

# Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 6

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 5](#)

[Archive 6](#)

[Archive 7](#)

## Contents

- 1 Wikilink to Slovenia
- 2 "Socialist Republic of Slovenia, ... today a part of Republic of Slovenia"
- 3 Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 31 May 2017
- 4 First naturalized First Lady
- 5 External links modified
- 6 update needed
- 7 Bible in caption
- 8 She was baptised
- 9 Languages spoken
  - 9.1 Proposed edit
  - 9.2 First First Lady to speak Fluently in two or more languages is a false statement

## Wikilink to Slovenia

"She was born in Slovenia" should be... "She was born in Slovenia", linking to the current Wikipedia article about the country. Tvaughan1 (talk) 21:44, 24 May 2017 (UTC)

When she was born there, it was the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, so it is appropriate to link to that. --MelanieN (talk) 20:02, 25 May 2017 (UTC)

I simplified the text in the lead, while retaining the distinction.[1] ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=782689855&oldid=782582487](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=782689855&oldid=782582487)) Hope this helps. — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 15:18, 28 May 2017 (UTC)

## "Socialist Republic of Slovenia, ... today a part of Republic of Slovenia"

Why "a part of"? What else was added? Or is it the same territory, with a different name? The articles on Slovenia and the SR of Slovenia do not indicate any change in borders at independence and unsocialization. --Richardson mcphillips (talk) 20:17, 25 May 2017 (UTC)

You are correct. I simplified the text in the lead, while retaining the distinction.[2] ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=782689855&oldid=782582487](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=782689855&oldid=782582487)) Hope this helps. — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 15:18, 28 May 2017 (UTC)

## Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 31 May 2017

In the section of, "Role in 2016 U.S. Presidential Election," first sentence needs to be changed: "In November 2015, when asked about her husband's presidential campaign, Trump said: 'I encouraged him because I know what he will do and what he can do for America.'" In the text, "Trump" replaced "Melania." Please change "Trump" to Melania" in the sentence.



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

In the section of, "Role in 2016 U.S. Presidential Election," first sentence needs to be changed: "In November 2015, when asked about her husband's presidential campaign, Trump said: 'I encouraged him because I know what he will do and what he can do for America.'" In the text, "Trump" replaced "Melania." Please change "Trump" to Melania" in the sentence. 2605:A000:4783:FB00:DDBC:1392:105B:2DF4 (talk) 22:28, 31 May 2017 (UTC)

**ⓘ Not done:** In accordance with our style guide (see WP:SURNAME), the subject of this article is properly referred to by her last name. **Rebbing** 22:42, 31 May 2017 (UTC)

## First naturalized First Lady

I am aware that Louisa Adams was the first "foreign born" First Lady, and that *is* in the lead. (Personally, I would take it out as unimportant, but I'm not going to argue the point.) But Louisa Adams, contrary to what some have written, was NOT the first "naturalized citizen" to become First Lady. Louisa Adams was never naturalized, because she never needed to be.

Ms. Adams' birth in England was a bit more than a year before the Declaration of Independence was signed. She was born to an Englishwoman and, very importantly, *to an American father*. Through him, she gained citizenship *without* having to go through any type of process (aka, naturalization), as soon as the US became a nation. Indeed, her father served in London as a US diplomat. If a baby is born in Montevideo to Kelly Keiderling, the US Ambassador to Uruguay, would that baby be "foreign born"? Sure. But they would also be a US citizen from the moment of their birth, even if they were not to visit the US for many years.

So please, do not again remove the very noteworthy observation that Melania Trump is the first naturalized First Lady of the US. **Unschool** 23:56, 21 May 2017 (UTC)

You know, I'm trying to be considerate here. I made my points here on the talk page, but am once again reverted without the same courtesy being extended to me. I'm going to continue to be civil, and ask the same in return. Now, on to the content issue.

According to the reverting editor, the fact that Melania Trump is the 2nd foreign born FLOTUS is noteworthy enough to include in the lead, but the fact that she is the *first* naturalized First Lady is not. This strikes me as absurd for two major reasons. First of all, Louisa Adams' "foreign born" status is, stated in isolation, deceptive (I'm not suggesting that it is *intentionally* so, just that it misleads the reader). It gives the impression that she was not a natural-born American citizen, when in fact, because her father was American (and later during her stay in England, a US diplomat), she was an American as soon as there was an America. Putting Melania Trump in the same category as Louisa Adams misses the point entirely, that Trump had to actively go through the naturalization process to become a citizen, whereas Louisa Adams did not. Their situations are only nominally similar, and the current edit completely obscures that point.

