you merge a disambiguation page? **HJ Mitchell** | **Penny for your thoughts?** 18:19, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

It's not (currently) "a disambiguation page", but rather explicitly a stub. *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 18:22, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

- Change my !vote to **Merge** per Hrafn. I searched around for a good merge target but couldn't find one. Environmental law#Administration and enforcement seems like a pretty good one. The section needs content, and the article has no length issues. SNOTTYWONG^{spout} 15:17, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Like the similar AFD of Agriculture and the Environment, this is the rare case where notability is not the main argument in favor of deletion. It has been demonstrated that the subject is already covered in numerous other articles and that those articles do a much better, more thorough job of covering the topic. It is possible this could still be useful as a redirect, maybe to an as-yet-nonexistent list of all articles that fall under this general subject, but the current version is a poorly written content fork. While poor writing in and of itself is almost never a reason to delete, it is in the case of a content fork as nothing of value is lost. Again, no prejudice against recreation in another form that directs readers to the content we already have on this subject. Beeblebrox (talk) 03:09, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Water and the environment

Water and the environment (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Water and the environment" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Water+and+the+environment%22)))

Deprodded with a WP:SOFIXIT rationale even though prod was 2 hours past the 7-day limit. Article is four sentences long, almost tautological and ridiculously incomplete. I think the title is far too vague to be of any use, not to mention that it just parrots stuff already at marine pollution, water pollution and other similar articles. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 04:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep.** ~~Agree with everything here, pointless article.~~ After reading Alan's comment I changed my mind. **Bluefist**^{talk} 05:08, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Environment-related deletion discussions. --- Alan Liefing (talk) - 05:15, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Strong keep.** It is a very notable topic. The article needs expanding not deleting. Contrary to what the nominator asserts the article topic is clearly defined - namely the intersection of water and the environment. A similar AfD by the nominator is at Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Agriculture and the environment. -- Alan Liefing (talk) - 05:15, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Yes, and Agriculture and the environment is a content fork just like this one, and looks like it is going to be deleted. What's your point? **SNOTTYWONG**^{talk} 16:05, 29 January

2011 (UTC)

- **Keep**-The article is on a very important topic.It can be a good wiki article if expanded.--Poet009 (talk) 08:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** The article under discussion here has been {{rescue}} flagged by an editor for review by the Article Rescue Squadron. SNOTTYWONG^{prattle} 16:00, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - This article currently has just about zero content, aside from four blazingly obvious sentences and various links to other articles. If this article were to be expanded, it would be a content fork of all the articles it currently links to. There is nothing that could be said in this article that isn't already discussed at length in Water, Water pollution, Marine pollution, Water conservation, Peak water, and a myriad of other articles discussing various facets of this topic. Note to closing admin: I believe my !vote is the first such one that doesn't fall under WP:ITSNOTABLE or WP:ILIKEIT. SNOTTYWONG^{prattle} 16:00, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete:** unsourced and largely contentless WP:CFORK of Water (particularly Water#Effects on human civilization) and subsidiary articles (particularly Water pollution). *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 16:53, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** Notable topic with ample coverage. Click on the Google news archive or Google book search at the top of the AFD. Thousands of results for each. Some of them are surely valid. And it isn't just about water pollution either. **Dream Focus 02:37, 30 January 2011 (UTC)**

The boilerplate WP:GHITS argument from Dream Focus is even less compelling than usual for this article. There's no doubt that if you google "water and the environment" you will get billions of results, but what does that prove? You seem to be trying to prove that the subject of water as it applies to environmentalism is notable, however no one is claiming that it is not notable. The nomination and most of the delete comments are based on the fact that the subject is discussed at great length in several other articles. In other words, this article is a useless content fork (that is, if it were updated to actually have *any* appreciable content, *then* it would become a content fork). I haven't heard any arguments yet which refute that point. SNOTTYWONG^{express} 19:43, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

In some nations they have a minister for Water and the Environment, calling it that. [24] (<http://www.echonews.com.au/story/2010/10/14/murray-darling-still-plan-making-a-big-splash/>). I see there are agencies dedicated to this as well, such as the Anglian Water and the Environment Agency^[1]. Not every search result is about that, but there are plenty of them. This term is commonly used. **Dream Focus 16:35, 1 February 2011 (UTC)**

I'm fairly sure you'll find that the ministry in question covers the wikt:conjunction of water and the environment, not the wikt:intersection of the two, as the article does. *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 16:53, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** The nomination is too vague to be of any use as it offers no policy-based argument for deletion. Our actual editing policy is to retain and develop stubs on such evidently notable topics. Colonel Warden (talk) 08:56, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - "Vague" boilerplate references to WP:IMPERFECT likewise "offers no policy-based argument for" *keeping* an obvious (unsourced and largely contentless) WP:CFORK. *Hrafn*^{Talk}*Stalk*^(P) 09:25, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** As far as I can tell this article is nothing but a list of the phases of water followed by a list of some articles related to water. Plus, all possible additions to this page should already be covered in another, more fitting article (for example, erosion, or the section of the water page covering its effect on life.)--Yaksar (let's chat) 02:19, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** per nominator and Yaksar. Johnfos (talk) 02:24, 5 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. Very poor content fork of Water, especially Water#On_Earth and Water#Effects_on_life. An article of this sort should be developed organically as a split-off from Water per WP:SS, not simply created as a haphazard and unsourced stub. Sandstein 09:41, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. This is all done elsewhere far better, just not worth rescuing such a vague concept. Szzuk (talk) 21:38, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **speedy delete**, per WP:A2, which does not just apply to foreign language content. -- *Lear's Fool* 12:01, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] -ton

-ton (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "-ton" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22-ton%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22-ton%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22-ton%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22-ton%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22-ton%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22-ton%22)))

Dictionary like article **Dusti**^{*poke*} 04:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Speedy delete** copy-paste of wikt:-ton 65.93.15.80 (talk) 06:01, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:37, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Dolphin safe label

Dolphin safe label (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "Dolphin safe label" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Dolphin+safe+label%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Dolphin+safe+label%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Dolphin+safe+label%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Dolphin+safe+label%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Dolphin+safe+label%22))

- This article is, essentially, a stand-alone list of labels. As such, the notability requirement is to show that the list itself is notable, per WP:NOTESAL.
- I have attempted to find a reliable source establishing the notability of this particular list, and have failed to do so.
- Many claims in article are cited to claimants. That fails WP:RS.
- As claimants are product vendors, article gives the appearance of being WP:ARTSPAM.

24.177.123.74 (talk) 04:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- Completing nomination for IP. Rationale taken from article talk page. **Jujutacular** talk 04:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** seems to meet a minimum level of notability, referenced well enough to keep. Maybe a rename and expand as "Dolphin safe tuna" or something like that, but the subject matter seems reasonable for a Wikipedia article. --**Jayron32** 04:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** and expand and improve references. Could possibly be renamed as "List of Dolphin safe labels".--Salix (talk): 10:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** no reason to delete this article, is notable (see talk page of article for reasoning) and is found to be within the scope of two wikipedia projects. It is by no means spam (it does not promote the products). If this would be spam then Captain Birdseye and similar articles would certainly also require deletion? Any problems with the references could be discussed on the talk page and then addressed simply by editing the article. It is not simply a list of some labels, the article includes background information as well. @Jayron32: Dolphin safe tuna already redirects there :) BabyNuke (talk) 12:26, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**. Seems notable to me and it is possible to expand and improve references *Find sources:* "dolphin safe label" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22dolphin+safe+label%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22dolphin+safe+label%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22dolphin+safe+label%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22dolphin+safe+label%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22dolphin+safe+label%22). @Salix: In my opinion the article can be more interesting than just a list of Dolphin safe labels.--Crazy runner (talk) 12:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Food and drink-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:57, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Environment-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:57, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The subject is notable; the article can be cleaned up. Regent of the Seatopians (talk) 02:11, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - Valid encyclopedic topic, in my estimation. Carrite (talk) 03:10, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 19:46, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Sangeeta sethi

Sangeeta sethi (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Sangeeta sethi" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Sangeeta+sethi%22)))

Doesn't seem notable per WP:Bio; no sources cited to show notability, see WP:V. NawlinWiki (talk) 04:04, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**. I agree completely. **Bluefist** ^{talk} 04:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per nom. **Dusti** ^{*poke*} 04:10, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**- Non notable author.Should be deleted--Poet009 (talk) 08:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of India-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - No indication of notability. **Joaquin008** ^(talk) 15:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. No evidence of notability. Suspected conflict of interest, see this. **Salih** ^(talk) 16:36, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 02:02, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Live '11

Live '11 (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Live '11" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Live+%2711%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Live+%2711%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Live+%2711%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Live+%2711%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Live+%2711%22))

I don't think that concerts qualify for event notability, plus the author has explicitly put "There are no references for this article, as there have been no documents of this event, published or otherwise, created to date" in the "References" section. **Bluefist** ^{talk} 02:28, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** An article written in good faith by a high school student about a non-notable fund raiser. I encourage this young person to write an article about a truly notable topic instead, and to learn about Wikipedia's policies during that process. Cullen328 (talk) 04:27, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Music-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:50, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per Cullen. --Metropolitan90 (talk) 18:55, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

This page has been blanked as a courtesy.

