

Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 4

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 3

Archive 4

Archive 5

Contents

- 1 Proposed wording of libel text
 - 1.1 Proposed wording 1
 - 1.2 Proposed wording 2
 - 1.3 Survey
 - 1.4 Explanation
 - 1.5 Proposed wording 3 (post-RfC)
 - 1.6 Proposed wording, modified from proposal #1; call it Proposal #5
 - 1.7 Proposed wording 6
 - 1.7.1 Opinion needed
 - 1.8 Consensus version inserted into article; end of discussion about how to enforce the RfC

Proposed wording of libel text

*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 discussion below. — JFG ^{talk} 20:16, 19 March 2017 (UTC)

Proposed wording 1

We clearly have consensus to include something in the article. I don't think it can be done in a single sentence. Building from the wording suggested by Tataral above, how about something like this?

In February 2017 Melania Trump filed a lawsuit against Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail* newspaper, seeking \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article that alleged that she had once worked for an escort service. The *Mail* retracted the allegation a month later. In the lawsuit, Trump claims the article ruined her "unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which Plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world".^[1] Commentators said the claim raises "real ethical questions about profiting from being first lady."^[2] However, her attorney said "The first lady has no intention of using her position for profit and will not do so."^[1]

References

1. Puente, Maria (February 7, 2017). "Melanie Trump's 'Daily Mail' Lawsuit: A FLOTUS First?" (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/life/people/2017/02/07/>)

melania-trump-daily-mail-libel-lawsuit-first-lady-profit/97590284/). *USA Today*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.

- Reid, Paula (February 7, 2017). "Melania Trump libel suit settled, another filed" (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-filed/>). *CBS News*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.

Comments, edits, wording changes? Also, where in the article should it be put? --MelanieN (talk) 20:02, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

That seems fine. I think it should be a sub section of another section, either the first lady section, or potentially another (yet to be written) section about e.g. legal affairs. The reason that it should be part of the first lady section (if no other more appropriate first-level section is created) is that the controversy is primarily revolving around her use of the position as first lady for potential private monetary gain. The lawsuit was also filed during her tenure as first lady, and is receiving the attention it receives in RS precisely because she is first lady and because the lawsuit concerns her use of that position. --Tataral (talk) 20:17, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

I think the wording is fine. I'd suggest adding some text from the New York Times editorial [1] (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/opinion/melania-trump-inc-imperiled.html>) and footnotes from some other sources of similar caliber. As to location, I believe someone suggestion a "litigation" section and I think that makes sense. Coretheapple (talk) 20:23, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

Certainly there is much more that could be said, opinions that could be quoted, etc. But considering that this is a biography article, and considering how recent this news is, I would rather keep it to the minimum needed to lay out the facts and issues for now. We can add more material later if continuing coverage makes it warranted. --MelanieN (talk) 20:35, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

I was thinking a bit more text indicating the breadth of opinion concerning the commercial interests. As to location, one possible place for this might be in a section concerning her business activities. Coretheapple (talk) 14:08, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

I like it! I think it should go in § First Lady of the United States as the controversy is precisely because of her role. I oppose creation of a litigation section. Rebbing 20:31, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

I'll reply to you since you at least *claim* to know a bit about the law. **Defamation** is the basis and issue of the lawsuit; the estimated **damages** resulting from it are separate. And the lawsuit is *not* about an **ethics** controversy. I explained all that above.

But you and the others amazingly agree with an editor's OR rant above to go Off topic, minimize the libel retraction, and simply free-ride the lawsuit bus (http://www.heapsoffun.com/pictures/20120106/funny_bus_free_ride_m1006.jpg) to promote an ethics issue. But the lawsuit is *not* an ethics issue, and the lawsuit and retractions (<http://www.thewrap.com/melania-trump-escort-story-retracted-by-daily-mail/>) do not rely on lost profits, whether \$1 or \$150 million. The damages estimate stands alone if there was an injury. I won't change my oppose just to join free-riders obsessed with misusing a valid libel claim by turning it into a separate controversy about ethics. If someone wants to create a topic based on ethics as an issue, feel free.--Light show (talk) 22:19, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

I share your view that it's an unreasonable exercise in imagination and transparent political prejudice to project an ethics issue onto Ms. Trump's complaint. But it's not for us to look through to the merits of a controversy; instead, we merely ask whether the controversy is worthy of mention by virtue of receiving significant attention in reliable sources. Rebbing 05:30, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

I agree. The ethics issue is well sourced, and anyone could create a new topic based on that, as I mentioned.--Light show (talk) 06:54, 17 February 2017 (UTC)
Just to note that they're separate issues since by law (p. 209) (http://catalogue.pearsoned.co.uk/assets/hip/gb/hip_gb_pearsonhighered/samplechapter/140825414X.pdf), for defamation, *a claimant does not need to prove that they have lost money, or*

suffered any other kind of loss or damage. --Light show (talk) 07:14, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

MelanieN -- **Premature** - the RFC has been up only 2 days so moving to close and presuming all three questions were 'go go go' is premature. Come back in a few more days and see what's here, or at least follow WP:RFC process -- either Cores close it, 30 days elapse, or a non-involved editor proposes closure to the noticeboard/RFC and that goes for closure. Part of the closure should get by-question answers (1) whether to mention lawsuit, (2) whether to avoid retracted text that is in a libel lawsuit re potential that it is libel to do so, and (3) context of whether it is to be a separate section. Personally I'm at no, heck no, and if neither happens then #3 doesn't happen. Markbassett (talk) 23:13, 10 February 2017 (UTC)

Well, at least the "supports" can work out a definite proposal, so we know exactly what we are talking about inserting. 30 days is probably more than this is going to need, but the RFC should stay open for at least a week. --MelanieN (talk) 01:37, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

There is clearly consensus to include the material in question in some form, and an emerging consensus for the wording suggested by MelanieN, although the discussion should probably continue for a few more days before we conclude. It is also much more helpful for the discussion that we discuss and agree on a specific wording early in the process. --Tataral (talk) 12:52, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

Yes, the fact that it has been up two days, and an overwhleming consensus has already emerged, actually indicates that there is no reason for delay and certainly none to wait for another 28 days. It is a "SNOW" situation. One or two editors with repetitious, stale arguments don't detract from that. RfCs are not "temporary injunctions." Just a means to an end, which is to get more eyeballs on an article. The eyeballs have arrived and they reinforce the consensus. Coretheapple (talk) 14:08, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

I don't think SNOW applies here, at least not yet. Numerically, we're at 9 and 2—what I would consider clear but not overwhelming agreement. Perhaps thirty days is unnecessary, but I think this should be up at least a week. I also don't agree that Light show's arguments are stale or repetitive. **Rebbing** 17:11, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

Rebb -- A week seems a more reasonable timeframe to me for some outside inputs to appear. WP:RFCEND says the poster Coretheapple can close it earlier but 2 days seems excessive urgency. My input (that this both smells bad and does not suit a BLP) is in, for what it's worth. Cheers. Markbassett (talk) 03:21, 13 February 2017 (UTC)

Proposed wording 2

The the core of the RfC started by Coretheapple is the libel suit, which asks a few relevant questions:

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

However, since the supporters are primarily interested in the ethics issue, which is a digression from the core issue, I'd propose a simple chronological alternative, borrowing from Genesis: "In the beginning"

In August 2016, the *Daily Mail*, a British newspaper, published false allegations which defamed Melanie Trump, including "racy photos" of her in sexy poses. She denied the published details were true, and the newspaper admitted there was actually no support for the allegations. The original source blogger of the details admitted in part that their details were "replete with false and defamatory statements about her... had no legitimate factual

basis... [and] acknowledged that these false statements were very harmful and hurtful to Mrs. Trump and her family..."^[1] The newspaper also apologized for suggesting the allegations were true or may have caused her harm.^[2] Those allegations were published while her husband, Donald Trump, was running for President.

On February 7, 2017, she filed a libel suit against the newspaper for defaming her and causing her reputation injury.^[3] She claimed damages based on lost business opportunities for a line of clothing she had intended on launching. Outside of the context of the litigation, however, some have questioned the ethical aspects of a first lady potentially profiting from her position.