Beyond this, there is a natural Wikipedia tendency to consider "firsts" to be noteworthy and thus often important enough to include in the lead. For example, we learn in their respective lede sections that:

- Eleanor Roosevelt was the first presidential spouse to . . . speak at a national party convention. Do we note which First Lady was the second?
- Eleanor Roosevelt was the first presidential spouse to hold regular press conferences, write a daily newspaper column, write a monthly magazine column, host a weekly radio show
- Barbara Bush was the mother of the first Connecticut native to assume the Presidency.
- Michelle Obama was the first African-American First Lady
- Hillary Clinton was appointed the first female chair of the Legal Services Corporation
- Hillary Clinton the first female partner at Rose Law Firm
- Hillary Clinton was the first female senator from New York (not the first female senator, she was the *30th* female senator)
- Hillary Clinton was the first female candidate to be nominated for president by a major U.S. political party

Now, how important are all of these? To my mind, Michelle Obama being the first African-American FLOTUS, and Hillary Clinton being the first woman nominated by a major party are clearly the two biggest "firsts" listed. And then, in third place in my opinion, after those two, is Melania Trump's "first" as the first naturalized FLOTUS. I mean, from a perspective of historical interest, the fact that she is the first naturalized First Lady is a bit more important than HRC being the first "female chair of Legal Services Corp", or Barbara Bush giving birth in Connecticut to a future President. Trump's status is also bigger than the fact that the daughter of a US gentleman who would later become First Lady happened to be born abroad.

So if the lede is just too long to accommodate both Trump's first naturalized FLOTUS status and the fact that she is the second foreign born FLOTUS, it's clear which is more noteworthy. The other editor's WP:ES states, *OK but the distinction is too much detail for the lead paragraph which already says they are both foreign-born; perhaps explain it later*". How about we explain the detail about being the second foreign born FLOTUS "later"? I mean, who is this article about, Melania Trump or Louisa Adams?

I will be courteous and wait a few days before restoring what clearly belongs in the lede. I'm open to persuasion, but it takes two to have a conversation. **Unschool** 06:43, 22 May 2017 (UTC)

Hi Unschool, I reverted you before reading this; sorry, happy to discuss. I agree that mentioning that Melania is the first naturalized first lady is lead-worthy, and we must also consider that the comparison with Louisa Adams is often made. The question becomes, how do we convey both facts without sounding repetitive and nitpicking. Let me suggest a new wording:

Trump is the first naturalized citizen to become First Lady of the United States, whereas Louisa Adams was born in London to an American father and acquired US citizenship automatically.

This emphasizes the "first" and also informatively compares with the Adams situation. Would you approve? — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 07:09, 22 May 2017 (UTC)

Thank you. I *think* that'll be fine, depending on its placement. Go ahead and do it, and we'll see how it looks. **Unschool** 11:02, 22 May 2017 (UTC)

✓ **Done** — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 11:15, 22 May 2017 (UTC)

Hey, JFG, I see that User: Al-Andalus has changed the wording on the topic of our discussion. In my opinion, he or she has improved upon the wording that we had agreed to. Our wording included a slightly stilted use of "whereas", and Al-Andalus has found a way around that which I like. **Unschool** 00:59, 28 May 2017 (UTC)

Yes, and I tweaked it further for grammar and fluidity. Should be fine. — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 15:14, 28 May 2017 (UTC)

Looks perfect. **Unschool** 04:19, 29 May 2017 (UTC)

@JFG: I don't see any consensus here or in the given source that states she (Adams) is "natural-born". This is a disputed term as clearly evident on the respective page, and so I don't think it is helpful to link to it. A more appropriate link would be the undisputed Birthright citizenship in the United States. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 00:21, 1 June 2017 (UTC)

@Emir of Wikipedia: You are correct: our article on the natural-born clause discusses the requirements to be President, so is the wrong link. However, our article on birthright citizenship doesn't confirm Louisa's status either. She was born before the United States existed, so the notion of her acquiring U.S. nationality at birth is preposterous. In the Naturalization Act of 1790, children born overseas from two American parents were granted birthright citizenship, and not before 1855 was this provision extended to children born to an American father and foreign mother, like Louisa – she was already dead by then. It is thus anachronistic to claim that she acquired birthright citizenship due to her father being American. Bottom line: I don't know how to characterize her acquisition of U.S. citizenship without original research. Maybe she was assumed to be American but no paperwork documented this, or maybe she acquired nationality upon marriage in 1797? This is getting really off-topic for a trivia fact in Melania Trump's article. I would suggest simply removing the legal aside in the sentence, yielding this wording: **Trump is the first naturalized U.S. citizen to become First Lady, and the second one born overseas after Louisa Adams, born in London to an American father.** — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 06:23, 2 June 2017 (UTC)