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. (non-admin closure) Logan ^{Talk} ^{Contributions} 00:52, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Deichstraße

Deichstraße (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Deichstraße" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Deichstra%C3%9Fe%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Deichstra%C3%9Fe%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Deichstra%C3%9Fe%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Deichstra%C3%9Fe%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Deichstra%C3%9Fe%22))

Article doesn't meet Notability guidelines, nor are there any sources for verification. **Dusti** ^{*poke*} 02:19, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** While there is an article in the German Wikipedia (<http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deichstra%C3%9Fe>), it doesn't have any references either. Bluefist talk 02:56, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Germany-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:48, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Transportation-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The German article has lots of info that could be added but also lists two books as sources, one of which I added to teh article as a source; I can only see it in snippet view on GoogleBooks but it refers to at least 4 specific buildings on the street as architecturally significant. I added references from several guidebooks, including 2 saying the "Great Fire" of Hamburg broke out at a specific house number on the street. The street has its own subpage on the official Hamburg website, which I also added as a reference. I think that's enough to establish architectural and historical notability and I'm sure more could be found. I also added the pic the German article is using, and the Commons category link. And the interwikis to both en. and de. I think the article creator should be lashed with a wet noodle, but I note that he doesn't seem to have been notified and nor does the AfD template appear to have been placed on the page. Maybe after those are done he will add more references himself. Yngvadottir (talk) 17:11, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Strong Keep** It is an important historical part of Hamburg and I believe it deserves mention here.- JustPhil 20:01, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep**, probably speedy. - No sources for verification in existence? Quite the leap of faith there by the nom. Just a g-book search (<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&biw=1024&bih=692&q=Deichstra%C3%9Fe&um=1&ie=UTF-8&tbo=u&tbs=bks:l&source=og&sa=N&tab=wp>) brings up quite a lot of sources for verification. --Oakshade (talk) 23:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Strong Keep.** Very notable street of historical significance. Large numbers of references available. --Boson (talk) 00:32, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Keep.** Would have done that myself if I had not been out of action for so long and don't really want to look up all the red tape. Agathoclea (talk) 18:28, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. No valid policy based arguments to keep are presented. Beeblebrox (talk) 03:20, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Rushi Tai Chi Chuan

Rushi Tai Chi Chuan (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
 (Find sources: "Rushi Tai Chi Chuan" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Rushi+Tai+Chi+Chuan%22))

This is an unsourced article that gives no reason why its subject is notable. An SPA IP user removed all tags (PROD, notability, unreferenced, orphan) without making any comments or improvements so I'm bringing it to AfD. Papaurisa (talk) 02:00, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Martial arts-related deletion discussions. —Papaurisa (talk) 02:00, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** I found nothing that shows this is notable and no independent coverage. Astudent0 (talk) 14:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** This article contributes to an understanding of the current development in the field of Taichi Chuan. The subject of Rushi Taichi Chuan is notable due to the following reasons:
 1. It emphasizes the importance of the “thirteen grand postures” in the learning of Taichi Chuan as stated in Wang Zhong-yue’s classic “Treatise of Taichi Chuan”. Although Wang’s “Treatise of Taichi Chuan” is widely known in the Taichi circle and his words are frequently quoted, but the importance of “thirteen grand postures” is not always acknowledged. Where this is noted, it is often misinterpreted or not duly followed in practiced.
 2. By highlighting the word “grand” in “thirteen grand postures”, it helps to clarify some popular misunderstandings of Taichi Chuan, and provides useful insights to fundamental questions such as what Taichi Chuan is all about and how Taichi Chuan should be taught. Simply said, according to Rushi Taichi Chuan, Taichi Chuan is equivalent to the “thirteen grand postures”, which are expressions of a spherical movement, and as such, must not be treated as 13 isolated movements. Nor should it be taught like 13 individual movements as often do in popular Taichi classes.
 3. It urges beginners of Taichi to start from the core of Taichi Chuan, i.e. train on the “thirteen grand postures” --- a skill that is fundamental to all forms and all schools of Taichi Chuan.
 4. It emphasizes that the power of Taichi is something everyone is born with. It is part of your nature. You just grow up to forget about your own capability. The purpose of Taichi training is therefore to rediscover your own potential.
 5. Rushi Taichi offers three practical methods (3 form sets) to find your way to Taichi: (1) by practicing the thirteen grand postures (the spherical form); (2) by practicing the water form; and (3) by practicing the void form.
 6. Rushi Taichi has attracted a large crowd of followers since its inception in 2010. It has been gaining ground rapidly even among professional Taichi practitioners and instructors. An independent learners’ association known as Rushi Taiji Learners’ Group was formed in Hong Kong in January 2011.

Lutongsan (talk) 13:05, 4 February 2011 (UTC) — Lutongsan (talk • contribs) has made few or no other edits outside this topic.

Even if all of what you wrote is true, that has no bearing on whether or not something is notable for Wikipedia. You might find it helpful to look at the guidelines for verifiability (WP:V) and notability (WP:N). To be notable for Wikipedia, the article needs to have significant coverage by reliable sources that have no connections to the article's subject. Papaurisa (talk) 21:34, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** I found no reliable sources that show this brand new style is notable. All of the above

reasons to keep amount to WP:ILIKEIT. 131.118.229.17 (talk) 16:07, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** no reliable independent.Dwanyewest (talk) 21:31, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** Notability not establish, no way for me to find anything given the language barrier. Up to the author to provide refs, had a week so should be delete. Szzuk (talk) 21:35, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **no consensus**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:39, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Norazia

Norazia (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Norazia" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Norazia%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Norazia%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Norazia%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Norazia%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Norazia%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Norazia%22)))

I just can't find any sources on this worth anything. **D O N D E** groovily Talk to me 05:09, 14 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 03:02, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:02, 21 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:51, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment.** Not easy to find reliable sources for this, but there is a bit in French. This one, from Radio France (2005), is both independent and substantial.[25] (<http://sites.radiofrance.fr/franceinter/em/souslesetoilesexactement/index.php?id=37968>) An article in *Guitar Extreme* magazine indicates that she was nominated for a fr: Prix Adami/Bruno Coquatrix new artist award in 2008. A few other tidbits: a listing from *Le Figaro*[26] (<http://scope.lefigaro.fr/musiques/concert/world-music/e-e560927--norazia/static/>); a page from a magazine/website called *Le Most*[27] (<http://www.lemost.fr/index.php?page=article&ref=1&sousref=4&art=769>); a sort-of-review of her second album at fr:Radio Néo[28] (<http://www.radioneo.org/artistes/biographie-norazia>).--Arxiloxos (talk) 07:10, 30

January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** Ahmad, Azman (28 January 2005), "Tough fight for Siti", *The Malay Mail* says she had 4 nominations at Anugerah Planet Muzik 2005 and that looks like a good enough award. Coverage also in Bouziane, Daoudi (16 January 2004), "Norazia", *Libération Tentations* (machine translation includes "Indonesian cosmopolitan, Norazia signed a first album that has elapsed to nearly a million copies.") and a short review in "Rappels", *Libération Tentations*, 23 January 2004. duffbeerforme (talk) 09:46, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **no consensus**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:39, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] RobApps

RobApps (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "RobApps" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22RobApps%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22RobApps%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22RobApps%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22RobApps%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22RobApps%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22RobApps%22)))

