

Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Forward (generic name of socialist publications)

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

ads not by this site

< [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**. Reading though the various comments here, various good points made on either side, but in the final analysis it seems clear that (as an editor noted below) "There is little or no connection between the disparate publications of the same or similar name other than similar ideological outlooks." While the publications listed in the article are indeed individually notable, there does not appear to be a unity between them except in terms of sharing some name and being socialist in character. As several editors raised, this is a significant [synthesis](#) case.

We already have a [disambiguation](#) page, [Forward](#), and of course various publications can be listed there.

Thanks for all comments. [Neutrality](#)^{talk} 06:46, 8 May 2012 (UTC)

Contents

- [1 Forward \(generic name of socialist publications\)](#)
 - [1.1 Random section break](#)
 - [1.2 Arbitrary break](#)
 - [1.3 Random section break 2](#)

[Forward \(generic name of socialist publications\)](#)

[Forward \(generic name of socialist publications\)](#) ([edit](#) | [talk](#) | [history](#) | [links](#) | [watch](#) | [logs](#)) – ([View log](#) • [Stats](#))

(*Find sources:* "[Forward \(generic name of socialist publications\)](#)" – [news](#) • [books](#) • [scholar](#) • [JSTOR](#) • [free images](#))



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](#) 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}}`

This is a candidate for deletion because:

1. - it is Patent Nonsense (CSD:G1)
2. - it is being used for a [blatant political attack](#) which constitutes a violation of [WP:BLP](#).
3. - it appears to be being gamed by a [compromised account](#)
4. - the only two sources on the page are invalid because the first does not concern the topic and the second is related to the political attack above.
5. - *it cannot possibly be attributed to reliable sources.*

I have thus submitted it to be deleted. [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 19:03, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
[SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 19:44, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

I believe I know why this article was created. It was a "disambiguation" deliberately made to cause tilted mentions on the top of certain pages. See my re-edit comparison [here](#). [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 20:50, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

New slogan by Obama-Biden 2012 campaign. There ya go. If you're far enough on the right wing loony fringe even a tepid, unprincipled, warmongering, capitalist centrist like Obama looks like a Socialist; ergo, out comes the POV tarring brushes for an exercise in Baffling 'Em With Bullshit... [Carrite](#) ([talk](#)) 23:36, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Rewrite as disambiguation page** similar to [The Times \(disambiguation\)](#). Currently this is something of a dictionary definition, which is [not appropriate for Wikipedia](#). [GabrielF](#) ([talk](#)) 19:49, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

That disambiguation page [already exists](#). I'm not sure what the original motivation for creating this article was save for tying the word "forward" to the concept of "socialism" for some strange reason. [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 19:53, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep.** The gratuitous mention of Obama's campaign slogan in the article history is of course completely inappropriate, but I don't see the nominator's rationale for deletion as valid. It is not patent nonsense. The fact that it has briefly been the subject bad editing is irrelevant, as is the nature of editor [User:Spazoto](#). I'm predisposed to thinking that a reasonable article could be written about this topic, but if not then the article should be converted to a disambiguation page (as suggested above) instead of being deleted. [Peacock](#) ([talk](#)) 19:58, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

As I noted above, a disambiguation page for the word "Forward" already exists. I have looked and can find no sourcing to ever indicate any notable papers being written on the

word "Forward" being uniquely associated with Socialists or Communists over any other group; indeed, quite to the contrary there are a large number of other groups and newspapers as well as counties, states and countries, that use the word "Forward" as all or part of a slogan. Could you please give an example or draft of what such a supposed disambiguation page - or addition to the existing page - might look like?

[SkepticAnonymous](#) (talk) 20:03, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

I don't think it would be too much work to simply take the list of publications currently in this article and format it per guidelines at [WP:MOSDAB](#) and have a good disambig page which collects similarly named topics. [Peacock](#) (talk) 20:25, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

I will try your suggestion. I note another problem here: the page lists [The Forward](#), a Jewish-American newspaper published in New York, as a "socialist publication" when it is not so. I think I spy WHY this page was created in the first place on that basis.

[SkepticAnonymous](#) (talk) 20:36, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

Please see the change to the disambiguation page [here](#). Will it suffice?

[SkepticAnonymous](#) (talk) 20:36, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- ~~• **Keep.** I'd also endorse rewriting as a disambiguation page similar to the The Times as Gabrielf suggests. The page content clearly demonstrates a pattern and is not original research. I could see this article as being expanded with further sources, or in its current state being turned into a disambiguation page pretty much leaving the lede intact. Regardless of either of those two solutions, I see absolutely not grounds for deletion here. — [NINTENDUDE](#)⁶⁴ 20:06, 1 May 2012 (UTC) [NOTE: Self-applied strike, please do not revert.]~~
- **Keep.** "I'd also endorse rewriting as a disambiguation page similar to the The Times as Gabrielf suggests." This article is fact based. There is plenty of information to back up the article. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [97.66.98.98](#) (talk) 20:14, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

— [97.66.98.98](#) (talk • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- ~~**Comment.** Yes, it is fact based but the question is whether it is encyclopedic to have an article on the concept. Initial consensus of participant appears to concede that at least a disambiguation page is warranted. AfD's run a few days before any decision is made so there is still plenty of time to [save](#) the article by expanding it. — [NINTENDUDE](#)⁶⁴ 20:23, 1 May 2012 (UTC) [NOTE: Self-applied strike, please do not revert.]~~

It's clear why some want this page eliminated. Obama chose "forward" as his campaign slogan. The historical use of "forward" in a political sense is now embarrassing to him. Thus the page must be removed. This is an effort at political censorship. Obama chose the word for his campaign. Wikipedia should not protect him from the consequences. The choice of "Forward" as his slogan should have been more carefully vetted. It wasn't. Now the Obama campaign should have to live with it. And just because someone uses the information on the historical use of "Forward" in socialist and communist publications to oppose the Obama reelection is insufficient

reason for Wikipedia to delete the entry. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [24.99.195.186](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#))

PLEASE [stop it](#), Nintendude64. Not funny. [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 20:59, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

Comment: What the hell is your problem? Why are you trolling your own AfD? --

[NINTENDUDE](#)⁶⁴ 23:45, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

SIGH The fact that there is a series of political hit pieces about this, combined with a repetitive [WP:BLP](#) violation on the subject, doesn't register with you? This is not an effort at political censorship. As I note, on closer inspection the original writer seems to have slipped into his list of "socialist" newspapers [The Forward](#), which is a Jewish-American paper published in New York and **has absolutely nothing to do with socialism**; in other words, it appears this was one of those "hey look jews are communists" troll articles, well written to slip by at first glance and nothing more, which happened to become popular with another group of political troll types later on.

[SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 20:39, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

The Forward was founded as a socialist paper and was quite famous for being so in the 20s and 30s. [GabrielF](#) ([talk](#)) 21:17, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep.** This article, while a snub, addresses a specific list i.e. the names of socialist publications using the term "Forward," therefore it is not nonsense.

Nowhere in the article does it address a current political situation in an attack method, therefore it is not a Blatant Political Attack. (Please note that if someone uses this page as a reference in a Blatant Political Attack, that does not mean that this page itself is a Blatant Political Attack.) An Argument can be made that since each of the items listed in the list are references, and each of those publications have references including the applicable websites of said publications. Therefore, ample resources are listed. Finally, it is impossible to make a valid argument that referencing a publication's name in an article "discussing publications' names" is not a reliable source. Therefore the arguments that ([SkepticAnonymous](#)[talk](#)) use for deleting the article are not valid arguments. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [BabyDoc23](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#))

— [BabyDoc23](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- - [User:BabyDoc23](#) has no other edits than this AfD, and is thus the same as the anon ip commenting above, seemingly an attempt to fake a wider consensus by gaming the AfD. Striking out his/her comments. --[Soman](#) ([talk](#)) 21:00, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
 - Proof, Soman? Thought not. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [Floyddabarber](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#))

After further research, it appears the creation of this article was a racist attack designed to stick the name "socialist" on the page of [The Forward](#) in an oblique and unnoticed manner. [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 20:55, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep and Comment.** This AfD is one of the weirder in recent times, and I'm not sure where to begin. I'll try it like this:

1) The rationales for deletion given in the nomination are faulty. To try to invoke BLP, CSD, etc. is blabant nonsense. Accusing other editors of racism, is not helpful either.

