

Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Sorcha Faal (2nd nomination)

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 **delete**. J04n(talk page) 19:19, 10 April 2013 (UTC)

Sorcha Faal



If you came here because someone asked you to, or you read a message on another website, please note that this is **not a majority vote**, but instead a *discussion* among Wikipedia contributors. Wikipedia has policies and guidelines regarding the encyclopedia's content, and **consensus** (agreement) is gauged based on the merits of the arguments, *not* by counting votes.

However, you are invited to participate and your opinion is welcome. Remember to assume good faith on the part of others and to sign your posts on this page by adding ~~~~ at the end.

Note: Comments by suspected single-purpose accounts or canvassed users may be tagged using: `{{subst:spa|username}}` or `{{subst:canvassed|username}}`

Sorcha Faal (edit | talk | history | links | watch | logs | views) – (View log · Stats (http://toolserver.org/~snottywong/cgi-

AfDs for this article:

- Articles for deletion/Sorcha Faal
- Articles for deletion/Sorcha Faal (2nd nomination)
- Articles for deletion/Sorcha Faal reports

bin/votecounter.cgi?page=Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Sorcha_Faal_(2nd_nomination)))
 (Find sources: "Sorcha Faal" (https://www.google.com/search?as_eq=wikipedia&q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22&num=50) – news (https://www.google.com/search?q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22&tbn=nws) · newspapers (https://www.google.com/search?&q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22+site:news.google.com/newspapers&source=newspapers) · books (https://www.google.com/search?tbs=bks:1&q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22) · scholar (https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22) · HighBeam (https://www.highbeam.com/Search?searchTerm=%22Sorcha+Faal%22) · JSTOR (https://www.jstor.org/action/doBasicSearch?Query=%22Sorcha+Faal%22&acc=on&wc=on) ·

free images (<https://www.google.com/images?safe=off&tbm=isch&tbs=sur:fmc&q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22+-site:wikipedia.org+-site:wikimedia.org>) · free news sources (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Free_English_newspaper_sources) · The Wikipedia Library (<https://wikimedialibrary.wmflabs.org/partners/>) · NYT (<https://query.nytimes.com/search/sitesearch/#!/%22Sorcha+Faal%22/>) · WP reference (<https://www.google.com/custom?hl=en&cx=007734830908295939403%3Agalkqgoksq0&cof=FORID%3A13%3BAH%3Aleft%3BCX%3AWikipedia%2520Reference%2520Search&q=%22Sorcha+Faal%22>))

No verifiable high-quality sources (of WP:BLP standard) actually about the subject. Fails to establish third-party notability. Recent extensive revision was just a list of passing mentions in other sources; no verifiable sources actually about Sorcha Faal, and in no way up to the standards required of a BLP. From WP:BLP, "Being in the news does not in itself mean that someone should be the subject of a Wikipedia article." A BLP of someone barely notable with no high-quality sources about the subject should be deleted forthwith as a BLP hazard - David Gerard (talk) 17:33, 3 April 2013 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the list of Conspiracy theories-related deletion discussions. • Gene93k (talk) 17:48, 3 April 2013 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the list of Internet-related deletion discussions. • Gene93k (talk) 17:48, 3 April 2013 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the list of People-related deletion discussions. • Gene93k (talk) 17:48, 3 April 2013 (UTC)

- **comment** Those interested in judging this article might wish to see the full version (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sorcha_Faal&oldid=548516812) from the recent history.

David Gerard might wish to read the AfD messagebox and the instruction *the article **must not be blanked***. Removal of 4/5th of the article volume isn't complete blanking, but nor is it an open and collegial action. If this content was so bad as to warrant blanking, I'm sure deletion would be an adequate substitute. Andy Dingley (talk) 18:55, 3 April 2013 (UTC)

