

Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 3

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 2

Archive 3

Archive 4

Contents

- 1 RfC: Melanie Trump libel suits
 - 1.1 History
 - 1.2 Survey
 - 1.2.1 Support
 - 1.2.2 Oppose
 - 1.3 Threaded discussion
- 2 Autism charity work
- 3 Birther interview
- 4 On the citation for languages spoken
- 5 Erroneous closing of RfC
 - 5.1 Issues per renewed RfC
- 6 Secret service name
- 7 Removal of sources
- 8 Libel suit against *Daily Mail*

RfC: Melanie Trump libel suits

*The following discussion is closed. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.*

As reported in multiple sources, Mrs. Trump has brought libel suits in the U.S., most recently in New York, concerning allegations originally published in *The Daily Mail*. These new developments are not a simple rehash of the original, inflammatory allegations, but rather delve into how Mrs. Trump is protecting her brand. Multiple reliable sources are reporting on this, including *The New York Times* in this article (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/us/politics/melania-trump-libel-suit-daily-mail.html>) and accompanying editorial[1] (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/opinion/melania-trump-inc-i mperiled.html>).

The questions we need to address is

1. whether the libel suits should be mentioned
2. if so, to what extent, if at all, should the original allegations published by the *Mail* be mentioned?

I am of the belief that after running for a near-full course, the RFC has generated clear consensus on most aspects while it remains a bit hazy on certain other spheres. Also the discussion has of late failed to garner any new interest to the community. Hence the decision to close.

- As to **Q-1**--There are ample policy cum rationale driven arguments which roots for the **inclusion** about the context of libel suits in some manner. Consensus is clearly established.
- As to **Q-2**--There is consensus to **briefly** mention about the original allegations mainly because it could serve as the source of how the matter initially sprang up .Also, it **shall** be mentioned

3. Should they be included as a separate section or subsection?

--Coretheapple (talk) 17:52, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

History

~~Withdrawn per WP:RFCEND. Clear consensus established to support discussion of the libel suits. Coretheapple (talk) 22:51, 16 February 2017 (UTC) here is the entire RfC discussion...~~

Reopening per discussion. Coretheapple (talk) 18:06, 21 February 2017 (UTC)

Survey

Support

- Support** This is not tabloid fodder. The material addressed in the news articles, such as the ones I posted, deal with the Trump family's commercial interests and the libel suits in relation to them. Favor mention of libel suits in a separate section or subsection. Uncertain about inclusion of original allegations, lean in favor. Coretheapple (talk) 17:52, 8 February 2017 (UTC)
- Support** as it is now an issue about ethical conduct about which a number of people have commented on, including constitutional law experts and ethics counsels of Obama and Bush - [2] (<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-melania-trump-lawsuit-20170207-story.html>), [3] (https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/melania-trump-missed-out-on-once-in-a-lifetime-opportunity-to-make-millions-lawsuit-says/2017/02/06/3654f070-ecd0-11e6-9973-c5efb7ccfb0d_story.html), [4] (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/02/08/is-there-any-legal-reason-melania-trump-cant-profit-from-being-first-lady/>), [5] (<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/08/ethics-watchdog-melania-trump-daily-mail-lawsuit-us>) The Daily Mail allegation however should NOT be mentioned as it has been retracted. This is about the lawsuit itself rather than the allegation. I think putting it in a controversy section should be fine. Hzh (talk) 18:40, 8 February 2017 (UTC)
- Support.** This clearly needs to be included. It is a very high profile lawsuit filed by Melania Trump herself, after she became first lady, against one of the world's largest newspapers. It has been the subject of extensive coverage and commentary in reliable sources due to the extraordinary statements that Melania Trump herself makes in her own lawsuit, namely what she describes as her intention of using her current position to "launch a broad-based commercial brand" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships". The key story here is the lawsuit, her own statements about using her current position for monetary gain and the very serious response to those statements. We should just briefly mention the background for the lawsuit, the escort allegations, which is necessary for understanding what the lawsuit is about (and which can be neutrally sourced to *her own public statements* in her lawsuit) but which isn't the main issue for our purposes, which is rather the controversy over using the first lady position for monetary gain. The material should be covered in a sub section under the first lady main section, because the lawsuit was filed when she is first lady, because the main focus in the coverage in reliable sources is on her stated intention of using the position as first lady for monetary gain, and because she herself makes her current position as first lady the main issue in her lawsuit. **My proposal for a wording can be found here (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&oldid=764256703#Lawsuit_against_Daily_Mail).** -Tataral (talk) 19:23, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I would just say that what's important is the criticisms raised by ethics counsels and constitutional law experts, which you didn't mention. It is not clear from what you wrote what the issue is. You should also add the denial that there is any intention to use her position for profit. There is an excessive number of cites and trimmed the quote (mention of jewelry, fragrance, and whatnot is unnecessary.) Hzh (talk) 23:16, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

that they have been since retracted. The second line per the two people of the four who stand opposed to the inclusion because of the subsequent retraction.

- As to **Q-3**--Consensus is **not clear**. Either the participants on the page could discuss and develop a consensus or another RFC could be held solely on the location of the section/paragraph. *Winged Blades* Godric 06:31, 8 March 2017 (UTC) Amended-11:07, 8 March 2017 (UTC)

The ethical aspects of her business are not at issue here. It's only about the lawsuit against the *Mail*. She's not suing them because of any comments about ethical business practices, but only because they damaged her reputation. Whether she intended to use her position for profit is unrelated to the lawsuit. So the legality and ethics of profiting from political positions, even if *unintended*, is an important issue otherwise; but it's not relevant to the lawsuit against the tabloid. --Light show (talk) 02:03, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

I think you'd find that it's the rationale given in the lawsuit that is the issue, and that is what the article should concentrate on. Hzh (talk) 02:41, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