User:SkepticAnonymous needs to take things down a notch, for the sake of reason. 2) One questionable edit is not a basis for deletion. There is no relevance to the Obama edit to the article, and that passage can be swiftly removed. 3) The article in question is one of the those cases were it got started but never took off. My ambition has however been to expand it further than a disamb page, to give an historical overview of the name in the socialist movement. Recently, I found some material that could be used for an expansion, mentions of how the name fell out of fashion in Soviet Russia following 1917 (see *Nachrichten*). I'll try to search for other sources as well, to provide more detail. --[Soman](#) ([talk](#)) 21:11, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

I have trouble with your logic, Soman.

1 & 2 - The article has been the subject of continued IP-based and new-account (in one case a presumably compromised account, which makes more sense than an account last used in 2009 spontaneously returning) vandalism trying to insert mentions of the Barack Obama presidential campaign; these are not-coincidentally [connected to spreading blogposts](#) based on [a Washington Times hit piece](#). In short, it's a vandalism target.

3 - You have only one source for the entire article, and even that source doesn't qualify as an [WP:RS](#). This has existed in that state for months, apparently unnoticed.

4 - I have a big problem with the publications you choose to list as "socialist", starting with [The Forward](#). There has been a long habit in right-wing circles post-WW2 of trying to tie the Jewish religion/people with "socialism" as a cover for anti-semitism, and to behave in this manner is simply beyond the pale. There is **absolutely no reason on wikipedia** to have a "disambiguation page" that labels any page referenced by it "socialist" when the generic disambiguation page [Forward](#) can do just fine to differentiate PUBLICATIONS with similar names, as currently written for [Forward#Publications](#) in an actually neutral way.

I ask in the name of [WP:BLP](#), [WP:RS](#), and [WP:NPOV](#) that you see why I have strong objections to your incredibly non-neutral creation here. There is simply no reason to try to tar any pages, people or groups with an epithet-by-disambiguation when it can be so easily avoided. [SkepticAnonymous](#) ([talk](#)) 21:22, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- - Well, I have trouble with your lack of logic:
 - 1 & 2. "Continued IP-based and new account"? That edit conflict is less than 24 hours, if we were to delete every article that attracted bad quality edits at some point, we would delete most of the relevant material at wikipedia. If there would be persistent vandalism, the page can be protected. But we are very far from that stage now.
 - 3. In what way wouldn't the source (Ismael) qualify as [WP:RS](#)?
 - 4. Interestingly, The Forward itself choses a different approach than you:
<http://forward.com/articles/10461/forverts/> --[Soman](#) ([talk](#))
 - I have more trouble with yours.
 - 1 & 2. When I cleaned up the article from the vandalism that was ongoing, it removed **more than 50% of the article**. It wasn't even a well-written stub.

- 3. While Ismael makes the assertion of "common use" of the word, there's no actual research in the quoted section to back it up.
- 4. The fact that a publication took a "social democratic" bent does not make it socialist, and in fact, the source you quote points out that it was ardently anti-leninist. [SkepticAnonymous](#) (talk) 22:21, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- - - Final point: if you think you can write your article in a neutral manner, and I see you're trying, please do so. I'd like nothing better than to be proven wrong about it and seeing a well-written article rather than a stub of garbage sit in that spot. But the fact remains, an article shouldn't do dual duty as a disambiguation page, **especially when it ends up tarring linked pages with a term commonly used as a political epithet.** [Forward#Publications](#) is far better for disambiguation of any publications using permutations of that name. [SkepticAnonymous](#) (talk) 22:24, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

OH PULEEEZE. Are you serious, SkepticAnonymous? Racist? Now your true colors have come to the surface. Just another proggie who starts screaming "racist" when the argument is lost. Time to grow up. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [24.99.195.186](#) (talk) 22:13, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Delete** as unnecessary and [WP:OR](#)-padded [WP:POVFORK](#) of [Forward#Publications](#) and totally implausible search term. --[Lambiam](#) 23:11, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
- Delete -OR at best, patent nonsense at worst. This is Campaign 2012 fooliganism related to the new Obama campaign slogan, with the Right Wing POV warriors starting the offensive to skew WP content with a view to affecting public perception of that campaign. Start taking names for the inevitable topic bans to follow. [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:28, 1 May 2012 (UTC) Last edit: [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:32, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

In the almost unthinkable unlikely event of a keep result here, note that this is an improper name for an article. [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:30, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
 Note also that this is a ~~POV~~ fork of the valid disambiguation page [Forward](#). [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:33, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment**, I'm sorry Carrite, but since when do I qualify as a 'Right Wing POV warrior'? --[Soman](#) (talk) 23:38, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

Having just finally looked at the edit history, I was just diving back in to remark that it's hilarious that this was started by Soman, who is a long term, quality editor on this topic. My bad. The title is still improper and the page still needs to go bye-bye, in my opinion. [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:41, 1 May 2012 (UTC) Last edit: [Carrite](#) (talk) 23:46, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Delete** as improper disambiguation page of [Forward](#). Key publications merit their own pieces; else this is a random accumulation just sharing a name. [Carrite \(talk\)](#) 23:43, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Keep**. The article creator in a short amount of time has put in the work to begin [saving](#) this article. Aside from the fact that this AfD is quite frankly bogus on all counts listed, I think the work has been done to justify keeping this as an encyclopedia article rather than trimming it down to a disambiguation page. I've stricken my earlier comments which suggest this possible course of action. --[NINTENDUDE⁶⁴](#) 00:00, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- - **Comment** - it's fairly obvious to anyone that Nintendude64 is the sockpuppeteer behind most of the IP vandals showing up on the page as well as trolling this discussion and violating [WP:CIVIL](#) quite often. As well, nobody has yet explained why the deletion of an unnecessary [WP:POVFORK](#) deliberately designed to be used for nasty political and anti-semitic insinuations is controversial to anyone but anti-semites. The AfD submitter has shown how easy it is to implement the content in a NEUTRAL way on the ACTUAL disambig page as well as an affected page by the slimy linking scheme, and so there is even less justification for this page's existence than might have been claimed at the outset. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [107.28.112.235 \(talk\)](#) 04:17, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment**. And it's *fairly obvious* that the sockpuppet investigation, which SkepticAnonymous never bothered to post on my talk page, went nowhere. If you continue to harass me, I will be filing an incident report. That being said, you comment will not disparage my !vote. --
[NINTENDUDE⁶⁴](#) 18:09, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment** This page was mentioned on Rachel Maddow tonight (if I heard it right) and may be driving some of the traffic to this page and its AFD. [☯Soap☯](#) 02:12, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete**. [Natureguy1980 \(talk\)](#) 05:10, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** per Lambiam & Carrite. [WP:FORK](#), improper disambiguation page.--[JayJasper \(talk\)](#) 05:16, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete**. Serves no valid purpose. Just a useless [WP:POVFORK](#) of the [existing disambig page](#). — [Red XIV \(talk\)](#) 06:10, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **STRONG KEEP** The page was around before the Obama campaign chose their slogan. Wikipedia should not allow censorship based on shifting political winds. In a few weeks this will be a non-issue. Just leave it be. Why not protect it to limit the vandalism? The page can be kept without it being fodder for a political attack. [214.13.69.132 \(talk\)](#) 06:14, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment.** I might try to give an explanation as to why the article was started (in the spring of 2011, obviously without any linkage to the Obama campaign). I had wanted to write a passage for the Vorwärts article on other publications named after it, but was then confronted with the fact that there had been 2 'motherships' so to speak, and it was not possible in a non-OR way to determine which was related to which. The conclusion is that the term, or better said the name, has a specific place in early modern socialist discourse. For me, the intention was never that the article would merely be a link page or disamb, but would be dedicated to the evolution of the name and its usage. The subject is notable, it is not OR, it is not POV, and Wikipedia should not be tailored to fit political campaigns. Btw, 'Mitt' is the Khmer Rouge word for '[Comrade](#)'. --[Soman](#) ([talk](#)) 08:15, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Comment** (actual thought is **Merge**). The difficulties Wikipedia often has with English is American politicians warping political, economic and social sciences, primarily through the misuse of terminology. Simply reading the end of the article on [Liberalism](#) makes it clear that associations within the sciences are foreign to US citizens. This is amazing as I've had three required high school classes that cover the terminology objectively. It would be nice if Wikipedia required the correct and scientifically objective use of such terminology.

That aside, however, the term, "Forward," became a political point in the transitional period between the [Enlightenment](#) and Liberalism, as noted by the State of [Wisconsin](#)'s own adoption of the motto in the 19th century. The [Wisconsin Idea](#) that followed this era would lay the foundation of US [Progressivism](#), giving US citizens direct elections of Senators, progressive taxation, compensation for on-the-job injuries, regulation of private infrastructure upon which the public depends and some protection and extension of rights for former slaves.