- - Incorrect - you don't leave spurious rubbish in BLPs, even for a deletion debate. I appreciate the concern, and I did consider the specific issue, but BLP rules trump ordinary deletion procedure in several important ways - David Gerard (talk) 06:58, 4 April 2013 (UTC)
 - You're probably right, but, considering that this individual, *if it is a single individual* (and I'm not necessarily sure that is the case), but in this case we are dealing with an anonymous blogger, so it is, to a degree, really kind of impossible to know what does and doesn't meet BLP. Maybe. I'm not saying you're wrong in any way here, but I think it might be useful if WP:BLP or some other similar page made specific provision for anonymous possible BLPs. John Carter (talk) 18:29, 7 April 2013 (UTC)
 - **Delete.** This might be appropriate as part of an article on the website publishing these reports, but not as a standalone BLP. Gamaliel (talk) 00:02, 4 April 2013 (UTC)
 - **comment** I agree with Andy, the full version should always be left in place, otherwise anyone can destroy an entry just for the purpose of saying it should be deleted. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Kmt885 (talk • contribs) 12:27, 4 April 2013 (UTC)
 - — Kmt885 (talk • contribs) has made few or no other edits outside this topic.
 - You have the link above for debate purposes - David Gerard (talk) 12:36, 4 April 2013

(UTC)

- **Seriously?** Are we really going to have to keep doing this deletion thing to keep an honest debate from happening? I am not convinced that a WP:BLP standard even applies to this entry due to the fact that this Sorcha Faal remains anonymous and could very well be an algorithm. For example, see this story from Vancouver Sun about how the LA Times are using them instead of reporters. <http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Robo%2Breporter%2Bcomputer%2Bprogram%2Braises%2Bquestions%2Babout/8156059/story.html> Keep in mind too when evaluating this entry what it says in Wikipedia:WikiProject Alternative Views *Because alternative views lack the widespread acceptance enjoyed by dominant views and often suffer from a lack of coverage in verifiable and reliable sources, fewer editors know or care about them, and this imbalance puts alternative views at risk of neglect, misrepresentation, and a level of coverage not in keeping with their relative notability. This project aims to counter that tendency by facilitating collaboration among interested editors.*
 - It is worth noting that the restored material is mostly rubbish - one editorial in an RS that disparages the subject of the article, several non-RSes and editorial opinion pieces, many of the non-English language sources are actually letters to the editor ... this is an attempt to overwhelm in quantity despite the distinct lack of quality. Again, none of this is BLP-adequate - David Gerard (talk) 12:35, 5 April 2013 (UTC)
 - Yes, it's rubbish. The point is that *we* can decide if it's rubbish or not, rather than *you* telling us that it's rubbish and that we're not to even look at it. Andy Dingley (talk) 13:19, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

I think that the idea that alternative/fringe views aren't getting the necessary due weight in wikipedia to be a very extraordinary claim. Wikipedia has the reverse problem; If you edit in the area of fringe theories, you will realize the extreme amounts of undue promotion that go on. IRWolfie- (talk) 22:39, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

- **comment** May I respectfully suggest Mr. Gerard that we submit our differences about this entry Wikipedia:Third opinion before you delete it again? Kmt885 (talk) 12:57, 4 April 2013 (UTC)
 - AFD is precisely a request for third opinions - David Gerard (talk) 20:04, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

This is admittedly a complex entry and deserves a substantial amount of discussion as this Sorcha Faal could very well be an algorithm and not a real person. And if so, how are such entries to be handled?Kmt885 (talk) 13:24, 4 April 2013 (UTC)

- Everything I've seen treats "Sorcha Faal" as a person. If you're now claiming they're not, I assume you have a WP:RS to this effect - David Gerard (talk) 14:29, 4 April 2013 (UTC)

I've removed the RfC. RfC's aren't appropriate in an AfD. IRWolfie- (talk) 17:52, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

- **Delete** No significant coverage in reliable sources. The sources presented to demonstrate notability: Sorcha_Faal#Notability: *: Passing mention [1] (<http://www.news.com.au/opinion/global-warming-hysteria-misplaced/story-e6frfs99-1111113498978>)
 - dead link: [2] (<http://www.opednews.com/articles/A-Note-to-my-Spiritual-Bro-by->

QuietBear-081024-556.html/)

- No mention of Sorcha: [3] (<http://www.wnd.com/2009/08/106695/>)
- I don't think Boing Boing, a group blog, is a reliable source except for opinion [4] (<http://boingboing.net/2010/05/06/bp-oil-spill-conspir.html>)
- Some advocacy website, not RS as far as I can see. Only a passing mention. [5] (<http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/05/02-0>)
- SPS [6] (<http://www.vdare.com/articles/the-arizona-shootings-the-second-amendment-and-aaron-zelman>)
- No mention of Sorcha: [7] (<http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2013/02/obama-sending-death-squads-after-gun-rights-activists>).

