

# Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 1

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

< Talk:Melania Trump



This is an **archive** of past discussions. **Do not edit the contents of this page**. If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the current talk page.

Archive 1

Archive 2

## Contents

- 1 Birthdate
- 2 Name
- 3 Notability of trivia & appropriateness of other material in "Melania Trump" article
- 4 New NEWS today, for future editing
- 5 Pronouncing her name
- 6 was her father a member of the Communist Party?
- 7 New NEWS today, for future editing
- 8 Did Melania Trump graduate from the University of Ljubljana?
- 9 Relevance?
- 10 QVC jewelry line and caviar cream
- 11 Languages spoken — add Italian
- 12 German?
- 13 Include Reince Priebus' Quote
- 14 Semi-protected edit request on 19 July 2016
- 15 The Breast Cancer Research Foundation
- 16 Semi-protected edit request on 19 July 2016
- 17 Semi-protected edit request on 20 July 2016
- 18 "This article was proposed for deletion by an editor in the past."
- 19 Why does Wikipedia campaign for the Trumps?
- 20 2016 RNC Speech
- 21 Melania's Speechwriter Apologizes
- 22 Inclusion of the use of the lyrics from "Never Gonna Give You Up"
- 23 Proposed merger of the Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy article to the RNC article
- 24 RNC speech in lead section
- 25 separate article needed on speech?
- 26 Semi-protected edit request on 20 July 2016
- 27 Culpability means "deserving blame"
- 28 Semi-protected edit request on 22 July 2016
- 29 Plagiarism accusation: undue weight
- 30 COPYVIO
- 31 Clarification and balance needed
- 32 University Degree Controversy
  - 32.1 Old BIO stored at archive.org
  - 32.2 RNC biography
- 33 Fashion-designer?
- 34 Melania's website scrubbed
- 35 Can someone check whether Melanjia Knavs gave false testimony during her US Naturalization process?
- 36 Visa history
- 37 "Germanize"?
- 38 New York Post photos
- 39 Knauss or Trump?
- 40 "Nodded in agreement"
- 41 Photographer says she was not paid in 1995. That would mean she wouldn't have been violating a tourist visa--if that's what she had.
- 42 Why is a law firm website an unreliable source?
- 43 On the confirmation of languages spoken
- 44 Webistes archive points out wrong saying about 2012 web site creation on wrong bio
- 45 Testifying about her degree?
- 46 New material: her lawyer threatens to sue

## Birthdate

So was she born in '70 or '74?

Different sources on the net have either one or the other. IMDB.com, for example, shows her year of birth as 1970. Amchow78 00:22, 12 November 2005 (UTC)

Looks like this dispute is over! Her bio on her new official website reveals 1970 as her year of birth!Amchow78 22:54, 13 May 2006 (UTC)

## Name

The article says she anglicized her name to "Knauss", but Knauss is not an Anglo name; it's German/Swedish.

## Notability of trivia & appropriateness of other material in "Melania Trump" article

@Vesuvius Dogg: I grant the validity of your concerns as expressed at my TalkPage on 2015-09-05, where you wrote: "*From WP:BLP: "In the case of public figures, there will be a multitude of reliable published sources, and BLPs should simply document what these sources say. If an allegation or incident is noteworthy, relevant, and well documented, it belongs in the article – even if it is negative and the subject dislikes all mention of it. If you cannot find multiple reliable third-party sources documenting the allegation or incident, leave it out. Professor JR, you have made wholesale deletions from this page, incorrectly concluding that Melania Trump's comments in 1999 to Howard Stern are tabloid-sourced (although Joyce Wadler's interview, which repeated the "not much" quote and elicited Knauss' own response to it, originally appeared in The New York Times, and Bloomberg is anything but a tabloid, although you removed that August 2015 reference entirely). I'm under the impression that any potentially unflattering insights related to Melania Trump and not already echoed on her own promotional website is unsuitable, in your eyes, for inclusion, up to and including the rather benign fact that she is raising her child in both English and Slovenian, and that she has been unavailable for recent interviews but both supports and intends to play a role campaigning for her husband. Believe me, I take WP:BLP seriously, but I feel like you are stripping the article almost to the point of non-utility, deferring to its bare-bones major source, which is Mrs. Trump's own promotional website focussed on her jewelry and caviar cold cream. That's a shame, because there are RS sources to give the article depth and balance, so it reads less like the PR copy which has previously been suggested for deletion. After a partial restoration of some of what you've removed, I'd appreciate moving the discussion to the article's Talk page (if you continue to object to what I've added) so that we can together find consensus.*" Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 12:07, 5 September 2015 (UTC)

Discussion here on the article's TalkPage is a good idea. Perhaps a relevant starting point for a measure of what should and shouldn't appropriately be included in the Melania Trump article (in addition to due consideration of Wikipedia:Trivial mentions and BLP) would be to look at the Wikipedia pages (in some cases non-existent) for the spouses of other current presidential *candidates*: e.g. - Columba Bush, Jane O'Meara Driscoll (Sanders), Frank Fiorina, Katie O'Malley, Ladena Carson, Tonette Tarantino (Walker), Mary Pat Foster (Christie), Janet Huckabee, Libby Pataki, Anita Thigpen Perry, etc. We may want to also take a look at Theresa Heinz as a possible comparable here, as Heinz was both a presidential candidate's spouse, and a business-person and individual of some prominence in her own right.

My concerns with the Melania Trump article, more than with BLP problems, had to do with tabloid sourced gossip sorts of items, and with Wikipedia policies regarding inclusion of non-notable trivia. (Also, the under-age children of political candidates are generally off-limits.) Additionally, Melania Trump -- apart from her public celebrity persona vis-à-vis her previous modeling career, and current jewelry, watch and cosmetics businesses -- is a rather private person, actually somewhat shy. At the very least, Wikipedia owes her modestly equivalent treatment to that accorded other presidential *candidates'* spouses. If she were to become *First Lady*, that's a whole different story (and, of course, Bill Clinton is a whole different story). What are your thoughts? Thanks. --- Professor JR (talk) 18:31, 5 September 2015 (UTC)

@Vesuvius Dogg: Please note that I have added back in the sourced bilingual bit about the Trumps' son, as well as making a few other minor edits to this article, but have left out the nude-photo stuff, etc., as in my opinion it's probably not worthy, and a bit gratuitous, to call attention to it here. See what you think.

--- Professor JR (talk) 10:29, 7 September 2015 (UTC)

@Professor JR: I did add a reference to the "notoriety" of the Howard Stern interview, without elaboration; I also added a line about Trump suggesting the name Barron, as it jibes with what's mentioned in his "Personal Life" section on his own bio, that it's a pseudonym he's used for years; I also cleaned up a bit the footnoting and prose. I probably made it read even more like a PR piece, but can we at least agree these recent changes are non-controversial?

Though I did NOT add it back, I still think it's acceptable to mention their age difference, or ages at the time they were married (my preference), in keeping with contemporary and recent RS sources which have widely reported it. I don't think it's controversial, and while it makes them outliers, as only 1% of marriages have a husband 20 years of more older than a spouse, the fact they've been a couple for 17 years speaks for itself. While I'm not sure Columba Bush is an entirely apt comparison, you did bring her up (above), and you'll see that both her and her husband's age are mentioned b/c they were so youthful. But I'm somewhat resigned on this age issue, as a couple other editors have objected to including it in Trump's own "Personal Life" section. (Oddly, no one seems to have objected to any of my contributions there to the lawsuit and organized crime section, factoids I'd think would be much more objectionable to editors trying to defend Trump's reputation and political viability. So it seems the objection about including their age difference comes genuinely from the conviction that these things SHOULDNT matter. But IMHO that's different from including it, citing reliable sources, because it has been widely reported.)

While I personally think the nude/see-through/no-bra (<http://www.businessinsider.com/meet-melania-trump-the-511-supermodel-married-to-donald-trump-2015-9>) cultural standard is different in the U.S. than in Europe, and it's anyone's guess how a few old modeling pictures of Trump's spouse might become relevant in the election cycle, if at all, let's at least be clear we're talking about something much closer to PG-13 than NSFW, which is why I weigh toward tactful acknowledgment. She's not afraid to show cleavage, and she has spoken publicly (<http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-08-17/vitamins-and-caviar-getting-to-know-melania-trump>) about their sex life. That does set her apart from most political spouses. Censorship itself might lend it undue weight; another editor could insert comment on it later. What I think is of some more immediate biographical relevance is the way they advertised their sexual relationship early on, as couples are wont to do, hence the Howard Stern "notoriety" reference, which I think deserves inclusion. Also a link to the recent Bloomberg profile. Thoughts? Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 13:59, 7 September 2015 (UTC)

I have included material on the Caviar Complex distribution lawsuit, which I suppose was resolved through arbitration. She did prevail in an Indianapolis courtroom and that's worth noting. Oh, and we should probably say somewhere that's she stands 5' 11", as that's contextually relevant to her modeling career. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 20:16, 7 September 2015 (UTC)

@Vesuvius Dogg: All of your recent changes, and the photo-image someone added, look fine to me -- and the article as a whole as it now stands seems to be in pretty good shape, too, barring any future major developments (e.g. - if she starts campaigning in a big way for her husband, or some such, etc.) I did add a few more details on their son, and a quote from Melania about potentially becoming First Lady, as well as some rather insightful *New York Times* quotes regarding the Clintons' attendance at the wedding. --- Professor JR (talk) 08:33, 8 September 2015 (UTC)

@Professor JR: have a look at Melania Trump's profile in today's Washington Post ([http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/meet-melania-trump-a-new-model-for-first-lady/2015/09/30/27ad0a9c-6781-11e5-8325-a42b5a459b1e\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/meet-melania-trump-a-new-model-for-first-lady/2015/09/30/27ad0a9c-6781-11e5-8325-a42b5a459b1e_story.html)). Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 07:22, 1 October 2015 (UTC)

@Professor JR: WaPo gave her birth/family name as 'Knav' without the 's' at the end. I changed it but was quickly reverted; am no expert on Slovenian patronymics but simply assumed WaPo might be right b/c they had found and spoken with one of Melania's childhood friends. Will keep an eye out, but we may need to see the long-form birth certificate Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 15:37, 1 October 2015 (UTC)

Am going back to 'Knavs' per a recent revert comment ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&type=revision&diff=683643395&oldid=683637119](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revision&diff=683643395&oldid=683637119)) by a Slovene speaker, who said is seemed more natural. Also, her Slovene Wikipedia entry has 'Knavs'. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 18:40, 1 October 2015 (UTC)

## New NEWS today, for future editing

Donald Trump is interviewed by HollywoodReporter and is asked about his wife.

Headline-1: **The Donald Trump Conversation: Murdoch, Ailes, NBC and the Rush of Being TV's "Ratings Machine"**

- <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/features/donald-trump-murdoch-ailes-nbc-816131>

QUOTE: *When will you get Melania out there talking about you?* "Pretty soon. She wants to do it. She is a very confident person. You've seen her on The View, and you've seen her on different shows. Larry King. You've seen her being interviewed. She's got a great style, and she would be an amazing first lady with heart." -- AstroU (talk) 05:12, 20 August 2015 (UTC) -- PS: FYI for future editing.

Headline-2: **The Donald Trump Conversation: Murdoch, Ailes, NBC and the Rush of Being TV's "Ratings Machine"**

- <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/features/donald-trump-murdoch-ailes-nbc-816131>

QUOTE: *"What would Melania care about as first lady?"* She would care very much about women's issues. We're talking about mostly medical issues but women's issues. She was very strong on that with me the other day. Ivanka and Melania said, "You're not getting fairly treated on your feeling toward women." My mother was this incredible woman. I have known incredible women. I have many women executives, frankly, that are better than my men executives. I pay them the same or more." -- AstroU (talk) 05:17, 20 August 2015 (UTC) -- PS: FYI for additional future editing.

More news for more future editing (a lot of comments brought out by Barbara Walters. There are pictures and direct quotes in this article/interview.

Headline-3: **Barbara Walters Is Shocked that Melania Trump Is Smart Because She's Also Beautiful**

- [http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2015/11/20/barbara\\_walters\\_is\\_shocked\\_that\\_melania\\_trump\\_is\\_smart\\_because\\_she\\_s\\_also\\_beautiful](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2015/11/20/barbara_walters_is_shocked_that_melania_trump_is_smart_because_she_s_also_beautiful)

QUOTE: "Barbara Walters: ... maybe because she's so beautiful, we don't expect her to be as smart as she is." -- AstroU (talk) 22:15, 21 November 2015 (UTC) -- PS: FYI for future: (a lot of informatin here.)

