

# Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Erika Grey

*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** per consensus of opinion that this person's body of work doesn't meet notability criteria and that mention of her in Reliable Sources lacks significant coverage, being related only to a single event. — CactusWriter <sup>(talk)</sup> 19:25, 24 March 2017 (UTC)

## 0.1 Erika Grey

Erika Grey (edit | talk | history | protect | delete | links | watch | logs | views) – (View log · Stats)  
(Find sources: “Erika Grey” – news · newspapers · books · scholar · HighBeam · JSTOR · free images · free news sources · The Wikipedia Library · NYT · WP reference)

The bulk of the references are actually just author bios on various websites. The publisher “pedante press” appears to only publish Grey's book making them self-published and not inherently notable. Justeditingtoday (talk) 22:34, 26 February 2017 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the list of Authors-related deletion discussions. Shawn in Montreal (talk) 23:38, 26 February 2017 (UTC)

Note: This debate has been included in the list of Christianity-related deletion discussions. Shawn in Montreal (talk) 23:38, 26 February 2017 (UTC)

- **Comment:** called a "Bible-prophecy expert" by the *New Yorker*. StAnselm (talk) 23:54, 26 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Keep** per prophecy expertise noted in reliable sources. StAnselm (talk) 05:49, 27 February 2017 (UTC)
  - Those 2 mentions are in WP:RS, The New Yorker and the Christian Post. Both are more than the usual quote-from-an-expert-on, albeit neither is extensive.E.M.Gregory (talk) 17:32, 27 February 2017 (UTC)

- Sources: Here is the *Courier Times of Roxboro, North Carolina* (dunno where Grey lives and if this is local or not,) covering a new book of here . **Note** that it is published by “PeDante Press”, which appears as though it may be self-published, at least, all books listed on Amazon.com as published by PeDante are by Erika Grey , and “Pedante Press” doesn't google well .E.M.Gregory (talk) 17:32, 27 February 2017 (UTC)

- Grey's 2013 book *The Empire: Bible Prophecy and the European Union* is published by a vanity press, Next Century Publishing. My gNews search found no mentions of this book. Nor do I find books under he name by searching the catalogue of a major library.E.M.Gregory (talk) 17:46, 27 February 2017 (UTC)

- Odd, E.M.Gregory (talk) - I clicked your link, and I found her book mentioned. Maybe click it again? Click the “The+Empire%3A+Bible+Prophecy+and+the+European+U&oe=utf-8 All results link. Try that: it shows Grey's book. OK, I can't get the 'All results' link to work: try this. Click *your* link: gNews search and then click the 'All results' link at the bottom: that shows her book (whereas 1st glance did not).96.59.153.17 (talk) 03:31, 9 March 2017 (UTC)

- The link in my comment above is a gNews search. It “found no mentions of this book” in any secondary sources. It did produce 1 hit, to an online bookseller. 96.59.153.17, what is needed are WP:RS

that discuss & describe the book. things like book reviews. E.M. Gregory (talk) 09:52, 9 March 2017 (UTC)

- I'm not an expert in this gNews search of which you speak, but here, let me tell you what I did. I clicked the little "7" link above, and got one "hit," but below it, there was a blue-clickable-link that said "All results for "The Empire: Bible Prophecy and the ... »," and I clicked it. I got both Barnes & Noble and also Kobo and also some book-seller in a foreign language and also something ending in "dot UK and also "The+Empire:+Bible+Prophecy+and+the+European+Union" a Google books hit and also some alternative website, maybe hers?? and even a

page off her official namesake website, as well as something in Ireland here, and also one of our mirrors, plus also a big headache! Then, if I click the blue-link below *that* which says: "repeat the search with the omitted results included," I get like "About 335 results (0.59 seconds)," And a bigger headache! Let's see *you* write a book that gets so many hits! OK, let's do an experiment: **HERE** is a book by a friend, ok? Now, if you put "Blind Chance or Intelligent Design?: Empirical Methodologies and the Bible" (the title to that) into Google.com, like *you* did, you get NO hits! So, Grey must be notable after all. We all should be