That these are considered the sources which demonstrate notability, is really scrapping the barrel. It does not demonstrate notability. Like in the previous AfD there is no signs of notability.

IRWolfie- (talk) 18:05, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

- **Delete** this "person" is not notable. There is not coverage of the person in any significant degree in reliable, third-party sources. The coverage is built from passing-mention in opinion pieces that are attacking other people. It is trivial coverage. I have grave concerns about articles on anonymous bloggers, that may or may not be just one person. That said, this article clearly incorporates original research, specifically a google search. It also incorporates junk claims, like the persons work has been "published in nearly every language". This is a puff piece, not an encyclopedic article. John Pack Lambert (talk) 19:52, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

Additionally, this article may be the result of copyright violation. It was not created until 2012, yet some of the footnotes claim the website links were retrieved as early as 2007. John Pack Lambert (talk) 20:05, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

It's not possible to save copies of a website, and then refer to them several years later when writing an article? Psychonaut (talk)

Someone keeps recorded the information about when they edited an article for years before they write articles? That doesn't sound remotely plausible.

IRWolfie- (talk) 22:35, 5 April 2013 (UTC)

I don't know about your operating system, but mine (and just about every other one going back to the 1980s) conveniently timestamps all files with their modification date. The information is conspicuously presented in the file manager. I've got copies of web pages I saved back in the 1990s, and could get you the exact time and date with about three seconds' work.

—Psychonaut (talk) 10:24, 6 April 2013 (UTC)

- **Keep** I must first state that this entire deletion process for the Sorcha Faal entry is so riddled with Catch22 rules and Orwellian Newspeak it makes fairness and common sense mute points thus allowing self appointed judges to substitute their biases in place of what is really true and staring them in the face...but I'll make my points anyway.

Firstly, Sorcha Faal should be judged on the guidelines for Wikipedia:Notability (organizations and companies) religious denominations, sects[8] ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Notability_\(organizations_and_companies\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Notability_(organizations_and_companies))), and not as a bio for a living person. Under these guidelines it clearly says: *Notable means "worthy of being noted" or "attracting notice."*

Under this guideline, especially “attracting notice”, has Sorcha Faal achieved this? The answer to

this question is an unequivocal yes. In a Google Advanced search using the term Sorcha Faal this is easily verified with this name being mentioned in: English over 500,000 time; Chinese (traditional) over 1 million times; Russian over 200,000 times; Spanish over 800,000 times; French over 100,000 times; German over 150,000 times, to just name the most used ones.

If this isn't notability what is? The anonymous Zero Hedge writer Tyler Durden[9] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zero_Hedge) and the anonymous founder of Bitcoin Satoshi Nakamoto[10] (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bitcoin>) are mentioned far less times in these languages than Sorcha Faal, are their entries next up for deletion?

Secondly, as this Sorcha Faal entry clearly falls under the guidelines of Wikipedia:WikiProject Alternative Views[11] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_Alternative_Views) it should be noted that: *Because alternative views lack the widespread acceptance enjoyed by dominant views and often suffer from a lack of coverage in verifiable and reliable sources, fewer editors know or care about them, and this imbalance puts alternative views at risk of neglect, misrepresentation, and a level of coverage not in keeping with their relative notability.*

Thirdly, and admittedly, this entry does deserve a really good cleanup, but begs the question as to why this hasn't been attempted by these self appointed judges? To refuse to acknowledge the global notability of this Sorcha Faal in the face of the overwhelming evidence that proves otherwise defies belief. Kmt885 (talk) 08:40, 7 April 2013 (UTC)