## Pronouncing her name

Many Wikipedia articles have audio for readers who are interested. Does she (or Donald Trump) say 'Mel-Lawn-ia' or 'Mel-Layne-ia'. Americanized might be 'layne' but the European might be 'lawn' in my lifetime experience. -- Charles Edwin Shipp (talk) 21:12, 17 August 2015 (UTC) -- PS: This would be to improve the article.

Joy Behar pronounced her name "mel-LAWN-ia" in an interview archived on YouTube. CNN also pronounces it that way. Although she has referred to herself to herself since her marriage as Melania Trump (<http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0505/17/lkl.01.html>), her maiden name is pronounced "kuh-NAUS", according to Joyce Wadler's December 1999 profile which originally appeared in the New York Times ([https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=19991202&id=Z\\_1OAAAIAIBAJ&sjid=fRQEAAAIAIBAJ&pg=2818,1649658&hl=en](https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=19991202&id=Z_1OAAAIAIBAJ&sjid=fRQEAAAIAIBAJ&pg=2818,1649658&hl=en)). Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 15:53, 4 September 2015 (UTC)

Thanks. I heard Donald Trump say 'Mel-Lawn-ia'.

Many Wikipedia articles have audio for readers who are interested. -- Charles Edwin Shipp (talk) 08:46, 13 October 2015 (UTC)

✓ **Done** -- So "Mel-Lawn-ia" it is. -- AstroU (talk) 11:18, 24 March 2016 (UTC)

## was her father a member of the Communist Party?

According to people who knew the family, he was (<http://mobile.reuters.com/article/idUSKCN0VL14T>). FYI. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 19:10, 14 February 2016 (UTC)

Wikipedia editors are particularly careful about what they say about living people. Donald J. Trump could take aggressive action for publicity, but instead, his campaign team speaks to this. The article actually says the opposite: "...but Reuters could not independently confirm this. The Trump campaign team offered Reuters a different account of her childhood and career, saying Melania began modelling at the age of five, that her mother was a fashion designer and her father a manager in a car company. **"Her father was never a member of**

**the Communist Party,"** a spokesperson said." -- AstroU (talk) 23:59, 17 February 2016 (UTC) PS: Best to not go down that path. It would rightly be immediatedly reverted!

✔ **Done** -- "So let it be written, so let it be ..." dropped. -- Charles Edwin Shipp (talk) 11:22, 24 March 2016 (UTC)

## New NEWS today, for future editing

Speaking of 'notability', the future First Lady just became more 'notable'. People vote for First Lady, too.

Headline-1: **Things just got ugly: Trump retweets unflattering image of Heidi Cruz compared to Melania before Ted hits back at Donald saying 'real men don't attack women'**

- <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3507259/Things-just-got-ugly-Trump-retweets-unflattering-image-Heidi-Cruz-compared-Melania-Ted-hits-Donald-says-real-men-don-t-attack-women.html>

QUOTE: "Trump retweets unflattering image of Heidi Cruz compared to Melania; Ted hits back at Donald saying 'real men don't attack women' " -- AstroU (talk) 13:17, 25 March 2016 (UTC) -- PS: FYI for future editing. NOTE the very interesting and attractive pictures and a video from Heidi Cruz. Call it "The First Lady Wars". They do this for media attention.

## Did Melania Trump graduate from the University of Ljubljana?

We have conflicting reports about whether Melania Trump actually graduated with a degree from the University of Ljubljana. Does anyone have definite and unequivocal evidence that she does indeed have a degree from said institution and that said degree is in "design and architecture"?

Here are the conflicts:

- from the *Daily Mail* [6] (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3279399/Will-Lady-Melania-Trump-s-extraordinary-journey-card-carrying-Communist-s-daughter-teenage-model-White-House-favorite-s-wife-revealed.html>): "Not long afterwards, **she abandoned the degree**, moving first to Milan where she met New York agent Paolo Zampolli - the matchmaker who introduced her to Trump."
- but CBS News says she does have a degree [7] (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/five-things-to-know-about-melania-trump/>): "She took a break from full-time modeling to attend the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, but then returned to the profession **after completing a degree in architecture and design**. She moved to New York in 1996."

So which one is it? Does she have or not have a degree?

Let's keep the discussion civilized folks.

—Ahnoneemoos (talk) 22:00, 27 March 2016 (UTC)

- Her own website claims she completed a degree in architecture and design "at University in Slovenia"[8] (<http://www.melaniatrump.com/my-world/>). But I know reporters have attempted to verify that university degree, so far without success. Note how slavishly the CBS story follows Wikipedia's facts and formatting. There's no evidence in it of efforts to verify or double-check information; it appears they have taken Melania's claim of a college degree at face value, because she said it on her own website. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 22:51, 27 March 2016 (UTC)
- I included two reliable sources to support the claim that she studied architecture and design at the University of Ljubljana (well, one makes that exact claim, and the other one makes the assertion that she studied at that university without specifying further). It's not a contentious claim and I see no reason to debate the matter further. No claim is being made that she actually graduated. Maybe she studied there for a year, or maybe she graduated. However, we are not detectives; all we can do is provide reliable sources. It's the way Wikipedia works. Besides, it seems highly unlikely that she would make up that story. The university is still there. It would be easy to find out if she never actually enrolled there. If the university does provide proof at some point that she graduated, then we can make that assertion. Dontreader (talk) 01:09, 28 March 2016 (UTC)
  - We gotta be careful when using the verb "studied." Notice how meticulous the authors were in the sources you provided: "the teen went on to study" and "she took up her studies at." That's not what this article said when this concern was brought up. I have rewritten it in a way that is not contentious: "she coursed studies at." —Ahnoneemoos (talk) 01:20, 28 March 2016 (UTC)
    - Okay Ahnoneemoos, but I have a question. My English isn't perfect. Could you please back up your claim that "studying" implies graduation? I looked up the verb "study" here [9] (<http://www.wordreference.com/definition/study>), and this is what we find:

"to take a course of study, as at a college"

"to take a course of study, as at a college."

"to take a course in (a subject), as at a college"

There's even an example on that page: "He's studying at Harvard." So I wonder, if someone is studying at a university, and then does not graduate, does that mean that the person never studied there? That seemingly contradicts the source I provided. Aren't you perhaps implying with the way you phrased the sentence that she never graduated? Because we just don't know.

Another example is The Free Dictionary [10] (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/study>):

"to pursue a course of study: *studied at Yale*. **COMMENT:** to pursue does not mean to graduate.

"(Education) to take a course in (a subject), as at a college". **COMMENT:** again I don't see that this implies graduation.

"to take a course of study, as at a college."

So I don't see what's wrong with the original wording unless you can provide sources that indicate that studying something at a university implies graduation. I think what you wrote implies the opposite, which is why I'm asking you. Thanks. Dontreader (talk) 02:00, 28 March 2016 (UTC)

- It's an idiom in American English. Everything that you linked to shows literal meanings, not idioms. In a typical conversation in American English saying, "I studied at Yale" implies that you obtained a degree from that institution, not that you just "pursued studies" in there. Regardless, we do have a few reliable sources that state that Knauss, "studied design and architecture at the University of Ljubljana" so continuing this discussion is moot. —Ahnoneemoos (talk) 03:32, 28 March 2016 (UTC)
  - Many thanks for the explanation. I lived abroad for 30 years, so I will perhaps forever be unaware of certain details. Anyway, I think I addressed the issues concerning primary sources well enough. Bloomberg seems reliable enough in my opinion (which was already there as an inline citation for the photographers) and I added other really good sources, most of which were already present in the article backing other claims. Thanks again. Dontreader (talk) 03:43, 28 March 2016 (UTC)

Even media in Slovenia have problem with it, for quite a number of years. I read some reports that she attended university for one year, and that there is nothing in the Cobiss data base (thesis should be listed if a person graduated). But how reliable those sources are? So, it seems complicated. Also people who speak Slavic languages as their native language when they say they studied, it doesn't imply graduating, like the American idiom implies, it communicates that one attended university. This can lead to innocent misunderstandings. As M. Trump didn't state when she graduated, and which degree she has, and wikipedia readers should not be required to know American idioms, in general I agree with Ahnoneemoos, further discussion will not bring much. Bialosz (talk) 09:44, 29 March 2016 (UTC)

## Relevance?

Who is this person apart from Donald Trump? Does the person's innate biographical interest rise to the level of entry in an encyclopaedia, or is it just, as it appears, celebrity accessorising? I believe this entry should be stricken. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 99.242.138.173 (talk) 22:47, 14 December 2013 (UTC)

I agree. Apart from some minor modelling, the only details of her life here are about her relationship to Trump, including tabloid style details of her wedding, etc. Ashmoo (talk) 08:19, 16 July 2015 (UTC)

Agree. And the sources, askmen .com? Do we really need to quote such sources here? I don't think we need a separate article on WP, the mention which is already included in Donald Trump article is enough. Bialosz (talk) 04:06, 2 August 2015 (UTC)

Since she might be the the First Lady, it would be wise to wait and see. -- Charles Edwin Shipp (talk) 19:40, 6 August 2015 (UTC) -- The real question is, "Are Wikipedia readers interested in learning about Melania Trump?"

-I- might be the First Lady one day... should I start my wiki biography now and hope for the best? Probably not... and not just because I'm a dude. I agree with striking the article. The world is full of models -and- potential First Ladies. **Erikeltic** (*Talk*) 21:17, 6 August 2015 (UTC)

The “potential First Lady” argument is inappropriate, and she really is famous only because she is married to Trump. But she is kind of famous, so I would say leave the article. If you disagree, then what about all the other Trump’s relatives that have their own Wikipedia articles – would you strike them down also? I would argue that not that many people would know these people, if it were not for Donald Trump. SyaWgnignahCehT (talk) 21:41, 11 August 2015 (UTC)

There has been a lot of WP-editor activity on her page here, but not much TALK. Why is that? And I would say she will rise in prominence (as Donald Trump has stated) as the Trump Campaign picks up momentum. -- Charles Edwin Shipp (talk) 21:10, 1 September 2015 (UTC)

If you go to the Sports Illustrated Swimsuit edition infobox, you'll see almost every model in that edition is important enough for a Wikipedia page. (This is totally not my specialty but somehow I ended up here.) >> M.P.Schneider,LC (parlemus • feci) 05:11, 22 February 2016 (UTC)

Yes, and since the question was raised about deleting this article, she has had more coverage than *most* people with WP articles. Why was the question even raised? -- AstroU (talk) 11:16, 24 March 2016 (UTC)

The question was raised last year, things changed since, and also in WP the quality of sources is also important. When the question was raised there were some articles in gossip magazines, nothing really of quality, so, the comment about "celebrity accessorising" was a fair point. For ex. Ivanka Trump was mentioned by Forbes, big difference, it is a serious source, not a tabloid or men magazine. But since last year Mrs. Trump also got coverage in quality sources, for ex. Washington Post, etc. Bialosz (talk) 09:51, 29 March 2016 (UTC)

## QVC jewelry line and caviar cream

For some reason her commercial ventures have disappeared from the article. Shouldn't they be restored to her career history? Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 15:53, 7 May 2016 (UTC)

## Languages spoken — add Italian

Melania Trump stated that she speaks Italian, in addition to the languages listed in this WP article. She stated this when being interviewed by Greta Von Susteren. The interview aired on the Fox News Channel on Saturday, May 28, 2016. I think this should be added to this article. I would have done so myself, but I don't know the proper citation or link. Lyttle-Wight (talk) 00:48, 29 May 2016 (UTC)

## German?

Knave is itself a Slavicisation of German Knauss, right? --YOMAL SIDOROFF-BIARMSKII (talk) 16:10, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

## Include Reince Priebus' Quote

Please add Reince Priebus' quote into Wikipedia that *It'd be reasonable to fire the speechwriter*. Source:

[http://www.bostonherald.com/news/us\\_politics/2016/07/rnc\\_chairman\\_reince\\_priebus\\_itd\\_be\\_reasonable\\_to\\_fire\\_melania\\_trumps](http://www.bostonherald.com/news/us_politics/2016/07/rnc_chairman_reince_priebus_itd_be_reasonable_to_fire_melania_trumps) — Preceding unsigned comment added by 173.65.234.214 (talk) 15:37, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

In all fairness to Melania this quote should be immediately included into Wikipedia, or Wikipedia is a farce. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 173.65.234.214 (talk) 16:15, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

## Semi-protected edit request on 19 July 2016

I guess someone that it was funny to list her school as Velvet Jones School of Technology. This needs to be removed.