- **Support** It is no longer a question of privacy; she has invited the coverage by filing this high-profile lawsuit. Highly relevant: the suit explicitly says she had intended to leverage her position as First Lady to make million-dollar deals. (“[The] plaintiff had the unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, as an extremely famous and well-known person, as well as a former professional model, brand spokesperson and successful businesswoman, to launch a broad-based commercial brand in multiple product categories, each of which could have garnered multimillion-dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world.”[6] (<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/06/melania-trump-refiles-150-million-libel-lawsuit-daily-mail>)) Her lawyer later said that wasn't what she meant and she would never do that, so we can report his denial also. --MelanieN (talk) 00:29, 9 February 2017 (UTC) P.S. Obviously we will have to mention the allegation that led to the lawsuit, but we should do so as briefly as possible and in generalities if possible, and of course point out that the story was retracted. The lawsuit and her justification for it is the story; the tabloid allegations are not. --MelanieN (talk) 00:33, 9 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** - While notable, this deserves no more than a sentence in the Career and immigration to the United States section. Anything more would be WP:UNDUE. Also, a Controversy section is not needed. Meatsgains (talk) 03:13, 9 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** *It is no longer a question of privacy; she has invited the coverage by filing this high-profile lawsuit ... the suit explicitly says she had intended to leverage her position as First Lady to make million-dollar deals.* The suit (and commercial logic attached to it) is precisely the issue, the original 'Mail' article is now mere background. Pincrete (talk) 17:27, 9 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** - as long as mention is not UNDUE and follows WP:BLP#Public_figures, which should *simply document what these sources say*. A section for Litigation is appropriate, but I cringe at the use of the term "Controversy" in any BLP which should be following NPOV; therefore, void of controversy. With regards to the DM litigation, a brief mention of the lawsuit and DM's retraction would be appropriate, such as DM stated "yada yada", and MT denied the allegations stating "yada yada". DM retracted the article - make it succinct. The same should apply to the other litigation and/or legal issues. A spin-off article for Melania Trump Litigation might be a consideration in the future if such matters grow rather than shrink. Atsme^{🗨️} 15:20, 10 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support**. At this point, the amount of continuing coverage makes this relevant and is enough to overbear my previous concerns about WP:NOTNEWS and unfairly amplifying libelous remarks. I'm particularly pleased with MelanieN's proposed wording, which I believe is a neutral and appropriate summary of the facts and controversy. Rebbing 20:45, 10 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** - per all of the above, this deserves a mention of sensible length. (I.e., not too long, but sufficient to identify the main issues and put in context). I support MelanieN's wording or something similar. Neutrality^{talk} 06:29, 11 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Weak support** – The libelous article *per se* would not deserve mention, per WP:BLP and because it was retracted. However the extensive coverage now resulting from Melania's lawsuit against the *Daily Mail* and the editorial exploitation of these circumstances to accuse her of graft, have now made the event more notable. Extreme care should be taken in the formulation (I will comment below on the currently-proposed phrasings). Waiting a few weeks until the formal end of the RfC would hopefully also provide some more insight on further development of the story. WP:NOTNEWS, WP:No deadline. — JFG ^{talk} 08:32, 12 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** per previous comments. --David Tornheim (talk) 01:57, 1 March 2017 (UTC)

Oppose

- **Oppose**, for the reasons mentioned in first discussion, namely that it undermines too many guidelines. I'll probably add a few other comments later. --Light show (talk) 19:30, 8 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Oppose** - (1) WP:BLPGOSSIP a tabloid put out a sexy story and it's since been retracted so there is no longer a source for the implication; (2) WP:UNDUE prominence to a foot note of her life -- while titillating it's just not an enduring tale nor is a lawsuit a widely important part of her life -- or is that more WP:OFFTOPIC?; (3) she is WP:NOTPUBLICFIGURE not an elected official nor otherwise sought public celebrity, doesn't even seem to be wanting to do First Lady role; and (4) unsuitable material, the sensationalism tabloid nature runs counter to WP:NOTSCANDAL and also would want to avoid the potential or appearance that WP here is a proxy way for attacking Donald. Cheers Markbassett (talk) 22:25, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

Threaded discussion

- **Issues** worth considering:

BLP. It likely goes against its guidelines: *Wikipedia is an encyclopedia, not a tabloid: it is not Wikipedia's job to be sensationalist, or to be the primary vehicle for the spread of titillating claims about people's lives; the possibility of harm to living subjects must always be considered when exercising editorial judgment.*

Any lawsuit filed in a U.S. court is public. The fact that the media read it and turned it into a headline news story, even publishing the full lawsuit (a primary source,) naturally started an editorial frenzy for the MSM.

WP not a newspaper. The guidelines were quickly broken with edits such as this one (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=764255588&oldid=764139165), creating an entire sub-section, with **8** citations! In any case, suing tabloids is fairly common. Their methods (<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/BzS0TZAicAAhYMR.jpg>) of presenting the news (<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/CQgKzBaXAAAEji5.jpg:large>) leaves a lot to be desired.

Allegation. Allegations are not facts: *In law, an allegation is a claim of a fact by a party in a pleading, charge, or defense. Until they can be proved, allegations remain merely assertions.* While this is SOP for the media, which survives by attracting readers for selling ads, WP has a higher standard.