I think your suggested wording is probably better, as it removes the questionable legal terms. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 14:09, 2 June 2017 (UTC)

## External links modified

Hello fellow Wikipedians,

I have just modified 2 external links on Melania Trump. Please take a moment to review my edit (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?diff=prev&oldid=784377746>). If you have any questions, or need the bot to ignore the links, or the page altogether, please visit this simple FaQ for additional information. I made the following changes:

- Added archive [https://web.archive.org/web/20110525035523/http://www.starpulse.com/Supermodels/Knauss%2C\\_Melania/Biography/](https://web.archive.org/web/20110525035523/http://www.starpulse.com/Supermodels/Knauss%2C_Melania/Biography/) to [http://www.starpulse.com/Supermodels/Knauss%2C\\_Melania/Biography/](http://www.starpulse.com/Supermodels/Knauss%2C_Melania/Biography/)
- Corrected formatting/usage for <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2017/05/25/us-first-lady-melania-trump-is-catholic-spokeswoman-confirms/>

When you have finished reviewing my changes, you may follow the instructions on the template below to fix any issues with the URLs.

✓ *An editor has reviewed this edit and fixed any errors that were found.*

- If you have discovered URLs which were erroneously considered dead by the bot, you can report them with this tool (<https://tools.wmflabs.org/iabot/index.php?page=reportfalsepositive>).

- If you found an error with any archives or the URLs themselves, you can fix them with this tool (<https://tools.wmflabs.org/iabot/index.php?page=manageurlsingle>).

If you are unable to use these tools, you may set |needhelp=<your help request> on this template to request help from an experienced user. Please include details about your problem, to help other editors.

Cheers.—**InternetArchiveBot** (**Report bug**) 00:24, 8 June 2017 (UTC)

## update needed

" She is expected to continue living in Trump Tower with her son Barron at least until the end of the 2016–17 school year.[73] [74]" However, the move to the WH has now happened: <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/first-lady-melania-trump-son-barron-11-move-white-house-n770836> 87.247.53.24 (talk) 02:28, 12 June 2017 (UTC)

✓ **Done** [3] ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=785198536&oldid=784377746](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=785198536&oldid=784377746)) — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 05:13, 12 June 2017 (UTC)

## Bible in caption

Request moved from personal talk page — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 20:39, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

(Sorry I don't know how to contact you with this suggestion or request: capitalize Bible in the caption in the article about Mrs Trump. Thanks for all your work on Wikipedia articles.) — Preceding unsigned comment added by 70.114.186.73 (talk) 15:34, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

✓ **Done** — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 20:39, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

## She was baptised

According to Bojan Požar: *Melania Trump. The Inside Story*. Ombo, Ljubljana, 2016, p. 111, Melanija Knavs was baptised on 14 June 1970 in Raka (the village where here mother came from). The church was called St. Lawrence, the master of ceremony was pastor Franc Campa. Her older sister Ines had also been baptised there, and there had been a church service following the official civil marriage of her parents in 1967 (Požar, p. 94). This was all not in accordance with what was officially allowed to members of the Communist Party, but it was nevertheless quite common to do it secretly (Požar, p. 113).

The widespread wrong information that Melanija had not been baptised is tracked back by Požar to a mistake made by the *Daily Mail*. And it seems to be just a wrong conclusion from the fact that communists should not do it at these times. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 17:48, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

Hi User:Klaus Frisch, thank you for finding that information, as well as for providing the quote from Požar's book. I have added ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&type=revision&diff=785655959&oldid=785528952](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revision&diff=785655959&oldid=785528952)) that information in the article. I also found another source corroborating the reference you offered, here (<https://aleteia.org/2017/06/05/melanie-trump-was-baptized-catholic-confirms-slovenian-cardinal-franc-rode/>). I hope this helps. With regards, Anupam<sup>Talk</sup> 18:21, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

I'm glad that I could help. And that you took it up instantly. :)

Požar's book is full of further interesting informations, and especially the part on her early life in Slovenia (and her ascendants) is very sound and thorough. I think this important and much-noticed person deserves a comprehensive description of her life before she became famous, and for this, Požar's biography is by far the best source. I used it for de:Melania Trump, and I am quite astonished that nobody else at least takes a look (at the book, I mean ;). It is cheap, and it is also available on Kindle. At least it should be listed at the end of the article. -Klaus Frisch (talk) 19:13, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

It is most likely the best option to keep the article to the current form and not to reframe it into the german one. Stick to what you're good at Klaus, you already bogarted the german article for yourself successfully and just have fun with that. --Joobo (talk) 21:45, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