96.59.200.129 (talk) 21:48, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

✔ **Done** Thanks for spotting. Gap9551 (talk) 22:07, 19 July 2016 (UTC)



This edit request has been answered. Set the |answered= or |ans= parameter to **no** to reactivate your request.

## The Breast Cancer Research Foundation

Is there any evidence that the Trumps have ever actually contributed money to The Breast Cancer Research Foundation? That's actually a highly-regarded organization. If she's done something good, it would be nice to mention it. I would be impressed.

OTOH, "associated" violates WP:WEASEL. If all she did was show up at one of their parties, that's not significant. That's like saying you're associated with the Metropolitan Opera because you saw an opera there. Unless someone has a WP:RS to show that she was doing some meaningful charity work, the section should be deleted. --Nbauman (talk) 22:34, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

Donating money, IMHO, is not enough to merit "associated" - I could give \$5, it doesn't make me personally associated with the charity in any real sense. If she chairs an event, speaks at a benefit, etc, then I could see use of this word. Otherwise, yes, weasel. —Мандичка<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 22:42, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

And one of the sources is just a collection of photos from some BCRF event and I presume, she's in there. That's not enough. So I removed it. Volunteer Marek (talk) 22:58, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

Strike that, both sources are just photos. Volunteer Marek (talk) 22:59, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

## Semi-protected edit request on 19 July 2016

Please add them following to subsection 2016 NRC Speech Controversy. Source:

<https://amp.cnn.com/cnn/2016/07/19/politics/melania-trump-michelle-obama-speech/index.html>

Melania Trump's speech, July 2016: "From a young age, my parents impressed on me the values that you work hard for what you want in life, that your word is your bond and you do what you say and keep your promise, that you treat people with respect. They taught and showed me values and morals in their daily lives. That is a lesson that I continue to pass along to our son," Trump said.

And we need to pass those lessons on to the many generations to follow. Because we want our children in this nation to know that the only limit to your achievements is the strength of your dreams and your willingness to work for them."

Michelle Obama's speech, on August 25, 2008: "And Barack and I were raised with so many of the same values: that you work hard for what you want in life; that your word is your bond and you do what you say you're going to do; that you treat people with dignity and respect, even if you don't know them, and even if you don't agree with them.

And Barack and I set out to build lives guided by these values, and to pass them on to the next generation. Because we want our children -- and all children in this nation -- to know that the only limit to the height of your achievements is the reach of your dreams and your willingness to work for them."

Rs21867 (talk) 05:55, 19 July 2016 (UTC)



This edit request has been answered. Set the |answered= or |ans= parameter to **no** to reactivate your request.



Agreed. Characterizing the speech with those adjectives is pure propaganda. Also, there are people that are saying that Michelle Obama's speech was taken from Saul Alinsky. If that IS in fact the case, then maybe Melania's speechwriter got it from Alinsky also. We just don't know, and it would be reckless to hypothesize either way until the facts are known. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Whamrick3 (talk • contribs) 17:35, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

At this point it is going to remain as not including the information would also be a non-neutral point of view. The information should be included that gives a balanced viewpoint between the media, and the Trump campaign's stance on the matter. - Knowledgekid87 (talk) 17:51, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

The facts are any similarities to Mrs. Obama's 2008 speech were acts of plagiarism by whomever wrote the speech. Had they credited the source; no problem. Mentioning the resulting firestorm is not a point of view. It's what happened (everywhere except on Fox News). Critical, expressive parts of the Trump speech were "lifted", almost verbatim, from Obama's speech. I think the article thread, as it stands, is as fair and impartial as could be expected. In my estimation the most ridiculous part of the story is Campaign Manager Paul Manafort, the next day, accusing Hillary Clinton of being involved in the plagiarism, "It's just another example, as far as we're concerned, that when Hillary Clinton is threatened by a female, the first thing she does is try to destroy the person," Manafort said. **Buster Seven Talk** 18:30, 19 July 2016 (UTC) Manafort's response in defense of Malania should be included in the article. If and when included, the fact that the Melania Trump/Michelle Obama parallels were first pointed out on Twitter by un-employed journalist Jarrett Hill (<http://www.rawstory.com/2016/07/melania-trumps-speech-the-guy-who-scooped-everybody/>) should be mentioned. **Buster Seven Talk** 18:40, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

**Agree** with IP user 50.189.1.9 and suggest that the section be condensed as this issue has been making rounds in the media but does not need so much information. This section is a huge chunk of her page and her page is not that large. De88 (talk) 20:29, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

Considering this topic is what she has appeared to have had the most public attention for though. (Besided being married to Donald Trump) I think the large portion is warrented. That is a good bit of what the readers would be interested in right?Pulliam.thomas (talk) 20:55, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

While the editors have tried to make it sound the most neutral possible, it seems they are taking this as an opportunity to create a negative image of her. Yes, I understand plagiarism is bad and her marriage to Donald Trump has caused a lot of controversy, but this issue should not have been so expanded. It just doesn't need so much information. Keep the most important info and simply condense. It still provides enough info on this issue while balancing the article. De88 (talk) 21:09, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

"Taking this as an opportunity to create a negative image of her"? Hardly. She did that all by herself. Or maybe with help from some speechwriters. But I've added every significant defense of Trump's speech I could find without repeating any criticism of it. (Such as the *Washington Post* article that surveyed high school teachers and college professors and found they would have failed her for plagiarism or reported her for discipline.) Unfortunately, Trump's people have generally been silent so there's not much to add to the article, but I did add Priebus and Manafort. Another editor added Sean Spicer. — Malik Shabazz <sup>Talk</sup>/<sup>Stalk</sup> 21:34, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

"Taking this as an opportunity to create a negative image of her"? More a critique of the speech writer(s) and the Trump campaign than of Melania. ~~Her innocence has not been questioned~~ (although she did say that she wrote the speech with very little help). **Buster Seven Talk** 01:37, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

My mother gave me a very similar speach many times before either lady was born. When I here either speech it reminds me of my mother. Should I complain that both stole my mom's speech. No, every mother should be saying the same same thing to their children. Saltsailor (talk) 04:19, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Your mother had an audience of one. Melania had an audience of possibly 35 million. Big difference. **Buster Seven Talk** 04:48, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## Melania's Speechwriter Apologizes

Please add this to wikipedia <https://www.yahoo.com/news/melania-trump-speech-writer-mciver-000000807.html> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 173.65.234.214 (talk) 17:54, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## Inclusion of the use of the lyrics from "Never Gonna Give You Up"

It seems like users are divided about mentioning that media have questioned if she have used the lyrics to the song Never Gonna Give You Up. On the one hand, Volunteer Marek had removed the information because the article is "a freakin' BLP". On the other hand Ribbet32 mentioned that this information was published by reputable sources such as Time Magazine and New York Magazine. So I propose that we should have a discussion whether to include it in the article or not. Yoshiman6464 (talk) 16:14, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Here are sources from Google News that you might could look at before deciding: Trump + "Never Gonna Give You Up" (<https://www.google.com/#tbm=nws&q=Trump+%2B+%22Never+gonna+give+you+up%22>) and Trump + Rick Roll (<https://www.google.com/#q=Trump+Rick+Roll&tbm=nws>) Yoshiman6464 (talk) 16:17, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I'm against inclusion at this time. The accusations seem unsubstantiated and more like a joke than like serious reporting. If/when more media outlets cover the story then I'm open to reconsidering. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 18:43, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## Proposed merger of the Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy article to the RNC article

It has been proposed that the article Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy be merged/redirected into 2016 Republican National Convention#Melania Trump's speech. Obviously some of the material will be retained at this article as well. To discuss whether the "controversy" article should remain as a separate article or be merged/redirected, please go to Talk:Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy. --MelanieN (talk) 20:11, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## RNC speech in lead section

Skibumpmc, you have now removed reliably sourced and highly significant content from the lead section twice without explanation (here ([http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=730700011&oldid=730698466](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=730700011&oldid=730698466)), here ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=730707284&oldid=730706740](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=730707284&oldid=730706740))). Please do not edit war. Could you please explain why you're in favor of removing this information? --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 19:28, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I replaced it. (1) It was a subject of huge media attention. (2) Recentism is an essay, not a guideline. It's just one editor's opinion. (3) It was deleted without discussion in Talk. --Nbauman (talk) 20:15, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## separate article needed on speech?

It seems like the speech would warrant its own article for BLP purposes, especially considering a lot of the fallout, excuses and fingerpointing is not going to be about her specifically. This fiasco is truly one for the ages and meets notability requirements. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 22:46, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

I don't dislike the idea, if someone wants to make an article then go for it. Do you have any article name ideas? - Knowledgekid87 (talk) 22:57, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

I'm guessing "Melania Trump 2016 Republican National Convention speech" or something. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 23:31, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree. There are many viable aspects to the situation that might be able to be elaborated on if there were a separate article. *Buster Seven Talk* 01:15, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Let's wait until a few days have passed and the media have moved on to more important things, like whether Hillary hates small children or Donald kicks dogs, before we judge the lasting effect (if any) of the plagiarism incident. — Malik Shabazz <sup>Talk</sup>/<sup>Stalk</sup> 01:44, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Considering Clint Eastwood at the 2012 Republican National Convention is apparently still notable, it seems unlikely that *this* speech won't have lasting notability. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 03:05, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I'd hold off on a dedicated article for now, per Malik, but the info should be mentioned here. Volunteer Marek (talk) 04:01, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Also, the stuff on the Rick-rolling, aside from being stupid, sophomoric and inane (and actually not fitting the definition of "rick-rolling") does not even fit in with a section which is about a "plagiarism controversy". Volunteer Marek (talk) 04:15, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

**Agree** with Volunteer Marek. It is absurd to create a separate page for this issue. I feel this is going to end up fading out of the spotlight in a few days. It's just not something the media will keep reporting on. In all, there are bigger issues facing this election and a plagiarism issue from the next (potential) "First Lady" is just not that important. Yes, it is bad, but to be fair, the speech sounded rather "generic". Nothing that really stood out. Also, she did not literally copy word for word on Michelle's speech. They did sound similar but again they were just generic, cliché as one delegate puts it in a *Vox* article. Every delegate I asked about Melania Trump's plagiarism gave basically the same answer (<http://www.vox.com/2016/7/19/12232732/melania-trump-speech-plagiarism>) De88 (talk) 04:39, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree, a separate article seems appropriate. I redirected **Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy** to this article for now, but I would welcome its expansion. ---*Another Believer* <sup>(Talk)</sup> 14:53, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I also added a tag to the article to encourage additional discussion. ---*Another Believer* <sup>(Talk)</sup> 15:03, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Disagree, a separate article is not needed. It's a minor point, not noteworthy of an article, the news channels have already cited several speeches by Obama that were allegedly plagerized, that would require a separate article for each speech according to this type of reasoning. An aide has taken credit for the noted error in Melania's speech already, so its not worth of an article. Melania's speech was well received. StarMountain (talk) 17:53, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

@StarMountain:.Please provide sources for your claim of "the news channels have already cited several speeches by Obama that were allegedly plagerized,..." I scour the various news channels and I think I would have seen such a claim. *Buster Seven Talk* 18:56, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

But this incident is much, much more than simply improper attribution. Various people associated with the campaign are offering different, even contradictory reasons, and some people have called for the campaign manager's resignation. And sure, Melania's delivery was well received, but that is not an argument against having an article about this major controversy. ---*Another Believer* <sup>(Talk)</sup> 18:10, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

The speech being "generic," someone else possibly plagiarizing at some other time, and someone else taking credit for the plagiarism is irrelevant to the notability of the speech and its continued coverage. These are excuses lobbied out by the Trump camp and are not the criteria Wikipedia uses when determining notability. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 18:12, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree, in fact Melania Trump's Speechwriter has just taken responsibility for speech "lifing". [12] ([http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/melania-trump-speech-meredith-mciver.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/21/us/politics/melania-trump-speech-meredith-mciver.html?_r=0)) I feel bad for Republicans out there but this incident in particular is getting in depth coverage. - Knowledgekid87 (talk) 18:16, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I was bold and moved content over to Melania Trump speech plagiarism controversy. Please help improve if you are interested. ---*Another Believer* (talk) 19:09, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I'm in favor of merging. I don't understand the benefit of having a separate article for the plagiarism controversy. Our BLP policy applies to biography and non-biography articles alike. The controversy is about Melania Trump so it is within scope, and this article certainly isn't too long. See WP:WHENSPLIT. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 19:18, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree. It's noteworthy enough to mention but shouldn't be given UNDUE weight and certainly not enough for its own article. Especially now that they've fessed up and owned up to it I think it's going to become a non-story. Volunteer Marek (talk) 19:47, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

The independent article is too long, and the section in the Melania Trump article is too short. Now that further facts have come out, most of the blow-by-blow claims and counter-claims are irrelevant. We could get to the point with a much shorter discussion. I think the McIver statement pretty much summarizes the whole situation and should be included on this page in the Speech section. --Nbauman (talk) 20:20, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## Semi-protected edit request on 20 July 2016

After the mention of her plagiarism, it should be noted that Meredith McIver made a statement explaining the issue.