These points made, as this article is over a year old, I'd say only politiwag editing wars have really made this stand out as an AfD. My logic isn't the editing as much as the novelty of organising a non-disambiguation page with little else to qualify it. With that point made, I'm not saying it's useless information, but when considering collective semiotic works, there may be greater potential in incorporating a page of political/philosophical cultural semiotics, or include an appropriate subsections to those pages. I feel the latter would provide greater value. Also, someone who was ACTUALLY seeking this information could seek an article along the lines of "Notable Publications Advocating Political Philosophies".

As mentioned before, Americans will likely edit war even that article through every election. After which, they will look up [Meatwad](#) to see what he specializes in.

Thanks for the background, Soman. The disambiguation point in my comment is not meant to negatively assess the intent, and I feel contributors can continue from the exploration of the term as part of a cultural semiotics sub-section to [Socialism](#)
[173.242.89.38](#) ([talk](#)) 08:35, 2 May 2012 (UTC) EAZen: Never logged in, always contributing

- **Comment:** This article (and the deletion discussion!) got a substantial mention on the May 1, 2012, edition of *The Rachel Maddow Show*. - [Dravecky \(talk\)](#) 08:52, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Comment**, any link? --[Soman \(talk\)](#) 09:17, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **I Have one**, [\[1\]](#) --[Kumpayada \(talk\)](#) 10:00, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep** Most of the arguments against this page either center around "It's BS" or swipes at the right (and a strange, unsupported accusation of racism). The fact that the article is inconvenient for one side or the other doesn't change its validity. Is this any less valid than having an article on [Macaca?](#) [Izuko \(talk\)](#) 10:35, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Comment** With the explanation above "The conclusion is that the term, or better said the name, has a specific place in early modern socialist discourse", I have not checked but have you created articles for Arbeiter, Genosse, or frei? I ask because it seems this article is simply focused around the idea that some words, actually that one word, had a political meaning at one point. Interesting, to be sure. However, many words take on political meanings, does this fact merit an individual article? While I invite that for consideration, I'm not voting either way, I just came to know about the article. I would say from the little I read, I would not encourage a blanket delete. The information seems at cursory glance to be properly sourced. It may need another home, but it does not seem to be simply conjured for some unknown purpose.

As to a link to the link above of show that brought me here (<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/26315908/#47256402>) the relevant portion should begin around 1 minute into that ending segment clip. She was jabbing at a political pundit using it as his sole source that the term "Forward" being used in an ad then means Obama is a socialist. She also poked fun, it seems, at the 'don't delete this' fervor that has come of it. As this interesting piece of historical trivia now rests, in the minds of some, as proof that a politician has anti-American motivations. [68.229.93.129 \(talk\)](#) 10:38, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

— [68.229.93.129 \(talk • contribs\)](#) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- **Off Topic:** Would someone explain to me where striking comments that are NOT your own is an acceptable practice? This appears to be tendentiously disruptive, but I'm willing to Assume Good Faith; however, if comment counts as vandalism, it should be treated as such. Striking out another person's comment on the whole of it would appear to delegitimize their point, valid or otherwise, and the actual interpretation is meant to be that of voluntary retraction or change, thus making the strike out vandalism, and at least two users at risk of uw-warn. [173.242.89.38 \(talk\)](#) 10:51, 2 May 2012 (UTC) EAZen: Never logged in, always annoyed
 - **Comment**, because it is prone to vote-stacking and socking. Several of the different anon comments in this AfD are seemingly made by the same users. It is also always suspicious with users with no previous edits prior to an AfD, they are usually sock-puppets. If you wish to contribute constructively to Wikipedia, register an account. It helps a lot to maintain a dialogue. --[Soman \(talk\)](#) 11:00, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Comment** Who makes that decision? You? It seems like proponents for keeping the article are the ones have their comments struck out and then you justify it by further denigrating them. I have unstruck my vote as it is

completely valid. If you wish to denigrate me further, I will elevate the issue. [214.13.69.132 \(talk\)](#) 11:23, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment.** NOT A BALLOT! That is not a legitimate point or logic. Furthermore, having followed up on previous claims regarding these points: I find no geographical or commercial proximity of the IPs compared and BabyDoc23 may have simply signed a name which that person might use elsewhere. Assume Good Faith seems hard for you if you can't back any of your claims justifying these activities. You either show actual evidence to the claims of an organised edit war, intent to deceive or an explanation that is aware of the phrase NOT A BALLOT, show an acceptable logic to claim vandalism OR identify the WikiPolicy that allows you to strike other people's comments in this context, or there may be a more aggressive review. [173.242.89.38 \(talk\)](#) 11:12, 2 May 2012 (UTC) EAZen: Never logged in, seriously considering
 - **Comment.** I was surprised by this practice as well, it is extremely uncivil behavior and I'm glad someone else notice this and took the necessary actions to revert those edits. I did strike two of my own comments because I was changing my position, so I'll be restoring that myself. No hard feelings, I can perfectly understand reverting all the strike-thrus. --[NINTENDUDE⁶⁴](#) 17:58, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep** Article has existed for over a year, has decent number of cites for its length and is notable based on the common thread of being used by a number of different national communist/socialist parties. Agree that connections to Obama campaign are political opinion and [original thought](#) and should be removed, but that does not make the rest of the article worthy of deletion. --[McDoobAU93](#) 13:40, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

I will repost my comments. Please note that just because SkepticAnonymous chose to strike it out does not make it invalid, actually it makes it more valid. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [BabyDoc23 \(talk • contribs\)](#) 13:53, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

Actually, I struck NOTHING out, that was done by other editors. However, as you are a [WP:SPA](#) vandal and/or sockpuppet... [SkepticAnonymous \(talk\)](#) 14:05, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Close** - What a mess. I can tell you right now that the AFD for this article has already made its round on some of the talk show circuits out here. It's practically wallowing in its own infamy. We can't reasonably try to reach a consensus for deletion under these circumstances. Give the controversy a week or so to die down and then we'll take a look at it.--[WaltCip \(talk\)](#) 14:15, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

Keep - The entry for "Forward" is a proper reference to historical fact. The attempt to have it deleted is the blatant political act, the act of covering up and re-writing history and suppression of historical fact. Wikipedia is suppose to be a source of fact that is not effected by personal or ideological motives. The removal of entries is just as bad if not worse then the editing of entries. The attempts to strike AfD comments and the personal attacks of others in the AfD comments of

others further prove the blatant political act that the request to delete is. The original entry has been archived and if it is deleted or edited those changes will be exposed. It is this sort of editing of facts which is giving Wikipedia a reputation for not being a credible source or reference. ```` CParisho — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [68.102.206.28](#) ([talk](#)) 14:41, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

— [68.102.206.28](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- **Delete** The posting of the magazine already exists as http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Forward, therefore this reposting of it is an attempt to be misleading and purposely so. But something that everyone seems to ignore and it pointed out in the site itself is the first usage of the word **Forwert!** " First appearing in Paris in January 1844 as a German-language semiweekly, it was founded by Jewish opera composer Giacomo Meyerbeer as a musical and theatrical review." And Please note this is what it was used for before it began being used by Heinrich Heine, Moses Hess, Georg Weber, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and was summarially shut down the year after, all these things are being left out in the article, but they are all there in the "source material" The concept of calling it a generic name for socialist publications is suddenly being ascribed to something that was used to review musicals and theatre... So therefore Readers Digest, American Art Review, and Rolling stones are equally likely to be socialist publications. The name is misleading and politically motivated to give a false account of what it really is. On further viewing of "Forvert" they site their history as "Launched as a Yiddish-language daily newspaper on April 22, 1897, the Forward entered the din of New York's immigrant press as a defender of trade unionism and moderate, **democratic** socialism." Furthermore finishing it with the note "FORWARD" is the new slogan of Barack Obama's re-election campaign for President of the United States." makes it blatantly obvious that this is being pushed forward under a false premise. Anyone considering keeping it would have to allow for the removal of (generic name for socialist publications) cause that's just not true or relevant. Read more: <http://forward.com/about/#ixzz1tj4vP558> Read more: <http://www.forward.com/articles/10461/forverts/#ixzz1tiySq2v4> [Jarunasax](#) ([talk](#)) 15:49, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** as an irrelevant redirect to [Forward#Publications](#). Closing admin - keep voters have been cavassed - [\[2\]](#), amongst others. [Hipocrite](#) ([talk](#)) 16:08, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - Please point out which !votes are results of canvassing, and if so, why they should not be counted.--[WaltCip](#) ([talk](#)) 16:30, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - Not necessary, as this is [not a vote](#). --[BDD](#) ([talk](#)) 17:25, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep Notable.** [Herp Derp](#) ([talk](#)) 16:15, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** - utter and arrant nonsense with a blatant political agenda. Is "Forward" socialist when it is used as the state motto of Wisconsin, whose governor is [Scott Walker](#)?