I wrote about Požar's book. Any comments on *that*? --Klaus Frisch (talk) 21:58, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

Now I see that what Anupam did is not correct. I didn't "quote from Požar's book" and now the article quotes me (in a footnote) instead of Požar. What I wrote at the head of this thread was meant as a service for you here. Pick out what you think to be appropriate and refer to Požar with the pages I specified. The source that Anupam added is IMO irrelevant, just

hearsay. Požar investigated in Slovenia, searched for documents and talked to people that were involved. Again: This article should be based – as for the time before Melania became famous – on the one existing biography that deserves this description and not on newspapers (as long as they don't do investigative journalism but merely spread rumours). --Klaus Frisch (talk) 23:39, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

## Languages spoken

The correct notion "She declares to speak ..." has recently been replaced with "She speaks ...". As before, the only sources are newspapers that rely on what Melania declared. The only spoken languages that are known independently are Slovenian and English. And in respect to the latter, the only possibly interesting fact (by media coverage) is that she still has a heavy accent. English was her foreign language in school, already 40 years ago. When she introduced herself to a German-speaking model agent in Vienna in 1993, she spoke English, and this was, as the agent later said, "terrible". It is just not conceivable why we should spread her self-fashioning as a talent for languages. She obviously is not. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 00:22, 15 June 2017 (UTC)

Do not even think about trying to do the same here as you did with the German article. And keep your conjectures to yourself.--Joobo (talk) 23:55, 16 June 2017 (UTC)

Klaus: You seem to be on a campaign to interject negative things in the article and to remove positive things about Trump. This pattern has been established by you. Now as to the issue involved here. First, those that live in glass houses should not throw stones. If we were going to add the comments of some book (that no one has seen but you and sounds like a hit piece) then the phrasing should be "She claims to speak. . ." It should not be "She declares to speak ..." That grammar is, just as you said above, "terrible." Second, the addition of the phrase "she claims" (or the badly worded "she declares") is a classic weasel wording. See Weasel wording The phrase adds your opinion that she can't speak the languages. You point to a book that no one has seen but you. That source is not reliable. There are several reliable sources in the article that point out when Melania was on President Trump's first foreign trip she spoke various languages on her trip that your precious book has zero information on. For example, in Italy she visited children in a hospital and she spoke Italian to them. You can see how a REAL reliable source looks like here: Melania Trump speaks Italian with hospitalized children in Rome (<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/melania-trump-speaks-italian-with-hospitalized-children-in-rome/article/2624011>). The phrase "she claims" will stay out of the article as your opinion based upon a book that no one else has seen. The reliable sources do not support your edit.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 18:34, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

Why so aggressively *ad personam*? (I am used to that from Joobo.) The one and only serious biography is not unreliable because no one else than me bothered to look inside. And as I pointed out above, all the other "reliable sources" simply repeat what Mrs. Trump claimed. Now you come up with a source that is new to me, but that's just a variation of the theme: "according to her spokeswoman Stephanie Grisham". The problem here seems to be that you changed a correct wording 2 weeks ago. Let's see if other users without such a massive emotional bias will be interested in this topic. I am certainly not one of those who are on a campaign. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 19:51, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

BTW: In your last edit you confused Melania with Ivanka. :) If Melania wanted to prove her alleged language skills, she just had to speak Italian, French or German publicly. To send her spokeswoman instead is not reliable and rather evidence for the contrary. I have an ambiguous opinion on this person and above, I proposed to describe her childhood and youth in Slovenia based on Požar's book. This would be totally positive if you do it like I did in de:Melania Trump. (Use a translator if you are interested in that.) But later - and especially since she came to the States - it was her job to make a show and often also to pretend. So it is not unusual that she pretended to have a university degree (while in fact, as Požar found out, she didn't even complete the first year). Her breast augmentation (which is not mentioned in the article) does fall in the same category. She was a model, and that's the way it goes. After the marriage with Donald, she obviously has changed considerably. To me, this is merely fascinating. But it should be constated as it is. My opinion, that I will (and could) not fight for here. I am living in Germany near the village where Donald's grandparents came from. As in other realms, I now and then contribute in en.WP where I have something to offer. This is now the first time that I am personally attacked because of that. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 21:59, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

I simply commented an edit by User:SlackerDelphi two weeks ago.[4] ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=783506006&oldid=783435157](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=783506006&oldid=783435157)) The facts I provided here are taken from the book of Bojan Požar mentioned above. Maybe User:JFG would like to say something. (BTW: I just learned that Joobo has been blocked for more than a year in en.WP and is only allowed to participate again on the basis of WP:ROPE.) --Klaus Frisch (talk) 11:16, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