Non notable iPhone application creation company, which fails WP:ORG. Mattg82 (talk) 02:46, 14 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Software-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 02:51, 15 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Business-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 02:51, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:03, 21 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:50, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Nigina Abduraimova

Nigina Abduraimova (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Nigina Abduraimova" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Nigina+Abduraimova%22)))

Fails notability for tennis as she has only won 2 10K doubles events. Therefore fails notability. And has not won a junior GS KnowIG (talk) 08:22, 21 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:01, 21 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep?** I don't quite know entirely what constitutes the reason to delete according Wiki's deletion policy, but I don't think the record of a player should justify deletion. You guys should be glad someone took the time to actually add information regarding Nigina Abduraimova as junior players rarely have their own page. Scott523 (talk) 10:46, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

Fails notability or did just not bother reading KnowIG (talk) 13:09, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** - Passes WP:TENNIS/N 3rd criteria since she has competed in the main draw in one of the *major* professional tournaments: WTA International (2009 Tashkent Open – Singles and 2010 Tashkent Open – Doubles) **Arteyu ? Blame it on me !** 16:13, 23 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - player meets notability. Played in the main draw of a WTA event. (**Gabinho**^{>:}) 22:38, 23 January 2011 (UTC))

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:32, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** - Agree with Arteyu. -- **Joaquin008** (talk) 15:41, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **Tone** 19:47, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Illegal eagle

Illegal eagle (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(Find sources: "Illegal eagle" (http://www.google.com/search?

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Illegal+eagle%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Illegal+eagle%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?

tbs=bks:1&q=%22Illegal+eagle%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?

q=%22Illegal+eagle%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Illegal+eagle%22))

- WP:DICDEF, poorly referenced, and not a very commonly used term **Purplebackpack89** 01:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** An obscure numismatic usage and a Google search shows that the phrase more often applies to eagle feather poaching than to the wrong eagle species being portrayed on a coin. The single reference does not seem to be reliable, as it seems to be a blog masquerading as an academic paper. Cullen328 (talk) 04:56, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- The term exists, and people will want to look it up. I suggest that we consult some numismatists and people who study medals before closing this discussion. Anthony Appleyard (talk) 06:41, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Possible joke/hoax since the "reference" provided did not mention the incident at all. It is also not likely that an American would make this mistake. Borock (talk) 15:02, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Here is a typical result from a Google books search for "illegal eagle coin": "But the coin I wanted was a 1911 Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle. If I'm reading the date correctly — 1933 — then this Double-Eagle coin is illegal!" he told Nancy. *-The Baby-sitter Burglaries*, 1996 - Borock (talk) 15:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Various searches couldn't turn up any reliable sources for this use of the term. It *might* be used by some people, but even then it's not notable enough for an article. First Light (talk) 21:06, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **redirect to Administrative division**. **GedUK** 12:06, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Country subdivision

Country subdivision (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(Find sources: "Country subdivision" (http://www.google.com/search?

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Country+subdivision%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Country+subdivision%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Country+subdivision%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Country+subdivision%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Country+subdivision%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Country+subdivision%22))

Contested prod. This page is the product of banned user User:Tobias Conradi; I encountered it when one of his sock-puppets began to insist on it in a disuccion. The article is unsourced; the term, although not unknown, appears to be largely the neologism of one author; the text reads like a POV fork of administrative division; observe that the first sentence, even as it stands, is *Country subdivision refers to the division of a sovereign state's territory for the sake of its administration, description or other such purpose* and description by statistics (which seems to be meant) is an administrative function.
 Septentrionalis PMAAnderson 01:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** as nom. Septentrionalis [[User talk:Pmanderson|PMAnde--Septentrionalis PMAAnderson 20:54, 31 January 2011 (UTC)rson]] 01:12, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Redirect** to Administrative division. While this does appear to be an unnecessary fork, it's still a likely search term as evidenced by articles like List of country subdivisions by population, which wasn't named by the banned user. TheCatalyst31 ^{Reaction}•^{Creation} 09:03, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Politics-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** The article is a neologism, but perhaps there is merit in an article that covers all the ways a country is subdivided. Chipmunkdavis (talk) 07:44, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Oppose**, for two reasons. First, forgetting the title, the content certainly has some merit and would be OK under a different name. A "country subdivision" (or whatever other term one may choose) is a superset of the "administrative divisions" and includes not only the latter, but the subdivisions of other types as well. Second, I am not convinced the current title is a neologism. The term has been in use since at least 1927; see, for example, The Journal of Geography, vol. 26, 1927, p. 271 (http://books.google.com/books?ei=t8tGTfC_IYus8AaX7YyEAg&ct=result&id=2F8VAAAIAAJ&q=country+subdivision#search_anchor), and is currently used by the ISO ([29] (http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes/background_on_iso_3166/iso_3166-2.htm)), and major organizations which comply with the ISO standards (cf. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (<http://phinvads.cdc.gov/vads/ViewValueSet.action?id=99020EE0-BF11-DF11-80E4-0015173D1785>), US Food & Drug Administration (<http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/PriorNoticeofImportedFoods/ucm114929>), or Public Health Data Standards Through Partnerships (http://www.phdsc.org/NUBC_minutes_20100316.pdf)). There are plenty of gbooks hits (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22country+subdivision%22&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a#q=%22country+subdivision%22&oe=utf-8&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a&safe=on&um=1&ie=UTF-8&tbo=u&tbs=bks:1&source=og&sa=N&hl=en&tab=wp&fp=2e541dc7eaf46b78>) as well. — Ęzhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Ęzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); January 31, 2011; 15:00 (UTC)

Superset? The definition given is *division of a sovereign state's territory for the sake of its administration, description or other such purpose*. Description is an administrative function, so this boils down to: *for administrative purposes or purposes like them*. For example, the division of the United States or Australia into States was not done for *any* purpose; in both cases, the States existed before the country of which they are parts;

they're neither administrative nor "country" divisions. Septentrionalis PMAnderson 20:54, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Seeing how the "definition given" was unsourced to begin with and is now gone altogether, I wouldn't make far-reaching decisions based on it alone. It's just poor choice of words, is all. Wikipedia is full of poorly written definitions for all sorts of things. Last I checked, poor writing wasn't grounds for deletion. Anyway, other types of subdivisions (not necessarily for "purposes like them [i.e., administrative purposes]") also exist, which have nothing to do with the administrative function (which itself is different from one country to another). Postal areas, military districts, census territories, industrial regions—in many countries these have nothing to do with "administration", yet can be distinctly recognized as "country divisions" (or a similar concept). Also, as a counter-example to your US/Australia example (with which I disagree, by the way, but will accept for the purposes of this discussion), the division of the Russian SFSR was done for the purpose of administration, but that function was forfeited in 1993, so the best term for the modern federal subjects of Russia now is "political divisions". And, to conclude, as demonstrated above, the term "country division" *is* a valid one; plenty of sources exist to support it.—Ėzhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Īzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); January 31, 2011; 21:09 (UTC)

Yes, the article has been reedited by a single-purpose account (called User:country subdivision) who has begun editing since the ban of the article creator's *last* sockpuppet (in the manner of an experienced editor) - and who has not bothered to comment here, although the {{afd}} tag has been present the whole time. My confidence in the good faith of all this is -er- limited. Septentrionalis PMAnderson 21:24, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Well, as long as the sources are reliable and verifiable, what do we care about who added them? I, for one, am not here to enjoy fine conversations about wikipolitics with fellow editors or to play "catch a sock"; I stick around because I like the idealistic goal to build the best encyclopedia in the world. The article we are discussing here is far from perfect, it needs tons of work and cleanup (either before or after the recent edits), but I just don't see why it should be nuked. All of the evidence I've found so far keeps pointing the other way.—Ėzhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Īzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); January 31, 2011; 21:42 (UTC)

The sources are - **all of them** - google hits on *division* and *country* in the same sentence. A country can be divided without forming a "country division". Septentrionalis PMAnderson 21:47, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

Umm, no (to the first part) and yes (to the second part). A country does not necessarily need to be *divided* into "country divisions"; the concept of a "country division" may exist in different contexts. You seem to be thinking only in political/governmental terms (i.e., someone must actually declare a unit to be a "country division"), while the concept itself is much broader than that. Look at the definitions of the "term" (which is what the article should be about anyway).—Ėzhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Īzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); January 31, 2011; 21:55 (UTC)