References

1. "Melania Trump libel suit settled, another filed" (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-filed/>), *CBS*, Feb. 7, 2016
2. "Melania Trump: A retraction" (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3769798/Melania-Trump-retraction.html>), *Daily Mail*, Sept. 2, 2016
3. "In Libel Suit, Melania Trump Cites Loss of Chance to Make Millions" (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/us/politics/melania-trump-libel-suit-daily-mail.html>), *New York Times*, Feb. 7, 2017

The ethics of potentially profiting as first lady, or the conflict of interest issues, or the estimated \$ damages, are secondary and not directly relevant to the original libel. She could have claimed \$1 for damages, and left it up to a jury to decide damages. That's clear from the *DM* article in the link, where her line of clothing isn't even mentioned. Publishing defamatory information which causes personal injury is bad enough, and is all that's necessary for a Cause of action.

The real question is whether the subject should be in the *Daily Mail* article, not in this one, since it began with *their* publication. Had they not published the libel, there would be no lawsuit. It's not necessary or directly relevant to mention the many other famous people who have also sued them for libel, or even the fact that WP itself has acknowledged their poor record for accuracy. In any case, a lawsuit is a pending action that could take years to conclude if it ever went to court (unlikely, IMO.) And if it gets settled beforehand, there is no requirement that the terms be public. As the core issue (<https://intheblack.com/~media/intheblack/allimages/magazine-2014/12-december/apple-core-control.jpg>) is the defamation and personal injury, and the defamation has already been admitted, retracted, and apologized for, the libel suit is *not* a "controversy." --Light show (talk) 19:47, 11 February 2017 (UTC)

Survey

- **Proposed Wording 1** is far preferable to Proposed Wording 2, which is POV. Coretheapple (talk) 20:15, 11 February 2017 (UTC)
- I also strongly prefer MelanieN's proposal as better representing the sources. **Rebbing** 23:56, 11 February 2017 (UTC)
- As noted above, I support the wording by MelanieN, and there is currently a consensus for this wording (although we should still wait a few days before we formally conclude). The proposed wording by Light show is horribly biased, non-encyclopedic and written entirely from the enraged and emotional perspective of Melania Trump herself ("published *false* allegations which *defamed* Melanie Trump" and so on and so forth). In addition, it focuses on the trivial bickering over an old newspaper article from last year, instead of the *notable* controversy, her lawsuit filed after she became first lady. It also misrepresents her lawsuit and deliberately omits what RS consider to be the key issues in relation to the lawsuit, namely her claim for a 150 million USD compensation based on her stated intention (which she claims the *Daily Mail* ruined) of using the first lady role as a "unique,

once in a lifetime opportunity" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships." --Tataral (talk) 00:47, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

- **Proposed wording 2** preferred. It covers the lawsuit without giving undue weight to the ethics issue, which CBS stated is "outside of the context of the litigation." IMO, the text still gives undue weight to this lawsuit, but at least it's balanced and not being misused as a pretext to digress primarily onto the ethics factor. --Light show (talk) 01:36, 12 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Both are POV** – I prefer wording 2's chronological structure but it gives too much weight to the harm and distress allegedly suffered by Melania and her family, sounding like it came straight from their lawyers. On the other hand, Wording 1 overplays the editorial exploitation of these circumstances to accuse Melania of graft. Whatever we end up writing, extreme care should be taken in the formulation to abide by WP:BLP and WP:LIBEL restrictions. Waiting a few weeks until the formal end of the RfC would hopefully also provide some more insight on further development of the story. We are WP:NOTNEWS and there is WP:No deadline. Accordingly, I am not ready to put forward a more balanced wording proposal yet. — JFG ^{talk} 08:46, 12 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Proposed wording 1**, or some consensus-based tweaking with the same general thrust, for reasons I expound below in "Explanation". MelanieN alt (talk) 19:31, 12 February 2017 (UTC)
- **Proposed Wording 1**. Far better. Wording #2 draws legal and factual conclusions with the language "published false allegations which defamed Melanie Trump." That would be something a judge or jury would decide and even if it did, we would state it as the opinion of fact-finder. Also, the emphasis at least one of the news articles in on the ethics and potential conflict of interest with the first lady profiting off of her position. Wording #1 does a much better job summarizing that aspect. -- David Tornheim (talk) 02:13, 1 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Proposed Wording 1**. Far better than 2 at any cost. *Winged Blades* Godric 15:19, 13 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Comment**---Since the discussion has been stale(and I have closed the RFC),I am pinging@Coretheapple, Light show, Rebbing, MelanieN, David Tornheim, and JFG: to resume discussion about the proposed version to be included and **esp.** it's location.*Winged Blades* Godric 15:19, 13 March 2017 (UTC)

Responding to ping. I gave my two cents on which of the two versions. If there is a new one, since I gave my opinion, please point to it, or make a proposal 3, 4, etc. As for location, I don't feel like reading all of this to try and figure out what locations are proposed. If you can point to a succinct expression of two or more places to put it, I will give my two cents on that as well. -- David Tornheim (talk) 18:20, 13 March 2017 (UTC)

- Thanks to Winged Blades of Godric for closing this stale discussion and reviving the discussion about what to include. We are tasked with choosing a wording and deciding where to put it. There was a lot of discussion last month. Just to recap, the Survey shows six !votes for wording #1, one !vote for wording #2, and one !vote for "neither". This should not be taken as a cause for immediate action because a month has passed, and people's opinions or the situation may have changed. --MelanieN (talk) 16:03, 13 March 2017 (UTC)
- My own opinion: I still support Wording #1 and I favor putting it in the First Lady section. ~~If there was a section about her career or her business ventures I would put it there, but at this time there is no such section. The section called "Career and immigration to the United States" is all old/historical information, mostly about her coming to the U.S., and not about what she has done in recent decades.~~ On second thought I would put it in the First Lady section regardless - because the suit itself is based on her lost business opportunities as First Lady. --MelanieN (talk) 16:07, 13 March 2017 (UTC)
- I agree with Wording #1 and also with it being in the First Lady section. A subsection wouldn't do any harm but is not necessary. Coretheapple (talk) 17:54, 13 March 2017 (UTC)
- I don't think either wording is useful, since both may be incorrect and misleading for a number of reasons:

1. Both wordings have been proposed in response to the RfC. But if we read them, that of #1, and less so #2, are focused on the ethics issues of business, which was never part of the RfC. It's an entirely new topic and should be treated as one, not commingled.
2. The off-topic ethics issue is more than stale; it's moot (<http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/22/politics/melania-trump-drops-controversial-language-from-150-million-lawsuit/>). So it's questionable to

have it as a new topic. And even *if* it wasn't moot, by law a *claimant does not need to prove that they have lost money, or suffered any other kind of loss or damage*. Injury to a famous person's reputation is more than enough.

3. While the "allegations" are also a key issue, no one has yet shown that "allegations" is even a correct term in this situation. The dictionary definition of an allegation: *a claim or assertion that someone has done something illegal or wrong, typically one made without proof*. Has there been any verification that, in Italy or other parts of Europe, someone who worked as an "escort" was doing something illegal? The suit was filed it seems because of innuendo in the U.S., which can create defamation.--Light show (talk) 19:01, 13 March 2017 (UTC)

- Interesting that the lawsuit was amended to exclude the controversial text. Still, this should not invalidate the essential results of the RfC, namely that some mention of the incident is warranted, while not falling into the trap of sensationalism. Reading the proposed wordings again, I maintain my previous stance that **both are POV** and we should build a new proposal, taking into account the RfC outcome and recent developments. For clarity, we should report events chronologically. I'll try writing a draft below. ✓ **Done**, see proposal 3. — JFG ^{talk} 00:40, 14 March 2017 (UTC)

Explanation

There are a lot of IDIDNTHEARTHAT comments here, so I will briefly point out something which Light show seems unable or unwilling to understand/accept: The lawsuit filed by Melania Trump isn't simply a lawsuit for libel over the old article from last year. If that had been the case, she wouldn't have received all this criticism, there wouldn't really be much of a controversy. Her case is *specifically* about claiming a huge compensation for "business opportunities" she claims that she lost as a result of the article, and she has described these "business opportunities" in a very specific way; they are about using her husband's office for monetary gain (according to herself). If she had merely filed a lawsuit in a British court for libel she might have been awarded a few hundred thousand pounds if she were lucky, or maybe even less, because that is a more typical amount in a libel case. What she is claiming is 150 million USD not based on libel itself but on allegedly lost "business opportunities" – "business opportunities" that Richard Painter (chief ethics lawyer for the George W. Bush White House) has said would be corruption, plain and simple.[2] (http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2017/02/07/why_is_melania_trump_s_own_lawyer_arguing_she_would_have_made_millions_exploiting.html)

Painter added that Melania is effectively claiming ownership of something he believes she never had in the first place: the right to make money from the presidency

--Tataral (talk) 01:10, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

Most of your comments are personal opinions, heavily biased, and self-contradictory. For instance, you downplay the original defamatory text by saying it's from an "old article from last year," thereby ancient history and irrelevant. Yet you and CoretheApple nonetheless prefer to **keep** the defamatory text in the article.