This edit request has been answered. Set the |answered= or |ans= parameter to **no** to reactivate your request.

Bobbert723 (talk) 23:03, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

**X Not done** The lead only gives a summary (i.e., just that the plagiarism happened), no details. The section below gives a quote by McIver. Gap9551 (talk) 23:11, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

## Culpability means "deserving blame"

- 1) According to Melania Trump's personal website, she obtained a degree "in design and architecture from a University in Slovenia," Interestingly, the name of the school is missing. Truth is she only completed a freshman year at the University of Ljubljana before beginning her modeling career. An effort to elevate her social status? A continuing attempt to deceive?
- 2) She was the person who decided to plagiarize sections from First Lady Michelle Obama's 2008 convention speech in spite of what Merideth McIver has taken the blame for. She has yet to accept her major role in deciding on the final draft of her speech. She wrote it, as she herself says, "with little help" from others... she spoke it at the convention... it's her speech. She is deserving of blame (culpable) for the resulting embarrassment to her husbands campaign.

The continuing efforts to soft-sell the incident and what it indicates is a dis-service to our reader. *Buster Seven Talk* 12:48, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree that, to start with, the article as written was revised to downplay the idea that her web site and the Republican program says (claims) that she has a degree, but WP:RS, including her biography, say that she didn't finish. I propose that we change the wording from:

Knauss studied architecture and design at the University of Ljubljana for one year before dropping out,[citation needed] though her website says she obtained a degree in architecture and design there.

to:

Although Knauss' website says she obtained a degree in architecture at the University of Ljubljana, other sources [citation needed] say that she studied for one year and did not get a degree.

Those [citation needed] were in the article before the editor revised the article to eliminate the citations. --Nbauman (talk) 14:10, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

This would be a step back, as it would imply a false equivalence between reliable and unreliable sources. The GQ, New Yorker, Politico, New York Times, etc. articles are reliable. Trump's website is unreliable. The only reason why we should include any mention of Trump's website is because it's noteworthy that it contains false information. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 16:43, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

## Semi-protected edit request on 22 July 2016

Remove this sentence: Television personality Barbara Walters, impressed with Trump's intelligence when she met her, has said of her: "Maybe because she's so pretty, we don't expect her to be as smart as she is." [36]



This edit request has been answered. Set the |answered= or |ans=

Source not credible and neither Walters or Rush are qualified experts who can discuss her intelligence or IQ. Characterization, not a fact.

parameter to **no** to reactivate your request.

R2D2 28 (talk) 22:51, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

✓ **Done** I agree. Gap9551 (talk) 22:58, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

## Plagiarism accusation: undue weight

Hi, I've tagged the lead with {{undue weight section}}. In my opinion, the plagiarism accusation is a recentism that will soon become pretty much forgotten, a minor episode in the life of M. Trump. As such, its inclusion in the lead as an independent paragraph goes against WP:NPOV, which states: "For example, discussion of isolated events, criticisms, or news reports about a subject may be verifiable and impartial, but still disproportionate to their overall significance to the article topic. This is a concern especially in relation to recent events that may be in the news." --Eleassar <sup>my talk</sup> 20:20, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

As far as I can tell, this incident is the second-most significant reason for her being notable (after her marriage to Donald Trump), and it takes up about 10% of the prose right now. Gap9551 (talk) 20:35, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Yep. Some people think Every. Single. Wikipedia. Article. needs a maintenance tag, and don't even stop to think whether it's necessary. Ribbet32 (talk) 20:49, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I think Eleassar's concern deserves to be taken seriously. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 20:55, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I don't think we have a weight problem. I agree with Eleassar that recentism is a potential concern, but in this case I think the extreme amount of coverage overrides that concern. Google News is currently showing over a million hits for "melania trump" "speech". I have a hard time imagining that the speech will end up being just a blip in her biography. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 20:53, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I am aware that the event has received significant coverage, but I still don't think it deserves a separate paragraph, while other parts of the article are poorly summarised. There are other notable persons the plagiarism of which attracted a great interest of the public at the time, e.g. Joe Biden or Fareed Zakaria, and it's ok to mention it, but it is not even near as much exposed as here. --Eleassar <sup>my talk</sup> 21:19, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

For those people the plagiarism is proportionally less significant--not because the plagiarism is less important, but because relatively speaking the other aspects of their biographies are more important. Zakaria and especially Biden have had long and storied careers. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 21:34, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

The page view statistics go from 10,000 all year to 1.5 million since she gave that speech. [https://tools.wmflabs.org/pageviews/?project=en.wikipedia.org&platform=all-access&agent=user&range=latest-20&pages=Melania\\_Trump](https://tools.wmflabs.org/pageviews/?project=en.wikipedia.org&platform=all-access&agent=user&range=latest-20&pages=Melania_Trump) That's quite a bit of weight. It's reasonable to conclude that readers are interested in her role at the convention. That's the information people come here to get, and that's the information we should give them. --Nbauman (talk) 21:45, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

It's totally appropriate to cover the plagiarism in depth in this article. It's really the main thing for which she is known and has received a large amount of news coverage and commentary across the planet, so the current coverage is not undue in any way. If anything, it's too short. --Tataral (talk) 22:10, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I've suggested above that the plagiarism fiasco should be its own article, for this and other BLP reasons. Some have suggested this controversy will just fade away but that goes contrary to logic. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 22:58, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I just want to say WP:NOTTEMPORARY. - Knowledgekid87 (talk) 23:00, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

This discussion is about how the lead section of this article should be written, not about whether the plagiarism controversy should have its own article. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 23:31, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

- The fact that this is a BLP urges us to err on the side of caution; I have therefore removed the plagiarism note from the lead and replaced it with a more general statement. To address a few concerns: of course this is recentism, and of course this is important and it's driving Google and Facebook interest in her, and so we should balance things. The typical Trump fan is likely to search a different Internet, one where they don't see (because they don't want to or otherwise) the plagiarism issue, and we can hardly prophecy that "our" readers are coming to this article to read about her plagiarism. That she is a notable person in her husband's campaign is unquestionable, so a mention in the lead of her being a part of it is more than acceptable. NOTTEMPORARY doesn't apply here at all, of course; what we should ask ourselves is why we are so sure that all this urge we feel now to talk about her speech will still be there next week or next month. If it's still there next year, we can add it to the lead then. In the meantime, we should not overburden the lead with this one single instance, which took only a few minutes, of her entire life. Drmies (talk) 00:47, 23 July 2016 (UTC)

## COPYVIO

Someone should check this article for copyright violations. Just sayin' Volunteer Marek (talk) 19:12, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

Can someone say if there's any legitimacy to this allegation? Ribbet32 (talk) 23:50, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

@Volunteer Marek: The copyvio claim needs more specifics. Exactly which sentences or sections in the Wikipedia article do you believe were copied and exactly where they copied from? Keep in mind that many web sites extract or copy from Wikipedia. For example, I compared the current version of the article against one from 7 February 2016 ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump)

&oldid=703695472) and found a long sentence that has not changed in six months. A Google search (<https://www.google.com/search?site=webhp&q=%22As+an+infant%2C+Barron+reportedly+occupied+his+own+floor+in+the+Trumps%27+apartment+in+Trump+Tower+in+Manhattan%2C+but+often+slept+in+a+crib+in+his+parents%27+bedroom.%22>) for that sentence finds 508 copies which likely were all copied from Wikipedia. Thus you will also need to show when the copyvio material was added to Wikipedia and that it had already existed on another source at the time. --Marc Kupper|talk 18:46, 28 July 2016 (UTC)

## Clarification and balance needed

The following edit, below, needs to be added to clarify the matter, and be balanced, but I can not add it, since I am not a registered editor. Please, no one lecture me on "registering," since I don't think highly of being bullied and arguing. I can contribute just fine, as it is, and my contributions can stand or fall on their own.

This article is "semi-protected," and this edit can't be done by me, but here it is, if it helps:

To be more precise, McIver places some of the blame on Ms. Trump: "In a statement issued by the campaign, Meredith McIver took the blame but made it clear that Mrs. Trump knew the passages were from the first lady's speech."<sup>[1]</sup>

Thank you.96.59.186.103 (talk) 23:02, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Sounds like WP:EDITORIALIZING to me. --Nbauman (talk) 02:39, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

Sounds like culpability for Mrs. Trump to me. *Buster Seven Talk* 03:38, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

If the source doesn't say it, we can't say it. The source says Trump knew the passages were from Obama's speech. It doesn't say McIver placed some of the blame on Trump. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 05:42, 21 July 2016 (UTC)

**Dr. Fleischman**, can you not read!? With all due respect... it says that McIver "took blame," but then goes on to use the word 'but,' a conjunction which shows CONTRAST, and that would be ... part of the blame is on Ms. Trump, in contrast to part (probably most) on McIver, the speechwriter. Yes, it DID show that there was "shared" blame on both sides. Doy... THIS is why I am not a registered editor, because nonsense runs amok. Use common sense, Dr.F ... I know you are smarter than that. :) Thus, *Buster Seven Talk* is correct when he or she says: *Sounds like culpability for Mrs. Trump to me.* -- Correct: Blame to be had on both sides, if the reader simply READS the article, hello?. Thx.96.59.186.103 (talk) 05:13, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

I agree with Dr. Fleischman. *But* indicates contrast, but it doesn't always imply the negative. Consider this sentence: "I got a promotion, but my dog died." The second clause ("my dog died") doesn't diminish the fact of my promotion. The source is similar: it states that Ms. McIver took the blame, and that she asserted that Ms. Trump knew the passages were from Ms. Obama's speech. It does not definitively say that Ms. McIver placed any of the blame on Ms. Trump. *Rebbing* 05:44, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

Please tone down the rhetoric, Lakeland. I read the article with common sense. However I firmly believe in avoiding improper synthesis. If a source doesn't say something explicitly, then we shouldn't either. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 07:33, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

The article in *The Ledger* of Lakeland, Florida said that (and I quote) that: "*Mrs. Trump knew the passages were from the first lady's speech.*" That, in plain English, means that she was partly to blame. If this logic confuses you, please listen to the following analogy: If an article said a person held up a bank, stole money, and killed people, and got convicted in a court of law, but did not use the word "crime," your logic would prohibit the use of the word "crime," but that is nonsense. The "plain language" meaning of the *Ledger* article is this: Both parties shared blame, and for you to say that either one or the other party was fully at fault is intellectually dishonest, and that is why some other editors agree with me. Listen to logic. Listen to the other editors. Listen to me, and then read the article as it is, not as you would want it.96.59.186.103 (talk) 10:05, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

Your logic makes perfect sense to me, and I'm certainly capable of connecting the dots, but you're connecting dots in a way that the cited source did not do. As such it is inconsistent with our policies on verifiability and original research. Not to worry, however: If your logic is as common sense as you say it is, then journalists will make the same connection in future articles and then we can cite them when those articles are published. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 17:49, 22 July 2016 (UTC)

Of course, I disagree with you, but, should I decide to revisit the issue, I might attempt to quote an article directly, which, I think, would be less objectionable to "strict" editors, like you who, I think, are legalistic, and set an unreasonably high bar. No offense, but that is just my opinion. Also, if my logic is correct, another avenue might be to make my case with other editors, some of whom agree. (Or I might try both methods at once, slight rewording, and consensus-seeking.) - OK, that is my take, and I disagree, but we must present the news as it is, nor edited down or diluted.. Thank you for replying.96.59.147.247 (talk) 01:41, 23 July 2016 (UTC)

Perhaps more editors will weigh in and agree with you. And you are free to pursue dispute resolution. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 02:46, 23 July 2016 (UTC)

Thx for the suggestion. Hopefully, it won't go that far, but it's good that mediation & such exist. PS: I normally would not edit your comment, but your indentation was off, and so I fixed it; I hope you do not mind.96.59.147.247 (talk) 10:48, 23 July 2016 (UTC)

An item to keep in mind about this is that per WP:USEPRIMARY we should not be putting too much thought and parsing of the language in the primary source which seems to be the Meredith McIver statement in this case. WP:PRIMARY is Wikipedia policy in this regard. --Marc Kupper|talk 18:12, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

## References

1. Ohlemacher, Stephen (July 20, 2016). "Trump Speechwriter Apologizes for Melania Trump's Speech" (<http://www.theledger.com/article/20160720/NEWS/160729994?p=all&tc=pgall&tc=ar>). *The Ledger*. Retrieved July 20, 2016.