Note: This debate has been included in the [list of News-related deletion discussions](#). — [Frankie](#) ([talk](#)) 16:33, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the [list of Politics-related deletion discussions](#). — [Frankie](#) ([talk](#)) 16:33, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep** - Perhaps the motivations behind the creation were less than pure, but "Forward" does indeed exist as a commonly-used term/name in socialist and nationalist movements. There should be no mention of Obama 2012 here, though. That is a fringe criticism of non-notable far-right sources. [Tarc \(talk\)](#) 16:46, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

Your point is arbitrary, for example "Moving Forward" being a word to note people moving from a bad situation, is also the name of a band, the name of a business and the title of Zeigeist:Moving Forward. Forward is an arbitrary that is being used not only as a campaign slogan but to mount political attack and trying to link them to wikipedia in the same way that Santorum was made to suffer in google search engines or how John Kerry got associated with Flip flopping is the realms of politics not Wikipedia. Forward is also the direction we go when we drive.[Jarunasax \(talk\)](#) 17:17, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

That doesn't really address a thing about what I said, which was noting the historical usage of the term. [Tarc \(talk\)](#) 17:22, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep**. The AFD only appeared recently, and unfortunately, despite it's merits gives the appearance of being politically motivated. Sometimes the appearance if non-neutrality can be as bad as non-neutrality. Deleting it at this times gives the appearance of non-neutrality for Wikipedia as a whole. The entry for "Forward" is a proper reference to historical fact, and is obviously notable. This will all be forgotten in a few days, but, if it's deleted, it's going to be major news. [Jtjathomps \(talk\)](#) 17:16, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** as a [WP:SYNTH](#) problem that serves little to no purpose already covered on the [Forward](#) disambiguation page. A glance at the "Publications" section alone tells a reader that there have been several socialist publications by the name. Relationships between individual publications should be covered in their respective articles. At a bare minimum, **rename** to better fit conventions--something like "Forward (socialism)." --[BDD \(talk\)](#) 17:25, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** per BDD. There doesn't appear to be support for "forward" as either a term with special significance to the communist movement or as a generic term for all publications, as the title would suggest; without either of those connections, there's no real significance that isn't already covered by the dab page. Repeated use itself does not establish a special significance; we need sources that discuss a special significance. [Writ Keeper](#) ☐ 👑 17:41, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete** — "Forward" is not a "generic name of socialist publications" and as such isn't notable. Further, I think its fairly clear this is a blatant political attack. | [pulmonological talk](#) * [contribs](#) 17:42, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Comment**. Are you seriously claiming that when I created this article in January 2011, it was done in order to torpeo the Obama-Biden campaign of 2012? That is really a fringe theory. --[Soman \(talk\)](#) 17:55, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Comment to your comment** the posting at the time was insignificant and a stub, and already existed in The Forward magazine. It also ignores the fact that [Vorwärts!](#) and [Vorwärts](#) are one and the same. There is almost no validity to the stub and if it hadn't been brought up by the news agents it would have stayed irrelevant. But it isn't anymore, therefore it has to be cited, validated and checked. [Jarunasax \(talk\)](#) 18:11, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- Good point. Perhaps this article and [Vorwärts](#) should be merged into [Vorwärts!](#). -- [BDD](#) ([talk](#)) 18:22, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Comment** well if we look at everything the wiki stub actually strategically uses and combines 3 different references. [Vorwärts!](#), which is the paper that marx wrote for in 1844 , [Vorwärts](#) which was the german socialist paper in 1876 and [The Forward](#) was founded in 1896 and still exists to this day as is noted here [Forward connections](#) and it's obvious to anyone who reads it.[Jarunasax](#) ([talk](#)) 18:33, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

KEEP. Was the article true before the word was adopted by the Obama campaign? Is it still true? Keep it. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [Fantumfighter](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) 18:20, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- - - Can I borrow your future prediction device that you used to predict that "Forward" would be Obama's campaign slogan? I'd like to use it to predict next week's lotto numbers. Thanks. --[B](#) ([talk](#)) 23:04, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep**. The entry for "Forward" is a reference to historical fact. Deleting it will only prove the politicians correct, that there is a left wing conspiracy. [ChuckEngels](#) ([talk](#)) 19:13, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

— [ChuckEngels](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- **Keep** It's pretty obvious this desire to delete this article is because of the fact that it is the same as the new Obama campaign slogan, which could be embarrassing. If the article had been whipped up immediately after that new slogan was unveiled, I could see the political motivation being in the opposite direction, and would probably vote delete. But the fact that this has been around for almost a year and a half, and is well-sourced, better sourced even that it was a week ago, makes this an easy !vote. By the same token, there shouldn't be any [synthetic](#) attempt to link it to the Obama campaign. —[Torchiest](#) ^{talk}_{edits} 19:16, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **comment** I think the article is broken... — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [Jarunasax](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) 19:24, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

KEEP. This article was created by Soman on or before Jan 1, 2011. The Obama Campaign announced the slogan on April 30, 2012. Just because they, and SkepticAnonymouse ARE Socialists, does not mean they get to rewrite history. If Wikipedia deletes this entry, it will show that the organization is biased and political. I would hope that they would keep to being a straightforward catalog of facts as they originally founded themselves to be. The fact is, many socialists and groups, including Marx and Engels, used the name Forward. Hey, socialists, you came up with the tag, now wear it. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [216.110.75.11](#) ([talk](#)) 19:41, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- Please observe [WP:AGF](#) and keep arguments focused on WP's relevant guidelines and policies for inclusion. Thanks.--[JayJasper \(talk\)](#) 20:31, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- It occurs to me that some of these IP users might be happier at [another wiki project](#). --[BDD \(talk\)](#) 19:49, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep**, significantly predates slogan, no reason to delete for recentism reasons... --[SarekOfVulcan \(talk\)](#) 20:08, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

Random section break

- [\(edit conflict\)](#) **Redirect** to [Forward](#). If this is a page about a generic name for multiple socialist publications then it should either be a disambiguation page itself or redirect to one, and right now to me the most appropriate of the two is to redirect it to a "Socialist publications" (or even just "Publications") section at [Forward](#). [Ks0stm \(T•C•G•E\)](#) 20:14, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- SIMPLE SOLUTION: Strong keep - if the article was written BEFORE Obama's selection of a slogan. Delete - if written After Obama's selection. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [71.196.124.200 \(talk\)](#) 20:20, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Weak Keep**. Originally I was going to say delete, in agreement with Lambiam and Carrite particularly. It's true we have articles on published works using that name that aren't to do with socialism, e.g. *Forward!* and *Forward Magazine*. It's also true the title is terrible and an implausible search term. If we need to disambiguate a title let's do it more in line with naming conventions; [BDDs](#) suggestion "Forward (socialism)" is sensible. It's further true it's likely to attract OR, in the form of xyz is a socialist-oriented/related publication *therefore* they chose the title because of its historical associations with socialism. Maybe so, maybe not; if saying that there needs to be a source such as an online magazine About page explicitly saying it or the founder saying so in an interview, etc. But that is an argument for editing not deletion. On the face of it sources used in the article seem reliable, and the term does seem to have a specific usage derived from the mid-C19th German newspaper mentioned. I think it's reasonable to have a small sourced non-OR article on its influence and usage, separate from from the article on that paper. --[92.6.211.228 \(talk\)](#) 20:27, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete** per Lambiam. Plus the disambiguation phrase is unlike any I've ever seen here. [Beyond My Ken \(talk\)](#) 21:25, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete** is based on Original Research WP:OR, and a WP:POVFORK of [Forward#Publications](#) and totally implausible search term. There has also been blatant [Canvassing](#)
- **Redirect** to [Forward#Publications](#). To be fair to the creator of this article, this is a legitimate topic, and I have no reason to believe it was created for bad-faith reasons. But I'm just not convinced there's actually anything to *say* about it beyond 'these are some publications called Forward', which can be done perfectly well at the main disambiguation page. I'm open to being convinced otherwise, if anyone can demonstrate there's really enough source material to write a decent article here; but I suspect that if kept, it will remain perpetually at the stub level it is now, not really adding anything

beyond what's at the main disambiguation page. [Robofish \(talk\)](#) 21:59, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Strong Keep** this article was in existence for a year and can be fixed with appropriate work. [Drboisclair \(talk\)](#) 01:41, 4 May 2012 (UTC) I would also support **Redirect**. It is inappropriate for Wikipedia to be pressured by political movements in the United States. Let the truth be told. [Drboisclair \(talk\)](#) 01:41, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

Arbitrary break

- **comment** this article is completely out of context all you have to do it read the various sources connected to the alternatives and see how it misconstrues the facts, the article needs to be heavily edited or redirected. And here is the full evidence.