NPOV. It's basically impossible to maintain a neutral POV about a non-neutral legal dispute. Note that the editor who added the sub-section also commented above that it was Trump's intention to "exploit" her standing, which is their personal opinion, and shows how this lawsuit can become a gossip-magnet for those so inclined. In 2010 she already had a line of jewelry being sold, but that fact is not mentioned in the article. Not as titillating maybe. If there was a way to mention the lawsuit yet limit the inclination by editors to expand it and blow it out of proportion, I'd support it. I don't think that's possible. It would be easier to put a cork (http://www.livescience.com/images/i/000/023/076/original/champagne-cork-popping.jpg?interpolation=1&anzos-none&downsize=*:600) back in the bottle, IMO. --Light show (talk) 20:18, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I don't think the argument that *"If there was a way to mention the lawsuit yet limit the inclination by editors to expand it and blow it out of proportion, I'd support it"* which basically boil down to "I can keep it but won't because of what others might do" is going to convince. Others might argue for the opposite using the same kind of argument ("if you don't keep it then others will keep adding it"). The BLP issue is certainly a concern, even though allegations are permitted for public figure per WP:PUBLICFIGURE, I think it should not be mentioned given that it is an unsubstantiated allegation that has already been retracted. If someone else adds it, then you deal with it as appropriate. Criticisms of the lawsuit (or rather the implications of what's been said in the lawsuit) however is another matter, removing it would be more problematic, precisely because doing so would make the article non-neutral, and can be seen as trying to airbrush something controversial out of someone's biography. Hzh (talk) 22:56, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

(ec) I would respond to the above as follows:

BLP: this might have been applicable early on, but no longer is a "tabloid" matter.

Not a newspaper Not applicable either, as I think is self-evident. We don't use that proviso to arbitrarily eliminate relevant material.

Allegations I don't understand this objection so I can't reply to it.

NPOV We ensure NPOV by mentioning the lawsuits in neutral fashion. Omission is the NPOV issue in my opinion.

--Coretheapple (talk) 22:47, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

If you really believe that "omission" is the issue, all *three* supporters should oppose. Note that the added text (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=764255588&oldid=764139165) was 120 words with 8 sources. Yet while it included details about allegations *against* Trump, it oddly *omitted* that they were all denied *and* retracted. And *each* of the 8 sources made it clear that the allegations were denied and retracted. To include a 120-word sub-section which on its face is thereby deceptive and misleading by omission, is why IMO the NPOV issue can't be dealt with. Even User:Hzh mentioned the retraction, but didn't see any harm in omitting it. --Light show (talk) 00:16, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

I'm not quite sure what it is that you think I "didn't see any harm in omitting", but whatever it is, I think you misunderstood what I wrote (I wrote that the allegation should not be mentioned, I certainly didn't say that the retraction can be omitted). I do agree with you on BLP, and we need to be careful writing something like this, certainly on an allegation that has been retracted. The issue here is whether the lawsuit has any place in the article, and I believe it has, how you write it is another matter. Hzh (talk) 02:36, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Light show has written a wall of text above, but nothing that is relevant to this discussion. The existence of her lawsuit is not an "allegation", it is an undisputed fact. The controversy is about the existence of the lawsuit (an undisputed fact) and the existence of the claims that Trump has made in connection with the lawsuit about using her position to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships" (also undisputed facts). --Tataral (talk) 22:59, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

That's correct, and thanks for putting your finger on the issue. What's relevant is that a controversy has arisen over the *existence* of the libel suits, which are indeed indisputable. As a public figure this is highly relevant. The fact that it spawned such breadth of coverage leads me to believe that unless we have some substantive opposition in addition to what LightSnow has posited above, that we have a "snow" situation. But this is an RfC, there is no rush. Coretheapple (talk) 23:09, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I'd like to point out that Ms. Trump hasn't actually stated a desire to use her position to establish multimillion dollar business relationships; rather, she opined through counsel that she had the **opportunity**, "as an extremely famous and well-known person," to pursue such relationships. There are a number of fairly obvious strategic reasons why a competent lawyer might add such language to a complaint regardless of his client's actual intent. **Rebbing** 00:36, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

There are two issues we should keep separate: the *allegations* by the tabloid, and the *amount* of the lawsuit. They're related, but still independent. Even if Trump was only an unknown housewife checker at a supermarket, or a fashion model, she could have sued them for defamation of character. The "opportunity" loss is only used to estimate damages. If she was a checker who had a home business selling cookbooks or a fashion model, her damages would have been less. If she only suffered "emotional distress," or injury to her reputation, which Trump claims, she could sue on those.

Plenty of suits have been filed against the *Daily Mail* for damaging reputations: Didier Drogba, Angelina Jolie[7] (<http://time.com/2975796/angelina-jolie-sue-daily-mail-video/>), J. K. Rowling, Bob Ainsworth, Sally Morgan, David Duchovny[8] (<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-duchovny-idUSTRE49L8AQ20081023>) and George Clooney[9] (<http://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-28262019>) have all filed suits. IMO, it's the allegations by the *Mail*, especially since they're denied and were last year retracted, which are the BLP issue. Her being famous or widely photographed are only used to support the amount of damages. --Light show (talk) 01:31, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

I'm beginning to sense a WP:IDIDNTHARTHAT element to your one-person campaign to exclude this material. There is clearly a consensus to add, and so far as I know only you have objected to this material being included, at least at this stage. However, we do need to discuss how much to add on the libel suits and whether to make reference to the original allegations at all. User:MelanieN sums up my sentiments. Coretheapple (talk) 14:40, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Based on the original coverage in the *Daily Mail*, it might possibly not have been appropriate to mention the escort controversy. However, with this extremely high profile lawsuit by her (she recognises in her own lawsuit that she is "an extremely famous and well-known person") against an equally "extremely famous" newspaper (one of the world's largest) there are some things to consider

1. The lawsuit in itself is without doubt highly notable and needs to be mentioned – not because of the escort controversy but because of the nature of the lawsuit, the claims made by Trump in the lawsuit relating to using her position for monetary gain, and the overwhelming response to that, and coverage of all this in reliable sources
2. Mentioning the lawsuit without mentioning what it's originally about would not be a good solution
3. Trump has actively sought much more publicity regarding this controversy than was originally the case before the lawsuit
4. The claims that started it all can now be sourced entirely to *her own public statements* in her own lawsuit (as reported on by reliable source); no "third party gossip" or anything like that is necessary to mention this, so even if there was, possibly, formerly a concern over privacy/BLP in relation to reporting on this based only on the original controversy, there no longer is. In her lawsuit she now herself publicly describes the allegations that were made against her, why she disagrees with them and so on.
5. At some point a person can become so prominent, and a controversy so prominent and widely reported on, that it is meaningless to argue that the information in question should be excluded for privacy reasons – for example we have an entire article devoted to the Barack Obama citizenship conspiracy theories and claims that Obama is a muslim; a person's birth certificate and religion would normally be considered entirely private matters, but in this case Obama's status as President and the prominence of the controversy trump such concerns.