You wrote that the "case is specifically about claiming a huge compensation," implying *again* that the defamation of a potential first lady is irrelevant in your neck of the woods, and certainly petty in the UK, which might have awarded her a few shillings for hurt feelings. (In the UK, the law of defamation "is probably the single most important area of law for any journalist to know about." [3] (http://catalogue.pearsoned.co.uk/assets/hip/gb/hip_gb_pearsonhighered/samplechapter/140825414X.pdf)) So if you want to write about ethics as a new issue, go ahead. But don't manipulate and downplay the lawsuit to do so. The sources make clear that the ethics issues are "**outside of the context of the litigation.**" --Light show (talk) 02:11, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

Wikipedia is not about litigation. Litigation does not get privileged treatment here. Wikipedia is about notability as judged by reliable sources. In this particular controversy, the controversy over the ethics of using public office for monetary gain is the single most important aspect. Noone except Melania cared about that newspaper article and noone argued it should be

mentioned in the article before this lawsuit – it is the lawsuit and the ethics controversy which make it necessary to mention it, albeit briefly, as background information of secondary importance to the main controversy over ethics. --Tataral (talk) 12:23, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

- I disagree with Light Show's premise here - that this item ought to be purely about the lawsuit itself, not about the public reaction and the coverage emphasis of virtually every Reliable Source. That appears to be your opinion, rather than having any basis in Wikipedia policy. That would be like saying the article about an administrative action by a president must be entirely about the administrative action itself, not about the consequences or the reaction. I disagree with this premise for several reasons. First, Wikipedia's selection of material is based on what Reliable Sources report, and virtually every Reliable Source is quoting from, or citing in full, that one sentence about the million dollar deals she thought she could make because of her position as First Lady. That sentence and its implications are the news here, not as a matter of Wikipedians' opinions, but as a matter of WP:Reliable sources and WP:DUEWEIGHT. Second, we pretty well have consensus that for BLP reasons we should NOT dwell on the paper's original allegation any more than is necessary for clarity. Your premise makes it front and center. Third, the tabloid's article and its retraction are old news, and would long since have vanished from the public view if she hadn't reacted so publicly and so persistently. I think most people in her position would have been satisfied to accept the retraction and let the allegation vanish down the memory hole. Bottom line, I think the proposed writing I came up with can be improved but we should keep the same focus. So I **support** version #1 and **Oppose** version #2. (Rereading version #2 I find a fourth reason to oppose it: it is so singularly focused on her side of the issue that it sounds like it was written by her PR firm.) MelanieN alt (talk) 19:27, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

Lest we forget, the issues for this RfC, Talk:Melania_Trump § RfC:_Melanie_Trump_libel_suits, are about the lawsuit, not about side issues:

The questions we need to address are 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? 3. Should they be included as a separate section or subsection?

I've already commented that I don't feel the lawsuit should be in the article at this point, and if it is, shouldn't be an entire section. I didn't think the editors were capable of staying on the issue. That they would keep digressing (<http://case-study.hu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/BstcbncIcA ApCGS1.jpg>) into the ethics question and corrupt the bio with commentary "outside the context" of the lawsuit.

And I agree with you that there's no need to magnify the retraction details, which you feel sound like they came from a PR firm. They were added *after* Tataral wrote, in error, that the original version 2 wording was *horribly biased, non-encyclopedic and written entirely from the enraged and emotional perspective of Melania Trump herself*. So I simply edited version 2 (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=764983727&oldid=764983286) to quote from the CBS article which *you* added in version 1, to clarify where the comments came from: the *Daily Mail* and its source blogger.

But your vague suggestion: *we should NOT dwell on the paper's original allegation any more than is necessary for clarity*, is unlikely to happen. The two editors who initiated the RfC have already said they **want** those defamatory details to be included. Who's to prevent them from adding images? They have already used text from the original lawsuit itself. They keep riding the wake of the lawsuit RfC as a pretext to digress into ethics. I suggest they simply get off the wake (http://www.swaylocks.com/sites/default/files/img_4604_jpg_4fdbc003a7.jpg) and create a topic based on the ethics issues. --Light show (talk) 20:43, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

That's just false. I am totally in accord with MelanieN's characterization of how the subject of the original allegations should be dealt with, and I have made that clear, as I have that this RfC deals with the brand identity claims. You really to stop the nonsense. You are just wasting everyone's time with your stale, repetitive arguments. Coretheapple (talk) 20:58, 12 February 2017 (UTC)

MelanieN alt - (are you MelanieN?) I doubt that "let the allegation vanish" ethics of letting libel profit or ethics of not get to defend herself can viably be separated from how much to sue for, or from the underlying libel, or the legal (<http://www.politico.com/story/2017/01/melania-trump-libel-suit-blogge-r-234263>) bits as or if it progresses. It's all a tarry mess. Light show exaggerated only slightly in saying "Who's to prevent them from adding images?" because its links to the "Girl-on-girl photos" already going on below since the photos aren't public domain. Markbassett (talk) 04:57, 13 February 2017 (UTC)

"What's to prevent" mythical editors hell-bent on adding libelous material here is utter nonsense. There is no consensus for adding pornographic images etc here, only whatever text is necessary to make Mrs. Trump's branding allegations understandable. Misrepresenting what other editors have said (referring to previous comments, not the one directly above) is disruptive and needs to stop. This article is under Arbcom sanctions and disruptive conduct is not tolerated. Coretheapple (talk) 15:22, 13 February 2017 (UTC)

Since I was speaking of actual editors and stuff that already did -- so think can view anything about "mythical" editors as OBE. Resuming the other bit to Melanie now. Markbassett (talk) 04:02, 14 February 2017 (UTC)

I was referring to comments made previous to you. Perhaps you didn't notice the parenthetical. Coretheapple (talk) 15:03, 14 February 2017 (UTC)

Coretheapple - ??? That's not making any more sense to me than why you'd say "mythical editors" about actual edits. For "Comments made previous to you" - I'm doing find and not seeing any comments starting addressed to me. For 'Misrepresenting what other editors said referring to previous' - well previous to this tarbaby bit I think I sometimes disagreed but wasn't usually doing response to another except me posting after your "for one editor" to say 'more than one' because I'd just joined and made it 2. If you've got a specific item then point to where you're concerned and maybe I can see what you mean and sort it, but at the moment it's not making sense. Cheers Markbassett (talk) 06:16, 16 February 2017 (UTC)

If I felt that further discussion with you on this wasn't going to be a waste of time, I'd take another crack at it. Coretheapple (talk) 20:33, 16 February 2017 (UTC)

Coretheapple - up to you, but going away without specifics when asked or offered to sort it -- I'll take as there is nothing worth mentioning or worth sorting and we all move on. If there's anything you'd rather do via my talk page instead I'll be happy to work it with you. Cheers. Markbassett (talk) 03:42, 17 February 2017 (UTC)

MelanieN alt - back to the actual RFC questions and prospective content and ethics is all one tarball ... again I doubt that the different aspects of ethics questions can be viably separated as you seem to say, particularly since they form a sequence and are dependent on each other. Just doesn't look like it works when it's all one big tarry mess. Even if you dropped the second sentence about retraction to flow a bit better, and move the lawyer bit earlier so all parts of that cite are together and not thrashing to and back between sources, it's only going to be a 'some say they have ethical questions' and just not going to make much sense unless more about the competing ethical premises and circumstances is added. (p.s. It's "refile" and think \$150M damage claimed not "seeking" \$150M said [here (<http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/melania-trump-files-defamation-suit-against-daily-mail-political-blog-n641771>.)] The sources all seem too brief and light to cover ethics anyway. Those are at least two solidly major RS, thanks for that, I know it's hard amongst all the lesser sites that jumped on it which google hits, but treatment of the story simply is short all over and not going much into ethics info. As an odd sidenote, ABC remarked about WP with making it more likely she'll win here (<http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/s4618821.htm>).