I In citing [Vorwärts!](#) the snub ignores the founding of the paper and its original purpose and the reason for Marx joining the paper in the first place, after the closure of [Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher](#) which eventually lead the closure of Vorwärts by the Prussian King [Friedrich Wilhelm IV](#) 2 In repurposing of the paper in 1876 [Vorwärts](#) Soman ignores that Vorwärts did not become an organ of the [Social Democratic Party of Germany](#) till 1891 to 1933 after the actual paper as he claims. He also says the editor was Wilhelm Liebknecht who actually edited [Volksstaat](#) which existed in October 2, 1869 to September 23, 1876 which was actually an organ for [German Social Democratic Workers Party in the Czechoslovak Republic](#). Another paper that published in that time (1891-1933) was the Volksstimme. It was properganda their were alot of papers. 3 The Russian version Vpered did not publish Lenin. Soman claims "the publication that Lenin started after having resigned from the Iskra editorial board in 1905 after a clash with Georgi Plekhanov and the Mensheviks." [the publication that Lenin started after having resigned from the Iskra editorial board in 1905 after a clash with Georgi Plekhanov and the Mensheviks.](#) when an alternate and conflicting version states [It backed the Russian Marxist economists and then, after the split in the Party, the Mensheviks. It published articles by Leon Trotsky, but would not publish any by Vladimir Lenin.](#) 4 He ignores the conflict the paper had with hitler, "The libel proceedings against the Socialist editor were instituted by the reactionary leader of Bavaria following the publication by the Vorwaerts of a report that the Hitler Organization was receiving financial aid from "American Jews and Henry Ford."" 5 one lovely thing that has noting to do with the suit but ignored connections is "During the Nazi period, the Social Democratic Party of Germany was banned, and so the publication of Vorwärts in Germany had to stop in 1933, but it was continued in exile in Czechoslovakia until 1938 and subsequently in Paris until 1940." [Jarunasax \(talk\)](#) 22:16, 2 May 2012 (UTC) I believe the reason for making the snub was legitimate, but because of the uproar it's causing, everything about it becomes questionable and the missed connections becomes big holes within something he would have gotten round to eventually [Jarunasax \(talk\)](#) 22:16, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- - **Comment**, I'm sorry, but I don't see your point. Regarding (1), there is no claim that the article would cover all aspects of the publications mentioned. Regarding your (2), you confuse DSAP (the party in Czechoslovakia, founded in 1919) and SAPD (which later took the name SPD). Vorwärts emerged as the central

publication of the German Social Democrats, but was by no means the sole party newspaper. The info Jarunasax cites from the en.wiki article of [Vorwärts](#) appears incorrect, the de.wiki article has more detail of Vorwärts was the central party organ from 1876 onwards. Not sure what this has to do with the AfD. (3) Vpered was not a Russian edition of the German Vorwärts. There is no claim of that in the article either. There is even a mention of how the name 'Forward' fell out of fashion in Soviet Russia, a development that happened in response to the [First World War](#). Regarding (4) and (5), again, not sure what you want to state. By World War I, the name (which is the subject of the article) was already an international feature. --[Soman](#) ([talk](#)) 22:43, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment in response** Der Volksstaat was the actual name of the paper that was edited by Wilhelm Liebknecht, not Vorwärts. Two different names. Lenin started the Iskra not Vpered. Vpered was just a russian translation of Forward or Vorwärts. I'm reassessing my concept of having the snub deleted, coming to terms that your research though is missing contextual connections that allowed it to be sabotaged and set for deletion. Infact I've come to a simple conclusion that the snub can be saved with revisions contextual ones.

And no I don't have any edits outside of these 2, It doesn't make me a bot or a troll, these were things that interested me, and I have no intention of editing your post for you. nor am I being rude or abusive of abusing the wiki policies, I'm just pointing out to you that your snub needs work to make it salvagable.[Jarunasax](#) ([talk](#)) 23:09, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- - - **Comment.** I'm sorry, but you are both about Vorwärts and Vpered. There is plenty material on both these publications, at google books for reading. Regarding your edit count, the fact that your second edit ([\[3\]](#)) could be considered as a defensive move caught my attention. --[Soman](#) ([talk](#)) 23:23, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Comment** My sig that was basically a play on word for "I think there fore I am" sounds defensive to you? That's an impressive stretch, but completely off the mark. It would play out in a longer sense, I think, I am, I exist. Oh well "shrug" I'm sure the editors have considered the same thing you have and have seen no reason to censure me. Still does not change that your connection of the word is a stretch at best. Again I'll point out that your missing research is what allowed your probably good research to be scrutinised in a way that it wouldn't have been normally [Jarunasax](#) ([talk](#)) 00:49, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep** - this article predates the current nonsense regarding Obama's reelection slogan and, if not for that slogan, would have continued to be a non-controversial article. The first reference in the article - [\[4\]](#) - is an external source (again, predating Obama's slogan)

that addresses the topic of "Forward" as a publication, so this article isn't any kind of original research or novel synthesis of unrelated topics. There is no policy reason to delete this article - only a political one. --[B](#) ([talk](#)) 23:01, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep** - There is no mention of Obama in this posting and therefore the request for deletion is itself politically motivated. You cannot delete history simply because it is not politically convenient. 23:28, 2 May 2012 (UTC) — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [BeReasonableNReal](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#))

— [BeReasonableNReal](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

Keep it.....If you delete in light of obummers planned use of the work, there will be no use for your service or website — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.151.171.104](#) ([talk](#)) 23:35, 2 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Shifting from no vote to keep** - My reasoning is that if there is a choice between abandoning this knowledge or keeping it (i.e. if moving it is for some reason not an option), then I feel it is more relevant to have it. Thus, I'm going to make a case. With regards to claims of synthesis, the sources directly state this relation, it is not an editor point of view. The sources state flat out that "vorwärts" as well as some other phrases held a specific meaning during a certain period of time. If the sources are not suspect, the statements are well sourced. Whether there is too fine a point on it, if it's taking a small historical fact out of context within a greater narrative, that's something else. Some people are arguing that and that discussion may be fruitful in some ways, some arguments made about 'holes' in the coverage make sense to me. However, I disagree with the synth argument for the same reason I disagree with the 'attack piece' argument. If it's being used as an attack, it's because others are taking a small piece of information as proof of something well out of the scope of its intent. It's not because the contents of the article (vandalism aside) are not true. The only thing I am curious about is why the name isn't "Vorwärts (generic name of socialist publications)", as that seems to be the original name from which other publications (Avante!, Új Előre) seem to draw. A small point, but something for consideration in case there isn't an obvious reason I missed! [68.229.93.129](#) ([talk](#)) 00:21, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Keep** - the nominators rationale is flawed on all points. It is not "Patent Nonsense", it is very understandable prose. Patent nonsense refers to "incoherent text or gibberish with no meaningful content or history". This is coherent text, not gibberish and has referenced history. While it may, of late, be the target of some partisan editing, it is not being used as a "blatant political attack". The article existed long before the Obama campaign announced (I would speculate even came up with) their new campaign slogan. The article may have been edited by a compromised account recently, but we are not being "gamed" by one. The article was created by a respectable editor and other respectable editors have contributed to it. Only recently have questionable edits joined the fray. There are many more sources than the two mentioned and many more appear available. Did the nominator follow [WP:BEFORE](#)? [WTucker](#) ([talk](#)) 00:33, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Shift to Keep** since the original connection to this was by connecting it with the Obama slogan and citing is a socialist ideal, it made the topic and its vague connections tenuous at best. With the current new inclusions [Forward](#) and revisions [Forward \(Obama-](#)