6. Because the escort controversy is of secondary importance to the lawsuit itself, Trump's claims in the lawsuit, and the response to those claims, the escort allegations should only be very briefly mentioned as the background for the case. There is no need to go on at length about it, but it should be briefly mentioned in a neutral and factual manner. My wording proposal is something along the lines of: **In February 2017 Melania Trump filed a lawsuit against Mail Media, the owner of the Daily Mail newspaper, over an article that alleged that she had worked as an escort. In the lawsuit Trump claimed the article had hurt her chance to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships" ...etc** --Tataral (talk) 15:35, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Yes, I agree with your analysis and your proposed solution. Coretheapple (talk) 15:58, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

I find the persistent attempt to add the allegation without even saying that the Daily Mail had retracted it ([10] (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3769798/Melania-Trump-retraction.html>)) to be extremely unhelpful, and certainly cannot be considered unbiased. Someone else might be more suited to writing it. Note also that Daily Mail is no longer allowed as a source - Wikipedia:Reliable sources/Noticeboard#Daily Mail RfC. Hzh (talk) 16:27, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

I agree that a de novo approach to this passage is warranted, and that the retraction needs to be mentioned, obviously. Yes, the *Mail* is indeed not a reliable source and that has been getting considerable publicity! In fact, it's getting so much publicity that it arguably may be worth mentioning in the article on the newspaper. Coretheapple (talk) 16:56, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

This controversy is about the lawsuit. It is not about the escort controversy in itself. Personally, I see no particular need to go into *lengthy detail* about her original quarrel with the Daily Mail relating to the original controversy, as discussed above, which would serve to make the discussion of whether she was an escort or not longer. There is also no need for us to pick sides in that quarrel; Wikipedia merely reports what reliable sources report, and in this context the background story is that *Trump has sued the Daily Mail over an article which said she had worked as an escort* and the controversy is about the lawsuit itself and the claims she has made in connection with it about

"multimillion dollar business relationships" and the response to those claims. Whether an old newspaper article noone (except her) cares about was retracted or not is a trivial detail in all this, since the controversy – for Wikipedia's purposes, as covered now in reliable sources – is not about that article or its content in itself. Furthermore, I'm not aware of anyone proposing that we use Daily Mail as a source, which seems like an attempt to derail the discussion. The Daily Mail is quite irrelevant in all this, except for being the party that Trump has sued (which we can report on by citing other reliable sources, not the Daily Mail itself). --Tataral (talk) 17:22, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Moving post below, which had been inserted out of sequence and within one of my comments- thus making it impossible for me to respond without screwing up my post entirely. Please do not respond to people *within* their posts. Thanks, Coretheapple (talk) 20:09, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Using WP as a vehicle to repeat allegations, especially when they've been both denied and retracted by the tabloid, goes against policy to avoid SOAP, i.e. "scandal mongering." Even when sensationalist fake news gets retracted and the paper apologizes, there are enough people who will still read the story and believe it *may* have been true. Doubt is created, at best, and the story get repeated. For that reason alone, it would reward the *Daily Mail*, IMO, to detail that they're being sued and what for. It's just another publicity stunt to get readers and increase sales. (<http://c8.alamy.com/comp/E1C84P/stand-of-tabloid-newspapers-at-a-newsagents-london-uk-the-sun-the-E1C84P.jpg>) And I realize that WP can use any RS, but when an unreliable source (https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/feb/08/wikipedia-bans-daily-mail-as-unreliable-source-for-website?CMP=share_btn_tw) gets sued, and they've already admitted to the printing of fake news, it creates a possible exception. I'd leave the entire suit out of WP. Just an opinion.--Light show (talk) 18:18, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

This has been amply addressed already and I am not going to repeat myself in response to an "IDIDNTHEARTHAT"-style comment. Coretheapple (talk) 20:09, 9 February 2017 (UTC)

Correct me if I'm wrong, but is the lawsuit *initiated by Melania Trump* after she became first lady, and which has created this new controversy discussed here which revolves around shameless abuse of public office at the White House for the purpose of entering into "multimillion dollar business relationships", in reality a publicity stunt to get readers and increase sales for the *Daily Mail*, all thought out by Melania Trump, who must be a real friend of the *Daily Mail* in that case? Also, shouting "fake news" at mainstream media (an absurd abuse of the term, which really refers to an entirely different specific phenomenon) is not really helpful for you or your argument. --Tataral (talk) 12:41, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

That's correct. We're dealing with new facts, and for one editor to continue to raise the same stale arguments is disruptive. Coretheapple (talk) 17:12, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

More than one editor objecting here, and the RFC is still running. Seems to me there are a lot of WP reasons her bio page or for WP encyclopedia reputation should not include a now-retracted tabloid story and a not-notable lawsuit, not seeing much reasons why it should. It seems in the same bucket of trivia with the tale of the moth named after Donald or the orange alligator or coverage of her dress being white (gasp!), and just propagating a now-retracted titillation.

I'm also a bit dubious on treating first lady as Public figure since she is not politician, celebrity, nor business leader but just married to one, and the lawsuit seems not getting a higher burden of proof mentioned that a public figure would. I guess as stuckee first lady

does mean 'pervasively involved in public affairs' for WP guides but it seems a bit different from seeking the limelight for herself and a bit of a stretch.