<http://www.google.com/search?q=The+Empire:+Bible+Prophecy+and+the+European+Union&source=bl&ots=nSFRvHUfVg&sig=qKr09yJQ>



gets around. When you can get on C2C-AM, and get on all these shows, you can speak from experience. Me and you, we just dream of stuff like that. **Addendum:** This blog, and this online paper and this book website, and even this page at Right Wing Watch. 96.59.153.17 (talk) 21:32, 8 March 2017 (UTC)

Calling the *New Yorker* an “NN publication” seems a bit over the top. **StAnselm** (talk) 22:53, 8 March 2017 (UTC)

I would agree, **StAnselm** (talk), but calling ALL of these in sum-total to be 'no name' publications is even worse: Sure, some are less worthy news sources than others, but the “lesser” news sources do nothing but ADD to the cake. The cake is there, and if there *are* some so-called 'no name publications,' they are merely icing on the cake: The cake is quite solid.96.59.153.17 (talk) 02:25, 9 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Sources'**

User:

**StAnselm**, I did find that first source in one of my searches,

Ca-naryCryRacio [] Is self-describes as a podcast, a sort of audio blog. It didn't look like a meaningful secondary source.

Was I wrong?E.M.Gregory (talk) 10:05, 9 March 2017 (UTC)

- The bill-martine-

zlive.com/show [bill-martine-zlive.com/] hosted by **Bill Martinez** interviewed her. He's got 5,000 followers on twitter and 5,000 on Facebook. Is this enough?E.M.Gregory (talk) 10:05, 9 March 2017 (UTC)

- I don't know what defense St. Anselm might give, but I will point out that after having cleaned up the article (*and, as I said, above,*

no,  
I'm  
not a  
WP:  
SPA:  
I edit  
else-  
where,  
but  
my  
IP  
changes]],  
the  
case  
for  
nota-  
bility  
or  
news-  
wor-  
thi-  
ness  
has  
in-  
creased  
by  
about  
one  
order  
of  
mag-  
ni-  
tude.  
You  
can  
see  
the  
arti-  
cle  
page,  
and  
judge  
for  
your-  
self:  
I  
may  
not  
be  
per-  
fect,  
but  
my  
edits  
are  
all  
made  
in

WP:  
Good  
Faith,  
and,  
on  
bal-  
ance,  
ap-  
par-  
ently  
help-  
ful &  
ac-  
cepted  
by  
oth-  
ers,  
but  
take  
a  
look:  
This  
one  
is  
worth  
saving.<sup>96.59.153.17</sup>  
(talk)  
18:57,  
9  
March  
2017  
(UTC)

- **Keep** A number of others have discovered numerous credible secondary sources citing the woman. I imagine more could be found, but that would require Googling and get me a headache. I'll leave it to the experts to find any more sources, if needed.<sup>47.192.27.215</sup> (talk) 22:07, 8 March 2017 (UTC)— <sup>47.192.27.215</sup> (talk) has made few or no other edits outside this topic. The preceding unsigned comment was added at 10:25, 23 March 2017 (UTC) (UTC).
- **Comment** I just now noticed this: <http://www.erikagrey.com/p/events-radio-tv-conferences.html> her personal page lists her appearances, and while I can't verify the absolute accuracy of them, the few about which I know, on this list, are correct: She is one VERY BUSY person, and is like "Savoir-Faire," she is "everywhere!". This, of course, does not (all by itself) warrant or justify an Encyclopedia entry, but it sure doesn't hurt. Also, I would add that while she is probably only in some "professional organization" directories or "religious" encyclopedias (and hinted by her copious & ubiquitous presence on their online counterparts), her possible absence in a "regular" encyclopedia (say: Britannica as but one example) is not necessary fatal to her entry here: Times are