No, I'm making a linguistic point about a linguistic section (which belongs in Wiktionary, if anywhere): sources which say a "country is divided" are not attesting to the existence or the meaning of "country division", but to "divided countries". In English, word order *is* syntax. Septentrionalis PMAnderson 22:25, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

My reference was not to the sources which simply say something like "a country is divided" (and we are getting increasingly off-topic here).
—Ězhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Īzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); February 1, 2011; 20:51 (UTC)

- **Delete or redirect** another attempt by sockmaster Tobias to bend Wikipedia to his will. Unless the term has strong usage in reliable sources that differentiates it from the term Administrative division, it shouldn't be its own article. --**JaGa**^{talk} 21:36, 31 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Heh, I see User:TurkChan and User:TopoCode contributed as well. I wonder if there are any more TC socks that worked on this. --**JaGa**^{talk} 00:49, 1 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy delete** per WP:CSD#G5. The user who created this article, Country subdivision (talk · contribs), was found to be a sockpuppet of another blocked user; see the SPI case. — **HelloAnnyong** (say whaaat?!) 22:23, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

The article was not created by a sockpuppet but by Tobias himself, well before his ban, which makes WP:CSD#G5 inapplicable.—Ězhiki (Igels Hérissonovich Īzhakoff-Amursky) • (yo?); February 1, 2011; 20:51 (UTC)

In short, it was written by a now-banned user, edited by two of his sock-puppets after the ban, and massively restructured by a third. This is exactly the sort of situation that justifies G5: depriving the banned user of the incentive to violate his ban. Septentrionalis PMAnderson 22:55, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Not to mention the article appears to be massive OR. --**JaGa**^{talk} 01:08, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Merge** or redirect to Administrative division. Same thing, but has potentially useful content. The banning issue is not relevant as it seems the article was created before the author's ban. **Sandstein** 09:25, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to*

this page.

The result was **keep**. Whilst he probably doesn't meet WP:ACTOR, there is clear opinion that he does meet the GNG, which is the most important criteria GedUK 11:52, 7 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] John Roberts (actor)

John Roberts (actor) (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "John Roberts (actor)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22>) · scholar

(<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22>) · free images

(http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=

([cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22))&q=%22John+Roberts+%28actor%29%22))

Unreferenced, unsourced and very poorly written. The only link it has is to *Bob's Burgers* FOX page. Rusted AutoParts (talk) 14:08 21 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Actors and filmmakers-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 19:21, 21 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** I was going to opine a redirect to *Bob's Burgers* per WP:TOOSOON#Actors, as 1 episode of *Late Night with Jimmy Fallon* and 4 episodes (so far) of *Bob's Burgers* fails WP:ENT... but *Bob's Burgers* is receiving coverage, and this actor with it. [30] (http://www.thefutoncritic.com/video/2011/01/09/video-a-few-minutes-with-bobs-burgers-co-stars-john-roberts-kristen-schaal-and-eugene-mirman-717411/20110109_bobsburgers/)[31] (<http://www.mamapop.com/2011/01/youtube-sensation-john-roberts-now-starring-in-bobs-burgers.html>)[32] (<http://www.tvsquad.com/2011/01/21/bobs-burgers-cast-interview/>)[33] (<http://www.chicagonow.com/blogs/life-and-times-of-a-young-republican/2011/01/review-bobs-burgers-on-fox.html>)[34] (http://www.boston.com/ae/tv/articles/2011/01/08/bobs_burgers_serves_up_some_unsavory_chuckles/) And more. I think we have a reasonable presumption that there will be additional and continued coverage. Schmidt, ^{MICHAEL Q.} 02:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep.** Notable per *Bob's Burgers*. A main character on a television show on Fox, doesn't seem deletable to me. — Timneu22 · talk 02:45, 25 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Strong Keep** Per Schmidt. Gage (talk) 08:20, 25 January 2011 (UTC)

It is getting some info now, but this is what it looked like when i nominated it. [35]

([http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=John_Roberts_(actor)&diff=409201074&oldid=406991813)

[title=John_Roberts_\(actor\)&diff=409201074&oldid=406991813](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=John_Roberts_(actor)&diff=409201074&oldid=406991813)) Rusted AutoParts (talk) 13:41 25 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:13, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Relisting comment.** Another view or 2 on this would be helpful. --Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **delete** easily fails WP:ARTIST. Can also re-write this stub when he wins the Academy Awards. In contrast, John Roberts int e TV journalist is notable. Ryan White Jr. (talk) 08:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** per my own comments above and further consideration. The individual has *just* enough

available for multiple events to push at WP:GNG [36] (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?as_user_ldate=2000&as_user_hdate=2011&q=%22John+Roberts%22%2C+%2B%22The+Christmas+Tree%22&scoring=a&q=%22John+Roberts%22%2C+%2B%22The+Christmas+Tree%22&lnav=od&btnG=Go)[37] (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?q=%22John+Roberts%22%2C+%2B%22Jackie+and+Debra%22&btnG=Search+Archives&scoring=a>)[38] (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?q=%22John+Roberts%22%2C+%2B%22Late+Night+with+Jimmy+Fallon%22&scoring=a>)[39] (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?q=%22John+Roberts%22%2C+%2B%22Bob%27s+Burgers%22&scoring=a>) and for the stub to merit being kept and improved over time and through regular editing. And by the way... I just went and gave the article's author his courtesy notice of this discussion.[40] (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Owartists&action=history) **Schmidt**, *MICHAEL Q.* 22:53, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak Keep**. Per gng/RS refs (that could be added).--Epeefleche (talk) 09:09, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete**. Although he may have a significant role in one Fox show, the notability guidelines say that an actor must have "had significant roles in *multiple* notable films, television shows, stage performances, or other productions." I do not think that applies to this actor. Logan Talk Contributions 00:56, 6 February 2011 (UTC)
 - Failing a SNG does not equate to failing the GNG, as SNG's are set to allow a presumption of notability through sources likely existing. If the multiple sources adduced here do not meet the GNG, then fine. But if they do meet the GNG, then we have the notability and an article that can be improved through regular editing. **Schmidt**, *MICHAEL Q.* 10:37, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **no consensus**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 02:03, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] William Vickers (fiddler)

William Vickers (fiddler) (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "William Vickers (fiddler)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:l&q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22William+Vickers+%28fiddler%29%22)))

Paragraph 2: "*Little is known of the man*" / WP:N Choyooŋ'jǰhí:Seb az86556 >hane' 15:22, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:41, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

~~***Delete** Very little seems to known about this person which doesn't indicate notability. The manuscript he wrote may or may not be notable, if it is the info should be added on an article on that~~—Travelbird (talk) 16:52, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

I will amend the title if that is preferable - but the William Dixon (piper) article is in a similar situation - an important MS about whose author we know little beyond his name. — Preceding unsigned comment added by John Gibbons 3 (talk • contribs) 16:55, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

Yes, I think it might be preferable to have the article on the manuscript rather than the man. The same may be true in the William Dixon case, but that could be discussed elsewhere. --Deskford (talk) 17:31, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

I have done this - William Vickers manuscript is the current version. — Preceding unsigned comment added by John Gibbons 3 (talk • contribs) 17:35, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

Neutral After the page move I am now changing my vote to neutral. I really don't know enough about piping/Fiddling to decide whether or not this manuscript is particularly notable, so I'll defer to the experts on this one. Ideally we would require a couple more source to establish notability more clearly. Travelbird (talk) 18:09, 15 January 2011 (UTC)

I can add a discography to the new page, of modern recordings including Vickers' tunes. The influence of this music, particularly in the folk revival in the NE from the 1960's to the present, is clear, and an article on the topic is necessary. Shifting the emphasis of the title from the man to the MS was correct however. John Gibbons 3 (talk) 13:22, 16 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:14, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- -- **Cirt** (talk) 09:26, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.***

Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **Delete**. The argument that "he may be notable in the future" is not and never has been valid at AfD. Ironholds (talk) 15:40, 6 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Taylor Ellington

Taylor Ellington (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Taylor Ellington" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Taylor+Ellington%22)))