You do not have to tell that all over again with "the" book. If you aim to change this article the same way you did with the German one, in which you intentionally edited purely negatively about this particular BLP and did not even make a secret about it;- then I am telling you that this is not going to happen here. The fact that you mention that I was blocked for a long time, is not only digressing but a poor attempt to undermine some users' credibility. Fun fact Klaus: this is the

English Wikipedia, not the German one, such surreptitious work attitudes as you were used to using in the german one, will not work here.--Joobo (talk) 17:29, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

If I were Melania (and had the money) I would now sue you for libel. :) But anglophone WP readers are not told that she is the first FLOTUS ever to start (and win) a libel suit. Instead, alleged language abilities are highlighted (even as "fluent") without any independent confirmation. I hope this will not become usual in en.WP. And I see forward to what will happen with your "rope". BTW: Did you ever contribute to this article? --Klaus Frisch (talk) 20:26, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

Your first sentences makes no sense at all as it is absolutely ambiguous. And to your other expectable passive-aggressive and supercilious statement of you looking "forward" for my nonexistent rope (as you probably misunderstood that metaphora): You should be the one concerned with getting in trouble if you aim to act here the same way as you did in the german WP. where you bogarted the whole article for yourself. Everything has been said.--Joobo (talk) 21:38, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

No: Did you ever contribute to this article? And I still hold that you libel me here (as you did before in de.WP where nobody was impressed). But my first sentence above obviously was a joke. I know that you have no sense for humour. But the following is not a joke: Stop your denunciations or I will demonstrate you what WP:ROPE means. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 22:20, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

Let me summarize it, you behaved absolutely incredible in the german WP never WP:AGF nor looked for WP:CONS, denounced almost anything that did not went your or your two/three fellow user companions' way with the same, to put it gently at least "questionable" intentions for this BLP article. You almost completely overtook the article (the majority of the content there now is once again edited by you according to edit stats, and the share will probably even rise in the coming months) and you failed to the most basic standards of decency with regard to WP:BLP, and now you threaten me and want to "demonstrate to me what rope means" completely ignoring WP:CIV. And before that also ignoring all propriety when coming up with such dubious "libel"? And then out of a sudden you say it was a "joke" as you might remember about WP:LEGAL? I give you one absolute final advice in case you still do not get it. Do not even think about doing the same here as you did in the german WP. In case you want do want to give genuine and truly beneficial contribution; do it cautiously, always keeping WP:NPOV, Wikipedia:No original research and Wikipedia:Verifiability in mind; as well and in particular WP:BLPSTYLE. That is the absolute final statement to that matter by me, also concerning WP:TALK. Joobo (talk) 23:16, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

Joobo, I appreciate your desire to note the history of controversy at the de.Wikipedia article, but at this point, I think it's getting a little excessive, and I think more of this would quickly start to become disruptive. I'm not sure of the German Wikipedia process, but here talk pages are not really meant to host extensive discussion about editor conduct. If you feel Klaus exhibits a bias significant enough to push his behaviour into problem editing, then when he crosses a policy line, you can broach the matter at WP:ANI or WP:AN3, or approach an admin directly. For the time being though, let's please keep discussion focused on the content and relevant policy arguments, not allegations of supposed bias on another project entirely.

On that topic, this is clearly a WP:WEIGHT issue, as SlackerDelphi indirectly notes above. And even a claim backed by a reliable source can be kept out, as a matter of balance and neutral point of view. That said, Klaus is not entirely out on a limb here. Being a polyglot with complete command of at least six languages is no small thing; I know many linguists who cannot boast of that. And on this project, exceptional claims require exceptional sourcing. And note that even the source that Delphi cited as a proper reliable source on Mrs. Trump's speaking Italian goes on to say "**It's been reported that she also speaks German, French, Italian and Serbo-Croatian.**" (emphasis added). And some of the rest of the sourcing seems to follow that trend. So if what we have here is one reliable source that explicitly states that there is reason to believe these skills are deliberately overstated on the one hand, and then on the other hand a number of other sources which are much more numerous and seem to tacitly support her facility with these languages, but which are also mostly small blurb pieces which treat the subject superficially and transparently don't even purport to any significant independent research on the matter, then surely the thing that NPOV requires of us here, if we are going to have one simple statement, is to also say that she is "reported to have" spoken these languages.