## University Degree Controversy

As of June 19, 2016, Melania Trump's personal online website claims that Melania earned a "a degree in design and architecture at University in Slovenia." <sup>[1]</sup> The official RNC schedule also states that Melania Trump obtained a degree in design and architecture at University in Slovenia. <sup>[2]</sup> Several news agencies, including The Huffington Post <sup>[3]</sup>, Politico <sup>[4]</sup>, and Gawker <sup>[5]</sup> have disputed these claims, noting that she dropped out after the first year at university. Other than the Trumps' statements indicating otherwise, there is no evidence that Melania Trump was awarded a degree from any U.S. or foreign institution. --Sterilizedusername (talk) 18:11, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

## References

1. <sup>[1]</sup> (<http://www.melaniatrump.com/my-world/biography/>)
2. <sup>[2]</sup> (<http://convention.gop/post/147558746375/2016-gop-convention-program-announced>)
3. <sup>[3]</sup> ([http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/melania-trump-college-claims\\_us\\_578dd95ce4b0c53d5cfac0dc](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/melania-trump-college-claims_us_578dd95ce4b0c53d5cfac0dc))
4. <sup>[4]</sup> (<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/rnc-2016-melania-trump-biography-225781>)
5. <sup>[5]</sup> (<http://gawker.com/trump-campaign-lies-about-melania-trumps-nonexistent-co-1783912735>)

Right. There are many WP:RSs which point out the discrepancies between her claims on her web site that she graduated college, and other accounts which say that she did not.

<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/rnc-2016-melania-trump-biography-225781>  
 RNC program flubs Melania Trump's biography  
 The RNC refers to a college degree, but Trump left college after one year.  
 By Katy O'Donnell  
 07/18/16

<http://gawker.com/trump-campaign-lies-about-melania-trumps-nonexistent-co-1783912735>  
 Trump Campaign Lies About Melania Trump's Nonexistent College Degree  
 Ashley Feinberg  
 This article links to other articles in Politico, the New York Times, and the New Yorker.

So this meets WP:RS and WP:WEIGHT on all fours. There are many references to it in major WP:RSs. There are good reasons for including it. As Gawker says, it bears on the issue of the truthfulness of not just Melania but the whole campaign. Put it in. I think deleting it would be WP:CENSOR. --Nbauman (talk)

I agree this article should address the degree controversy. —*Мандичка*<sup>YO</sup> ☺ 22:37, 19 July 2016 (UTC)

I attended 4 schools of higher learning. I did not graduate from any of them. Ergo, I am not a college graduate nor do I have a degree. I think any mention of a degree should be removed. We need not shine a light on whether the campaign is truthful or not. Sources say she didnt graduate so we shouldnt mislead the reader by implying that she did. ***Buster Seven Talk*** 01:28, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Many WP:RS are reporting it, which means it qualifies under WP:WEIGHT and belongs in the article. There is documentation that she said she had a degree, and documentation that she doesn't have a degree. I think someone could reasonably conclude that she's lying, but can let the reader decide. The WP:RS give reasons why it's important; for example it demonstrates Trump's attitude towards the truth. This all supports including it under Wikipedia rules. I don't understand why under WP rules you think we should keep it out. --Nbauman (talk) 04:12, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

I have reconsidered. I agree re: mentioning the false claim of a degree. I think declaring someone has a degree when they don't is a demonstration of D. Trump's clouding of the truth with the intent to create an accomplishment for someone who didn't complete the task. ***Buster Seven Talk*** 04:59, 20 July 2016 (UTC)

Here is link to New York Times article, "With Degree Debunked, Melania Trump's Website is Taken Down," I think degree controversy should be mentioned. This is too serious of an issue here, as serious or even more as plagiarism. <sup>[1]</sup> Bialosz (talk) 05:22, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

## References

1. [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/us/politics/melania-trump.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/us/politics/melania-trump.html?_r=0)

## Old BIO stored at archive.org

- Mar 8, 2006 - <https://web.archive.org/web/20060308013136/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio/>
- Feb 1, 2009 - <https://web.archive.org/web/20090201041349/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio/>
- Apr 4, 2013 - <https://web.archive.org/web/20130404071255/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio/>

• [Sbmeirow](#) • [Talk](#) • 05:45, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

## RNC biography

The article currently says: "*Her biography in the 2016 Republican National Convention official program also incorrectly stated that she had obtained a degree in Slovenia.*" Should this sentence be removed? It strikes me as not particularly biographical and perhaps a little coatrack-y. This article is about Trump, not about the RNC. And lots of ordinarily reliable media outlets said that Trump got the degree before the truth was exposed. Why would we call out the RNC and not mention those media outlets? --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 18:41, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

The media has gotten very lazy in recent decades to properly fact check, and some media outlets push their own agenda so hard they either don't fact check or ignore the facts, but this isn't a new thing in July 2016. As for the RNC official program, the information just didn't magically appear out of thin air without any input from candidates support team, thus is why the RNC official program issue is more important than mistakes in numerous media sources. • [Sbmeirow](#) • [Talk](#) • 16:21, 30 July 2016 (UTC)

### References

## Fashion-designer?

The summary says she is/was a fashion-designer, but there is no mention of this in her career on the page. If she was a designer, add that information. If she wasn't a designer, then remove it from the summary. — Preceding unsigned comment added by [Alchemista2](#) (talk • contribs) 03:34, 26 July 2016 (UTC)

✓ **Done** I couldn't find a reliable source supporting this content, so I removed it. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 17:15, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

## Melania's website scrubbed

In the wake of Melania's plagiarism scandal, and the incorrect assertion in the RNC program that she obtained a degree from the University of Ljubljana, the Trump campaign has scrubbed from the Internet her own promotional website, which included the falsehood about her college credentials. I note that the sentence claiming that she worked "with photographers including Helmut Newton, Patrick Demarchelier, and Mario Testino" is also sourced back to Melania's website, and an RS interview repeating that fact clearly drew from the website (and also claimed she was a college graduate). I have independently researched Melania's modeling claims and found no independent evidence she worked with any of these three photographers. Can anyone find them? Otherwise I will delete. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 01:55, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

Yes, the evidence can be found in the cited reliable Bloomberg and New York Times sources. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 05:42, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

There's currently a bit of an edit war going on regarding whether her web site redirect is notable enough to include in this article or not. I suggest we talk it out here before making further edits. Pinging [DrFleischman](#) and [Jason Quinn](#). [Funcrunch](#) (talk) 07:18, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

There's just been constructive back-n-forth. No edit war, which has a precise meaning. Dr. Fleischman made a change because material an editor and myself added was redundant to previously added material. I'm glad it was done because I missed the earlier mention and would have done the same if I spotted it. My latest change mostly just moved material whose inclusion is not contested by Dr. Fleischman. As for the redirect itself, it's one of the few things about her that have ever had significant coverage in national/world news so it's among the *most* notable things about her. [Jason Quinn](#) (talk) 08:11, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

Not an edit war by strict definition perhaps. What I meant was that I added a (referenced) bit about the redirect ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=732105875&oldid=732069370](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=732105875&oldid=732069370)), [DrFleischman](#) reverted it ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=732112032&oldid=732105875](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=732112032&oldid=732105875)), I reworded and re-added ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=732129748&oldid=732129404](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=732129748&oldid=732129404)) it to another section, you added additional context ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=732580212&oldid=732267426](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=732580212&oldid=732267426)), then the good Dr removed both of our edits ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&type=revison&diff=732584096&oldid=732580212](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revison&diff=732584096&oldid=732580212)), then you restored the text about the redirect as part of a larger edit ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=732632539&oldid=732590945](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=732632539&oldid=732590945)). So I thought the three of us should take it to discussion at this point. [Funcrunch](#) (talk) 16:30, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

I don't think the removal of the website is significant enough for inclusion in our article (per WP:NOTNEWS and WP:RECENTISM). People's official websites go up and down all the time without it rising to the level of being included in the person's encyclopedia article. That said, if we *do* conclude that the removal of the website is significant, then we need to consider *what* its significance is so that its mention gets put in the appropriate section. I posit it isn't about Trump's early life and it isn't about her career. If anything it's about the significance of the plagiarism controversy in the context of Donald's presidential campaign. Therefore if we're going to include this material (which, again, I oppose) then it should be moved to the subsection "Speech plagiarism controversy." --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 16:40, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

Melania Trump isn't just any random person with an official web site; she is the wife of the Republican candidate for president of the United States. The sudden disappearance of her web site after the convention got a significant amount of media attention. I personally couldn't care less about her education or credentials, but I added the information because I felt it was clearly notable. As far as where to put it in the article, I'd be fine moving it to the section on the plagiarism controversy. [Funcrunch](#) (talk) 16:51, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

I also support mentioning the take-down of Ms. Trump's website. True enough, the history of a subject's website would ordinarily be pure trivia even if it were covered in secondary sources, but this removal is much more significant (and better covered) than a mine-run removal. [Rebbing](#) 17:02, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

I'm out to lunch. I got confused between the plagiarism controversy and the education controversy. If we're going to keep this content I think it should stay where it is. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 23:31, 2 August 2016 (UTC)

I agree that the sudden disappearance of her website got significant coverage and should be mentioned here (just a mention, not a big deal). --MelanieN (talk) 00:38, 3 August 2016 (UTC)

## Can someone check whether Melanjia Knavs gave false testimony during her US Naturalization process?

Consequences of Providing False Testimony During Naturalization - did Melania Knaves lie about having an Architecture degree?

Can someone expand this section, or add in, and find out if journalists have looked into her application?? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.191.132.75 (talk) 15:37, 31 July 2016 (UTC)

We don't do original research. And please don't make fun of her name. --MelanieN (talk) 00:36, 3 August 2016 (UTC)

We aren't your investigative team. Post links here to article(s) that have actually investigated it. • Sbmeirow • Talk • 05:08, 3 August 2016 (UTC)

## Visa history

Politico has a good overview (<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/melania-trump-immigration-donald-226648>) of her visa history and the current situation. At the very least it should be used to source info about her immigration, but it should also be used to source generally a statement about her disputed visa status. 👉 CZAR 11:40, 4 August 2016 (UTC)

Thanks for the link. I created a subsection to cover this. zazpot (talk) 19:37, 4 August 2016 (UTC)

## "Germanize"?

Is it germanize or rather Germanize? 75.172.241.80 (talk) 08:28, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

✓ ~~Done~~. Nice catch; thank you. Rebbing 15:40, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

Actually Webster's[13] (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/germanize>) prefers small "g", although it says "often capitalized". Reverting. But thanks for asking. --MelanieN (talk) 15:43, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

My (old, print) version of Webster's gives *Germanize*,<sup>[1]</sup> as does *Wiktionary* and our article. Google n-grams ([https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=Germanize%2Cgermanize&year\\_start=1900&year\\_end=2016&corpus=15](https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=Germanize%2Cgermanize&year_start=1900&year_end=2016&corpus=15)) also shows *Germanize* as continuing to be far more common. Rebbing 16:23, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

Yes, I saw that, and I have posted questions about this at Wiktionary and at our article talk page. In the meantime, I think it would be more in line with Wikipedia practice to keep the longstanding current version (small g) until there is consensus to change it. But it could also be argued that for consistency we ought to do it the way other Wikipedia pages do (noting, however, that Wikipedia is not a Reliable Source). Anyone else have a thought here? --MelanieN (talk) 18:00, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

That's fine, don't bite your nails over this, was just wondering... 75.172.241.80 (talk) 02:17, 6 August 2016 (UTC)

### References

- G. & C. MERRIAN CO., WEBSTER'S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 420 (3d ed. 1919).