a changing, and so we must change with them: An online encyclopedia e.g., [Wikipedia](#) is (or should be) more inclusive than one you might find in your local public library. So, based on these factors, she seems appropriate here (even if, I admit, not as 'notable' as, say, Dr. Billy Graham).([Google lookup on phrase above and related video - funny!](#). My 0.02 worth.[96.59.160.94 \(talk\)](#) 13:37, 10 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Comment** -- There are about as many interpreters of Biblical eschatology as commentators. If PeDante Press really publishes nothing but her work, it is self-published (or effectively so), in which case the article should be treated as a mere ADVERT and deleted. Her two books on beating addiction are both published in the same year, which also does not inspire confidence. [Peterkingiron \(talk\)](#) 19:50, 12 March 2017 (UTC)

- OK, you raise some good points. I did not know about this aspect of her publishing, but I did a little research and find that [NOVEL RANK](#) lists only one book as having been published by them: "The Seat of the Antichrist." However, [AMAZON](#) at [this link](#) shows a *bunch* of books, all by her as an author, but **every single** book in this list has a co-author other than Grey: "by Erika Grey and Lawrence D Palmer" are the authors for one book and "Erika Grey and Lia Frederick" for the rest. The very fact that Amazon lists more than Novel-Rank suggests to me that these rankers are not exactly comprehensive. (But I would not imagine much would get past [Amazon.com](#). Her authorship, if it were the only thing, might be suspect if she was self-published and didn't sell a lot. But many others think she is an expert, so the book issue is icing on the cake, and not the cake itself. Now, <http://www.erikagrey.com/p/events-radio-tv-conferences.html> lists her schedule. As I said before, I can not vouch for the accuracy of her list, but in several cases, I did some checking, and all the entries I checked were actual cases where she was a guest. The fact that she is a guest on a regular basis (and not as a "one-time" thing), indicates that many others objectively consider her some sort of expert. Myself, as smart as I am, still, by contrast, I'm very lucky to get ONE letter to the editor, or in rare occasion, a guest column, published. And, I have never been a guest on any program, at least in recent memory. I am lucky to

call in, and this is in spite of my brilliance, the fact *I've* written a book, and also accomplished some very impressive things in the legal field, which was not the degree with which I graduated from college. (It was in other than law; I studied hard biosciences.) So, you see, unless you can put together such a solid record of being cited in top-ranked journals, or put on numerous shows on a regular basis, then I would not stand on equal ground: whether her views are correct or not is not actionable (tho she does seem mostly accurate, at the least). That many others, objectively, think so, when she makes the TV, talk show, or radio show tour on a regular basis, and/or gets cited by credible reliable sources is a valid metric. That she has also books is merely additional, not substantive. (But, ten or so books is still impressive; and I would faint under such a heavy TV talk/radio show, and schedule for conferences, unless I devoted myself singly to that: The sheer volume of her TV/radio/conference appearances indicates that she is no small-potatoes expert, in the objective eyes of numerous news media/conferences/etc. So I scanned a few of her appearances, as I said earlier, and verified as accurate at least those few I checked: I might be stronger, faster, and smarter than Grey in a head-to-head battle, but in her specialty, she is much better than me. Here is evidence (even if not proof) of her notability on this head: others (who invite her [HERE](#) on a regular basis think so). This implies notability.[96.59.183.125 \(talk\)](#) 21:56, 12 March 2017 (UTC)— [96.59.183.125 \(talk\)](#) has made few or no other edits outside this topic. The preceding unsigned comment was added at 10:25, 23 March 2017 (UTC) (UTC).