That's one possibility. Another is to present both perspectives in carefully worded and attributed statements and allow the reader to draw their own conclusions. That's

ultimately what policy requires in the case of directly contradictory sources. This is a borderline case, insofar as we're talking about a single source, but provided that source is a reliable one--and you can always take the matter to WP:RSN if you want to argue that point--then I don't see why we wouldn't report it here; it would pass the WP:DUE test for me, under the circumstances. But at the very least, it seems like this statement could use some tweaking. Snow<sup>let's rap</sup> 00:36, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

Thank you for coming back to topic, Snow. I don't understand everything you wrote, but I think I got the essence. Now due weight should not mean that we count the newspaper articles that just repeat what the authors read elsewhere. In fact we only have two sources: Melania Trump herself (and her spokeswoman) and investigative journalists - in this case the renowned (or at least very popular) Slovenian journalist Bojan Pozar, in other cases Julia Ioffe, and that's all up to now. Pozar wrote a book full with thoroughly investigated informations. This is not one opinion but in most cases the only available source besides Melania's own claims. All the newspapers just repeat what they found in these two sources. And Pozar tells a rich story in which there is no place for noteworthy language skills besides Slovenian and English. He does not claim a negative but simply described what happened. And I gave a very brief summary above. Given the obvious lie about a university degree and her assertion that she wrote a speech alone and with little help that turned out as written by others including important phrases plagiarized from Michelle Obama (I could mention more), we should strictly avoid to uncritically spread what this person claims. Just the same as what concerns her husband. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 01:25, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

Well, let's be careful not to swing too much in the other direction here. It's not really our place to speculate too deeply when it comes to the editorial practices of our sources. In some cases, their own language may indicate that they are just passing along reports; in other instances, the degree of independent resource may be nebulous, but WP:V and other major policies direct us not to interject our own WP:Original research-based analysis of their probable internal process. In this case, it suffices to me to say that the sourcing is inconsistent and *probably* merit some well-attributed statements to address that inconsistency. That said, the claims would need careful consideration, this being a BLP and all.

Your second paragraph here gives me some concern. Each individual claim needs to be evaluated on its own sourcing and policy basis. General assertions about the lack of trustworthiness of the article's subject (especially when we are talking about a subject who touches upon areas as polemic as politics) don't really help your case here, but in fact do give the impression, as has been suggested, of a bias on the topic, sufficient enough to skew your editorial take. I recommend focusing on the matter at hand, and not bringing in these tangential comments about other matters that she may or may not have misled on. Snow<sup>let's rap</sup> 05:38, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

In de.WP we decided to omit this language thing. It is not important at all, and there is no independent evidence for more than the two obvious languages. To the contrary, covfefe (media coverage) could make it relevant that she still (40 years after first learning English in school) has obvious deficits in English and that her son Barron also has a Slovenian accent. Since her parents, who only speak Slovenian, spend a great part of the year with her and Barron (and now also moved to the White House with them), it is assumed that despite the assertion of "English, English, English all the time", they spoke mostly Slovenian up there in the Trump Tower. These are aspects that had a "weight" in the media while the alleged other languages were only snippets that have been exaggerated in WP. Undue weight. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 01:56, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

That's actually something that I took away from that interview. Her command of English syntax is obviously not that of a native or 100% fluent speaker. So, as she seems to believe that English is one of her better languages, it suddenly makes more sense that she says she (or those representing her) say she can speak half a dozen languages. "Ohhhhh, you mean you can speak them at *less* than that level, gotcha." But it does underscore just how variable is the definition of facility that is covered by

the statement that someone "speaks" a language. What you perceive as a cynical lie told for the purpose of self-aggrandizement might be (at least partly) just a difference in perspective on what is substantial ability in a language. I will say that this discussion has got me wishing I could have been a fly on the wall when she was talking to those kids in Italian. But all of this is good reason why additional context and attribution might be helpful to our readers. The readers most concerned with this statement will, at least by and large, already be familiar with her facility in English, have their own opinions about how fluent that ability is, and use it as a cognitive baseline for other statements about her relative level of ability in other languages. As to the inner linguistic habits of the Trump family, I don't think that's really relevant to the point being debated here, and actually feels a little like you are reaching to find every instance possible to accuse her of some act of misdirection. *Snow let's rap* 05:57, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

And again, my putative intentions are becoming the topic instead of the one or two words (including "fluent") I suggested to change (which in the case of "she claims" would be a correction of what SlackerDelphi did 2 weeks ago). In one point I really agree with you: There is a wide range of what can be meant by "I speak Italian", and for the purposes of Mrs. Knauss back in Europe as a model, "speaking Italian" might mean very simple conversation. If I read the two relevant interviews I get the impression that she just honestly meant it that way. No reason to see a cynical lie (as you wrote). The question is what we make of this. "The first FLOTUS being fluent in more than two languages" is clearly not backed if we interpret her statements like I just did - and BTW very doubtful as there might well be several former First Ladies who speak or spoke at least three languages. But the more I write here, the more opportunities for arguing about my intentions instead of the article. Wish you a good time. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 08:08, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