I'll add a WP concern too that in your disagreement with Lightshow about your mentioned premise of WP:WEIGHT for the story seems like it should apply for all the parts -- if any of it is BLP (and I think either as legal tiff or ethical debate it is WP:OFFTOPIC for a BLP) then seems like all of the bits the stories go into belongs. To pick just some parts when more is in the same articles as equally commonly said might not look like WP:DUE, it might look more like not WP:BALANCE or some flavor of WP:Cherrypicking. Just sayin. Cheers Markbassett (talk) 06:00, 14 February 2017 (UTC)

Proposed wording 3 (post-RfC)

In August 2016, *The Daily Mail*, a British tabloid, published nude photos of Melania Trump dating from her modeling career, and echoed defamatory rumors, which the newspaper later admitted were unfounded. In February 2017 Melania Trump sued Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail*, seeking \$150 million in damages. The original lawsuit claimed the article ruined her "unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which Plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world". Following backlash over hints of abusing her position as First Lady for personal gain, the lawsuit was amended to exclude this line of attack, focusing instead on libel, reputation injury and emotional distress.

Spatter with relevant sources at will... Comments on the text? — JFG ^{talk} 01:10, 14 March 2017 (UTC)

I have to first wipe the coffee spatter off my monitor :/ --Light show (talk) 05:17, 14 March 2017 (UTC)

We should get this settled and move on. @Winged Blades of Godric, Coretheapple, Light show, Rebbing, MelanieN, David Tornheim, Tataral, and Markbassett: Any support for wording 3 in light of the amended lawsuit as pointed out by Light show? — JFG ^{talk} 00:50, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

~~**Support.** Thanks for following through with this. Rebbing 01:31, 16 March 2017 (UTC)~~

Oppose. If one took the worst aspects of wordings #1 and #2, added some OR clickbait, and expanded it into 120 words, we'd get #3. --Light show (talk) 01:47, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Assuming everything were cited, what part would you consider to be original research?

Rebbing 02:03, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Sentence #1 implies one of the causes of action for defamation were the photos. That's unsourced and as OR it implies a direct connection with the suit. Sentence #3 is force-feeding 35 words of digressive old news which is now moot. Sentence #4 has 33 words based on more OR, stating, not even implying, that the suit was modified "following a backlash ..." That leaves the 19 words in sentence #2, which is accurate, but goes against guidelines: *Wikipedia should not offer first-hand news reports on breaking stories.* Although I'm glad a photo wasn't suggested for the first OR.--Light show (talk) 02:22, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Thanks for your detailed remarks. If we followed your suggestions fully, we would remove the whole paragraph, however the RfC compels us to write *something*. I mentioned photos for context, I don't mind removing that, but then readers will be nagging editors about "so what did the *Daily Fail* actually publish?" (hint hint pant pant, another Wikipedia conspiracy to hide The Naked Truth...) We can sure clarify that the suit is unrelated to the pictures but then we can't say what it is really about either, as that would be a BLPVIO. In sentence 3, I agree the quotes should be nuked and replaced by a short description of the motives. Finally, "backlash" may be a strong word but a large amount of negative coverage can be easily sourced, and that's the reason we are discussing this in the first place. (If you ask me, this is all a giant useless WP:NOTNEWS non-issue but we are here to find consensus.) — JFG ^{talk} 02:47, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Most of the voters and most of the wording suggestions, have focused on the ethics issue. But the ethics issue has never been part of the RfC. As for your fear that "readers will be nagging editors about 'so what did the *Daily Fail* actually publish?'," your're right. That's why I mentioned "clickbait." No one should feel compelled to add news. I agree with your comments a few days ago, which also pertains to *this* lawsuit event: *...clickbait this week -- it will be gone and forgotten next week, therefore it is not Encyclopedic*. And as far as the "backlash" idea, please provide a source supporting the assertion that it was because of the "backlash" that the suit was revised. Otherwise, it's not just a "strong word," but a misleading one.--Light show (talk) 03:06, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

The RFC found consensus for briefly mentioning the retracted prostitution allegations. Rebbling 03:21, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

In that case, the RfC outcome should be discarded because enforcing it would be a glaring WP:BLPVIO. — JFG ^{talk} 09:48, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Thank you for that explanation. I was surprised by the first sentence as I didn't remember anything about the photos in the complaint, but I assumed the fault was my memory, not SYNTH. I'm also unable to locate a usable source for the (reasonable) suggestion that Ms. Trump amended her complaint in response to ("following") the ethics criticism. Since the RFC closure doesn't (and, per CONLEVEL, couldn't) direct us to disregard NOR, I don't think we can use this as written. *Woof*. Rebbling 03:21, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Strong oppose** - I was at just oppose for the WP:BLPGOSSIP WP:NOTTABLOID, WP:NOTBLOG. It's just a now-retracted sensationalist tabloid fiction that should not be part of her Biography article as it is nothing important nor WP:V to her life. It goes to **strong** oppose because it's now after the RFC closed below, and this is looking a bit WP:COATRACK for WP:UNDUE amount of 3.5 of 6 lines content going to opinions objecting on how she is defending herself, a wikilink to Graft, and all of it seems asking for others to find supports for what was said instead of trying to paraphrase the bulk of the coverage and positions ??? Just ditch the tarbaby tale of sleaze and lawsuits thereof and move along. Markbassett (talk) 04:31, 16 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Note** – Personally, I agree with the opposition voices here, and I'd be glad to leave the whole story out of this BLP for obvious reasons, but I'm trying hard to find how we can honestly reflect the RfC outcome. Here's a shorter version for consideration (**Proposed wording 4**):

In August 2016, *The Daily Mail*, a British tabloid, published slanderous material on Melania Trump, later debunked and retracted. In February 2017 she sued Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail*, seeking \$150 million in damages for libel, reputation injury and emotional distress. Some media commentators accused her of attempting to abuse her position as First Lady for personal gain.

Or perhaps we should run a new RfC proposing to drop the story completely given recent developments and BLPVIO aspects? Or simply WP:IAR and drop the matter, with a note in the RfC close that editors have not been able to agree a wording implementing the RfC outcome without running afoul of BLPVIO? — JFG ^{talk} 09:48, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

No, the consensus is the consensus, and I'd caution against acting against it. Still favor No. 1. Coretheapple (talk) 13:49, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

I see no great injustice in leaving this out of the article, but I don't agree with you that it would be a BLP violation to mention briefly the underlying libel while emphasizing that it has been retracted. Rebbling 14:49, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Any support or comments for the shortened wording 4? — JFG ^{talk} 16:25, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Can you explain the connection between the last sentence in the paragraph with the ones before it? It strikes me as a digression, producing the same problem. --Light show (talk) 17:04, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Well, many RfC !votes for inclusion indicated that the apparent "attempt to profit" was the key issue that made this story notable in the first place. That's why the text attributes these aspersions to "media commentators". Not sure what to do now that the scandal has died down, though... Remove that third sentence entirely? But then the whole story has no weight. — JFG ^{talk} 20:08, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

"Leave it out" is not an option; we just had an RfC which concluded we should have something in the article. (All of this debate has succeeded in keeping it out for ~~months~~ more than a month; it's time to implement the RfC, add a paragraph, and move on.) About the recent proposed rewrite: I don't like mentioning the photos, they were not the issue and had been published elsewhere. I don't like leaving out "worked for an escort service" which was widely reported as the real issue, but if people want to talk around that I'm OK with it. We absolutely need to keep in the stuff about the *Mail* damaging her business opportunities as First Lady, because that was the major point made by all Reliable Sources in reporting about this lawsuit. I do like adding that the business opportunities language was dropped from the lawsuit. I will work on a rewording of proposal #1 and i will propose it here shortly. --MelanieN (talk) 18:26, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

I agree. Time to implement the RfC. Coretheapple (talk) 20:03, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Oppose** per Markbassett Elmmappleoakpine (talk) 22:05, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Proposed wording, modified from proposal #1; call it Proposal #5

Proposal #5:

In February 2017 Melania Trump filed a lawsuit against Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail* newspaper. The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article, later retracted, which alleged that she had once worked for an escort service. In the lawsuit, Trump claimed the article had ruined her "unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which Plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world".^[1] Commentators said the claim raised "real ethical questions about profiting from being first lady."^[2] However, her attorney said "The first lady has no intention of using her position for profit and will not do so."^[1] On February 18 the lawsuit was refiled, omitting the language about her earning potential and focusing instead on emotional distress.^[3]

References

1. Puente, Maria (February 7, 2017). "Melanie Trump's 'Daily Mail' Lawsuit: A FLOTUS First?" (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/life/people/2017/02/07/melania-trump-daily-mail-libel-lawsuit-first-lady-profit/97590284/>). *USA Today*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.