[Biden Campaign Slogan](#)) then the connection has become insignificant, The snub needs more research and connections, but that does not call for a grounds for deletion anymore.[Jarunasax \(talk\)](#) 00:58, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Delete.** Setting aside its disreputable origin, this article in its cleaned up version appears to be [WP:SYN](#). There is a high bar here before writing articles where the subject is an exposition on words and language, as Wikipedia is an encyclopedia on things, not an essay on etymology. We have rules discouraging dictionary definitions, articles about neologisms, euphemisms, and so on. Only rarely does a turn of phrase cross the line where it is actually a distinct subject. Thus we don't have articles about [The Bee's Knees](#), [half dozen](#), [Involuntary termination](#)), and so on. If naming socialist magazines "forward" is a cultural trend, so what? There's another cultural tendency to name news magazines the "gazette" or "inquirer" or "post", one to use archaic spellings and words to name semi-upscale housing projects (steppes, fronte), and one to name mass market passenger vehicles after cosmic phenomena or wild animals. Observations on those tendencies are essay-like, and are not treatments of specific subject matter appropriate to an encyclopedia. Anyway, there are no sources that tie this all together as a subject on its own. So far all the sources just address the distinct examples, and the article makes a somewhat arbitrary grouping / list of them all. - [Wikidemon \(talk\)](#) 01:24, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
 - It really isn't a synthesis. If the article was original in its observation that "Forward" is a common name for leftist periodicals, then you would be correct. But that is not a novel interpretation. This [1998 book](#) talks about it (long before current events made it an issue). In light of the Obama's campaign choosing it as a slogan, numerous publications, such as [this US News piece](#) have pointed out the connection. The point of WP:SYN is that Wikipedia articles should not pull together pieces of information and form a novel conclusion that nobody else has formed. But that's not what this article does - very clearly other people outside of Wikipedia have come to the conclusion that "Forward" is often used as a name for left-wing publications. --[B \(talk\)](#) 02:13, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
 - The first source you mention is in the context of analyzing the political attack on Obama for using the term, not that bona fide uses of the term as communist slogan is a subject in itself. The second is a footnote on page 246 of a book on communism in Syria and Lebanon, again, hardly indicative that this is a subject distinct from others. - [Wikidemon \(talk\)](#) 17:17, 4 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Keep.** The article is factual and therefore the "patent nonsense" cause for deletion is invalid. There appear to be sources and at least one specimen image supporting the assertions. The claim that that the article was created to make [Obama](#) look bad because *FORWARD* was made his 2012 campaign slogan in mid-2012 seems unsupported by actual fact: The article was created in early 2011! Rather, it seems that nominating to delete is being done to hide something which now (at least to right-wingers and those opposed to social progress) reflects poorly on the President. **The nomination for deletion does not pass the POV smell-test.** I'm a known Obama supporter, but I can't stomach deleting referenced content for political reasons. Once we open *that* door, of course the [Rush Limbaugh](#) zombies out there will have a field day doing it right back to

us. What *should* change though is the title's foolish add-on. I mean "Forward (**generic name of socialist publications**)"? WTF? **That** is POV too. Change it to **Forward (slogan)** or **Forward (political publications)** or some such and keep the article. Put protection on it in such a way that [Dittoheads](#) can't make the title blatantly political again. [Cramyourspam \(talk\)](#) 02:25, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Delete** – Useless POV fork of a perfectly good disambig. Fails [WP:GNG](#) on its own: a [single footnote](#) from a 280 page book, and a laundry list of examples not referring to the concept? Really? [JFHJr \(注\)](#) 02:51, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete** - Is there even a single "keep" editor that isn't one of those [sockpuppets created for the sole purpose of rigging AfD](#)s? Or else doing [things like this](#)? The overwhelming consensus once the sockpuppets and Boortz meatpuppets are removed is DELETE.

Comment - um. well, I'M no sockpuppet. thank you. [Cramyourspam \(talk\)](#) 16:06, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Ok, you're ONE. Meanwhile, [right behind you in the history...](#) Someone out there is really good at making brand new throwaway accounts, and they're obviously organized enough to actually make accounts rather than simply making IP edits. Off-wiki canvassing of meatpuppets, sockpuppets, makes no difference, the consensus absent the socks is clearly delete. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.196.233.155 \(talk\)](#) 16:18, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Additionally - If we DO keep this one, can we write a "Tribune (generic name of capitalist publications)" article too? How about a "Times (generic name of jingoistic publications)" article? Those are just as "valid" in an absurd way as this joke of an article is. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.196.233.155 \(talk\)](#) 03:30, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
Note: This debate has been included in the Article Rescue Squadron's [list of content for rescue consideration](#). [Northamerica1000\(talk\)](#) 03:39, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Delete:** Bad-faith sneaky political tactic by tea party yahoos, complete with off-wiki canvassing. [Dominus Vobisdu \(talk\)](#) 06:14, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Comment This article existed for over a year. Anyone thinking that this article was used as an attack against a politician probably should read the citations. Quoted from "Not one man! Not one penny! German social democracy, 1863-1914"... "For example, [language] was an important factor in distinguishing the supporters of German social democracy from other Germans. Four particular words - vorwärts, Arbeiter, Genosse, and frei - took on distinctive connotations that made them special if not exclusive property of the social democratic movement in the years before the First World War".

Keep in mind, this snippet of knowledge makes no claim as to 'forward' proving President Barack Obama is a socialist, nor does it seem to use socialist as a pejorative, nor does it make reference to forward as it is understood in modern times. Only during a certain time in history. Regardless of how foolish it is to use it as an attack against the president, that does not have anything to do with the merits of this article. To say it is an unnecessary redirect or for similar reasons is one thing, but to discount it as a 'tea party yahoo' tactic is not thinking critically. It is a small fact being used to fabricate against someone, no different than any other political cheap shot. It does not mean the small fact isn't true, only that it is not at all related in the way they'd like you to think it is. [68.229.93.129 \(talk\)](#) 08:29, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Countercomment This article's existence is a joke. Should we start writing up similar articles for other common newspaper words? I'm thinking [Times \(generic name of jingoistic publications\)](#), [Tribune \(generic name of capitalist publications\)](#), [Sun \(generic name of Canadian publications\)](#)... they're just as valid and just as absurd as this "article" is. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.196.233.155 \(talk\)](#) 12:59, 3 May 2012 (UTC) If you have several sources, as this article does, stating that 'Times', 'Tribune', and 'Sun' were used in the 1850 to 1910 period as specifically having a connotation affiliating them with jingoistic, capitalist, and Canadian publications (or singing clubs) then yes, they would be valid, and not absurd. I would also like to know, do you still feel this article is created in bad faith by political opponents of the President of the United States? That was the whole of your original argument for deletion. [68.229.93.129 \(talk\)](#) 13:35, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

"My" original argument for deletion? Maybe you're new here (actually, looking at your edit list, you're just a sockpuppet from the Neal Boortz crowd, but what the hell I can humor the uneducated dolt squad for a moment). The circumstances of the original writeup for deletion are immaterial to me. I can see that at the time, you and your fellow vandals were rampantly inserting all sorts of garbage about the Obama campaign - hell, you actually created [your very own POV fork as well](#) to continue that kind of slander. Even without that, however, the article is LAUGHABLE. It's the worst kind of [WP:OR](#), [WP:SYNTH](#) garbage crafted from one-off sentences here and there in papers unrelated to the premise of the article itself. It's the metaphorical equivalent of having articles on arithmetic that derive not from scholarly papers and textbooks but from [Inchworm \(song\)](#) or a [Speak & Spell \(toy\)](#), or articles on political theory that derive from the insane rantings of a fat drug addict with a noontime radio show. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.196.233.155 \(talk\)](#) 13:45, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

I came here by way of the Rachel Maddow show, actually. I didn't create a POV fork, whoever that was, please check the IP, I didn't create any articles. I want you to invite for consideration, for example, your own edit history. Shall we then draw from it that you're a sock puppet for Neal Boortz? But yes, "Your" original argument for deletion. You didn't respond to it yet, you proposed delete and your argument was "Bad-faith sneaky political tactic by tea party yahoos". I responded by stating that this article existed before it was used as an inane attempt to slander President Obama, and I'm asking if you've refactored your position on that. I have a feeling that I cannot convince you I don't have some nefarious goal. However with regards to it being garbage from one off sentences...those sentences are direct published statements which support the article text. That is not synthesis, if the sources are suspect, then something can be said. But this is not fabricated. I came here for a grin myself, but I never assumed it to be a crafted article, I just wanted to see what straws were being grasped at. The only thing that amazes me is how people seem to be going out of their way to prove claims that there is a rabid push to censor 'the truth about Obama'. Notability is something I expected to hear argued, small articles always get tough scrutiny, but your arguments don't seem reasoned. I invite you may be exhibiting some small signs of a battleground mentality.[68.229.93.129 \(talk\)](#) 14:13, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

In Sequence: [state of the article November 2011](#). Raw stub, not even that, based on ONE "article", and that a throwaway with no references in the "notes" section. In short, worthless and not even [WP:RS](#) material. Apparently created SOLELY to place a POV-

laden disambiguation template on [The Forward](#) rather than linking to [the real disambiguation page](#).

Now on to the very next edit: [the vandalism begins](#). And then someone [resurrects a submarine sockpuppet](#) to hide their IP. Followed by attempted PROD, followed by Nintendude64's showing up and insisting it had to be in AfD because it would be "controversial", followed by more sockpuppetry at which point we can note that [User:Nintendude](#) pulled sockpuppetry in AfD's before too and was banned for it. At the time of removal of Spazato's edit, that literally removed half the content of the article, barely qualifying as a stub.