I am thinking **just follow the cites**, or simply Google wins here and WP:WEIGHT. Looking at CBS crash course on Melania Trump saying "She's fluent in 5 languages" "Though she may not have experience in public service, Melania Trump is prepped to help her husband out on the diplomatic front:in addition to her native Slovenian, Trump speaks four other languages: English, French, Serbian and German.". The ibtimes.com says six languages - Slovene, Serbian, English, French, German, an Italian. Markbassett (talk) 15:30, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

## Proposed edit

Not reading anything in editors' motives, I think it's fair to acknowledge Melania's statements about her language abilities, while at the same time attributing those claims to herself, as the sources are her own statements. Unless we find sources of her being interviewed in various languages, we can't really know, and that's fine: Wikipedia needs verifiability, not truth. In that spirit, I would support restoring the previous wording: "She declares speaking X, Y, Z" instead of "She speaks X, Y, Z". Can my fellow editors agree on this? — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 16:20, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

**NO SUPPORT** This proposed edit is based upon the false claim that there are no reliable sources indicating that she has spoken other languages publicly. She spoke Italian to the Pope at the Vatican and she spoke Italian to the children at the Rome Children's hospital. See Here: Melania Trump speaks Italian with hospitalized children in Rome (<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/melania-trump-speaks-italian-with-hospitalized-children-in-rome/article/2624011>). So this proposed edit is based upon a falsehood.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 16:38, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Do you really think she spoke Italian to an Argentinian (the Pope) while accompanying her husband who only speaks English? Funny. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 18:13, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Thank you Klaus Frisch. This comment proves my point. The reliable source states exactly that. The Pope made a joke about what Melania might feed Trump--implying that he is fat. She laughed and Trump did not. Also, it proves that you think you are smarter than the reliable source and you want to read into the article what you want to believe. Yes, I really believe that Melania spoke Italian to the Pope because the reliable source says so. You are attempting to substitute your incorrect opinion in place of the written statement of the reliable source. This is original research on your part. Also, as a side note, my wife spoke Russian all the time in front of me in Kiev and I do not speak Russian. Even your original research thought process is full of

holes. Why wouldn't she speak Italian in front Trump? Your comment is illogical and nonsensical. It is just silly.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 18:22, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Also, Klaus Frisch: You assume that Melania spoke first. I was not there (you weren't there but you act like you were there), but I can think the possibility exists that the Pope spoke first and that he spoke in Italian. I don't know that but the possibility exist. You make the assumption that you flat out know who spoke first. You don't know. You just pulled that opinion out of thin air. You are searching and searching to find a reason to make her look bad. You have an axe to grind for some reason. You have a campaign to add negative material to the this article. The reliable source says she spoke Italian. That's all we know. You don't get to jam into the article your incorrect, biased opinions. Find a realible source that says she did not speak Italian or that the Pope did not speak Italian and then you have a point but until then it is just your wild, unsupported claim based upon your personal opinion and that does not work.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 18:41, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Where is the "reliable source" you are referring to? In the article you cited above she only spoke one word: "potizza". And this is not Italian. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 19:11, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

The article is literally entitled, "Melania Trump speaks Italian with hospitalized children in Rome", by Caitlin Yilek in the Washington Examiner, dated May 24, 2017. You can read it here: Please read (<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/melania-trump-speaks-italian-with-hospitalized-children-in-rome/article/2624011>). And once again you don't get to substitute your opinion about happened over the statement of the reporter in ther reliable source.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 19:32, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

This reliable source is cited in the article. It has been available to you for days. Have you read the article? It is cited in the sentence right after the sentence that says, "She speaks . . ." It is cited in the exact next sentence, have you read the article? Why didn't you see this reliable source?--SlackerDelphi (talk) 19:36, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

You mentioned this source several times, I read it at least twice and I commented it several times, e.g. a couple of minutes ago. Since you persistently avoid any impersonal discussion about facts (especially with the other participants here) and not even have read most parts of this discussion up to now, you will probably just be ignored because there is no reason not to revert your edits. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 19:48, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