2. Reid, Paula (February 7, 2017). "Melania Trump libel suit settled, another filed" (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-filed/>). *CBS News*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.
3. Bennett, Kate (February 22, 2017). "Melania Trump drops controversial language from \$150 million defamation suit" (<http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/22/politics/melania-trump-drops-controversial-language-from-150-million-lawsuit/>). *CNN*. Retrieved 16 March 2017.

Or if people want to leave out "escort service", here's an alternate sentence #2; call it proposal #5A: "The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article which repeated a false rumor about her previous career; the *Mail* later retracted the article and apologized." Comments? --MelanieN (talk) 18:50, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Another view is that leaving this newsy incident out is a more logical option. In fact your own rationale for supporting the RfC was primarily about ethics, a totally irrelevant topic, and moot to boot, to the RfC questions posted:

Support...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.")

It's also worth noting that her entire article is 1,600 words, while this obsession by numerous editors to magnify anything negative about her has created a whopping 13,500 words of commentary. Not a subtle way slip in off-topic issues. All because some foreign tabloid, not even allowed as a RS, printed some debunked and retracted defamatory comment, and gets sued for it. Much ado about very little, it seems. I'd suggest waiting for another vehicle to improve the bio instead of shoving our way (<http://c8.alamy.com/comp/ED5BYK/woman-tries-to-squeeze-into-a-subway-car-when-the-doors-were-closing-ED5BYK.jpg>) into this one.--Light show (talk) 19:18, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Since I added my last comment before I saw your proposed wording, I'll add something about it: it's again off-topic and misleading. You added: *Commentators said the claim raised "real ethical questions about profiting from being first lady."* However, you did *not* include from the same source that it was another subject: *Outside of the context of the litigation, however, the claim raises real ethical questions about profiting from being first lady.* The result is that by your own source the ethics issue is a new subject, and should not be commingled with the RfC.--Light show (talk) 19:36, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

The readable prose of this article is 1507 words. What I am proposing to add is 134 words, an 8.8% expansion of the article. I don't think that is excessive. And of those 13,500 words of discussion at the talk page, how much of it is from you - arguing repetitively and at great length against what turned out to be consensus? Here's a hint: [4] (https://tools.wmflabs.org/sigma/use_research.py?name=Light+show&page=Talk%3AMelania_Trump&server=enwiki&max=) Her stated expectation of profiting from her high profile as first lady is what caused all the coverage of this suit - all the headlining of this subject from Reliable Sources. The fact that she (or rather her lawyer) decided to remove that wording does not make that issue go away; she said what she said. As for the quote, the same article said, a paragraph earlier, "This (her argument) raises unprecedented ethics concerns." But if you think the actual quote is misleading or about a slightly different subject, I will simply remove the quotation marks from around it. Or change it to "Commentators expressed ethical concerns about the implication that she intended to profit from her position as First Lady." with the same source.--MelanieN (talk) 21:15, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

You're again ignoring the key issue about the RfC, repeated about 50 times, per your link. Namely, that her business plans are "**outside of the context of the litigation,**" and therefore irrelevant to the RfC. And again, from your personal opinion: *her stated expectation of profiting from her high profile as first lady is what caused all the coverage of this suit.*" Prove it without speculating. --Light show (talk) 23:07, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

You have tried, over and over, to insist that this addition to the article must only be about the lawsuit itself, not about the reaction to it or the related issues it raised. You have not convinced anyone. --MelanieN (talk) 23:28, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

Well I'm glad you finally seem to admit there's no support for your opinion about the direct connection. But this discussion is about the RfC; the ethics issues are separate, and should be dealt with as a separate subject, not commingled and synthesized to muck up a bio. Recall:

Editors must take particular care when adding information about living persons to any Wikipedia page. Such material requires a high degree of sensitivity, and must adhere strictly to all applicable laws in the United States.

The RfC questions say nothing about business ventures or lost income. The RfC is also defective on its face, since it violates clear guidelines about not biasing an RfC, which this one does with a non-neutral link to an editorial about the issue. All of those problems have been repeated and are still ignored. Are they fake guidelines? Can you source your opinions? --Light show (talk) 01:31, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

@Tataral, Coretheapple, Rebbing, Markbassett, JFG, David Tornheim, and Winged Blades of Godric: Does anyone else have an opinion about this proposed wording, proposal #5? --MelanieN (talk) 23:32, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

It's way too long. Does this affair-of-the-week represent 8.8% of the subject's life? — JFG ^{talk} 23:44, 16 March 2017 (UTC)

No article will ever stay the same size, and it will almost certainly grow in size (it can easily double in size in a few years), so the argument is not relevant. If in the future we think that it has been given too much prominence, then it can always be trimmed. Hzh (talk) 00:21, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Support** - it's not how I want it worded, and ideally it should be shorter, but a consensus has been reached, there is no point in dragging it out further. Hzh (talk) 00:21, 17 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Support.** I think this should be implemented now, and this is essentially the wording we agreed on a long time ago (with some tweaks). --Tataral (talk) 00:24, 17 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Support.** Unless I am (again) overlooking something, this is an appropriate, NOR- and BLP-compliant implementation of the RFC consensus.

Also, this: A primary purpose of conducting an RFC is to reach a conclusion on some disputed points so we can move on. Yet I am still seeing debate about questions formally resolved by the RFC as if we were writing on a blank slate. We are not, and playing "I can't hear you!" is disruptive. The RFC determined that consensus is "clearly established" to include, "in some manner," the context of the libel suits—as the RFC proposal put it: "how Mrs. Trump is protecting her brand." The RFC also found consensus "to briefly mention . . . the original allegations," i.e., the claim that Ms. Trump worked for a prostitution service. Therefore, *contra* Light show, we have a mandate to cover the ethics question, and, *contra* JFG, we are to mention the libelous matter as MelanieN has done.

Anyone wishing to object to the RFC's outcome—particularly if he believes it violates one or more of our core policies—should follow our procedure and appeal the close to AN. Rebbling 00:36, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

The blogger source said she worked for an "escort service." Can you prove it's a synonym for your preferred term of disparagement? Such passion to corrupt the bio by including "the libelous matter as MelanieN has done," in other words using WP to repeat fabricated and debunked defamatory text, is amazing! Light show (talk) 01:31, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Please. My comment was neither voicing a preference for word choice nor expressing disdain for the subject. As a personal matter, I have friends who have worked in the sex industry, I am a vocal advocate of sex workers' rights, and I don't think less of women who have had sex for money—call it whatever you like.

And talk about projecting! Unlike you, I have shown little enthusiasm about the inclusion *vel non* of this material; in fact, I initially opposed! A person could similarly exclaim about *your* passion to distort this biography by opposing inclusion of unflattering material—the difference being that your profuse comments and dilatory debating tactics—for instance, demanding proof that "escort" is synonymous with "prostitute" in this context—support such an inference. Such a person may further take note of your fervent, relentless opposition coupled with your disinclination either to challenge the RFC's close, propose a follow-up RFC, or seek assistance from an appropriate noticeboard and conclude that you know your arguments have no merit. A person *could* analyze such things but it would be far wiser for us both to stick to the issue at hand rather than impugning each other's motives. Rebbling 02:14, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Per your friendly suggestion, and to avoid the bias issues noted in the original RfC, I'll open a new one that complies with all guidelines. Especially a key one, to "keep the RfC statement short and simple," instead of having three questions. It will deal with matters which were *not* in the first RfC.