Cheers Markbassett (talk) 22:53, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

Jeez, her lawsuit is not "a now-retracted tabloid story" and it is not "a not-notable lawsuit." Notability is judged based on coverage in reliable sources, not editors' personal views. The lawsuit is highly notable, and it is entirely her own initiative, and the "now-retracted tabloid story" isn't the issue at all, and only Trump cares about that story. That doesn't prevent us from writing about a highly significant lawsuit <redacted>. --Tataral (talk) 13:02, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

Ms. Trump has not said any such thing. Her complaint stated that she had the *opportunity* to do so, but opportunity and desire are not the same thing.

Rebbing 17:14, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

That is not true at all. Melania Trump has filed a lawsuit where she has claimed a huge compensation, 150 million USD, from the *Daily Mail's* owners based on what she claims are lost business opportunities in her current situation^[11] (<http://www.npr.org/2017/02/07/513970871/melania-trump-lawsuit-argues-once-in-a-lifetime-chance-to-make-millions-is-lost>). Her case, as argued by her, rests entirely on her claim that she *could have* earned millions of dollars by using her current position for monetary gain in a very specific way which she has described in great detail, and she claims that the *Daily Mail* must compensate her based on that claim. So if she were, theoretically, awarded the 150 million USD compensation that she claims, it would be based directly on the abuse of the first lady position for monetary gain. According to her lawsuit, the only reason she has not been able to use her current position in this way to enrich herself is the fact that the *Daily Mail* ruined the opportunity for her by reporting critically on her last year. Again, all this is based on her own claims in her own lawsuit, and she is still actively seeking to use the first lady position to enrich herself in this way by claiming the 150 million USD compensation for lost business opportunities. --Tataral (talk) 19:07, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

Tataral it's a bit hard to ignore that it was "a now-retracted tabloid story" that caused her lawsuit -- so for WP reasons her bio page or for WP encyclopedia reputation should not go to the retracted story, of which the lawsuit is part. We're supposed to be encyclopedia WP:NOTTABLOID nor WP:BLOG, and this article is supposed to be the important (and WP:V) parts of her life not some barely-started legal proceedings or WP:NOTNEWSPAPER chasing the trivia WP:BLOG tale of the week, especially since it's been retracted by the paper and blogger. While I'm loosely interested in the legal precedents that it was going forward (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-lawsuit-blogger-judge-rules/>), that's not BLP material something about her life -- whether repeating something as a rumor is still libel, that there was no mention of legally handling it as a public figure. The original blogger who the Daily Mail relayed has since issued a settlement statement that the tale "was replete with false and defamatory statements about her. I had no legitimate factual basis to make these false statements and I fully retract them." (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-filed/>) we can also skip. Just skip the whole titillating tar baby mess, let's just not take WP there. Markbassett (talk) 03:08, 13 February 2017 (UTC)

*The discussion above is closed. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.*

Autism charity work

Can someone add in a section on all the good work that the Trump family have done supporting Autism, including Autism Speaks? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 109.152.9.74 (talk) 16:16, 10 March 2017 (UTC)

Birther interview

Can someone please expand this section on Melania Trump and the interviews she gave to Joy Behar on Birtherism and President Obama.

<http://www.ew.com/article/2011/04/21/melania-trump-donald-president-birther>

Her comments were welcomed at the time by the Birther movement and posted on this Youtube Channel.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gBqkLZvJu0c>

On the citation for languages spoken

The statement "She can speak six languages: English, French, Italian, German, Serbo-Croatian, and her native Slovene" might be restated more accurately, perhaps as "By self-report she speaks five languages" or "She reports that she speaks at least five languages." The citation could then be something like Fox News, "On the Record," Interview with Greta Van Susteren. [youtube video titled MELANIA TRUMP FULL INTERVIEW WITH GRETA VAN SUSTEREN FOX NEWS 5 26 2016 1], 7:38. Retrieved March 12, 2017. On that video of the interview she mentions German, Italian, and French in addition to English (and her native Slovene). The sixth language often named (Serbo-Croatian) could be mentioned if a credible source can be found, at least for her statement about it, not just others' statements with no solid source. The current citation regarding six languages ("Melania Trump, explained" at vox.com) is simply one of many repetitions of this claim, with no actual evidence. Therefore, Mrs. Trump's recorded or printed remarks can be the only source, though they are not evidence. The Washington Post citation in note 1 to the article ("Meet Melania Trump"), mentioned in the earlier Talk on this topic, says that she speaks four languages (in addition to her native tongue), but again this gives no evidence and is simply a repetition of what is said all over the Internet and was on Mrs. Trump's website, which was removed when doubt was cast on her claim to having a college degree. The language claim is not verified merely by being repeated in the Washington Post, where without a source it says that she speaks four languages and not that she reports speaking four languages; nor can it be inferred by determining what is studied in Slovenian schools, nor by what is likely to be picked up in fashion capitals, nor by any other form of guessing. In English when we say that someone speaks a language, we assume a good degree of fluency. Mrs. Trump makes many errors in English, casting doubt on her true fluency in other languages. So until someone can witness or testify to her conversing in depth or writing or giving a speech in these other languages, Wikipedia should only say that she reports speaking these languages, not that she does speak them. The frequent media repetition of the claim to speak 5 or 6 languages appears to be designed to show that Mrs. Trump is cultured and educated. It remains to be seen if these languages will enable her to help the President in any way. This is not a trivial issue (it seems to have been abandoned after the earlier Talk), because it is a matter of precise language and truthfulness. Wikipedia is not a tool for promoting anyone's image. LhanaXano (talk) 15:29, 12 March 2017 (UTC)

Good point; I just attributed her own declaration of language fluency (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=770279906&oldid=770214697), so this is no longer in Wikipedia's voice.
— JFG ^{talk} 14:02, 14 March 2017 (UTC)

Erroneous closing of RfC

RfC was reopened. Coretheapple (talk) 15:49, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

*The following discussion has been closed. **Please do not modify it.***

Per snowball test, the RfC did not establish any consensus. The Talk:Melania_Trump § RfC: *Melanie_Trump_libel_suits* was a request to address a number of different questions. In response, while there were a number of "Supports," those supports were supporting different areas, and none of them were supporting all three RfC issues presented. Even Coretheapple, who opened and closed the RfC, stated they were themselves "uncertain about inclusion of original allegations..." The next Support by Hzh did not support those 3 issues, and in fact opposed a key issue, stating that it "should NOT be mentioned." Another support only referred to the privacy aspect, which wasn't an issue.