And as for the rest, I've responded to you below with specifics. It's up to you to actually discuss. What incident put a spotlight on this article and got eyes on it is immaterial to the discussion; the fact that it is poorly written, unencyclopedic [WP:OR/WP:SYNTH](#) garbage that needs deletion is incontrovertible. We can protect vandalism-target articles, but there is no sense in protecting vandalism-target [WP:POVFORK](#) stubs that don't have an ounce of encyclopedic material and that were designed for template abuse anyways.

- **Strong Keep.** Nobody would have even thought of suggesting this be deleted if it weren't for the Washington Times piece and subsequent brouhaha. People using existing Wikipedia content in ways you don't like isn't a valid criterion for deleting that content. Bad edits/vandalism may be a reason to consider semiprotection or such but aren't a valid reason to delete an article. Half of those arguing for delete seem, like Dominus Vobisdu, to conveniently ignore the fact that the article has been around for a year and a half and could not have been written in response to Obama's new slogan; the rest of them have very shaky arguments ("patent nonsense"? SYN? come on, don't be ridiculous). In reference to Cramyourspam's comment: I think the parenthetical part of the title isn't POV but just a very awkward way of trying to specify what the article's about. It's far enough from typical Wikipedia article title conventions to be a distraction and a problem; some kind of rename really would be helpful. (political publication) doesn't seem to me to quite hit the nail on the head but it's a solid improvement on what we have. BDD suggested (socialism) above. [Prodicus \(talk\)](#) 06:30, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete** Individual publications may very well be notable, but there is clearly no case for the notability of the general concept of socialist publications named forward outside of absurd POV pushing.--[Yaksar \(let's chat\)](#) 06:31, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong Delete** This pretty much started out as a right wing smear attack on President Obama's re-election campaign. The only interesting part about it is that on the one hand the right wingers associate the word with Communists/Socialists but on the other hand associate it with Nazism. Per Taksar, this pretty much seems like blatant POV pushing and attack piece, not an encyclopedia article. [74.79.34.29 \(talk\)](#) 10:55, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **STRONG KEEP** All of the statements in the article appear to be true. It is up to the individual readers to determine whether there is/is not a relationship between the individual segments of the article. In many languages, a given word can/will have different meanings. In a dictionary or encyclopedia, all of those meanings are defined and there are no relational values established between the different meanings. Just because the Obama/Biden campaign adopted the word "forward" as their campaign slogan, does/does not necessarily mean they have socialist leanings. The article is true and was

written long before the word was adopted by their political campaign. If you like, remove the reference to the Obama campaign but leave the rest intact. Just FYI, if Wiki starts editing/deleting articles just to keep politicians happy, I will make no further financial donations to Wiki. M.T.V, OKC, OK> — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [68.225.167.240](#) ([talk](#)) 13:15, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

— [68.225.167.240](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic. First of all, I doubt you've ever donated to Wikipedia in your life, so that little [WP:THREAT](#) of yours is irrelevant. Second of all, the existence for a year of a meaningless stub of an article - the motivations for creation of which are dubious at best - for "a year" doesn't mean it isn't a bad article in need of deletion, it just means it didn't get noticed because, at least from the article history, **nobody cared enough to edit it, not even the creator**. Third of all, there's an incredible amount of [WP:OR](#) and [WP:SYNTH](#) going on in the "sourcing" of the article even now, which makes the whole thing illegitimate. The circumstances of the article getting noticed are immaterial, what matters is that it's a badly written pile of [WP:SYNTH](#) that inarguably qualifies for deletion. That is an argument that can be taken seriously, but you didn't offer your evidence for consideration. What do you claim to be original research or synthesis? With that in discussion there's something to consider beyond accusations and political drama. The most compelling arguments before that have been more in the weeds, the nature of it as a redirect, etc. I'm really not experienced enough to judge on that. If this articles sourcing, claims or conclusions are in question, however, I think it would really advance the discussion. [68.229.93.129](#) ([talk](#)) 13:48, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

STRONG KEEP. Actually, I have (donated). Several times. Wont anymore, do as you like. You remind me of a college professor that has four PHD's, but has to get his 10 year old kid to tie his shoes :) — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [68.225.167.240](#) ([talk](#)) 16:41, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

First of all, you should read [WP:OR](#) and [WP:SYNTH](#). If you don't understand them there's no point in continuing this discussion.

Second of all, specific points:

1 - The article was fraudulently used as a "disambiguation" page template on only one other page: [The Forward](#), until corrected yesterday here: [\[5\]](#). Despite "listing" several publications, none of their Wikipedia pages appear to have ever had that same disambiguation template to refer back to this article. That speaks to a desire to place a POV-laden template on the page more than a desire to create a real article. This can be seen as a form of sneaky vandalism, attempting to hide NPOV-violating material within the context of a "procedural" edit.

2 - As stated by others in discussions here and at the article talk page, [WP:SYNTH](#) applies to the article's basic premise. One mention in a few-hundred-page book does not a proper scholarly reference make, particularly when the sentence is more or less a throwaway reference. Included in the list of "socialist publications" on this article at times has been a magazine whose primary purpose was as a review of stage and theater shows. The entire premise of the article rests on a single throwaway line in the "notes" section of [this](#), a completely worthless linkage that would get laughed out of any proper [WP:RS](#) discussion - and even that "notes" section can't decide whether it is talking about "social democrats" or "communists" or "socialists."

2.5 - Some of the "sources" right now are clear jokes - a book on computers, "Microform Review"? A book on the relation of sports games and identity? And "conveniently", the pages they claim to reference are never available for a quick check. I submit that this is actually worse than [WP:SYNTH](#), this is clear and obvious reference-padding designed to fool gullible people who won't bother to check the sources.

3 - When the proper disambiguation page reference [Forward#Publications](#) was filled out, the focus of the vandalism behavior shifted, with people from the Neal Boortz vandalism squad creating brand new accounts (presumably to hide their IP addresses as they were catching on to how quickly IP vandalism is detected and removed) trying to constantly re-edit that page. Eventually it was locked down for semiprotection, but the record shows it took a while to clean up the damage since one of them managed to slip in a changed reference to "Socialist Publications" instead of just "Publications."

Do you start to get the picture now? — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [98.196.233.155](#) ([talk](#)) 14:16, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

As to 1, i'm not going to get into the weeds about the exacts of a disambiguation page, as I said in my original argument if it has to be moved, let it be moved, my concern is the sourced nature of the claims. Which brings me to 2, you claim microform review, why not look to the other source that you can read directly? [This](#) is a source for the same statement. As to what you presume is a book on sports games, let me invite this piece of the book summary: "This book presents the first critically edited collection of Henning Eichberg's seven provocative essays into "body culture". Eichberg, a well-known scholar in continental Europe who draws upon the ideas of Elias, Foucault, Habermas and others, is now attracting considerable interest from sociologists, historians and geographers." With regards to social democrats and your perceived confusion, it made sense to me upon reading. Now, if you are saying that people have come to this page via pundit urgings or statements and caused trouble, I can concur with that. That, however, is not a good reason to delete, the wikipedia process is good at restoring stability, there's no need to be cowed by troublemakers. Also, using four tilde's allows you to sign your name, so that you know! [68.229.93.129](#) ([talk](#)) 14:47, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Regarding the tilde's - I know. I choose not to. Haven't signed since 2005, not going to start now, not going to give in to the "everybody must be registered" crowd either, fuck 'em.

As to Eichberg's book - READ some of it. It is a book about the impact of sporting teams (soccer, hockey, etc) and leagues on culture. The page they claim to quote from is unavailable by google review, and the pages that ARE visible have nothing to do with socialism, communism, or anything else of the sort.

The book you linked makes a far better justification for an article such as [Common Nomenclature of Socialist Publications and Organizations](#) than anything so specific as the current article. Again, [WP:SYNTH](#) in action - you're cherry picking in order to reach the conclusion of justifying the article, and cherry picking poorly at that.