Contested Prod - Non-notable hockey player who has not yet established himself to meet notability requirements per WP:NHOCKEY. Larkspurs (talk) 00:53, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Confused.** The article states that he was a second round entry level draft pick by the Vancouver Canucks, but I can't find anywhere that says he actually played a game. Player Log (<http://canucks.nhl.com/club/player.htm?id=8474108&view=gamelog>) Current Roster (<http://canucks.nhl.com/club/roster.htm>), although he was a part of the team at one point (<http://canucks.nhl.com/club/news.htm?id=538630>). I also looked at the roster (past and present) for the AHL team Manitoba Moose but the current roster (http://theahl.com/stats/roster.php?team_id=321) does not have him listed. The past rosters do have him listed though, here (<http://theahl.com/stats/player.php?id=3128>) is his player stat page. So I actually don't know what to do, maybe keep but with a heavy rewrite? Bluefist^{talk} 03:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Ice hockey-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:46, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sportspeople-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:46, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment:** He's only 18 games short of qualifying under NHOCKEY, but that he's *just* played 18 games this season in the ECHL and isn't on the current roster doesn't inspire confidence. I'd lean towards Delete. Ravenswing 15:25, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Comment** - Apparently, he is missing from the roster as he is currently on the *21-Day injured list*. Aside from being 18 games short of being able to qualify under WP:HOCKEY, how much weight would him being on the 2010 ECHL All-Star Game have? -Pparazorback (talk) 16:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

He didn't play as a starter, so by the definition of WP:NHOCKEY, thats still not enough to make him notable. Ravendrop (talk) 17:52, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

The all-star team portion is not covered by WP:NHOCKEY at this time. The only reference to *All-star* is for lower level leagues and *first-team all star* which afaik refers to if the player made the end-of-year first all-star team and not the all-star game itself. For the record, I am leaning toward delete at this time, but only if him making the all-star team does not help his notability for inclusion. Even though he is only 18 games shy of making the 100 game threshold which is doable this season, he appears to be injured and probably won't make it to his 100th game this season. -Pparazorback (talk) 23:56, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete:** Another article that was created under the old parameters of having simply played in one pro hockey game. An article of this size can easily be recreated once he meets the current criteria. – Nurmsook!^{talk}... 18:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep:** Seems redundant to delete at this point only to have it crated in later this season or next season when he plays the final 18 games needed.--Mo Rock...Monstrous (teech44) 19:26, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
 - That "when" being the big problem. The guy's on a medium-term injury list and has

played less than half the season to date as it is. This sort of situation is why WP:CRYSTAL exists. **Ravenswing** 03:15, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Personally this is the kind of article I would have left alone when I saw it because he is so ridiculously close to meeting the guideline. But since its been nominated now I have to vote delete. -DJSasso (talk) 22:44, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Delhi Belgian Club

Delhi Belgian Club (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "Delhi Belgian Club" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Delhi+Belgian+Club%22)))

Sources are mostly tangential mentions/incidental coverage. Dubious notability, minimal sourcing, ad-like. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 01:57, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Organizations-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:30, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Conditional keep - If people can take the time to eliminate the one-sentence paragraphs and eliminate the ad-like tendencies of this article, this article could help to be a notable link to the community's Belgian ancestors. GVnayR (talk) 04:11, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

Comment - I have already started on the path to making the article less ad-like. Maybe people should find additional references about the Delhi Belgian Club in print form to make it even more notable. GVnayR (talk) 04:38, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete.** A small club in a town of 4,000 people in rural Ontario does not meet any notability criteria whatsoever. Agent 86 (talk) 00:34, 25 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.
Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:49, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** per Agent 86. Though the article isn't blatant spam anymore, there's still nothing there that convinces me it even comes close to passing WP:ORG. Andrew Lenahan - **Starblind** 01:39, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] John Driffill

John Driffill (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(Find sources: "John Driffill" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22John+Driffill%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22John+Driffill%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22John+Driffill%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22John+Driffill%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22John+Driffill%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22John+Driffill%22)))

Not sure he passes WP:PROF. Tagged for Notability since 11/09. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 02:37, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- **Cirt** (talk) 09:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:36, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Queries** - Hammer, did you check out the long list on Google scholar? What is his *h*-index number? Bearian (talk) 21:25, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- I have, and it inclines me to a definite **Keep**. Xxanthippe (talk) 04:18, 23 January 2011 (UTC).
- I agree, **keep**. Bearian (talk) 18:36, 25 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:48, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** per WP:PROF#C1. —David Eppstein (talk) 22:37, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Sabar Koti

Sabar Koti (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Sabar Koti" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sabar+Koti%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Sabar+Koti%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sabar+Koti%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Sabar+Koti%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Sabar+Koti%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Sabar+Koti%22)))

Claims award wins but they're clearly not notable. No hits on Google Books or News in English or India stuff. **Ten Pound Hammer**, his otters and a clue-bat • (Otters want attention) 03:20, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- -- **Cirt** (talk) 09:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of India-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:40, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Bands and musicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:40, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:47, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

Delete- Fails WP:MUSIC. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Poet009 (talk • contribs) 08:48, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. The arguments for deletion are more policy based (i.e. the need for sources) than the arguments for retention can bring forward. –MuZemike 20:45, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Marc Scaringi

Marc Scaringi (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD) (*Find sources*: "Marc Scaringi" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Marc+Scaringi%22)))

Candidate in a future party primary; no properly sourced indication of actual notability per WP:POLITICIAN (at which the bare minimum is actually *holding* an elected office.) Previously prodded, but the creator deprodded with the rationale that the article was "contextually similar to Tom Corbett" — if you have any explanation as to how being a candidate in a party primary for an election that's still almost two years away is even remotely "contextually similar" to being the actual sitting incumbent governor, however, I'm all ears. **Delete**; he can come back if he wins the nomination and/or the Senate election, but until that happens he's not entitled to use Wikipedia to promote his candidacy in the meantime. Republican or Democrat, Tea Party or not, this is not what Wikipedia is for. Bearcat (talk) 05:41, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Weak Keep As a candidate who has never held public office, he may barely squeak by WP:POLITICIAN requirements based on independent coverage such as <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1110/45560.html>, http://earlyreturns.sites.post-gazette.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1972:casey-gets-an-opponent&catid=53:post-gazette-staff&Itemid=34 and <http://blogs.philadelphiaweekly.com/phillynow/2010/11/29/casey%e2%80%99s-first-challenger-steps-up/> Article needs some work to become NPOV if kept though. Jonathanwallace (talk) 08:22, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. -- **Cirt** (talk) 09:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Obvious delete** - "As a candidate who has never held public office" ... is a horrible way to try to apply the WP:POLITICIAN guideline, which by the way, doesn't accept most congressional candidates that don't endup congresspersons. Shadowjams (talk) 11:51, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Pennsylvania-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:42, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note**: This debate has been included in the list of Politicians-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:42, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:46, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** Doesn't yet meet politician notability standards at this time - this could obviously change, but for now, no. Nwlaw63 (talk) 01:20, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** - Article should definitely be rewritten (sounds promotional) but I think he passes WP:POLITICIAN. NYyankees51 (talk) 01:41, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

How does he pass WP:POLITICIAN, when the article barely even cites a single source that he didn't write himself? Bearcat (talk) 02:02, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Strong delete until such time as he a) becomes notable in a non-political context or b) gets elected.** DS (talk) 05:22, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.***

Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. –MuZemike 20:43, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Digital transform

Digital transform (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Digital transform" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Digital+transform%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Digital+transform%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Digital+transform%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Digital+transform%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Digital+transform%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Digital+transform%22)))

There is no topic related to the bi-gram "digital transform". See the article talk page. It's useless as a disambig, since none of things that were listed would every be sought under the name "digital transform", and it's useless as a redirect for the same reason. No good reason has been given to keep this article, but it was de-prodded. Dicklyon (talk) 07:32, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Disambiguations-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 15:57, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** The phrase *digital transform* is used in many respectable sources with the meanings given by this dab page. The page seems helpful for navigation to these topics and so retention is indicated by our editing policy. Colonel Warden (talk) 12:44, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