The other Supports were similarly vague and often off-topic, with one only stating they liked a proposed wording version. However, the actual "wording" was never an issue either. As for the subsequent suggested wording section, there were 2 proposals, with somewhat equal supports for both. But essentially there is no consensus for the RfC of 3 separate issues. I'd suggest restoring the RfC which was closed for the wrong reasons. --Light show (talk) 00:10, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

(Observations from an uninvolved admin) - **1.** The only valid oppose was Light show's, as Mrs. Trump is clearly not a low-profile individual. **2.** I would recommend that Coretheapple re-open their RFC, just so Light show doesn't have to open an entirely new RFC for the same question - simply because the result was **not** "unanimous".

— *Coffee // have a cup // beans // 00:56, 17 February 2017 (UTC)*

Why invalidate Markbasset's oppose? He in fact had a lot more reasons that even I did. BTW, no one has claimed that she was a "low profile individual." I also doubt I would suggest anyone re-open a new RfC for the same question, since this one was merely a request for comments concerning a variety of issues, not just a question. --Light show (talk) 02:45, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

@Light show: The validity of arguments is not tied to their quantity. And I'm not sure I get the point of your last sentence... I was asking the editor to do exactly what you were requesting they do (reverse their close of the RFC), and you have an issue with that?

— *Coffee // have a cup // beans // 04:59, 17 February 2017 (UTC)*

No issue with that at all. I was more confused at the apparent ignoring of Markbasset's lengthy comments with his oppose. --Light show (talk) 05:31, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

Coffee - umm, saying she was actively **seeking** media attention doesn't seem correct. Talk did mention WP:PUBLICFIGURE maybe marginally so, because while it's not an official post and apparently court not handling her as Public figure, she is still stuck with FLOTUS which is "pervasively involved with public affairs". Make that the boundary though -- dragging in all the ex-wives and kids and grandkids would just be tacky. Markbasset (talk) 04:52, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

Light show - Actually I'd been thinking today I should ask about closure, of Rebb since he said a week at the bottom of Proposal 1 section and JFG who'd said in his survey a few weeks for more input or perhaps more news, and to suggest that if they felt it time to start a new section (like this one) and propose it. But it's closed by poster so nevermind.

I see four more did show up after Melanie started proposal 1 at 20:02 10 Feb, but none since JFG at 08:32 12 Feb. I see few newsitems after that, iNews 12 Feb basically a late repeat that includes the WP and Gawker mentions; then ABC online 13 Feb also a repeat that mentions WP and adds London suit too. Then on 15 Feb just slightly related BBC News/USA Today on the NYT reporter in trouble for spreading it 'unfounded rumors', and the NYPost/USweekly about Melania 'miserable'. Suspect it's just nothing is happening fast on the case or maybe this was just a minor newsblip anyway. The close didn't detail by questions, but by casual (possibly flawed) look I think it wound up at

1. whether the libel suits should be mentioned - 10 yes, 2 no
2. should the original allegations be mentioned - 1 yes, 5 minimally

3. Should they be a separate section - 4 new section, 2 within existing section

Maybe some later fiddling on wording at the level of saying 'refiles' versus 'files' lawsuit or 'claim damage' versus 'seeking damage' I guess -- will have to see, partly as I think MelanieN may look in after returning from vacation. Cheers Markbassett (talk) 04:31, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

I did a quick review and came up with different totals:

1. Same: Yes=10; No=2
2. Yes=0; Minimal=5; No=7
3. New section=4; Within existing section=2; Not mentioned=7 --Light show (talk) 05:31, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

I see no rush to close the RfC before the nominal 30-day period. Once again, WP is not news. There is indeed a trend in "support" opinions but they are not always supporting the 3 questions explicitly. My own !vote was almost going to oppose per BLP but I found myself in agreement with some mention of the affair, while being extremely cautious not to overplay serious accusations of graft by inference. I think the SNOW close is being over-extended here; it is normally reserved for RfCs in which there is overwhelming support or opposition with no serious counter opinions. Here we have only *qualified* support numerically and we have a valid debate among several editors over the extent of the coverage that should be included. I would recommend that Coretheapple re-open the RFC and let it run the 30-day course. Alternately, I would welcome a new RfC with a tighter formulation. I do **not support** any inclusion of text about this affair in the article until clear consensus is achieved, either by a tighter RfC or by successful editor discussion on the proposed texts. — JFG ^{talk} 06:49, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

- There is a clear consensus on the questions posed by the RfC, so I ended it per WP:RFCEND. It was nine days (someone had suggested one week) and the supports far exceeded the opposes, all the wikilawyering above notwithstanding. We can and should add a reference to the libel suits, the objections of editors opposing the consensus notwithstanding. Consensus does not mean unanimity, and there is no reason to continue an RfC for thirty days when a clear consensus has emerged. While there is no deadline, the article has an NPOV issue due to its not mentioning the libel suits and that needs to be addressed, and there is a consensus to do so. Coretheapple (talk) 14:59, 17 February 2017 (UTC)
 - @Coretheapple: Consensus might not mean or require unanimity, but WP:SNOW (which is the basis you're relying on to use WP:RFCEND) sure as hell does require unanimity: "*If an issue is run through some process and the resulting decision is unanimous, then it might have been a candidate for the snowball clause.*" If there's this much contention about the close of RFC, which was open less than a third of the time most RFCs run, I'd say you haven't much of a leg to stand on here. — Coffee // *have a cup* // beans // 01:07, 21 February 2017 (UTC)
 - RFCEND allows RfC commencers to withdraw RfCs if they feel there is a clear consensus. I feel SNOW also applies, but if I'm wrong it doesn't much matter. Coretheapple (talk) 16:29, 21 February 2017 (UTC)
 - @Coffee:Be that as it may, if you wish to reinstate the RfC I have no objection, as all the wikilawyering is unhelpful. I would just revert my close but I am not sure if that would suffice. Coretheapple (talk) 16:38, 21 February 2017 (UTC)

