

Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Leonard Horowitz

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

*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**. chaser - t 20:20, 6 May 2008 (UTC)

Leonard Horowitz

Leonard Horowitz (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs | views) (delete (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Leonard_Horowitz&wpReason=AfD+discussion%3A+%5B%5BWikipedia%3AArticles+for+deletion%2FLeonard+Horowitz%5D%5D&action=delete)) – (View log)

Fails WP: BIO and WP: PROF. Tagged for better refs since November 2007, but continues to lack any evidence of notability through independent, reliable secondary sources. Largely a resumé, and without good secondary sources we can't write an encyclopedic bio. **MastCell**^{Talk} 22:32, 29 April 2008 (UTC)

- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Academics and educators-related deletion discussions. —David Eppstein (talk) 04:39, 30 April 2008 (UTC)
- **Note:** This debate has been included in the list of Medicine-related deletion discussions. —Espresso Addict (talk) 15:00, 30 April 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep.** I just viewed Jeremiah Wright's reference to Horowitz's book as his (Wright's) justification for asserting the U.S. Government intentionally developed the AIDS virus to kill off people of color. People need to know the credentials of this author -- or lack thereof, given that his title of "Doctor" comes from a background in dentistry and behavioral sciences, not medicine or biology. It would be nice to see more info here about Horowitz, rather than see the page deleted. —Preceding unsigned comment added by Convit (talk • contribs) 09:43, 2 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep.** I don't think he's notable as an academic; a Google Scholar search for "LG Horowitz"

in 1985. These are extremely low citation results for a medical researcher. I am not sure if he passes WP:Bio but, based on the discussion above, I am not yet convinced that he does.

Nsk92 (talk) 22:40, 30 April 2008 (UTC)

- **Keep**. Jeremiah Wright just cited Horowitz's book in his justification of the claim that AIDS was a genocide against blacks. I think that gets him enough notoriety to justify his position here. WillMagic (talk) 23:46, 30 April 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep** notable pseudoscience. **DGG** (talk) 05:40, 1 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep**. There are plenty of reliable sources to be found via Google Books ([http://books.google.co.uk/books?q=\(%22Leonard%20Horowitz%22%20OR%20%22Leonard%20G%20Horowitz%22\)%20%2Baids%20-designer&num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=np](http://books.google.co.uk/books?q=(%22Leonard%20Horowitz%22%20OR%20%22Leonard%20G%20Horowitz%22)%20%2Baids%20-designer&num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=np)) and Google News ([http://news.google.co.uk/news?q=\(%22Leonard%20Horowitz%22%20OR%20%22Leonard%20G%20Horowitz%22\)%20%2Baids%20-designer&num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=pn](http://news.google.co.uk/news?q=(%22Leonard%20Horowitz%22%20OR%20%22Leonard%20G%20Horowitz%22)%20%2Baids%20-designer&num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=pn)) (archive ([http://news.google.co.uk/archivesearch?num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&tab=pn&q=\(%22Leonard+Horowitz%22+OR+%22Leonard+G+Horowitz%22\)+%2Baids+-designer](http://news.google.co.uk/archivesearch?num=100&hl=en&um=1&ie=UTF-8&tab=pn&q=(%22Leonard+Horowitz%22+OR+%22Leonard+G+Horowitz%22)+%2Baids+-designer))). Having an article on the subject is in no way an endorsement of his views. Phil Bridger (talk) 09:18, 1 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep** Nomination for deletion was based on notability, but notability is established through mentions in many published works, both print and electronic. GaryColemanFan (talk) 04:38, 2 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep** If he's not notable, why is he being noted so much? I got here when I searched on Horowitz and "Emerging Viruses", while reading a transcript of Rev. Wright's recent remarks at the National Press Club. A Google News Archive search on keywords leading to mentions of conspiracy theories about AIDS as a germ-warfare concoction now aimed at African Americans confirms the currency of these ideas, which go back some years and apparently persist even now; if anything, Horowitz appears to be notably exploiting an already notable meme. Ironically, the hard part here will be the "Criticisms" section. It probably won't be easy to find authorities on the relevant subjects who would have stooped to comment directly on Horowitz; that leaves the task of citing reliable sources on the specific elements of Horowitz's brief. Not much more fun than unplugging a stopped-up toilet, but somebody's gotta do it.
—Preceding unsigned comment added by Yakushima (talk • contribs) 06:49, 2 May 2008 (UTC)

Move for deletion of most tags I've added a lot of material. NPOV isn't easy in cases like these, but luckily, his record speaks for itself pretty well. I think there's a rough

consensus against deletion; I've expanded the article considerably; there are now quite a few references. If there's anything lacking, it's how to put him in context. Yakushima (talk) 12:08, 2 May 2008 (UTC)