Key rationale: The CBS article (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-file-d/>), for one, states, *Outside of the context of the litigation, however, the claim raises real ethical questions about profiting from being first lady.* That implies they are separate issues and should be treated as such. While the original RfC included three questions, none of them mentioned the ethics issues. In fact, the original RfC included as part of its *own* rationale an explanation which implies they are both separate and "new" issues:

These new developments are not a simple rehash of the original, inflammatory allegations, but rather delve into how Mrs. Trump is protecting her brand.

So this RfC will try to correct those problems and focus on the ethics issue directly with a simple yes/no question. Nor will it require wording suggestions needing large paragraphs that try to answer three different questions.--Light show (talk) 04:03, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Addendum: To expand on my statement that one of the goals of this RfC is to avoid the bias issues, I'll add the guideline below and note that the original RfC has violated the neutrality requirement in its leading paragraph:

The RfC question should not include arguments supporting or opposing any particular outcome, unless included as part of a brief summary of all sides of the argument. Your own opinions should be included in a separate "support" or "oppose" comment in the discussion section of the RfC, not in the question itself. --Light show (talk) 23:15, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

OK, I think here is where we are procedurally. The first RfC was closed saying that we should insert something about this into the article, and we should work out what the wording should be. That is what we have been doing in the extensive discussion and the five proposals above. The conclusion of that process appears to be that we should insert Version 5 into the article, thus (finally) implementing the first RfC. I will go ahead and do that now, unless someone other than Light show objects. Since a couple of people thought it was too long, I might leave out the quote from her attorney; the removal of the claim from the lawsuit may serve as enough of a retraction. I further interpret that the material should go into the First Lady section, and should not be titled as a separate section.

So the new RfC below is about whether we should modify that wording.. However, it is not clear whether Light show wants to 1) remove everything about the First Lady / ethics issue (which their discussion here suggests is their point), or 2) remove the reference to "escort" (which their addition to the discussion below now says is the point), or 3) make some other change. They need to rephrase the RfC question into the form of a "simple yes/no question" that actually asks what should be in the article. The question as originally asked does not make clear what change they are proposing to make. After they clarify what they are asking to change, that RfC can proceed. --MelanieN (talk) 11:21, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Oppose** wording 5 – Reading the discussion again with a clear mind, I think we are looking at **two** distinct BLP issues with the proposed wording and sources:

1. The escorting accusation was unfounded and retracted with apologies from the original source, therefore it should be automatically excluded from the BLP.
2. The lawsuit was criticized by people hinting at exploitation of her position for personal gain, but this allegation was debunked by her lawyer, while keeping the meat of the defamation lawsuit active. Therefore, we shouldn't echo such editorial accusations either. We should especially **not** quote and emphasize the very portion of the lawsuit text that was used as a basis to allege graft, and that was since reworded for clarity.

The first BLP issue could indeed be circumvented by mentioning that the accusations were retracted. However the second BLP issue is not addressed properly in the proposed text; quite the opposite, the proposed wording 5 dwells at length upon the graft allegation. The combined impression left by those two accusations side by side is quite disparaging and probably would be frowned upon by the community if applying to another person. Perhaps we should request an opinion from the BLP noticeboard before proceeding? — JFG ^{talk} 13:29, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

I am fine with leaving out "escort", and in fact I have already proposed an alternate wording which does that. The original suggestion by the lawsuit that she had intended to make a lot of money out of being first lady was not "debunked" by her lawyer, it was denied by her lawyer - a very different thing. It was cut from the lawsuit after it touched off an uproar, but the uproar was notable. We dwell at length upon this suggestion because that is what literally every Reliable Source reporting on this lawsuit did. Pretty much every news report quotes directly from that sentence [5] (https://www.google.com/search?q=Melania+lawsuit&rlz=1C5CHFA_enUS568US570&oq=Melania+lawsuit&aqs=chrome..69i57j0l5.14076j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8) - and that was what triggered such a large reaction to what otherwise would have been a ho-hum story on page 16. Like it or not, our WEIGHT has to echo the weight of the coverage. --MelanieN (talk) 14:18, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

I agree that we must take the weight of coverage into account, but we see the usual pattern of sensationalism applied here: some Trump-related scandal comes up, it gets a yuge spike of coverage (gotta sell this paper or those clicks), people jump to include the controversy in Wikipedia (possibly in multiple articles), some edit war happens, a couple RfCs are discussed, and a convoluted consensus text emerges out of the process from best efforts of the most resilient editors. A few weeks later, the story is forgotten and all the energy invested in balancing it has gone to waste. A spike in coverage is not enduring coverage, and does not imply the story deserves any strong weight. I'm not even arguing the ten-year test, probably a 6-month test would be enough to slim down all this fluff.

Back to the BLPVIO considerations: please just pause and ponder for a few minutes whether such accusations would be rushed into Wikipedia, argued to exhaustion on talk pages, and finally expounded at length in BLPs for any other people than Donald Trump and his entourage. Do we see this happening for Theresa May? for François Hollande? for Shinzo Abe? I can quote you a dozen scandals and slanderous things floating around the French President and his entourage, but they are not considered encyclopedic material, and rightly so. But on the English Wikipedia as of 2017, not even Vladimir Putin gets the Trump treatment! — JFG ^{talk} 15:01, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Also, your Google search on "Melania lawsuit" confirms my point: there was indeed a yuuuge spike of coverage on February 7 as everybody jumped on the original story, but if we restrict the search to the past month (https://www.google.com/search?q=Melania+lawsuit&rlz=1C5CHFA_enUS568US570&oq=Melania+lawsuit&aqs=chrome..69i57j015.14076j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#q=Melania+lawsuit&newwindow=1&safe=off&tbs=qdr:m&*>) we get another spike on February 22 after the amended lawsuit was revealed, and finally when we restrict search to the past week (https://www.google.com/search?q=Melania+lawsuit&rlz=1C5CHFA_enUS568US570&oq=Melania+lawsuit&aqs=chrome..69i57j015.14076j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#q=Melania+lawsuit&newwindow=1&safe=off&tbs=qdr:w&*>) we just get some stories about Rachel Maddow calling this defamation lawsuit an assault on the media. Would you take a bet on the attention that will be given to this story next week? one month from now? three months? — JFG ^{talk} 15:24, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

JFG, this sounds like you are arguing against including anything about it in the article. That issue has been settled. --MelanieN (talk) 15:47, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

No, I still support inclusion per my !vote and subsequent comments trying to find an appropriate formulation; the currently-proposed text just doesn't seem to work because of its length and the dual BLP issues as explained above. — JFG ^{talk} 15:56, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

@MelanieN: Perhaps we could agree on my earlier wording 4 or some amendment thereof? — JFG ^{talk} 16:07, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

~~Maybe we could merge elements of 1 and 4.~~ I consider it essential to include a sentence about her expectation of future income based on her highly visible position; that was by far the most notable thing about the suit. Without that your final sentence makes no sense. I also think we should include a sentence saying that she later withdrew that language; that's the other thing that drew a lot of coverage, as your analysis showed. --MelanieN (talk) 17:08, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

On second thought, we already have five people supporting version #5, so any modifications we make should start with that version. Aside from removing the word "escort" (in other words, going with 5A), what else do you want to change about version #5? We could see if the other supporters will accept the changes --MelanieN (talk) 23:17, 17 March 2017 (UTC)

Sure; see proposal 6 below. — JFG ^{talk} 05:01, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Support.** This or No. 1 is fine. The wikilawyering and "IDIDINTHEARTHAT" relitigating of settled issues has to stop. Another RfC now? Coretheapple (talk) 15:40, 17 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Support** this version, although I think the original No. 1 was a little better. Actually, this is one of most highly publicized stories about the subject. My very best wishes (talk) 02:35, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Oppose yet another wording** 5? 5b?? - MelanieN et al: Or we could **just follow the RFC**. There are results, not that I like them -- and instead editors started writing before the close and then continued after with yet more that did not pursue the results. Normally, proposals not following the RFC results would be automatically not acceptable. I also suggest **just follow the cites** -- rather than writing something and then just googling for cherries that suit the OR, discuss a significant amount of coverage and paraphrase as best you can and work on the wording of that line. As to the RFC results I will point to:

(1) Include mention of libel.