## New York Post photos

*New York Post*'s "Menalia Trump like you've never seen her before (<http://nypost.com/2016/07/30/melania-trump-like-youve-never-seen-her-bef-ore/>) has been making headline in the past few days. Can we add it to the article? --74.190.106.98 (talk) 07:01, 3 August 2016 (UTC)

I think this (<http://nypost.com/2016/08/01/melania-trumps-girl-on-girl-photos-from-racy-shoot-revealed/>) is what you meant to link to when you referred to "same sex" in your section heading. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 16:22, 3 August 2016 (UTC)  
She is so beautiful. I especially like 3rd photo on the bottom in the article linked to by IP. That photo would make her BLP page a lot more attractive. But the image is probably under copyright and therefore can not be included anywhere. My very best wishes (talk) 04:02, 5 August 2016 (UTC)

Of course the pictures are under copy right! And why this should be included anyway? it is BLP, and those pictures were intended for limited audience anyway, for men who bought the magazine, not for all world to see. Wikipedia is not a place to use someone's nude photos from a tabloid story. Not her, not any other person's. I am surprised thi seven comes up as a topic to discuss. Bialosz (talk) 15:15, 7 August 2016 (UTC)

## Knauss or Trump?

I think we should aim for some consensus on whether we should be referring to the subject of the article as "*Melania Trump*" or "*Melania Knauss*." My position is that we should use "Trump" throughout our article.

Currently it looks like there's an attempt to use "Knauss" for sections related to her pre-marriage life and "Trump" for sections related to her married life. This doesn't seem to comport with the relevant guideline or the bulk of the reliable sources. Most (but not all) of our cited sources appear to use "Trump" for Melania's pre-married life as well. The guideline says we should use what is used by the majority of independent, reliable English-language sources with extra weight given to sources written after Melania changed her name. Also, the current approach reads illogically, with phrases such as "Knauss has a sister" (present tense, so should be "*Trump* has a sister") and "In early August 2016, it was reported that Knauss' account..." (she was "Trump" both in 2016 and for most of the time of her account). --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 17:55, 8 August 2016 (UTC)

I think we should use "Trump" throughout for the subject and "Donald Trump" for her husband, except where it would be particularly confusing (as in § Marriage to Donald Trump), in which case we should use "Melania" and "Donald." NAMECHANGES is about deciding the title for the article, which can only be one or the other, so I don't think it gives much guidance to this situation. I think SURNAME implicitly assumes we will use the subject's common name (Trump) throughout, but I may be misreading it. SAMESURNAME is insightful:

To distinguish between people with the same surname in the same article or page, use given names or complete names to refer to each of the people upon first mention. For subsequent uses, refer to the people by given names for clarity and brevity. When referring to the person who is the subject of the article, use just the surname unless the reference is part of a list of family members or if use of the surname alone will be confusing.

**Rebbing** 18:34, 8 August 2016 (UTC)

So true, thanks for correcting me. Different guideline, same result. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 19:50, 8 August 2016 (UTC)

✓ **Done**; I believe I got everything. Thank you for bringing this up: it was pretty confusing in its previous state. **Rebbing** 18:57, 10 August 2016 (UTC)

## "Nodded in agreement"

*I refactored this from my talk page (permalink). It appears to concern this edit to § Immigration to the United States.* **Rebbing** 02:21, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

I changed the sentence from "Melania said" to she "nodded in agreement" because the writer she nodded her head to is the only source saying Melania came anywhere near to saying she entered the US with that specific visa. No one else is quoting Melania saying she even knows what an H-1B3 is, or what might distinguish it from a B-1 or B-2. She may have nodded in agreement to affirm that she possessed a visa rather than any particular visa.

*(the quote in the Politico story referred to Mickey Rapkin: "When I interviewed Melania, I mentioned that she'd come to New York on that H-1B visa, and she nodded in agreement," Rapkin wrote in an email to POLITICO.)*

It isn't the biggest point in the world. I meant that change as a minor part of something larger I was working on but it got too late and I stopped.

Here's what I was working on: I discovered that when Melania was interviewed by People magazine for their Sept 2015 cover story on the Trumps<sup>[1]</sup>, she described in more detail than anyone now discussing this seems aware of, a series of visas and status documents starting in 1996 with a series of fairly easy to get temporary visas, to the last harder to get visa she applied for in 1998, to her green card and ultimately on to US citizenship. The problem for her is that the visa she applied for in 1998 seems like it was the first one that would have allowed her to work legally in the US, although it seems clear she was working in NYC from 1996 onward, some say 1995.

People republished this quote a few days ago in another article <sup>[2]</sup> Here it is. Melania's own words appear in italics:

"Melania told PEOPLE she came to the United States to model in 1996 on a visa. She explained the process:

*"You come on visa and you have a few times you need to fly back to Europe to stamp the visa and you come back and have another visa," she said. "I apply for the visa after two years when I was here. I went through long process through the lawyers – you need to show all your work, why you're coming here, [etc]. I went from five years when I had the green card you apply for citizenship – you cannot even apply before."*

The words in bold are the statement about the 1998 visa. This application sounds exactly like what a fashion model would have to do to get an H-1B3 because she says "you need to show all your work". Fashion models seeking an H-1B3 have to show the US Citizenship and Immigration Service that they are of "distinguished merit and ability".<sup>[3]</sup> They need to show "tear sheets" i.e. pages published in magazines showing photographs of them doing modelling work, the more the better, the more prestigious the magazine the better.<sup>[4]</sup> You don't need to "show all your work" to get a visa that doesn't allow you to work, and you don't need to show your work to get a green card.

In this account, she's talking like she came to the US in 1996 on a tourist or business visa which she renewed by flying back to Slovenia periodically until 1998 when she applied for the visa that did allow her to work, i.e. the H-1B3. A person holding an H-1B3 can, in some cases, "adjust status" to a green card, which can explain how Melania got her green card in 2001. Reports that Melania got her green card because she was married previously to someone other than Donald Trump<sup>[5]</sup> seem less credible, in part because Melania denies this and no hard evidence that she was married then is available, and also because if she did have a green card due to marriage in 2001 she could apply to become a citizen in three years, i.e. two years earlier than she did. She is complaining in that People quote that she had to wait five years before she could "even apply".

There are claims that when Melania posed for the photos that place her as working in NYC in 1995 she was not paid and hence she would not have been in violation of whatever visa she held at that time. However, according to advice for models hoping to work in the US maintained online by the Daryanani Law Group, "As with any individual coming to the US to perform productive labor, models coming to work in the US must first secure a work visa, even if it is unpaid work for a fashion show. If not, there could be potentially serious repercussions to both the model's future US visa applications as well as to the sponsoring US agency."<sup>[6]</sup> Jrandomcanuck (talk) 02:01, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

I reverted your edit for the simple reason that the five citations you repurposed (link) did not support your new sentence: "Mickey Rapkin, writing for *DuJour* magazine, says Melania 'nodded in agreement' when he said to her that she had come to New York in 1996 on an H-1B3 visa." I've read the entirety of your 799-word message, and I mean you no disrespect, but I don't have the time or interest to tease out whatever it is you are trying to say. It smells to me like a lot of detective work—original research or synthesis—which is not normally part of the "Wikipedia way." Perhaps some of the other regulars will take an interest in your opus. Best of luck. **Rebbing** 02:23, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

The first of the five citations, listed as 17. on the Melania Trump page does support my sentence. It contains the statement "Mickey Rapkin, who interviewed Melania for a May profile in the luxury lifestyle magazine *DuJour*, said she confirmed as much to him. "When I interviewed Melania, I mentioned that she'd come to New York on that H-1B visa, and she **nodded in agreement**," Rapkin wrote in an email to POLITICO." Jrandomcanuck (talk) 02:32, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

True enough, but the other four don't. Moreover, that sentence is easier to support—and less gossipy—as "Trump has said that she moved to the United States on an H-1B visa in 1996." That encompasses both her explicit statements as well as the nodding. **Rebbing** 02:42, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

Thanks for your reply. You agree there is support in one citation for my sentence using the expression "nodding her head" which is a direct quote from a citation, whereas I see no support for your reversion, "Trump said". There are no quotes I can find anywhere, in those five citations or anywhere else, of Melania Trump "saying" she came to the US on an H-1B3 visa.

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to "repurpose" five citations if this is something that shouldn't be done. I hardly understand how to edit a page on Wikipedia. I was just giving it a go. I felt the other four citations supported my change from "Trump said" to Trump "nodded her head" in response to prompting on a topic she may not have understood from a writer, because nowhere in the five citations is there any support for your reversion, i.e. "Trump said".

I don't have much experience here. The most time I put in was on the Blood Lead page. I did not understand, for instance, Wikipedia's "original research" or "synthesis" policy until you pointed it out to me. Thank you. I'm sorry to have posted some of this on your talk page to take up your time as you read and reposted it here. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Jrandomcanuck (talk • contribs) 03:13, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

I took another look, and I think you're right: The sources don't have her saying she immigrated to the United States in 1996 on an H1-B visa; the closest we've got is the nodding statement you carefully wrote up. I had assumed that the sources we had backed up the assertion that Ms. Trump said she immigrated to the United States in 1996 on an H-1B visa; I was mistaken, and I'm glad to stand corrected. So that version has to go. However, looking at it again, I also don't think it's fair to report the nodding: Nodding is not a clear affirmation, it was only published as a second-hand observation (a gesture observed by one reporter re-told to another reporter), and our reporting of it has reputational implications for the subject. Accordingly, I removed the whole paragraph; I think the remaining paragraph about the controversy is sufficient.

Also, you have nothing to be sorry for. You did good work bringing this up, and you did it calmly, politely, and with references. There's much to learn as an editor, little of which is intuitive, but you are already off to a good start. **Rebbing** 03:43, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

Removing the paragraph in question sounds good. I'm not so sure what remains is sufficient though. I will consider how to add to the "Immigration to the United States" section now that I've read the "original research" policy, make my edits and see what happens. Jrandomcanuck (talk) 03:58, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

Ok so now we have a new problem, which is that the now-first sentence of the section says that "Trump's account" may have contained inconsistencies without describing what that account was. Can the issue be solved by restoring the sentence but changing it from "Trump said" to "Trump indicated"? Generally speaking, nodding means "yes" and I'm not aware of any reliable source suggesting that Trump did not in fact take this position on her immigration history. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 04:19, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

## References

- Jess Cagle and Charlotte Triggs. " "At Home with Donald Trump and His Family" " (<http://www.people.com/article/people-magazine-home-donald-trump-family>). Retrieved August 10, 2016. "People magazine only put part of this cover story online. To see the quote referred to above see footnote 2. where the relevant section was republished August 6 2016"
- Dave Quinn. " "Melania Trump Defends Immigration Status Again As Anti-Trump Group Files Public Information Request for Her Papers" " (<http://www.people.com/article/melania-trump-immigration-status-questioned-public-records>). Retrieved August 10, 2016.
- US Citizenship and Immigration Services website. " " H-1B Specialty Occupations, DOD Cooperative Research and Development Project Workers, and Fashion Models" " (<https://www.uscis.gov/working-united-states/temporary-workers/h-1b-specialty-occupations-dod-cooperative-research-and-development-project-workers-and-fashion-models>). Retrieved August 10, 2016. "The H-1B3 category for fashion models requires that the distinguished merit and ability be demonstrated for the model. In order to show "recognition" in the fashion industry, an applicant must show several significant fashion "tear-sheets." Frequently models will work in Europe or Asia to get fashion jobs which will qualify them for a U.S. visa."

4. Daryanani Law Group. " "Visa Options and Special Considerations for Fashion Models" " (<http://www.hamidehfirm.com/practices/Immigration/Entertainment-Immigration/Fashion-Models/>). Retrieved August 10, 2016. "The H-1B3 category for fashion models requires that the distinguished merit and ability be demonstrated for the model. In order to show "recognition" in the fashion industry, an applicant must show several significant fashion "tear-sheets." Frequently models will work in Europe or Asia to get fashion jobs which will qualify them for a U.S. visa."
5. Gerardo Reyes. " "Questions raised about Melania's marriage history" " (<http://www.univision.com/univision-news/politics/questions-raised-about-melanias-marriage-history>). Retrieved August 10, 2016. "Michael Wildes, an immigration attorney who worked for the Trump organization, told Univision's investigative unit that she obtained a green card four years earlier in 2001, "based on marriage"
6. Daryanani Law Group. " "Visa Options and Special Considerations for Fashion Models" " (<http://www.hamidehfirm.com/practices/Immigration/Entertainment-Immigration/Fashion-Models/>). Retrieved August 10, 2016.

## Photographer says she was not paid in 1995. That would mean she wouldn't have been violating a tourist visa--if that's what she had.