Firstly, WP:GOOGLEHITS. Secondly, WP:OTHERCRAPEXISTS. Thirdly, a wikiproject blurb isn't to be taken as policy, in fact I dispute it's accuracy considering the large amount of non-notable fringe theories on wikipedia, and the amount of undue promotion that takes place. Fourthly, cleanup requires good sources, we have none because it is not notable. IRWolfie- (talk) 11:58, 7 April 2013 (UTC)

This is profoundly disingenuous. When I did try to clean up all the completely rubbish sources, you insisted on restoring them - David Gerard (talk) 12:57, 7 April 2013 (UTC)

- Rather disappointingly, Kmt885 has decided to canvass *everyone* from Wikiproject Alternative Views. IRWolfie- (talk) 16:15, 7 April 2013 (UTC)
- **Delete** - And I'm one of them here (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:John_Carter&diff=549125260&oldid=548983948). At this point, I have to say, based on the information presented, deletion is probably the better approach here. Like I said, above, I personally *really* think it would be useful to have BLP specifically address issues of "anonymous" potential BLPs, to provide some form of guidance on such subjects. But, at this point, from what I can see, the article doesn't have anything substantive to say about the alleged subject of this maybe biography, so I don't think that a good cause can be made that it meets the biography notability guidelines. Secondly, unless someone can prove that this alleged person is not a person, and continues to, basically, present itself as a person, I do think that we are obliged to apply BLP, until and unless clearly reliable sources indicating it is not a single person are provided, and they don't seem to be. John Carter (talk) 18:29, 7 April 2013 (UTC)
- **Delete** as non-notable.

I too was notified by Kmt885. There is nothing inherently wrong with notification, where it becomes problematic is when notified editors do not consider their position and just vote, or where the notifying editor bothers unrelated people. ~~Neither of those seem to have occurred in this case.~~

(Apparently Dougweller was bothered.)

There are not enough independent sources here to establish notability.

I should also say that anonymity and pseudonymity are "nothing new." Wikipedia already has hundreds of articles of pseudonyms (some of whom are entirely anonymous), including cases of collective pseudonyms which I would argue are analogous to an algorithmic identity. We do not need to construct a new policy or modify an existing policy. The issue at hand is not the identity or nature of "Sorcha Faal," but rather whether they have made a notable contribution that needs a Wikipedia article. If this article is kept, then identity questions become important to the tone and classification of the piece. But there is no evidence (either existing, or turning up in my own search) of notability at the moment.

Kmt885, you may want to userfy the piece if you think you may be able to find an independent source for the notability of Sorcha Faal or WhatDoesItMean.Com later on. Remember to notify the deleting editor when recreating a page. Also, go easy on the "Orwellian Newspeak" and "self appointed judges" stuff, everyone here has the best interest of Wikipedia at heart, there is no collusion beyond the common belief in the value of reliable sources. --Andrewaskew (talk) 03:28, 8 April 2013 (UTC)

- Even if we ignore the group of editors this was sent to, it was clearly not the neutral notification that we require - our guideline says "Campaigning is an attempt to sway the person reading the message, conveyed through the use of tone, wording, or intent. While this may be appropriate as part of a specific individual discussion, it is inappropriate to canvass with such messages." Dougweller (talk) 07:35, 8 April 2013 (UTC)
 - Mind you, I didn't know WikiProject Alternative Views existed, and I've just joined it. (And its guidelines on sourcing don't seem to say what Kmt885 thinks they say, fwiw.) - David Gerard (talk) 09:15, 8 April 2013 (UTC)
- **comment** - Aloha, everyone. I am admittedly unfamiliar with the subject matter at hand; still, it does seem to me that there is hope here. Certainly, the article needs cleanup. May I recommend that those requesting deletion first assist in a good-faith effort to improve the article by assisting with this, and/or suggesting changes that would reflect reasonable quality standards? While I agree that there seem to be many problematic spots, it is difficult to build consensus on an action such as deletion while there are passionate editors defending the article, especially if they are willing to work to improve it. Perhaps respectfully building consensus on the smaller issues would lead toward a quality, consensual answer on the "keep"/"delete" question? Aloha! Lualoha 09:54, 8 April 2013 (UTC)
 - We did indeed attempt to, but apparently all the terrible sources are of startling importance. What it quite specifically needs is sources that are actually up to the standards required by WP:BLP. You should not presume that this has not been attempted already - David Gerard (talk) 11:16, 8 April 2013 (UTC)
- **comment** I defend my querying of Alt View participants in this discussion as this issue goes beyond this single Sorcha Faal entry and attacks the very concept of what Notability even is anymore.