Issues per renewed RfC

The renewed RfC is confusing issues and has a neutrality problem. While the guidelines say keep it brief and neutral, this RfC lists 3 separate but related questions, per **top section**. All 3 questions relate to whether the lawsuit should be in the article. However, the explanation preceding the questions veers off into a topic about "brands": *These new developments are not a simple rehash of the original, inflammatory allegations, but rather delve into how Mrs. Trump is protecting her brand.*

But whether she planned on starting a line of clothing or even had a brand, are irrelevant facts for the defamation suit. As noted in the above discussion, her rights or injury for filing a suit for defamation against a newspaper does not rely on monetary damages. They are separate issues, (see laws, p. 209) (http://catalogue.pearsoned.co.uk/assets/hip/gb/hip_gb_pearsonhighered/samplechapter/140825414X.pdf), since for defamation, *a claimant does not need to prove that they have lost money, or suffered any other kind of loss or damage.*

And the RfC rationale admits that the "brand" issue is a "new development," not just a repeat of the old defamation. It's thereby a new and separate issue, one related to business ethics. And it implies that had there never been any defamation or a lawsuit, the ethics issues would remain the same. Yet with ethics admittedly being the main issue, there are 3 questions about the lawsuit and *none* about ethics, making the RfC confusing and defective.

In addition, the posted RfC states that *multiple reliable sources are reporting on this* [ethics issue]..., and gives a non-neutral link to an editorial about the issue. That link alone may go against guidelines about neutrality in creating an RfC. I would suggest the editor who opened it fix the problems with the RfC.-- Light show (talk) 23:05, 21 February 2017 (UTC)

Do you have any Westlaw cites? Honestly I have never seen such protracted wikilawyering. My last comment on this utter hogwash. The RfC is clear as a bell and so far overwhelming. Coretheapple (talk) 18:27, 2 March 2017 (UTC)

Secret service name

On the BBC they have said the options for Secret Service names for President Trump and Melania Trump - were - Mogul and Muse. Is this right??

They also mentioned the other options were Ego and Escort, but I think that was a joke?

It is correct that their Secret Service names are Mogul and Muse. [12] (<http://www.cnn.com/2016/07/27/politics/donald-trump-mike-pence-secret-service-codenames/>) It is tradition that all codenames for a given president and his family start with the same letter. What do people think, should we mention "Muse" in the First Lady section? --MelanieN (talk) 16:21, 13 March 2017 (UTC)

The nicknames could be briefly mentioned, yes. Unless Secret Service wants to keep them secret... 🙄 — JFG ^{talk} 00:28, 14 March 2017 (UTC)

I added it. --MelanieN (talk) 17:37, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Removal of sources

User:JFG, why did you remove the Los Angeles Times and Politico sources from the section about her immigration status? [13] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&curid=1209075&diff=770765220&oldid=770763646) "Debunked" where or how? --MelanieN (talk) 14:49, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

The Politico source was from August and included a long retraction of original claims, whereas the Vox source was from September, explaining what was wrong in earlier accusations. (See a pattern there?) The Los Angeles Times was simply unreadable junk, even after disabling the ad blocker. One source is enough, and I took the best of the three. — JFG ^{talk} 15:06, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

That sounds OK. Thanks for the explanation. --MelanieN (talk) 15:50, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

"Debunked" is not the sort of language we should use in an encyclopedia. This is a word more appropriate for debate in Internet forums than the more formal and dispassionate language we should use

in an encyclopedic article. --Tataral (talk) 13:33, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

"Debunked" was just part of his edit summary. It did not and does not appear in the article. --MelanieN (talk) 20:55, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Libel suit against *Daily Mail*

*The following discussion is closed. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.*

Consensus reached per RfC and discussion below. — JFG ^{talk} 20:16, 19 March 2017 (UTC)

Haven't been editing this article, and came here because of a previous RfC. In perusing the article I was surprised to find a total absence of any mention of the legal battle between Mrs. Trump and the Daily Mail. Yes, we need to be careful for BLP reasons. But *no* mention I think is just not reasonable. Today we have multiple reliable sources, including The Washington Post (https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/melania-trump-missed-out-on-once-in-a-lifetime-opportunity-to-make-millions-lawsuit-says/2017/02/06/3654f070-eed0-11e6-9973-c5efb7ccfb0d_story.html) indicating that she filed a libel suit against the Daily Mail in New York, claiming that she lost hundreds of millions of dollars because of an article that the Mail published.

Now, I agree that the allegations in the article per se are tabloid stuff that definitely need to be handled with great care, and perhaps not even mentioned at all in the suit context, per BLP. However, this high-profile legal battle is another matter entirely. Given that this article is under arbitration sanctions I think we ought to discuss it here first. In skimming this talk page and the archive I surprisingly saw no discussion of the libel suits. Comments? Coretheapple (talk) 16:10, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

Since lawsuits always have only two sides, the plaintiff and the defendant, it's near impossible IMO to maintain a neutral POV. Legal disputes such as this can expand to infinity thanks to the media, whose only goal is to sell more hot dogs and cotton candy. It also devolves into a trial by media, as any and all allegations and defense facts get published, with the public having no way to know who's right, partly right, or totally wrong. IMO, the cleanest way to deal with active legal cases is to note the final decisions by courts, or if settled, to give whatever facts about the settlement get published. --Light show (talk) 18:08, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

I don't believe that's necessarily been our practice in dealing with litigation. Note also that she settled a suit with a Maryland blogger just today.[14] (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/us/politics/donald-trump-administration.html>) I don't think that waiting until final adjudication makes sense, especially since most lawsuits don't have a final adjudication. I don't see BLP or NPOV prohibiting us from mentioning libel and other legal disputes involving major public figures prior to their termination. Especially given that in this instance she is *initiating* legal action. Coretheapple (talk) 18:16, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

I can't recall *ever* reading about the filing of lawsuits in traditional book biographies or encyclopedias. Suits are always based on unproven claims and counterclaims, where the only facts are the allegations. The fact that you wrote, "especially...[since]] she is *initiating* legal action," even implies a natural bias from innuendo alone. Encyclopædia Britannica would never mention a lawsuit until decided.