(2) Briefly mention the allegation, and that it has been retracted. My side resolution - no more cites that are or link to sexy photos.

(3) Location or separate section unclear, separate RFC to discuss.

I'll also mention prior wording notes. First, that it is "re-filed" lawsuit, and I suggest "re-filed in New York" to distinguish it from the lawsuit in the U.K or the closed one in Maryland. Second, that that it be "claimed damages" rather than "seeks damages" just an English nit of it's not that she wants to get damaged here but rather that she alleges she was damaged by the article.

Lastly, since time has elapsed there has been further revision to the complaint, dropping the controversial wording that led critics to question if she intended to gain financially from being first lady. (It also added cites of cases that the Daily Mail allegations were being repeated.)

Suggest '*stop random proposals* and start new, clean block about where it goes and then working the wording using all the RFCs. Cheers. Markbassett (talk) 20:30, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Thank you for calling my attention to the fact that the RfC said to mention the allegation. I had forgotten that. In that case, I don't need my additional question below and can go ahead and add #5. Suggestions to change it could be made here, using a new RfC if needed, but by adding this I will (finally) be carrying out the result of the previous RfC. --MelanieN (talk) 20:39, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Proposed wording 6

Following the above discussion with MelanieN, here is a fresh proposal, striving to cover the whole story while addressing the neutrality and BLP concerns expressed, and keeping it short. — JFG ^{talk} 05:01, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

In February 2017 Melania Trump sued Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail* tabloid, seeking \$150 million in damages for libel and reputation injury over a slanderous article published in August 2016, later debunked and retracted.^[1] The lawsuit claimed the publication had ruined Trump's opportunity to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which Plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world", raising ethical concerns.^[2] Trump's lawyer then amended the lawsuit, omitting the controversial language and focusing on emotional distress.^[3]

References

1. Puente, Maria (February 7, 2017). "Melanie Trump's 'Daily Mail' Lawsuit: A FLOTUS First?" (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/life/people/2017/02/07/melania-trump-daily-mail-libel-lawsuit-first-lady-profit/97590284/>). *USA Today*. Retrieved February 10, 2017.
2. Reid, Paula (February 7, 2017). "Melania Trump libel suit settled, another filed" (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-another-filed/>). *CBS News*. Retrieved February 10, 2017.
3. Bennett, Kate (February 22, 2017). "Melania Trump drops controversial language from \$150 million defamation suit" (<http://ww>

w.cnn.com/2017/02/22/politics/melania-trump-drops-controversial-language-from-150-million-lawsuit/). *CNN*. Retrieved March 16, 2017.

■ **Support** with suggestions:

1. The source only claimed "lost business profits," as opposed to "ruined opportunity." 2. I think that writing "multimillion dollar business relationships" is enough, without the 17 words following, but keeping the last 3: "raising ethical concerns." 3. I'd rephrase the last sentence to "Trump later amended the lawsuit to claim the libel primarily damaged her reputation, and omitted any reference to potential business.

I trimmed the words "then" and "controversial" from the last sentence since they imply (synth) a direct connection to the "ethical concerns" which is not sourced or explained. I trimmed off the word "lawyer" since it's implied. --Light show (talk) 06:28, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Appended rationale: As noted earlier, repeating a libel is also considered libel, and is beneath any encyclopedia's standards; it could even put another tabloid at risk of violating the law. WP should not join those bottom-feeder (<https://qph.ec.quoracdn.net/main-qimg-9b839e18ed4ddf3bec6c46bd35c6e815-c>) websites concerned with selling ads and attracting readers at any cost, thereby violating its own guidelines to avoid "scandal mongering." I believe Markbassett first pointed out the legal aspect over a month ago. And while the "ethical concerns" were brought up in conjunction with the news stories about the lawsuit, it's now old and stale news, since the initial ethical questions are now moot (<http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/22/politics/melania-trump-drops-controversial-language-from-150-million-lawsuit/>) and no longer related to the lawsuit. WP is not a newspaper. --Light show (talk) 16:31, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Absolutely not.** This is a laughable and blatantly POV wording ("over a slanderous article"(!), ridiculously biased language written entirely from the one-sided, enraged and emotional perspective of Melania) that seems like something written by Melania herself. The wording goes on in a totally unencyclopedic style ("later debunked", another POV claim and tabloid language found on forums, but not in an encyclopedia). Also, there is consensus to mention what the lawsuit is all about, and this ridiculous wording proposal doesn't do that. We should now go ahead and implement wording proposal no. 5 following consensus and weeks of endless discussion, and any further attempt to derail the implementation of the consensus now is disruption. --Tataral (talk) 13:23, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **No.** Agree with Tataral. This is an openly POV presentation. There is already consensus to implement version 5 on the page. Let's do it. If anyone would like to change that, they can open another RfC. This discussion/RfC was conducted already for a long time. My very best wishes (talk) 13:38, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **No.** This isn't a slight rewrite of #5, which is what I suggested because most people have accepted it; this is a whole new approach, starting over. The first few sentences leave it unclear what she was suing over. This omits the public reaction and minimizes why there were ethical concerns - why the language was controversial. No. People accepted version #5, they are sick of discussing it, they want to put the language into the article and move on. Let's go back to version #5 which most people had accepted and which was very close to consensus. Here it is again, modified slightly to respond to people's suggestions to eliminate "escort" and shorten it; call it 5-B. I was willing to tweak it a little to try to get you on board, and I will tweak it slightly more if you can suggest minor modifications. But this is the closest we have come to a consensus version and it's time to implement it. --MelanieN (talk) 14:17, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **No.** I share your opinion that the *Daily Mail* article was slanderous, but that's not a neutral viewpoint; this version omits necessary context (accusations of prostitution); and it soft-pedals the (silly, in my view) ethical objections. Consensus exists to implement version 5-A. Rebbling 15:17, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Strongly oppose** Ridiculously POV wording. Coretheapple (talk) 15:46, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- Wow, I rarely got such unanimous opposition to any proposal I ever made on WP! Guess I'm wrong then. — JFG ^{talk} 16:50, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Not quite unanimous. As writer George R. R. Martin wrote: "Words are wind." But going from this to this after some gusts seems unusual. --Light show (talk) 17:10, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Support in parts** JFG - Most parts are better than MenlanieN proposal 5/5a/whatever, some words are not. Getting hard to tell with multiple things ongoing and several lines thrown out at once, but comments for you:
 - Make that "re-filed" as it is and the cites seem to usually say it that way.
 - Suggest "claim damage" rather than the odd English "seeking damage". While the cites usually say 'seeks' I think there we can paraphrase the cites meaning with better English.
 - Condense the first part, in answer to the RFC 'briefly' mention it, mostly by de-commatizing straighten the sequence of wording and removal of pauses. Something like just one line, "On 6 February 2017 Melania re-filed a lawsuit in New York against the owner of The Daily Mail for an August story, since retracted, which reported a blog stated she once worked with an escort agency."
 - Focus on the controversy, in answer to the RFC to make the bulk of this about controversy in that filing. I think that would mean at least one line more than the lead-line. I also think simply stating the controversy and the parts involved, being cautious about stating conclusions or sides. "This lawsuit stirred attention and controversy due to the it's claiming \$150 million in damages, and from language basing it on her fame." I think the concerns are better voiced as a separate line, partly as this is harder: "This was widely interpreted as profiting from her position of First Lady, which led critics to question the ethics of her intentions."
 - Skip the quotation - I think that reporting the nature of the concern needs narration rather than a quote, especially since the words are now gone, and frankly the concerns in cites seem mostly speculative or emoting rather than based on the words.
 - Make short response and update - here I suggest the response be kept to one line, as it's less thn the controversy. "Her lawyers stated she had no such intention, and on 18 February the suit was amended to omit the controversial material.