The reason for this is because any discussion involving anonymous bloggers in the 21st century (especially anti-establishment ones) must include the subject of algorithmically constructed news.

The British national daily newspaper The Guardian reported in 2010 that algorithms are already reporting the news in the US[12] (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/pda/2010/mar/30/digital-media-algorithms-reporting-journalism>), the technology news site Wired has detailed[13] (<http://www.wired.com/gadgetlab/2012/04/can-an-algorithm-write-a-better-news-story-than-a-human-reporter/>) how the US company Narrative Science[14] (<http://narrativescience.com/>) is at the forefront of algorithmic news writing, and the tech blog Techdirt reported that the future of reporting is going to be algorithms, not people.[15] (<http://www.techdirt.com/articles/20130331/21015322519/programming-news-future-reporting-is-algorithms.shtml>)

The World Association of Newspapers And News Publishers[16] (<http://www.wan-ifa.org/about-wan-ifa>) even quoted one of their senior news executive who said that the advent of robo reporters is a “*coming apocalypse*”.[17] (<http://www.editorsweblog.org/2013/03/13/an-algorithm-of-hope-robo-reporters-could-redeem-hyperlocal-news>)

When you combine the FACT of algorithmically constructed news with the FACT that Business Insider reported last year that 6 corporations control 90% of the media (i.e. reliable sources) in America[18] (<http://www.businessinsider.com/these-6-corporations-control-90-of-the-media-in-america-2012-6>) and then blend in the FACT that Wikipedia only judges notability based on references to a subject/person/organization by these same 6 corporations, then anyone can plainly see that this apocalypse is already here when this unholy triad (**Algorithms-Corporations-Wikipedia**) have the potential (indeed is even doing so right now) to control information/truth any way they so choose.

Let me respectfully remind all of you of exactly what Wikipedia Values statement says: *An essential part of the Wikimedia Foundation's mission is encouraging the development of free-content educational resources that may be created, used, and reused by the entire human community. We believe that this mission requires thriving open formats and open standards on the web to allow the creation of content not subject to restrictions on creation, use, and reuse.*[19] (<http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/Values>)

So please somebody tell me, how can you outright delete this entry, without first trying to improve it (using alt standards), and still abide by the values of: “*Thriving open formats*” and “*Content not subject to restrictions of creation, use, and reuse*”?

As I've stated before, any competent search[20] (http://www.google.ca/advanced_search) of this Sorcha Faal show her/it/them being mentioned hundreds of thousands of times the world over for over 10 years. Why is this so? And who or what wants to silence this prodigious commentator[21] (<http://www.whatdoesitmean.com/index632.htm>)?

Passing mention or not, it is a FACT that this Sorcha Faal has become a thread in the global fabric of public discourse as a dissenter against the powers be that, in my humble opinion, shouldn't be silenced by Wikipedia working hand-in-hand with those *powers* always seeking to silence dissenting opinions.Kmt885 (talk) 12:36, 8 April 2013 (UTC)

You seem to have drunk a bit too much of the Kool-Aid, so I won't respond to your rather bizarre conspiracy theory about "Algorithms-Corporations-Wikipedia". Your comments also rely on erroneous arguments to use in deletion discussions (e.g WP:GOOGLEHITS). You appear to agree that you only have passing mentions, interesting. IRWolfie- (talk) 16:40, 8 April 2013 (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 "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Sorcha_Faal_(2nd_nomination)&oldid=775678044"

-
- This page was last edited on 16 April 2017, at 11:57.
 - 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.