Move to delete AfD tagging - I've beefed up the article considerably. It's got better context now, and refers to his legit peer-reviewed publications. I think it could use a cleanup, still. Maybe there should be something about Horowitz's fight to keep his daughter from TB inoculation in Hawaii (some press attention to that). Maybe there should be cross-linking to related or identical conspiracy theory articles. But that's about it, and I'm tired of this now. Can somebody just substitute a cleanup tag? Yakushima (talk) 09:08, 3 May 2008 (UTC)

- This is the type of article to **KEEP**. It causes people to think and do further research, hallmarks of a free society. Controversial, perhaps, but what's wrong with that? There is, IMHO, everything right about that. —Preceding unsigned comment added by contribs) 13:49, 2 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Keep** Per my above comment--*St.daniel* ^{Talk} 01:49, 4 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Delete** or merge the material into relevant articles. The article is currently not a biography and there is inadequate info to write *a biography*. The article is all about controversies. Ewenss (talk) 04:17, 4 May 2008 (UTC)

No, speaking as the guy who has probably put 20 hours into the article by now, you can see as well anyone, Ewenss, that the article cites his peer-reviewed publications, and mentions his credentials in more than one place. Is it "all about controversies"? It's not controversial whether the FDA and FTC sent Horowitz warning letters about his bogus SARS remedy. They did. Horowitz responded openly, publicly, by TRYING to make a controversy over it, by cocking a snoot at both agencies. ("No such thing as bad publicity", it seems.) It's not controversial that The Final Call cited his work about AIDS and Ebola, with conspiracy theories linking Jimmy Carter and Zbigniew Brzezinski into supposed programs of genocide against African Americans. The Final Call DID publish that. It's not controversial whether Rev. Jeremiah Wright cited Horowitz's *Emerging Viruses* in support of his contention that the U.S. government lied about having engineered HIV. He did. You can go watch that on video. I'm sure there are quite a few biographies on Wikipedia of people who have become notable chiefly because they sought controversy. (The list would probably include a healthy dollop of conspiracy theorists, and "conspiracy theorist" seems to be a label Horowitz would wear proudly, if

anything.) YOU need to make the case that Horowitz is not notable. And you're somehow going to have to do that despite the fact he's been extensively noted, in one way (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?hl=en&tab=wn&ned=&q=horowitz+emerging.viruses&ie=UTF-8>) or another (<http://news.google.com/archivesearch?q=horowitz+kimberly.bergalis&hl=en&ned=&ie=UTF-8>). Horowitz gravitates toward controversy, is mainly noted for his statements and writing on certain controversial topics, so OF COURSE the article on him is going to bring up the controversies he's been involved with. How could it be any other way? Yakushima (talk) 07:39, 4 May 2008 (UTC)

The material is about certain specific VIEWPOINTS. That is the basis for articles *about viewpoints*, NOT *a biography*. Clearly. Ewenss (talk) 07:41, 4 May 2008 (UTC)

(Just deleted a long and embarrassing rant of mine here. Trying again.) If somebody has become notable for his viewpoints -- and Horowitz is notable for more than that, though not much more -- he's still notable. If he doesn't have much non-conspiracy-theoretic, non-quackery information available about his life, it's because of what he's devoted his life to, isn't it? Given the nature of his work, how much can we believe anyway, to the extent that biographical information comes from him? I believe he has daughter, because she's mentioned in Hawaiian news as part of Horowitz's resistance to TB immunization of schoolchildren. I believe he has a wife -- she's quoted in press releases as defending him against against charges of being a public health menace because of his leadership role in opposing vaccination. Do I mention them without mentioning the Horowitz controversies they are tied up in? Do I just say he has a wife and a daughter? I don't believe these people are imaginary, but they do seem to live in their own heads, and their heads seemed to be stuffed up certain of their orifices. How do I treat the man and his life apart from his weird controversies? He himself makes that almost impossible. He's almost notable for that alone. ;-) Yakushima (talk) 14:30, 4 May 2008 (UTC)

"Long embarrassing rant" sums up the article nicely. Cryptographic hash (talk) 17:51, 4 May 2008 (UTC)

Really? I'm trying to stay even-toned. Do you have any

suggestions about how I might offer a bit more NPOV?

Obviously I can't just delete the words of Horowitz, Rev.