Perhaps you didn't read the talk page. If you had, I don't see how you could say that "The phrase *digital transform* is used...with the meanings given by this dab page." It's not; if I'm wrong, link us an example or two. As pointed out on Talk:Digital transform, none of the three linked articles mention anything like "digital transform," so there's no useful navigation function here. Dicklyon (talk) 17:09, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Redirect to digital signal processing or delete.** Absolutely generic term for data processing after digitizing. Nageh (talk) 22:01, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

NOTE: Discretization means non-contiguous sampling in one dimension (time), while digitalization means non-contiguous sampling in both time and value (amplitude). The current page lists one entry pointing to discrete transform, which is a redirect to digital signal processing. If even discrete transform redirects to digital signal processing then digital transform should even more so. This solution becomes obvious when looking at the second disamb entry, which exactly points to digital signal processing. On the other hand, just as there is analog-to-digital conversion

there is digital-to-analog conversion – so where is the article on analog transform? Nageh (talk) 21:57, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

analog transform [41] (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22analog+transform%22&tbm=bks&tbo=1&aq=f&aqi=g-c1&aql=&oq=>) is not about DAC, just as digital transform is not about ADC. Both article missing means simply that experts in DSP have little interest in educating via wikipedia. In terms of "Signal Processing for Dummies", digital transform is an implementation of a transformation of a signal in terms of its digital/discretized representation, while "analog transform" is kind of retronym for transformations of a signal in its analog form, e.g., using integrals and stuff. Lorem Ip (talk) 23:57, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

I was trying to make an analogy, stupid! And you are just repeating what I said that digital transform is any processing of digitized signals. Nageh (talk) 08:33, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

PS: I think I have sufficient knowledge on digital signal processing that I can claim that the term is generic. BTW, here is a List of transforms, with many possible transforms in digital/discrete domain, and you have redirected YOURSELF discrete transform to digital signal processing. Nageh (talk) 08:45, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep:** per CW. - Ret.Prof (talk) 03:34, 26 January 2011 (UTC)

Per CW? You mean you didn't look at the talk page, either? Dicklyon (talk) 03:44, 26 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment** – can I ask anyone who wants to say "keep" to please comment with respect to what's already on the article talk page? We had a few keeps above from people who did no good, since they ignored the followup questions and didn't say why they think there's anything useful here. Dicklyon (talk) 21:14, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep** and leave the experts in the subject decide whether there is only one meaning or two. I am vastly surprized the discussion in the article talk page. It takes only two minutes to find refs in books which refer to the two listed meanings of the term: this book (<http://books.google.com/books?id=6DUFm5m79GIC&pg=PA732&dq=%22digital+transform%22+DFT&hl=en#v=onepage&q=%22digital%20transform%22%20DFT&f=false>) directly refers to the DFT (discrete Fourier Transform) as "the digital transform", while this google search (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital+transforms%22+%22digital+image+processing%22&tbm=bks&tbo=1&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=>) and this (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital+transform%22+%22digital+image+processing%22&btnG=Search&tbm=bks&tbo=1&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=>) clearly show that digital transforms are instruments in digital signal processing. It is not my fault that DSP experts do not rush to wikipedia to explain their terminology. Lorem Ip (talk) 23:49, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

As already pointed out and enumerated, each such use is purely generic, not suggestive of a topic. If you had several books using the term in the same way, suggestive of a topic, you'd have something. These are nothing. It's like trying to make a topic or disambig out of something like "digital operation" (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital%20operation%22%20%22digital%20signal%20processing%22>) or "digital weather" (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital%20weather%22%20%22digital%20signal%20processing%22>) or something like

that. In terms of uses with "DFT", most are just random generic juxtapositions that happen to be on the same page: [42] (<http://www.google.com/search?tbm=bks&tbo=1&q=%22digital+transform%22+DFT>). Dicklyon (talk) 05:47, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

In my honest opinion this is exactly the purpose of a disambiguation page: to point to specific meanings of a term. Also, you may be intended a joke or a grotesque nonsense, but I would **love** to see the disambig page which would explain different usages of the term digital operation. On the other hand, unlike digital transform or digital operation, I fail to see the collocation digital weather in nominal (linguistics) position. By the way, feel free to nominate the page "nominal" for deletion: your logic quite applicable: "generic term", "not suggestive of a topic". I am baffled that there is an opinion that generic terms are disallowed. (By the way, can someone delete a misleading redirect, "generic term"? This is a good example of what may happen with generic terms when they are not properly disambiguated into particular ones.) Lorem Ip (talk) 17:07, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Referring to a discrete (Fourier) transform as a "digital transform" is just sloppiness. Jeez, can we prevent non-experts from yelling "keep"? Nageh (talk) 09:16, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Sure, you are a much smarter expert than the person who wrote the scientific book in question. ("Jeez, can we prevent know-it-alls from yelling whatever they are yelling when they know they know better than you") Lorem Ip (talk) 17:07, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Once again, "digital transform" is commonly used to include "discrete transforms" such as "Discrete Fourier Transform", "Discrete Cosinus Transform", "Discrete Wavelet Transform", etc.

In practice, discrete transforms *are* digital transforms because digital computers can only work on discretized/quantized information. Strictly speaking, however, Discrete Fourier transforms only require the time domain to be discretized. The coefficients in the transform (i.e., the sampled values) can be continuous (i.e., analog)! From this perspective, a Discrete Fourier transform is *not* a digital transform!

The point on the current disamb page is that discrete transform is a redirect to digital signal processing, and the second entry on the disamb page directly points to digital signal processing. So the page can be summarized as "Digital transform refers to transforms in digital signal processing." I don't think this is very useful as a disamb page. Nageh (talk) 18:21, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Actually, the solution should be:

Discrete transform -> List of transforms#Discrete transforms

Digital transform -> Digital signal processing, with a mention there that discrete transforms are also referred to as digital transforms

I really would hope for other users to comment. Nageh (talk) 19:20, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

Sounds reasonable to me. Lorem Ip (talk) 22:25, 1 February 2011 (UTC)

But discrete transforms are *almost never* called digital transforms. So why should we call them that in wikipedia? See [43] (http://ngrams.googlelabs.com/graph?content=digital+transform%2Cdiscrete+transform&year_start=1950&year_end=2008&corpus=0&smoothing=1) and [44] (http://ngrams.googlelabs.com/graph?content=Fourier+transform%2Cdiscrete+transform&year_start=1

950&year_end=2008&corpus=0&smoothing=1) and [45] (http://ngrams.googlelabs.com/graph?content=digital+transform%2Cdigital+signal+processing&year_start=1950&year_end=2008&corpus=0&smoothing=1) for some relevant relative frequencies. Dicklyon (talk) 00:23, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

Well, it's not precise terminology but apparently people use it like that. See [46] (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital+transform%22+%22discrete+cosine+transform%22>) or [47] (<http://www.google.com/search?q=%22digital+transform%22+%22discrete+wavelet+transform%22>). So without a specific definition it certainly does not warrant a separate article or disamb page but it is certainly appropriate to create this as a redirect to digital signal processing. Nageh (talk) 20:14, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

So far no new editors have expressed an opinion, and the none of the *keeps* has provided evidence of a topic. The article's creator, Lorem Ip, tried, but is clearly just relying on one peculiar mention in one book, which means nothing. And he's still flipping around on what the topic is, since his original version (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Digital_transform&oldid=408866324) had a rather different idea that got shot down, and since I reverted his subsequent redirect to digital signal processing as a poor substitute for deletion. Dicklyon (talk) 07:07, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** as disamb. Possible search term and a disamb page is better than nothing. -Atmoz (talk) 21:13, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

Please read the discussion above. The current disamb page points to digital signal processing twice! It would be better if we had a direct redirect to that article rather than a pointless disamb. Thank you. Nageh (talk) 21:20, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

The disamb also links to Discrete Fourier transform. I did read the discussion. Your baggering is annoying. Quit it. -Atmoz (talk) 21:24, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

So it should also point to discrete cosine transform, discrete wavelet transform, fast Fourier transform, etc. This is not baggering but trying to educate people like you with no background in telecommunications or digital signal processing. Nageh (talk) 21:28, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

Those pages seem good to link from the disamb page. And I have a background in signal processing. Any other ad homs you want to get off your chest? -Atmoz (talk) 14:17, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

~~I do: you're being a moron.~~ Why not give evidence of such usage, instead of just claiming that it seems OK to you? I've looked, and don't find it. Dicklyon (talk) 23:37, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