I don't think I want to get into the fray on this article, but I don't see anything in the edit history to suggest this has already addressed. IMHO either this should be added to the article in the section on her immigration status... or someone should give a cogent reason for not including it. rce,

Melania Trump Photographer Says She Did Not Get Paid Amid Illegal Immigration Accusations (<http://www.insideedition.com/headlines/17926-melania-trump-photographer-says-she-did-not-get-paid-amid-illegal-immigration-accusations>)

One of the inconsistencies in her account is that her description of having to return periodically to Slovenia to get her visa renewed suggests she was on a regular tourist visa. This would not have allowed her to work for pay legally in 1995. However,

“ Jarl Ale de Basseville told Inside Edition: "She didn't get paid. No magazine at the time paid their models." ”

"Inside Edition" probably counts as a reliable source, and it's verifiable that "Inside Edition" reported it. The verifiable fact is something that was said: that Jarl Ale de Basseville said that she was not paid.

Dpbsmith (talk) 16:38, 7 August 2016 (UTC)

I agree. I've worked it into the immigration section. **Rebbing** 17:01, 7 August 2016 (UTC)

On the other hand, the Daryanani Law Group Blog contains a page<sup>[1]</sup> discussing immigration issues for models wishing to work in New York that warns models to secure a work visa prior to modelling "even if it is unpaid work for a fashion show", adding that if proper documents are not obtained, "there could be potentially serious repercussions to both the model's future US visa applications as well as to the sponsoring agency". The story that some of Trump's earliest work was "unpaid" could have been floated in the interest of anyone involved wishing to avoid these potentially serious repercussions.... Jrandomcanuck (talk) 15:49, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

## Why is a law firm website an unreliable source?

*This section concerns this edit.*

I immigrated to the U.S. legally. It is hard to do. Websites maintained by lawyers were excellent sources of information for me as I navigated through the process. Can someone explain why a law firm specializing in advising fashion models for decades in NYC about how to obtain proper visas is not a reliable source worthy of using as a citation in Wikipedia, on a matter that falls specifically into their area of expertise, i.e. is it legal to work without a work visa in the US even if you are not paid for that work?

If whatever a law firm puts on the internet is suspect, why is whatever the photographer who took the recently published controversial photos of Ms Trump says taken to be "reliable"? A photographer who employed undocumented models, if this were the case and if this fact came to the attention of the US Citizenship and Immigration Service, is subject to penalties under US law. Therefore that photographer would have an incentive to come up with a story. Unfortunately for people who think that even if photos place Ms Trump as working in New York in 1995 any problem will go away if the story is she was not being paid, the USCIS takes a dim view of any work done without a work visa paid or unpaid.

It is of interest in an account of Ms Trump's immigration status that someone she worked with in 1995 says he did not pay her, but it is also of interest that lawyers working in New York specializing in advising people like Ms Trump warn all models not to work without a work visa even if its unpaid work. Jrandomcanuck (talk) 02:55, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

As I understand the "reliable sources" guideline, it's more about the work than the speaker; we can quote the photographer because *Inside Edition*, a reputable work, included his quote; we can't quote the Daryanani Law Group's blog because that blog doesn't have an established reputation as a news source. See BLOGS.

As a separate matter, I think your interpretation of the piece reads too much into it. Read literally, you say that that the Daryanani Law Group says that it's illegal for models to do unpaid work. I'm a U.S. citizen, and I've worked as an unpaid model in the United States. Surely, that was not unlawful?

But, even if you meant to say that the Daryanani Law Group says that it's illegal for *non-citizens* to do unpaid modeling work *without work visas*, that's still more than the source gives you. The source says that models coming to the United States *to do unpaid work* must first secure work visas; it doesn't say it's illegal to do unpaid modeling work without a visa. To see the distinction, imagine someone coming to

the United States on a tourism visa who, after arriving, accepts a request to sit for an unpaid shoot during her vacation. The Daryanani piece doesn't appear to address that. Cheers! Rebbing 04:00, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

The webpage I cited cannot be construed to mean US citizens must get work permits before working in the US. The quote I took from that page sits in the context of that page which assumes that anyone seeking advice on how to obtain a work visa to work in the US must not have status to work in the US. They don't bother to explain to US citizens who happen to be reading that the page does not apply to them.

The section I put my edit into was about Melania Trump's immigration status in the US. I assumed everyone knew she was not a US citizen when she first came to the US. The source I used warns models that "models coming to work in the US must first secure a work visa, even if it is unpaid work for a fashion show", otherwise "potentially serious repercussions" could ensue affecting the model and the agency sponsoring her. You say I take too much meaning from this?

A fashion show is a lesser thing in the range of work that models undertake to do, far lesser than a photo shoot where the model poses nude with a professional photographer known to sell work to magazines which is what the recent published controversial photos show that Ms Trump did. Ms Trump's agent at that time, Zampolli, has stated that it was common practice in New York for models to come to New York on a tourist visa to get photos taken "to build a portfolio to attract bigger name modelling contracts".<sup>[2]</sup> Building a portfolio to attract more work is work - it is hard to imagine that USCIS would view it any other way. I've seen a person refused entry to the US because he let it slip that he was going to a church in the US on a Sunday to do charity volunteer work with his fellow churchgoers in the local community he felt part of because he lived just across the border. Just because it was common practice in New York for models to go there on tourist visas to build up their portfolios to the point where they could qualify for H-1B3s does not make what was happening legal. I hear there are millions of people Ms Trump's husband says he will deport many of whom got here because it is common practice in a number of US industries for employers to seek out and employ undocumented workers. Jrandomcanuck (talk) 06:38, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

Context is always relevant, but your addition stated quite plainly: "The Daryanani Law Group of New York, who advise fashion models on how to obtain visas to work in the U.S., state that it is not legal for models to do unpaid modelling work." Perhaps, in a casual conversation, a person would understand that to mean that it's unlawful for foreign models without work visas to do unpaid modeling work, but the context does not imply that conclusion, and Wikipedia—like most fact-bound writing—demands more precision than a chat at the pub. I believe a phrasing supported by the source would have been: "The Daryanani Law Group of New York, which advises fashion models on how to obtain visas to work in the U.S., states that it is typically not legal for foreigners to come to the United States to do unpaid modeling work without first obtaining work visas."

I have no argument with your claim that the government does not allow foreigners to come to the United States on non-work visas to do unpaid work, even for charitable causes. Rebbing 07:43, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

Some lawyers' websites put out highly reliable content and some put out downright awful content. Just because someone has an "Esq." after their name doesn't make them right or much more knowledgeable than a diligent researcher. A law firm's website *can* be reliable but it must have a strong reputation for fact-checking and accuracy, just like any other source. In addition, more restrictive rules apply to self-published sources, such as solo practitioners' websites. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 04:50, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

I visited the Wikipedia page "Visa Policy of the United States". Just on that one page, I found four citations sourced to a law firm's website. This is a group of lawyers located in London, U.K. explaining US law, used as a citation on Wikipedia. These citations can all be located when on that page by searching on the page for usalawyers. I didn't pick the Daryanani Law Group as a source because they had Esq beside their name. They aren't the only website operated by lawyers where advice is offered to models. Jrandomcanuck (talk) 06:38, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

Jrandomcanuck, just because a relatively low visibility and non-controversial Wikipedia article includes sub-optimal sources does not mean that we should add sub-optimal sources to a high-visibility and highly controversial article. I suggest that you go fix the other article instead of trying to add mediocre sources to this article. Whenever possible, legal points should be cited to law books and law journal articles, not commercial law firm websites. Cullen<sup>328</sup> *Let's discuss it* 07:35, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

I searched for

usalawyers

on *Visa policy of the United States* but found nothing. Anyway, it doesn't matter: you'll soon find that Wikipedia has lots of articles that aren't up to snuff, but that's almost never a reason to ignore our standards. We have so many bad articles that, were that an acceptable argument, we would have no content guidelines left! Also, our sourcing and content guidelines are taken most seriously for biographies of living persons (BLPs), *especially* controversial material on BLPs, which this undoubtedly is. Rebbing 07:45, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

## References

- "Visa Options and Special Considerations For Fashion Models" (<http://www.dlgvisablog.com/blog/2014/2/7/visa-options-and-special-considerations-for-fashion-models>). February 7, 2014. Retrieved 11 August 2016.
- "Did Melania Trump break immigration law?" (<https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2016/08/05/former-modeling-agent-says-got-melania-trump-visa/Ouej0xpuLyt6mnjHpGqW7H/story.html>). 5 August 2016. Retrieved 12 August 2016. "He said it was possible she came to the U.S. on a visitor visa to check out the modeling agency, a practice he said was common when foreign models were considering making the jump to New York. 'They come to meet the client to see if they really should come to New York,' he said, noting that the process often includes taking photos to build a portfolio to attract bigger-name modeling contracts."

## On the confirmation of languages spoken

Keeping in mind the importance of our NPOV mission, I wonder if anyone has concrete information about Ms. Melania Trump's language skills. The reason I ask is that if she truly speaks both fluent French and German, she should have English pretty well mastered, in terms of case, word-strings, syntax and tense. I've noticed some English language irregularities that might not happen if fluent in both Romance and Germanic descent languages. I am only raising this as a question, not affirming or denying anything. Whoever raises these discussions, I am not certain; I've heard claims of 12 languages... KSRolph (talk) 01:02, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

I share your skepticism, and have noticed the same problem. Vesuvius Dogg (talk) 01:55, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

Irrelevant for our purpose here. What matters is whether the claim is supported by a reliable source. It is. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 05:35, 29 July 2016 (UTC)

Irrelevant is right. However there seems no clip or audio available or is cited - neither in the English or the German Wikipedia article about her where one can listen to her German speaking. However basic school education in Slovenia is likely to contain some German language as a foreign language. (BTW As well not found French speaking source) It is notable, that she does not claim to speak Italian, as this is taught in about the same extent in Slovenia (and a little similar to French). Instead of speculation links could help to end all discussions here? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 89.13.137.25 (talk) 18:17, 13 August 2016 (UTC)

## Webistes archive points out wrong saying about 2012 web site creation on wrong bio

The website with the false claiming was secured 155 times between März 8, 2006 and Mai 29, 2016. According to this it was updated with a new picture inbetween and claimed a graduate starting 2006. To say it was created 2012 as Melanie Trumpf confessed in a tweet seems wrong. It is a lie over a lie. To have a - political correct expressed - false statements (over here one would say lie) about degrees qualifies for directly elected politicians in most European states to step down immediately. (It is about to happen right now in Germany with a Member of regional parliament Ms. Petra Hinz claiming to have had a minor diploma called Staatsexamina. She only refuses to do, as long as she is in hospital.) I wonder, if this is not checked in the immigration paperwork before one gets US citizen?