Wright or The Final Call wherever *they* seem to be ranting (it wouldn't leave much to quote from them), but exactly where do you think *I'm* ranting in article? Yakushima (talk) 04:15, 5 May 2008 (UTC)

- **Comment from nominator:** Having seen additional sources, of which I was not aware, come to light as a result of this process, I'm willing to withdraw my nomination. I think there's enough here to establish notability in light of the Rev. Wright thing. It didn't show up in my Google search, but I should probably have checked Google News (in my defense, I'm trying hard to ignore "Wrightgate"). Anyhow, I'm satisfied with the addition of more good sources that a reasonable article can be written here. **MastCell** ^{Talk} 18:44, 5 May 2008 (UTC)
- **Comment from current principal (though not initial) author** Does this close the discussion? I'm not versed in deletion protocols, so I don't know where we are in the process. As long as I'm here: I've gone from **110% KEEP** (probably violating WP:NOTBATTLEGROUNDS here and there under the influence of my certainty) down to about **95% Keep** -- or would that be **Weak Keep**?. This change is a side-effect of earning the dubious distinction of suddenly becoming Wikipedia's #1 expert (probably -- who else would admit it?) on Leonard G. Horowitz. On the whole I'd prefer the side-effects of binge drinking, if a bender could help me forget what I now know about the guy. (Unfortunately I've watched some of Horowitz's YouTube video footage, so he is now burned into my brain as indelibly as certain scenes from I Am Legend.) I'll soon post some discussion at the article's discussion page, about why I think some notability arguments made above (both mine and others) are a little weaker, and why some arguments for deletion perhaps a little stronger, than I originally thought. This experience has improved my understanding of notability and BLP issues; growing understanding of these issues is another contributing factor in my weakening Keep opinion. Yakushima (talk) 13:17, 6 May 2008 (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.*

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Leonard_Horowitz&oldid=210646797"

- This page was last modified on 6 May 2008 at 20:20.
- Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.



About Leonard Horowitz

Public Figure

Leonard G. Horowitz was merged with this page [?]

Leonard George Horowitz is a dentist, a health industry entrepreneur, author and AIDS conspiracy theorist who opposes vaccination.

Publications

Dentistry

From 1978 to the mid-1990s, Horowitz wrote several articles on dentistry, including its relation to medical marijuana and holistic health.

Other works

Horowitz's self-publ...

Continue Reading

From [Wikipedia](#), the free encyclopedia · [Edit on Wikipedia](#)

✓ Liked

🔖 Save

✎ Edit




👍 332 people like this topic



 332 people like this topic

About Leonard Horowitz

 Liked

 Save

 Edit



Public Figure

This page has been deleted. The deletion and move log for the page are provided below for reference.

- 18:00, 15 August 2014 [Secret](#) (talk | contribs) deleted page Leonard Horowitz (Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Leonard Horowitz (2nd nomination))

Wikipedia does not have an article with this exact name. Please *search for [Leonard Horowitz](#) in Wikipedia* to check for alternative titles or spellings.

- [Log in or create an account](#) to start the ***Leonard Horowitz*** article, alternatively use the [Article Wizard](#), or add a request for it.
- [Search for "Leonard Horowitz"](#) in existing articles.
- [Look for pages within Wikipedia that link to this title.](#)

Other reasons this message may be displayed:

- If a page was recently created here, it may not yet be visible because of a delay in updating the database; wait a few minutes and try the [purge](#) function.
- Titles on Wikipedia are **case sensitive** except for the first character; please check alternative capitalizations and consider adding a [redirect](#) here to the correct title.
- If the page has been deleted, check the [deletion log](#), and see [Why was the page I created deleted?](#)

From [Wikipedia](#), the free encyclopedia - [Edit on Wikipedia](#)




WIKIPEDIA
The Free Encyclopedia

[Main page](#)
[Contents](#)
[Featured content](#)
[Current events](#)
[Random article](#)
[Donate to Wikipedia](#)
[Wikimedia Shop](#)

Interaction
[Help](#)
[About Wikipedia](#)
[Community portal](#)
[Recent changes](#)
[Contact page](#)

Tools
[Upload file](#)
[Special pages](#)

Languages 

[Create account](#)  [Log](#)

Article [Talk](#)

Search

Summer of Monuments

We need your help documenting history. » 

Permission error

You do not have permission to create this page, for the following reason:

Wikipedia does not have an article with this exact title. Please [search for *Leonard Horowitz* in Wikipedia](#) to check for alternative titles or spellings.

- [Log in or create an account](#) to start the *Leonard Horowitz* article.
- [Submit the content](#) that you wish to have created.
- [Search for "*Leonard Horowitz*"](#) in existing articles.
- [Look for "*Leonard Horowitz*"](#) in Wiktionary, our sister dictionary project.
- [Look for "*Leonard Horowitz*"](#) in the Wikimedia Commons, our repository for free images, music, sound, and video.
- [Look for pages within Wikipedia linking to this article.](#)
- If you expected a page to be here, it has probably been deleted (see [Why was the page I created deleted?](#) for possible reasons). You may wish to check the [deletion log](#).
- If a page were recently created here, it may not yet be visible because of a delay in updating the database; wait a few minutes and try the [purge](#) function.

Please also read the [deletion discussion for this page](#).