- **Comment** Articles in *not* patent nonsense, hence does not fall under [WP:CSD#G1](#) [71.175.53.239](#) ([talk](#)) 14:04, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Keep: The article was created well over a year before this so called "political attack". — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [129.2.129.150](#) ([talk](#)) 14:06, 3 May 2012 (UTC) Keep. "How

many fingers am I holding up?" "I'm not sure..." "That's better." George Orwell, 1984. The movie is available on Netflix. BW. Norman, Oklahoma. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [166.249.208.120](#) ([talk](#)) 15:23, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep, rename with a more generic (politics)** - It clearly is not nonsense nor is it a political attack as the original posting claims. The outrage that people are feeling is due to narrow-minded [recentism](#). The whole idea of 'socialist' being an attack or an insult is due to recentism as well. It might be good for this to be merged with Forward, so that you don't have a disambiguation page going to another disambiguation page, but then there'd be nowhere to put that two paragraphs worth (probably should be expanded on) of information regarding the historic usage of the word. It'd probably be better to rename it to "Forward (politics)" which is more generic than "Forward (generic name of socialist publications)". [Atari2600tim](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) 15:30, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
 - **Endorse.** I also agree that the title name is rather unwieldy. Renaming the article to something like [Forward \(politics\)](#) may be more appropriate and intuitive. With a more generic article name, the scope doesn't need to be as narrow either if editors choose to expand. --[NINTENDU64](#) 16:35, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

[WP:DNFTT](#)

If the article is over a year old, then how is this political shananigans? Don't let politics in here, if the president choose a slogan that happens to mesh with something from the past, that should not affect whether or not this article is on here. If there is verifiably false data, that should be adjusted or removed, but to throw out the whole thing flies in the face of the purpose of this site. [Peterwesson](#) ([talk](#)) 16:07, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

If the article was accurate before the Obama campaign adopted it then it is still accurate. Keep it and lock it down to prevent politicising it. Deleting it would actually BE a political act by Wikipedia; freezing it would not. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [GaJoe1950](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) 17:04, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

— [GaJoe1950](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) has made [few or no other edits](#) outside this topic.

- **Obvious keep.** The article has existed for over a year, and its creation cannot be attributed to an event that had not yet happened. #1: The article does not remotely meet G1. #2/3: That articles are being used for attacks is not a reason to delete them, that's a reason to protect them and/or hand out blocks. #4/5: As far as sources go, the article is pretty well-sourced. The nominator was clearly throwing out a bunch of reasons to see if any stick. Well, none of them have stuck. --[Chris](#) ([talk](#)) 17:34, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Strong keep.** Meets [notability](#) and [verifiability](#). I agree with [Chris](#): users, not an article, should be punished for bad behavior. And depending on how it's presented, I'm not even sure that a well-sourced mention of Obama's new slogan is bad behavior. The controversy has clearly become notable in itself. [SpectraValor](#) ([talk](#)) 18:21, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep'**. Neither is this article nonsense nor are spurious personal attacks a reason to delete an article that has been in existence for more than a year. [Chris](#) has said it all. [De728631 \(talk\)](#) 18:39, 3 May 2012 (UTC)

Random section break 2

- **Fix, protect and rename:** to something on the lines of [Forward \(socialism\)](#) or [Forward \(publication\)](#). The article is being misused at present, so it needs to be protected from the canvassed right-wing "Obama is a socialist" claptrap and fixed so said claptrap isn't in the article [pbp](#) 19:19, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
 - I notice none of the things I enboldened are keep or delete, so my opinion, due to what Prioryman notes, is now **weak delete**. [pbp](#) 20:45, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete.** This article reminds me very much of one that featured in a previous deletion discussion, [Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Allegations of Chinese apartheid](#), and I highly recommend that the closure statement in that AfD should be read by participants in this one. The fundamental problem is that the article is a [WP:SYNTH](#). There is little or no connection between the disparate publications of the same or similar name other than similar ideological outlooks. As far as I can see, there don't seem to be any publications that cover the issue of "Forwards" as a "generic name of socialist publications". It is an artificial, invented topic cobbled together from a mass of disparate sources. Individual publications such as [Vorwärts!](#) [are](#) notable and are already covered in their own articles, but the general concept does not seem to be notable nor the subject of specific coverage. The artificiality of the topic can be illustrated by the concept of an article called [Times \(generic name of conservative publications\)](#) linking the Times of London with various other conservative-aligned newspapers of the same or similar names. Nobody would accept that as a legitimate topic, nor should we accept this. [Prioryman \(talk\)](#) 20:18, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Weak Delete.** Nothing to do with current politics. I just don't see that this article covers anything beyond what is already listed under the "publications" heading on the "Forward" disambiguation page. [TCSaint \(talk\)](#) 21:25, 3 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Delete.** We have the dab [Forward](#). There's no use writing about this topic "generically". [Choyooʻijhi:Seb az86556](#) ^{>hane'} 00:46, 4 May 2012 (UTC)
- **Comment** – Per an excerpt from the book: Ismael, Tareq Y., and Ismael, Jacqueline S. [The Communist Movement in Syria and Lebanon](#). Gainesville [u.a.]: University Press of Florida, 1998. p. 246,

“ Ila al-Amam means forward, and the word has significance in communist jargon. The word "forward" was commonly used by the socialists, communists and other radical leftists as a title for their numerous journals and publications. Lenin himself, after his resignation from the editorial board of the organ of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party *Iskra* (The Spark), caused by his quarrel with the Mensheviks and Plechanov, published a new weekly, *Vperyod* ("Forward" in Russian) during the period of 4 January to 18 May 1905. ”

There's more to read here, but the topic has received significant coverage beyond a passing mention in this reliable tertiary source. As such, specific coverage about this specific topic *has* been published. The information in this source contradicts the delete votes in this discussion that are based upon statements of the article/topic supposedly being "patent nonsense", "original research", and others. [Northamerica1000](#)^(talk) 03:19, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Comment** – A footnote in a 280 page work constitutes substantial coverage of the topic? Even if this were possible, there are no multiple sources substantially treating the topic. [JFHJr](#) ([@](#)) 03:27, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

Update to comment – Here's another source. This one is comprised of significant coverage: Morton, Victor (April 30, 2012). "[New Obama slogan has long ties to Marxism, socialism](#)". *Washington Times*. Retrieved May 02, 2012.. [Northamerica1000](#)^(talk) 03:36, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Keep** – The topic meets Wikipedia's [General notability guideline](#) per:
 - Morton, Victor (April 30, 2012). "[New Obama slogan has long ties to Marxism, socialism](#)". *Washington Times*. Retrieved May 02, 2012.
 - Galupo, Scott (May 2, 2012). "[What Barack Obama's 'Forward' Slogan Really Means](#)". *U.S. News & World Report*. Retrieved May 2, 2012. (A valid [WP:NEWSBLOG](#) source)
 - Ismael, Tareq Y., and Ismael, Jacqueline S. *[The Communist Movement in Syria and Lebanon](#)*. Gainesville [u.a.]: University Press of Florida, 1998. p. 246

— [Northamerica1000](#)^(talk) 03:48, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

There's too much connecting the dots in those, and some of them appear to be op-eds in partisan publications [pbp](#) 18:40, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

No self-respecting journalist or analyst worth their weight in salt is going to dare make the connection between a campaign slogan and a socialist tenet.--[WaltCip](#) ([talk](#)) 18:42, 4 May 2012 (UTC)

- **Misplaced !vote:** *The following text was found at [WP:DRV](#) and has been moved here by [JJB](#) 21:26, 6 May 2012 (UTC), who cites [WP:TLDR](#) and has no opinion on the matter:*

Regarding the article on your website regarding "Forward (generic name of socialist publications)," I resent that you delete an article because it makes the president, whom you are biased about, look bad. He is the one who chose "forward" as his campaign slogan, not you. It's his responsibility to choose whether a slogan is bad for him, NOT YOU. In your business, you cannot afford to be biased or endorse a candidate. Taking down the truth to make Obama or anyone else look better in a factual truth is biased and you are guilty of it. The communist Marxist Nazi's did use this, and Obama chose this because of his agenda. It is NOT your job to cover for him, or his regime, and it is not your job to knock down truths and get them out of the way for his benefit. What kind of factual site are you? One that eliminates the truth and takes it off the site to cover for anyone who threatens and bribes is outrageous. You are no longer a

reputable site, and I for one, will not go to this site again. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [70.145.249.31](#) ([talk](#)) 20:49, 6 May 2012 (UTC)

Jeez. This is the English language version of WP. I'm sorry, but much of the English-speaking world could care less about US politics - except of course in so far as, well you know, all that stuff about.... Clearly the term "forward" has a particular historical use and the article in question should not be deleted. [Mfhiller](#) ([talk](#)) 07:11, 7 May 2012 (UTC)mfhiller

- **Delete** as [WP:SYNTHy](#) POV-fork of disambiguation. ~~ [Lothar von Richthofen](#) ([talk](#)) 05:07, 8 May 2012 (UTC)

Retrieved from

["http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Forward_\(generic_name_of_socialist_publications\)&oldid=491330144"](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Forward_(generic_name_of_socialist_publications)&oldid=491330144)

- This page was last modified on 8 May 2012 at 06:47.
- 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.