Please take back your words. Lorem Ip (talk) 23:55, 3 February 2011 (UTC)

Done. Dicklyon (talk) 06:44, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's*

talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:14, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Merging Technologies

Merging Technologies (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Merging Technologies" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Merging+Technologies%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Merging+Technologies%22) · books (http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Merging+Technologies%22) · scholar (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Merging+Technologies%22) · free images (http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Merging+Technologies%22))

Non exceptional/notable company, no third party refs, fails WP:CORP. **Paste** *Let's have a chat.* 13:20, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Business-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 16:10, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete**, doesn't appear to meet WP:CORP. NawlinWiki (talk) 03:58, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. **NW** (*Talk*) 03:43, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Donna M. Marbach

Donna M. Marbach
(edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) –

AfDs for this article:

(View AfD)

(*Find sources*: "Donna M. Marbach"

(<http://www.google.com/search?>

- Articles for deletion/Donna M. Marbach
- Articles for deletion/Donna M. Marbach (2nd nomination)

as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22&num=50) – news

(http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Donna+M.+Marbach%22))

Extremely minor local poet who fails WP:AUTHOR and who does not meet the requirements of WP:BK or WP:BIO. No WP:RS whatsoever presented or available. Tagged for notability since May, 2010, without a single source added in that time. Issues of WP:AUTO and WP:COI as well. The organization founded by the subject was recently deleted at AfD. [48]

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Just_Poets) Qwerty (talk) 18:37, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- This reads more like a resume than an encyclopedia article. I think there's a major conflict of interest as the creator of the article appears to be a SPA (which brings up OWN as well). Furthermore, I grew up in the area where she lives, and I've never even heard of her. --Benson (talk) 22:39, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Poetry-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 23:11, 23 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 23:11, 23 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete.** As an author, appears to have had a few works published, but there doesn't appear to be any critical commentary about her works, thus failing WP:CREATIVE. More importantly, there's nothing else out there about her, so she doesn't meet WP:GNG. The rest looks more like a resume. --Kinu ^t/_c 09:45, 24 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep:** A lot of small accomplishments that add up to enough to keep per WP:BIO on authors. - Ret.Prof (talk) 14:17, 24 January 2011 (UTC)
 - To be frank, this rationale seems very flimsy. A laundry-list that might may or may not meet WP:BIO/WP:CREATIVE does not mean that WP:GNG can be ignored (indeed, the basic criterion of WP:BIO is the satisfaction of WP:GNG). Especially important given that this is a WP:BLP. --Kinu ^t/_c 15:03, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Comment** Ret.Prof's argument-from-accumulation has the further demerit that there's nothing in the guideline cited in support of it (WP:BIO) that *says* that a lot of small accomplishments add up to general notability. Yakushima (talk) 11:27, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** Given the dearth of other sources directly about her, I concluded that her notability hinges entirely on WP:AUTHOR's condition that "[t]he person has created, or played a major role in **co-creating**, a significant or well-known work, or **collective** body of work, that has been the subject of [...] multiple independent periodical articles or reviews." She's edited or co-edited a number of books, after all. Maybe something there? Alas, none of those books show up at google book search as having been reviewed "in any of the usual places". Except for one edit to Grey[49] (<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Grey&diff=prev&oldid=147714425>), the

article's originator (User:DMMPoet) is WP:SPA for Donna M. Marbach, and clearly doesn't mean to make a secret of that. Under WP:AGF, my guess is that she just *thought* she was notable enough (possibly under the all-too-common WP:OTHERSTUFF assumption). She might well agree, if she were in on this discussion, that her bio doesn't make the cut. If so, a speedy delete here will help us get on to all that misleading OTHERSTUFF, of which there never seems to be any shortage. Yakushima (talk) 11:59, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** This article is inside WP:Bio and should be kept.--BabbaQ (talk) 00:36, 4 February 2011 (UTC)
 - And I ask again, which part of WP:Bio is met, and where are the WP:RS? Considering this is a WP:BLP, actually providing some rationale would be more helpful than a WP:VAGUEWAVE. --Kinu ^t/_c 00:43, 4 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **redirect** to Cale:Drew. –MuZemike 20:41, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Semaphore (song)

Semaphore (song) (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Semaphore (song)" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Semaphore+%28song%29%22)))

Fails WP:NSONG. Logan ^{Talk} ^{Contributions} 20:12, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Weak delete** I tend toward inclusion of nearly all singles, but this was apparently a 7"-only release that likely only got limited distribution and apparently never charted anywhere. Still, a **redirect** to Cale:Drew wouldn't hurt. Andrew Lenahan - **Starblind** 22:55, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Albums and songs-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 23:19, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:40, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Redirect** to Cale:Drew. And if anyone wants to be bold, the band's other singles should be redirected as appropriate, too, without going to AFD. --Starcheerspeaksnewslostwars (talk)

04:45, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:14, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Hugh Allison

Hugh Allison (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Hugh Allison" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Hugh+Allison%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Hugh+Allison%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Hugh+Allison%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Hugh+Allison%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Hugh+Allison%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Hugh+Allison%22)))

This has just been speedied, which was too hasty, then restored. Nevertheless the subject of the article does lack notability. Many of the claimed credits are for work which was not paid at all, or not at professional rates. I suggest deletion. SamuelTheGhost (talk) 21:04, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

- This has been speedy deleted four times since 2007, and the creator has not managed to fix it in that time. I speedied it recently after it appeared on the spam list, and restored it because the creator asked me to, but I can't find secondary sources. SlimVirgin ^{talk}contribs 22:13, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
- SamuelTheGhost thanks for keeping me up to speed. SlimVirgin, thanks for restoring it. I am going to cut the page down shortly (so it reads less like a CV as per your suggestion). I agree the subject lacks any real notability outside the London Fringe and Internet Radio scene, but I believe he is of interest to some people, maybe those auditioning for him.--TimothyJacobson (talk) 22:48, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

I should also thank SchuminWeb for deleting the original statement of spam, and should declare that I have messaged this user to ask for help in improving the article. NB, I have started work on changing this article so it is more wiki-worthy. It is breaking my heart to cut down a page I probably contributed more to than anyone else, but I do see everyone's point. I had felt that by putting links to where I found the info from would make the article more wiki-worthy, but I would agree that most of the info comes from www.hughallison.com (so this is what I credited) so I can now see it would have been best if I had not put the info on at all. Re SamuelTheGhost's comment above, which I have just re-read, although I have long suspected that most of Allison's work is that for which he has not been paid professional rates, if there is a site or similar which states this, I would appreciate knowing it, in case that provides more useful info/citations which I could use when trying to rebuild the page--TimothyJacobson (talk) 23:23, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

As per above, I am hoping to remove all credits which are sourced from www.hughallison.com - as a genuine question, should I also remove credits from doollee.com and or the Young Vic Genesis Page which I have also cited many times?--TimothyJacobson (talk) 23:33, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

I do apologise for adding so many comments to this page, but I want to keep everything I am doing above board, and also making it clear what I am doing and asking questions etc so as to make sure the page is not redeleted. I am aware that I still need to dramatically chop down and rewrite the "Directing" section and the "Writing" section. I am tired/hungry now, so leave it for a bit, but will strive to amend them within the next 48 hours. Do please message me to let me know if there is anything else that should be changed. Specifically, the "Gospel" section - is this ok, should it be shortened, should it go to a separate article page, or should I cut it completely? All thoughts & advice welcome--TimothyJacobson (talk) 23:47, 22 January 2011 (UTC)

Hi Tim, we're allowed in biographies of living persons to use the subject's own self-published website as a source, but only within reason. It can't reach the point where the Wikipedia article has effectively become an extension of —or even substitute for— the personal website, so that's a matter of editorial judgment, erring on the side of caution. Other than the subject's, we're not allowed to use any self-published sources. See WP:BLPSPS. The most important thing here is to find secondary sources who have written about him, to establish whether he's notable enough for a WP biography. [SlimVirgin](#) [talk](#)[contribs](#) 00:02, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