Allegations can also cause collateral damage, such as from Mickey Rooney's article. Since even though his allegations were never proven, and in fact denied, we can assume that his children's reputations have been seriously and permanently damaged. Those undecided allegations are even still in the lead. So while they always make for juicy sensational stories, they never seem encyclopedic, only a form of raw entertainment (http://www.phillyboxinghistory.com/venues/images_venues/blue_06.jpg). --Light show (talk) 19:06, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

This was clearly inappropriately removed as a case of WP:IDONTLIKEIT. It is neutral, highly relevant (as RS agree) and there are no NPOV or BLP concerns *at all*. The section that I wrote (not noticing there had been previous attempts to write about this) neutrally and accurately reported on this based entirely on *her own public claims* in the lawsuit she filed against one of the world's largest newspapers. The story is *not* about whether she worked as an escort or not, but about the lawsuit she filed as first lady in which she revealed her intention to use her husband's office to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships." This is the story that RS have highlighted and considered significant. The original (escort) controversy is really a parenthesis in all this. --Tataral (talk) 22:57, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

If anything, your rationale supports all the reasons for *not* including it: Lawsuits are never neutral, and thereby are always POV issues. To say that there "no NPOV or BLP concerns *at all*" is a bit silly IMO, since those are obvious. You wrote, incorrectly, that "she revealed her intention to use her husband's office to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships," which is an opinion with no source. And in any case, at least in the U.S., suing tabloids is common in celebrity and political circles, since tabloids like the *Daily Mail* are not considered reliable sources by anyone, including WP. --Light show (talk) 23:11, 7 February 2017 (UTC) It's also worth noting that you proposed an entire sub-section be devoted to that lawsuit, which you placed *under* **First Lady of the United States**. It would naturally draw undue attention, not only as a sub-section, but the *only* sub-section under her primary notability, effectively corrupting the entire bio.--Light show (talk) 23:32, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

It belongs under the first lady heading because the lawsuit was filed when she is first lady, and because RS focus on her stated intention of using that office for monetary gain. Indeed, she herself has made her current position front and centre in this case; her lawsuit is based on her claim that she could use the first lady office to to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships" and exploit her fame financially during the years she is first lady. --Tataral (talk) 09:24, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I oppose inclusion at this time. In my view, this is not significant to Ms. Trump's biography. True, there are a lot of headlines, but that's more reflective of the subject's prominent status than relevance or enduring attention. We are not a newspaper. More importantly, covering a defamation lawsuit gives voice to possibly libelous and unfair allegations—a perverse effect. What's been shown so far is not, in my view, nearly important enough to outweigh that concern.

I'd also like to point out that BLPREQUESTRESTORE applies to this material. **Rebbing** 23:15, 7 February 2017 (UTC)

@Rebbing: This has gone well beyond a simple matter of editors wanting to discuss spurious allegations. She has commenced litigation in multiple courts, lately claiming grievous financial loss due to diminution of her brand identity. That aspect sparked a New York Times editorial. [15] (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/opinion/melania-trump-inc-imperiled.html>) This has escalated to the point that we're tipping over into POV territory by excluding mention of it. Coretheapple (talk) 14:18, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I respectfully disagree. The complaint—drafted by attorneys, not Ms. Trump—merely makes a case for lost financial opportunities based on some fairly obvious realities; it doesn't actually state that Ms. Trump planned to make use of them. (For the curious, this (https://iapps.courts.state.ny.us/fbem/DocumentDisplayServlet?documentId=Yv9ua7eZrT T_PLUS_pEUque3HmQ==&system=prod) is the complaint filed on Monday.) In my view, the fact that the *New York Times* published an editorial on the matter changes little. But, by all means, open an RFC. **Rebbing** 15:42, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

Um, that was kind of... original. Her lawyers are employed by her, they are authorised by her to act on her behalf, and everything they do is by definition in her name. When a person additionally is the first lady and married to a highly controversial billionaire president who surrounds himself with lawyers, you don't get to claim that you do not understand what *your own lawyers* do on your behalf in a very high profile case. For Wikipedia's purposes, the claims cited by her her

lawyers in her lawsuit are *her own claims*. --Tataral (talk) 16:48, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

- I believe we've reached a kind of tipping point, such that exclusion of mention of the libel suits creates an NPOV issue. Note the *New York Times* editorial today:[16] (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/opinion/melania-trump-inc-imperiled.html>) This is not tabloid fodder. This is consequential. The local consensus here cannot overrule policy and I think we're heading in the direction of an RfC. Coretheapple (talk) 14:06, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I think the issue has gone beyond the Daily Mail, when ethics counsellors of Obama and Bush are commenting on the lawsuit - [17] (https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/melania-trump-missed-out-on-once-in-a-lifetime-opportunity-to-make-millions-lawsuit-says/2017/02/06/3654f070-eed0-11e6-9973-c5efb7ccfb0d_story.html) [18] (<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/08/ethics-watchdog-melania-trump-daily-mail-lawsuit-us>). It raises issues of ethical conduct, and I don't see how its removal can be justified now. Hzh (talk) 15:26, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

I agree with the editors that argue that it belongs in the article and I feel certain that a RfC would agree as well. Gandydancer (talk) 16:18, 8 February 2017 (UTC)

*The discussion above is closed. **Please do not modify it.** Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.*

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump/Archive_3&oldid=785004132"