Hope this helps. Cheers Markbassett (talk) 18:21, 19 March 2017 (UTC)

@Markbassett: Thanks for your comments, however we reached consensus in the meantime; see below. — JFG ^{talk} 19:54, 19 March 2017 (UTC)

Version 5-B

In February 2017 Melania Trump filed a lawsuit against Mail Media, the owner of the *Daily Mail* newspaper. The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article which repeated a false rumor about her previous career; the *Mail* later retracted the article and apologized.^[1] In the lawsuit, Trump claimed the article had ruined her "unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" to establish "multimillion dollar business relationships for a multi-year term during which Plaintiff is one of the most photographed women in the world".^[2] Commentators said the claim raised ethical questions about the possibility of profiting from being First Lady.^[3] On February 18 the lawsuit was refiled, omitting the language about earning potential and focusing instead on emotional distress.^[4]

References

1. "Melania Trump: A retraction" (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3769798/Melania-Trump-retraction.html>). *Daily Mail*. September 1, 2016. Retrieved 18 March 2017.
2. Puente, Maria (February 7, 2017). "Melanie Trump's 'Daily Mail' Lawsuit: A FLOTUS First?" (<http://www.usatoday.com/story/life/people/2017/02/07/melania-trump-daily-mail-libel-lawsuit-first-lady-profit/97590284/>). *USA Today*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.
3. Reid, Paula (February 7, 2017). "Melania Trump libel suit settled, another filed" (<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/melania-trump-libel-suit-settled-anot-her-filed/>). *CBS News*. Retrieved 10 February 2017.

4. Bennett, Kate (February 22, 2017). "Melania Trump drops controversial language from \$150 million defamation suit" (<http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/22/politics/melania-trump-drops-controversial-language-from-150-million-lawsuit/>). *CNN*. Retrieved 16 March 2017.

- The weaseling is disturbing: either we say she was accused of escorting or we don't; this middle-ground "false rumor about her previous career" is useless. Let's call a spade a spade: "which claimed she worked as an escort besides her modeling career." Also, can we shorten the first sentence with "sued Mail Media" instead of "filed a lawsuit against Mail Media"? — JFG ^{talk} 16:55, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Umm, the version #6 that you proposed did not mention escorting and in fact gave no hint at all what the "slandorous article" was about (not even "her previous career" as this version says). Now you want to include escorting? Please clarify. We could change "filed a lawsuit" to "sued"; to get rid of the repetition of "sue" we should probably combine that sentence with the first part of the second sentence. I actually prefer "filed a lawsuit". Why are you suggesting "sued"? Length? The additional two words do not add significantly to the length. --MelanieN (talk) 17:20, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Right. My point is either we say it fully or we don't say it at all. My proposal was in the "don't say it at all" camp; among your proposals, I actually feel more comfortable with the original "proposal 5" wording which says exactly what was published (with appropriate attribution and retraction of course). About "sued" vs "filed a lawsuit against", it feels more direct. And yes, combining the first and second sentences, as in my proposal 6, would flow better (to my ears at least): **In February 2017 Melania Trump sued Mail Media, the owner of *The Daily Mail*, seeking \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article which claimed she had worked as an escort during her modeling days.** — JFG ^{talk} 18:21, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Opinion needed

~~@Tataral, Coretheapple, Rebbing, Markbassett, JFG, David Tornheim, and Winged Blades of Godric: Sorry to ping you guys again; hopefully it will be the last time. One last question for the people editing here, particularly those who support adding version #5 to the article (which we are very close to doing): Do you prefer specifying that the *Mail* article claimed she had worked for an escort service, or not?~~

- ~~Option 1: Specify the allegation in the article: "*The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article which alleged that she had worked for an escort service during her modeling days; the Mail later retracted the article and apologized.*"~~
- ~~Option 2: Only mention it was about her previous career: *The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article which repeated a false rumor about her previous career; the Mail later retracted the article and apologized.*"~~
- ~~Option 3: Don't give any hint what the article was about: "*The suit seeks \$150 million in damages over an August 2016 article about her; the Mail later retracted the article and apologized.*"~~

~~Thanks! --MelanieN (talk) 18:40, 18 March 2017 (UTC)~~

- Prefer option 3, otherwise option 1. Weaseling per option 2 is useless. — JFG ^{talk} 18:44, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Support: Yeah, I'm with you M; enough of this phony decency stuff. Who cares if they retracted the titillating details or even apologized. Show me what they said (<http://www.commdiginews.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/HillaryCurtain.jpg>). Let's see (<https://ccsorrow.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/looking-under-the-bed.jpg>) what they had to apologize for. We're not children, so show us (<https://img01.rl0.ru/b3152bfa95b66a0fc4c7a5048a098ed1/c600x600/dailypicksandflicks.com/wp-content/upload>

s/2012/09/little-boy-peeking-under-girls-skirt.jpg) more. And please hurry up, for god's sake (<http://www.picserver.org/images/highway/phrases/do-it-now.jpg>). We're all waiting (https://static01.nyt.com/images/2012/11/07/us/07caucus_chicago3/07caucus_chicago3-blog480.jpg). --Light show (talk) 19:06, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

LOL! Your sarcastic but well illustrated comment is priceless. --MelanieN (talk) 19:48, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

- **Option 1** Wikipedia is WP:NOTCENSORED. Coretheapple (talk) 20:23, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Say escort.** I would suggest any coverage really has to accept the word, it's an article which "reported allegations that she once worked as an escort" BBC (<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-39060243>). Markbassett (talk) 20:41, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
- **Sorry** to bother you all! User:Markbasset just pointed out that one of the conclusions of the previous RfC was that the allegation should be mentioned briefly. In that case, Option 1 is the only possibility that complies with that RfC result, and I should go ahead and add this to the article. Anyone wanting to change it can discuss here, including starting a new RfC if needed, but in the meantime the result of the previous RfC is that it should be in the article. --MelanieN (talk) 20:43, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
 - Not a problem. I appreciate the ping. Coretheapple (talk) 20:46, 18 March 2017 (UTC)
 - Same for me. I would rather be overpinged than underpinged. The version (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revision&diff=770985085&oldid=770958122) you put in the article looks good to me. That said my interest in the nitty gritty of this article is limited. I saw a huge difference in the description in the RfC where I did express my opinion. I'll keep the article on my watchlist, but no need to ping me on minor changes. You can ping me if there is a new RfC opened here or on any other political article. --David Tornheim (talk) 01:42, 19 March 2017 (UTC)
 - @MelanieN:- I appreciate the ping.Per Mark, you have done good by adding option 1--rather than merely going on with these long discussions in the talk-page. You can always ping me if there is a new RfC opened here or on any other political article.Cheers!*Winged Blades* Godric 03:18, 19 March 2017 (UTC)

Consensus version inserted into article; end of discussion about how to enforce the RfC

I have added version #5 to the article, in the First Lady section, without a separate section heading. I inserted the paragraph chronologically with other information about her tenure as First Lady. I think we can consider this discussion about a wording to carry out the original RfC (the one that began February 8 and ended March 8) to be finally closed. Thank you all for your collaboration and good faith. Anyone who wants to alter the wording, and thinks they can achieve consensus to do so, can start new RfC at the bottom of the page. --MelanieN (talk) 21:04, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Thanks for your patience and dedication, MelanieN! — JFG ^{talk} 21:18, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

You're welcome. About your edits to the paragraph, I accepted all of them except the reference to Graft (politics), which is not at all what we are talking about here. --MelanieN (talk) 21:39, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

Yes, fine. As long as you're not attempting to profit from your position as First Namesake Lady of Wikipedia... 😊 — JFG ^{talk} 21:47, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

LOL, you caught me! 0;-D --MelanieN (talk) 21:55, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

I moved the sentence on the Secret Service handle, but aside from that I think it's fine. Appreciate your work on this. I had pretty much given up. Coretheapple (talk) 22:33, 18 March 2017 (UTC)

I appreciate your work too. The version (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revision&diff=770985085&oldid=770958122) you put in the article looks good to me. No comment on Core's change. I also appreciated JFG's copyedit, except that I agree with Melanie that "graft" is going too far. --David Tornheim (talk) 01:38, 19 March 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_4&oldid=776116621"