Hi Slim. Thanks for that. To be safe though, I will stick to not using quotes from the presumably self-published hughallison.com and will only use a minimal amount from the (presumably also self-published) wix.com. To my understanding, re my above question, I will also remove the "Young Vic" references, as I believe that anything about the Genesis Project can be edited by the directors, in the same way that actors can edit their Spotlight/imdb pages. Unless requested otherwise, I will keep the doollee.com citations, as (having looked at the site in more detail) it seems that anyone thereon still needs to submit their work to be vetted. // Also, re the comment on your talk page, I can't find any references anywhere to the Observer/As You Like It quote (other than on Allison's website and on other wiki's so I will remove it).--TimothyJacobson (talk) 01:11, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

I have done quite a bit more work, including cutting the no of words dramatically. I think my original thought was that the piece would have been less likely to be deleted if the page was longer, as it would imply Allison had done more and was thus wiki-worthy. I am now going down the less-is-more route. [also, I didn't want to risk the page being labelled a stub]// I would appreciate people having a look at the page as it stands, and letting me know their thoughts. Specifically, (1) Is there anything else that should be changed/removed, (2) does the page still rely on any sources from websites which are self-published or not allowed by Wiki for any other reason, (3) does it still look like an extension of Allison's website and (4) now that the lists are smaller, do the directing section and the writing section still need to be amended into more of a paragraph or encyclopedic style? I will be online again within 48 hours to make any suggested amendments.--TimothyJacobson (talk) 02:31, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

It's still just a list, not an article, and it needs secondary sources. That's the thing to focus on. If there are no secondary sources (e.g. newspaper articles about him, or that mention him in more than passing), it should be deleted. [SlimVirgin](#) [talk](#)[contribs](#) 03:51, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

I have just done more trimming and it is (in my opinion at least) no longer a list; just

a couple of basic paragraphs. I will work on the secondary sources issue within 48 hours.--TimothyJacobson (talk) 12:05, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

I have just gone back to the article. I can't find anything online where Allison gets more than a fleeting mention or a credit, so I believe that (much as it would break my heart based on the no of hours I have put in over the years working on the article) it is perhaps sensible that the piece is deleted. I also looked through several of the other Actors/Filmmakers for deletion, and I think I understand even more why the Hugh Allison one should go.--TimothyJacobson (talk) 00:19, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

Thanks, Tim, and thanks too for trying to find sources. SlimVirgin talkcontribs 00:23, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

No probs--TimothyJacobson (talk) 00:27, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Actors and filmmakers-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 23:23, 23 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - I can find no significant coverage in reliable sources to establish notability. Kudos to TimothyJacobson for a valiant rewrite, but at this point, I don't see that the subject meets wikipedia's inclusion criteria.-- Whpq (talk) 15:10, 24 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Ron Ritzman (talk) 00:39, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Delete** The first source [50] (<http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/theatre/show-23376849-gospel.do>) is actually a reader's comment (note the "report abuse" link on the review text.) The second leads to a site with more detail about him,[51] (http://www.google.com/search?source=ig&hl=en&rlz=1G1GGLQ_ENJP338&q=site:www.yorkshakespeareproject.org+hugh.allison&btnG=Google+Search&aq=f&oq=) but with no source meeting WP:RS for WP:N. The third is just an event listing, crediting him with co-direction.[52] (<http://www.thestage.co.uk/listings/production.php/47717/ferry-lights-tomorrow-we-build-our-jerusalem>). The fourth [53] (<http://www.doollee.com/PlaywrightsA/allison-hugh.html>) credits him with a list of plays, and there are some links to theater schedules, but it's not clear anybody's vetting the information posted. The fifth is a duplicate of fourth link. The sixth [54] (<http://www.hertfordshire.com/pages/entries/show-entry.asp?id=9651>) doesn't mention him at all. A google book search turns up only one source [55] (http://books.google.com/books?id=U5krAQAIAAJ&q=hugh.allison+playwright+-%22smith,+hugh+allison%22+-%22hugh+allison+smith%22&dq=hugh.allison+playwright+-%22smith,+hugh+allison%22+-%22hugh+allison+smith%22&hl=en&ei=evZDTZ6EMYG8vwPBk4jyAQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCYQ6AEwAA) that says anything at all about him -- and it's a bit dismissive (dings him for a "turgid" production.) So far, we don't have multiple independent third-party sources. At this point, the likelihood of finding any seems remote. Yakushima (talk) 11:16, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Footnotes point to superficial listings of individual's name and position. Fails to meet muster for non-trivial third party coverage, in my opinion. Carrite (talk) 03:15, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete;** I don't think anything can be done to save the page--TimothyJacobson (talk) 10:31, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **keep**. -- **Cirt** (talk) 21:13, 31 January 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Bondage rope harness

Bondage rope harness (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources*: "Bondage rope harness" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22) · books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22>) · scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22>) · free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Bondage+rope+harness%22)))

Does not appear to be independently notable. No references demonstrate this to me. Merrill Stubing (talk) 07:34, 20 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Sexuality and gender-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 17:58, 20 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Merge and redirect** to ~~Bondage equipment~~ rope bondage. Kenilworth Terrace (talk) 19:47, 20 January 2011 (UTC)

On further consideration I prefer The Anome's suggestion below. Kenilworth Terrace (talk) 12:26, 23 January 2011 (UTC)

- ~~This is clearly part of the larger topic of rope bondage, which is in turn clearly notable because of the large number of educational books on the subject. Merge and redirect to Rope bondage, which this will fill out to be a substantial article.~~ -- The Anome (talk) 15:24, 22 January 2011 (UTC)
 - Changed to **Speedy keep** per Logan's recent addition of page cites to multiple reliable sources. -- The Anome (talk) 16:17, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Keep.** I just added a second reference to the article, and there are 70 pages between the two. I imagine there are plenty of other sources. (Incidentally, Japanese bondage is a closer merge target.) --Pnm (talk) 02:03, 28 January 2011 (UTC)

Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion so a clearer consensus may be reached.

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, Logan ^{Talk} ^{Contributions} 00:30, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Keep** - Porn cruff is one of my pet peeves, but this is tolerably well done to meet muster as encyclopedia-worthy treatment of the topic. Sourcing could stand great improvement, obviously, but I don't doubt that it could be garnered. The idea of merger and redirection to rope bondage is also viable; deletion seems inappropriate. Carrite (talk) 03:20, 30 January 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

*The following discussion is an archived debate of the proposed deletion of the article below. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

The result was **delete**. Ron Ritzman (talk) 01:44, 5 February 2011 (UTC)

[edit] Doku

Doku (edit|talk|history|links|watch|logs) – (View AfD)
(*Find sources:* "Doku" (http://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Doku%22&num=50) – news (http://news.google.com/archivesearch?&as_src=-newswire+-wire+-presswire+-PR+-release+-wikipedia&q=%22Doku%22) • books (<http://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Doku%22>) • scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Doku%22>) • free images ([http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=\(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived\)&q=%22Doku%22](http://images.google.com/images?safe=off&as_rights=(cc_publicdomain%7ccc_attribute%7ccc_sharealike%7ccc_noncommercial%7ccc_nonderived)&q=%22Doku%22)))

No evidence of notability; the company's own website tells very little about them and gives the impression that they've only recently gone online.

Note: I have removed the "AFD's for this article" template, normally present, because the previous AfD was for something else of the same name. —*Soap*— 00:09, 29 January 2011 (UTC)

- **Speedy delete** per criterion A7 and maybe even G11. This article does not establish the business's notability, and it reads like an advertisement. Logan ^{Talk} ^{Contributions} 00:33, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** pretty clearly advertising. Borderline G11, certainly not an encyclopedia article. Andrew Lenahan - **Starblind** 00:35, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Business-related deletion discussions. -- • Gene93k (talk) 14:44, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Delete** per above. -- **Joaquin008** ^(talk) 15:43, 29 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Delete** as blatant spam. Regent of the Seatopians (talk) 02:13, 30 January 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy Delete** as blatant G11. iic02p —Preceding unsigned comment added by 12.25.93.2 (talk) 04:13, 2 February 2011 (UTC)
- **Speedy delete**, spam, db-corp. Hairhorn (talk) 14:51, 2 February 2011 (UTC)

*The above discussion is preserved as an archive of the debate. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page (such as the article's talk page or in a deletion review). No further edits should be made to this page.*

-
- This page was last modified on 8 February 2011 at 14:42.
 - Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. See Terms of Use for details.

Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.