- **KEEPI** have been one of the early contributors of this article and I believe numerous other people accept her as notable as she is regularly invited on radio talk shows and is listed in a key Evangelical Christian directory in her genre.[32.208.50.163 \(talk\)](#) 22:20, 12 March 2017 (UTC)— [32.208.50.163 \(talk\)](#) has made few or no other edits outside this topic. The preceding unsigned comment was added at 07:57, 12 February 2009 (UTC).[E.M.Gregory \(talk\)](#) 15:00, 13 March 2017 (UTC)

**Relisted to generate a more thorough discussion and clearer consensus.**

Please add new comments below this notice. Thanks, **J947** 18:22, 15 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Comment:** While there is disagreement here, I would point out two things: First, notability is inherent in the WP:RS, not our views of them or the subject of the article. Secondly, a good number of comments, on both sides of the issue, have been discussed on this discussion page (and elsewhere, when you include the talk page, [Talk:Erika\\_Grey](#), individual talk pages, and even in edit comments. One overlooked point was the lack of comparability between a “physical” encyclopedia, with its inherent limitations on space, and an electronic, or online, encyclopedia. I won't reinvent the wheel, but rather refer to the already-robust discussion above, as required reading material for anyone before they aspire to vote. Also, I do find it odd that nothing has been done, even though it has been slightly over a week since the last or most-recent relisting on the [15th.96.59.177.243 \(talk\)](#) 04:59, 23 March 2017 (UTC)— [96.59.177.243 \(talk\)](#) has made few or no other edits outside this topic. The preceding unsigned comment was added at 10:25, 23 March 2017 (UTC) (UTC).

- With all due respect, [User:Winged\\_Blades\\_of\\_Godric](#), that is not entirely correct: I have not only edited recently on other VfD pages such as [Glayton Modise](#) and [The World Tomorrow](#) (radio and television), but I've also edited other articles, such as [Frederick Samuel Modise](#) and the [Bohemian Grove](#) article, so it is not entirely correct to assert that I am a [Wikipedia:Single-purpose account](#), but my IP address is dynamic, and randomly changes because my ISP is a cheap company that does not have static or dedicated IP addresses LOL. Just saying, to correct the record. Nonetheless, I am sure that you acted in [WP:Good Faith](#), [User:Winged\\_Blades\\_of\\_Godric](#). (*Not that a SPA is necessarily always bad, but I just wanted to correct the record.*) [96.59.159.254 \(talk\)](#) 22:17, 23 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Delete** — fails [WP:AUTHOR](#). Coverage in sources is mostly either trivial, incidental, or one-event. Body of work is obviously self-published and not critically cited. Similarly fails [WP:GNG](#) due to lack of extensive, significant coverage. Pretty much at best, as far as attempting to establish expertise, we would have , which is solely due to a single appearance (Coast to Coast AM, a show that basically also gives random appearances to the [Ancient Aliens](#)/tinfoil-hat/pseudoscience crowd) and is probably de facto

a self-published media-release biography. She's admittedly covered in exactly 3 news articles (  and  ) that all popped up at the same time (inauguration), which even more seems to reflect the coverage as, at best, [WP:BIO1E](#) (i.e., “you'll never guess what *some* people are saying about Trump!”). --[slakr](#)<sup>talk</sup> / 07:28, 24 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Delete**, mostly as per [Slakr](#). She's a self-published author who isn't truly recognized as an expert in her field, and who has attracted limited attention from non-notable media appearances. The limited coverage in reliable sources appears to have been around the time of the inauguration and has not continued. [Mackensen \(talk\)](#) 11:26, 24 March 2017 (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.*

# 1 Text and image sources, contributors, and licenses

## 1.1 Text

- **Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Erika Grey** *Source:* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia%3AArticles\\_for\\_deletion/Erika\\_Grey?oldid=772005416](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia%3AArticles_for_deletion/Erika_Grey?oldid=772005416) *Contributors:* Mackensen, Peterkingiron, Slakr, Shawn in Montreal, StAnselm, CactusWriter, Onel5969, Winged Blades of Godric, E.M.Gregory, NukeThePukes, BobLaRouche, J947, Justeditingtoday and Anonymous: 7

## 1.2 Images

- **File:Emblem-WikiVote.svg** *Source:* <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/92/Emblem-WikiVote.svg> *License:* CC BY 3.0 *Contributors:* own work, using Image:Emblem-important-red.svg *Original artist:* G ambrus

## 1.3 Content license

- Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0