<https://web.archive.org/web/20060703002515/http://melaniatrump.com/bio/>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20090513030608/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio/>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20091205170719/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20130201061342/http://www.melaniatrump.com/bio/> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 77.177.211.2 (talk) 12:42, 10 August 2016 (UTC)

This is interesting and has been partially covered by this source (<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/jul/29/melania-trump-website-take-down-donald-reputation>), but in my view it's too esoteric for inclusion in our article. Certainly not every lie uttered by a politician (or a politician's spouse) warrants inclusion in their Wikipedia article. If this story receives more coverage by reliable sources then I'm open to reconsidering. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 17:40, 10 August 2016 (UTC)

Right but let's completely ignore the politician's spouse, Well, over here in Germany claiming to have a degree depending on where and how you do it e.g. when apply for a job and compile a copy with your name to a degree can be a crime: "Urkundenfälschung". The other way: If you say, one has NO degree but in reality he has, he might sue you! If you underpin a saying on a personal achievement with a decade missed in time - depending on the meaning - he might sue you. Back again: If someone says a website with a lie on it, was created 2012 but there is rather strong evidence, it was really created 2006 (already with a lie on it) and refreshed with new content - with the same lie on it - pushes you more towards the type of "serial in lies over a decade" than created once a website wrong. But you are right: That is esoteric and a somebody else's media problem. Here it is just enough to add the link of the July 2006-bio under the saying of "website was created 2012" as this is available online no matter what the media coverage is - as I strongly believe no Wikipedia reader needs other media to check a source!!! — Preceding unsigned comment added by 89.13.140.76 (talk) 14:26, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

Please consider reading our policy forbidding original research. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 20:20, 11 August 2016 (UTC)

OK Meanwhile I saw, that on this website in another section - in the "my world" section - after 2012-12.11.02.35.39 but before 2012-12-25-095909 the wrong statement showed up. That is around Christmas 2012. This might be referencing to the saying. Strange enough and dealt in the link from theguardian the history of the melaniatrump - website archive soon after was wiped out. Here you have the obtained degrees it in bio and my-world section:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20121225095909/http://www.melaniatrump.com/myworld/> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 77.177.227.125 (talk) 00:16, 15 August 2016 (UTC)

## Testifying about her degree?

I have removed a sentence saying that she testified under oath that she had a degree. The edit went way beyond that and into BLP territory, suggesting possible perjury, for which the sourcing was nowhere near strong enough. One of the sources was Jezebel (website) and another was Racked.com; neither of those qualify as a Reliable Source. The third was the Washington Post which is fine as far as it went, but it didn't go nearly as far as the deleted sentence. In a search just now I found no other reliable source with any mention of this at all. Without SIGNIFICANT coverage from RELIABLE sources it does not belong here. --MelanieN (talk) 20:29, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

Why didn't you quote the sentence here to anchor the discussion? The removed sentence is "*In August 2016, reports surfaced that Melania Trump testified under oath in a 2013 Indiana court case regarding one of her cosmetic lines that she had a degree from University of Ljubljana.*" All components of this statement are fact and no component seems contentious by itself. Let's try breaking it up this way:

- That reports surfaced in August 2016
- Melania testified under oath in a Indiana court case in 2013
- She testified she had a degree
- That the court case was about one of cosmetic lines

Do you find any of these contentious enough to need better sourcing? If none of them, then I suppose it is only the edit summary which concerns you, which reads in full "added sentence about reports of potential perjury over degree (with three refs)". Would you object to the material being re-added with a different edit summary? Jason Quinn (talk) 20:48, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

I don't have a problem with the sourcing but I'm nevertheless uncomfortable including this content from a BLP perspective, at least as currently written and I don't know how to re-write it to improve it. To me, the sentence seems non-neutral as it adds little encyclopedic value and reads as if it's there to implicate Trump in a crime. It also has nothing to do with Donald Trump's presidential campaign, except for the timing of its discovery, so it probably doesn't belong in that section. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 21:03, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

The edit summary was certainly a concern, yes. But the lack of reliable sourcing was a bigger concern, so I would object to re-adding it unless and until mainstream sources begin reporting this and treating it as if it was important. The "testified in court" item was mentioned in passing by the WaPo. It was mentioned in passing by Racked. Only Jezebel picked up on it as having any importance. We do not report every tiny fact that gets reported anywhere; we only use items that become a significant part of the reported story about the person. Particularly not if it has negative implications for a living person; per WP:BLP such things must be strongly sourced, and this isn't. --MelanieN (talk) 21:30, 22 August 2016 (UTC)  
P.S. And yes, I agree with Dr. Fleischman that it is non-neutral even if everything in the sentence is true. Including it could lead people to jump to conclusions about a possible crime, nudge-nudge, wink-wink, even though such a thing has not even been alleged. --MelanieN (talk) 21:34, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

The removal of the text under a sourcing concerns is at best made via a weak argument as the edit did not satisfy WP:BLPREMOVE in any obvious fashion. MelanieN, I see your comment but believe you are employing a rather rhetorical usage of "mentioned in passing" to support your removal. Nevertheless, BLP arguments for removal can still be made on other grounds as Dr. Fleischman has done. I can understand that view but do not share it. I think the material would be fine to stay but if it is premature to add it I can wait. I suspect this story will have large coverage over the coming days and this hopefully will make the status of the material clearer to all parties. In the interest of avoiding tedious debate, I am perfectly willing to wait a bit for time to increase coverage and clarify the story's significance. As for the significance of *the testimony*, I point out that two of the three stories directly say there was possible lying under oath and the third is consistent with that view. Mentioning that is not causing readers to "jump to conclusions", that's summarizing what the sources actually say. Jason Quinn (talk) 22:14, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

I agree we should reevaluate when there are more sources covering this story. On the other hand we have to be careful considering media attention when it comes to Melania Trump. She's in the spotlight right now because her husband is running for president and everyone wants to read about the latest Trump controversy. Ten years from now things about Melania that are in the news right now might not seem biographically significant. That's not to say that will be the case on this particular issue; we'll just have to see how things develop. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 23:59, 22 August 2016 (UTC)

If it becomes a major story we will want to add it, of course. But I don't understand your contention that poor sourcing (only one Reliable Source, which gives it two sentences halfway through a very long article) is a weak argument. As a matter of fact, "unsourced or poorly sourced" is the #1 reason for removal given at WP:BLPREMOVE. In any case, sourcing IS the key. More and better sourcing is exactly what will determine if this is a major story (in which case we will add it) or a minor one (as it is now). --MelanieN (talk) 00:17, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

MelanieN, regarding WP:BLPREMOVE, your interpretation of "poorly sourced" in "unsourced or poorly sourced" here seems to be closer to "two or more reliable sources are required to make it not poorly sourced". This is not what is required for contentious statements. A single reliable source is sufficient to satisfy BLP's "unsourced or poorly sourced" criteria. Let's dissect this case. Was the statement "unsourced"? No. We all agree. Was it "poorly sourced"? This question is more complex than the previous one because it has two facets: it can refer to both the reliability of the source and how explicitly the source covers the material in the article. Is the Washington Post reliable? Yes (you agree). Okay, so then how closely did the Washington Post article back the removed statement? Well, there are only a few components of the statement that the Washington Post article did not explicitly cover: A) that "[the court case was] regarding one of her cosmetic lines", B) it was an Indiana court, and C) that the testimony was "under oath". Statements A and B are non-contentious I suppose so I don't believe we are discussing them. This leaves only the phrase "under oath" as possibly contentious. But *all* testimony in American courts is under oath (correct me if I'm wrong on that) so this is implicit when the Washington Post writes "testified in court". In other words, "testified in court" and "testified in court under oath" are functionally the same. It's also made clear by the other sources that it was under oath so that adds to the evidence that the phrase "under oath" is valid and not contentious. (BTW, although I am not strongly committed otherwise, I do not accept as a given that the other sources are unreliable and would want to learn more about them.) The rest of the statement was directly backed by the Washington Post. Since the entirety of the sentence in question is basically covered by at least one reliable source (the Washington Post), the material was not properly removed under WP:BLPREMOVE sourcing concerns (I don't think the other criteria like "conjectural interpretation" are being invoked). As for the source only giving "two sentences halfway through a very long article", that doesn't matter at all as far as sourcing is concerned.

That said, just because material is sourced well enough not be removed under WP:BLPREMOVE does not mean it necessarily belongs. Other elements of BLP come into play, such as tone, undue coverage, and so on. That discussion, however, is of a different nature.

I provided this detailed reply assuming you were genuinely curious as to my reasoning. Part of this is academic as there are now more sources that could be used, including an entire Vanity Fair article (<http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2016/08/did-melania-trump-lie-under-oath>); so already some concerns could be eliminated with this extra source. Jason Quinn (talk) 19:39, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

OK, now you're talking. A Reliable Source, with a full-length article specifically about this information, with the headline asking the question - now we have one item of actual significant coverage. The question whether to include it now becomes one of WP:WEIGHT. At this point the story is pretty much under the radar. If it gets reported more widely and becomes a genuine controversy (as the "plagiarism" and

"immigration status" stories did), we should then include it. --MelanieN (talk) 21:06, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

P.S. And yes, "two or more reliable sources are required to make it not poorly sourced" is exactly what I believe for negative material about living people. --MelanieN (talk) 21:10, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

I do not share this view of our BLP policy. I looked through the WT:BLP and WP:BLPN archives and found nothing that was particularly helpful. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 23:43, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

MelanieN, the policy is more liberal than what you believe it ought to be. Deleting edits on sourcing grounds that satisfy the BLP sourcing policy but not satisfying your personal criteria is wrong. Jason Quinn (talk) 20:30, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

I also think this view is contrary to policy. True, we are more strict about what counts as a reliable source when it comes to controversial claims about living persons, but a single reliable source is sufficient to support a negative statement in most cases. I am also unfamiliar with the requirement that a source must have more than a certain number of sentences about a given fact in order to be used to support that fact. A reliable source is a reliable source. Significant coverage is a concern when evaluating a subject's notability, not when writing articles. **Rebbing** 21:01, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

I see nothing wrong with Jason Quinn's original edit: it was adequately sourced, neutrally-written, and did not constitute undue weight. I support reinstating it. **Rebbing** 21:01, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

Consensus seems to be to keep it. I will restore it, adding the new Vanity Fair source. --MelanieN (talk) 21:06, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

I'm not so sure. The only editor who has supported including this content is Jason Quinn. I opposed it on BLP/neutrality grounds unrelated to sourcing. As far as I can tell Rebbing has only weighed in how our verifiability policy works, not on whether the content should be added. --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 21:59, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

Look at this top of this subthread—I support the sentence as it now stands. 😊 That said, I'm also skeptical that consensus is for it. You (Dr. Fleischman) and MelanieN oppose it, and Jason Quinn and I support it. I don't know where that leaves us. It seems that, per BLPREQUESTRESTORE, you're entitled to remove it.

Personally, while I believe including it is appropriate, even from an UNDUE standpoint, I don't think it would be greatly missed, and I think your concerns are valid. I'd much rather we err on the side of caution here, especially considering this article receives in excess of ten thousand hits a day, so I would not see it as unreasonable for you to remove the sentence pending further discussion and clearer consensus. **Rebbing** 22:22, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

Thanks Rebbing, I've removed the material. I'm willing to accept that there's a consensus for restoring it if another editor chimes in and agrees it should be in the article. If no one watching this page weighs in then I suppose we could use WP:3O (call it "5O"). --Dr. Fleischman (talk) 16:36, 26 August 2016 (UTC)

Thanks for removing it. What I would suggest (if no one else chimes in to make a clearer consensus) is to wait and see if the story develops legs - i.e., more and more mainstream reporting - or stays pretty much under the radar as it is now. I will change my opinion if this becomes a major issue. --MelanieN (talk) 17:09, 26 August 2016 (UTC)

## New material: her lawyer threatens to sue

I have removed, as a potential BLP violation, this material which was just added: *"On August 22, 2016, Trump's lawyer Charles J. Harder threatened to take legal action against tabloids such as The Daily Mail because he believed that their statements towards Trump are "100% false". These claims include that Trump was an escort in the 1990s.<sup>[1]</sup>"* The source is reliable: The New York Times. But "lawyer says he might sue" talk is common, kind of a nothingburger of a story unless it results in an actual suit. And it has the unfortunate result of sneaking tabloid accusations that are in themselves BLP violations into a Wikipedia article. --MelanieN (talk) 05:10, 23 August 2016 (UTC)

1. Ember, Sydney (August 22, 2016). "Lawyer for Melania Trump Threatens Defamation Suits Against News Outlets" (<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/23/us/politics/melania-trump-lawsuit.html>). *The New York Times*. Retrieved August 23, 2016.

I concur. Thanks for your sharp eye. **Rebbing** 21:02, 25 August 2016 (UTC)

Suit has been filed, here's a copy. 1 (<https://www.scribd.com/document/322782788/Melania-Trump-Libel-Lawsuit>) JerryRussell (talk) 02:40, 3 September 2016 (UTC)

We can't use that primary source, but the filing of the suit has been covered widely. [14] ([http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/melania-trump-lawsuit-daily-mail.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/melania-trump-lawsuit-daily-mail.html?_r=0))[15] (<http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/melania-trump-files-defamation-suit-against-daily-mail-political-blog-n641771>) [16] ([https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/melania-trump-files-defamation-lawsuit-against-blogger-and-british-tabloid/2016/09/02/13baae70-713c-11e6-8365-b19e428a975e\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/melania-trump-files-defamation-lawsuit-against-blogger-and-british-tabloid/2016/09/02/13baae70-713c-11e6-8365-b19e428a975e_story.html)) So we probably do need to put in a sentence or two about this. I don't think this was wise on her part - it only calls attention to the (allegedly libelous) claims - but I'm not her advisor. (Nor am I her, despite my name.) --MelanieN (talk) 22:38, 4 September 2016 (UTC)

I added it. --MelanieN (talk) 23:04, 4 September 2016 (UTC)

Thanks MelanieN! JerryRussell (talk) 02:01, 5 September 2016 (UTC)

Retrieved from "[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania\\_Trump/Archive\\_1&oldid=749028286](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump/Archive_1&oldid=749028286)"