I just found another reliable source of her speaking Italian with the Rome children's hospital kids. It is Newsweek. Also, the Newsweek article has a video to accompany it and in the video you can see Melania speaking Italian to the children. The article states that she learned Italian while working in Italy as a runway model. Your silly book that you keep quoting is wrong. It is not widely available. It is a questionable source and there are much, much better reliable sources that verify that she spoke Italian in public. It is not simply her saying it or some spokesperson. You can't add your weasel words to the article because it is incorrect opinion. The reliable source says, "*The children broke the ice by greeting the First Lady in unison with a "Ciao Melania!" Without missing a beat, Trump replied in Italian, a language she picked up while working as a model in Milan in her youth.*" The reliable source is: '*CIAO MELANIA!' FIRST LADY GETS WARM WELCOME FROM YOUNG PATIENTS IN ROME* (<http://www.newsweek.com/melania-trump-her-element-interacting-young-patients-romes-pediatric-hospital-614896>) by Sofia Lotto Persio in Newsweek, May 24, 2017.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 19:53, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Okay, but saying (translated to English): "Hello". "How are you?" "Fine." does not prove that she really speaks this language. I could learn these few words in any language of the world in 2 minutes (in Western languages in 20 sec.). – Pozar's book is available everywhere. I bought it from Amazon. The other nonsense you are repeating here has already been commented or is ridiculous ("much, much better reliable sources that verify that she spoke Italian in public"). But I see

that you have finally found the end of this thread where the music is playing. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 21:08, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

She said more than the just words you have stated above. This is a fact and it furthers indicates that you have an axe to grind. You want to believe what you want to believe AND you want to jam it in the article without proof. This is called POV-pushing. Please stop. Please provide a reliable source that states that she did not speak Italian to those children (other than you) and we will have something substantive to discuss. The video shoots down all your specious claims where attempt to read between the lines and you apply your illogical arguments to the statements of reliable sources. See your comment above where you claim, bizarrely that MT would never speak Italian to the Pope because he is Argentinian or in front of her husband because he speaks English. Have you ever heard of translators, huh? I guess not. And you bizarrely attempt to claim to know who spoke first and in what language. The Pope speaks way more languages than MT and I believe he can choose to use whatever language he wants to use and he can decide to start the conversation. Your reading into things is original research and it is not appropriate. I provided several reliable sources and all you have is your bizarre speculations about what you believe really happened. I glad that you did that because it shows your true intent.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 21:21, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Also, even most recent response it all about you. You state that "I could learn these few words in any language of the world in 2 minutes (in Western languages in 20 sec.)" This comment is another example of how you have it all wrong. Wikipedia is not about you--regardless of highly you hold yourself in esteem. Wikipedia is supposed to focus on reliable sources and what reliable sources are saying. You don't have any reliable sources to point to so you substitute your opinion and opinions about yourself in the place of what the Wikipedia standard is: reliable sources. Now, you have pointed to ONE source, which is the hack job from writer who brought the world the book *Dangerous Liaisons of Naked Slovenia* ([https://www.amazon.com/Melania-Trump-Inside-Story-Potential/dp/0692764844/ref=pd\\_cp\\_14\\_1?\\_encoding=UTF8&pd\\_rd\\_i=0692764844&pd\\_rd\\_r=9KGA6BX8CW70NQR2Y1TK&pd\\_rd\\_w=N5EIU&pd\\_rd\\_wg=ryA1s&psc=1&refRID=9KGA6BX8CW70NQR2Y1TK](https://www.amazon.com/Melania-Trump-Inside-Story-Potential/dp/0692764844/ref=pd_cp_14_1?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_i=0692764844&pd_rd_r=9KGA6BX8CW70NQR2Y1TK&pd_rd_w=N5EIU&pd_rd_wg=ryA1s&psc=1&refRID=9KGA6BX8CW70NQR2Y1TK)), a classic of journalism (I'm sure!). See here: *Naked Slovenia* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=W68HAQAAMAAJ&q=inauthor:%22Bojan+Po%C5%BEAr%22&dq=inauthor:%22Bojan+Po%C>

5%BEar%22&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj209fT9MrUAhVB4iYKHaLLCikQ6AEIKzAB). But anyway, his book does not settle the issue about whether Melania Trump spoke to the children in Rome or not--so it is irrelevant to this discussion. There are reliable sources to support it and they are recent and verifiable. Naked Slovenia, not so much. MT lived in Milan for years. So your chest-pounding about learning a few words is irrelevant. Wikipedia is not about you, but about reliable sources.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 21:59, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Support for that. As till now that is accurate.--Joobo (talk) 17:00, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

"at the same time attributing those claims to herself" is just what I proposed. The former version was "she declares", SlackerDelphi wrote that "she claims" would be better. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 18:11, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

WARNING FALSE STATEMENT: edit Klaus Frisch makes the false claim that I proposed the wording "she claims" I did not do anything like this. He is attempting to put words in my mouth. "She claims" or "She declares" are BOTH weasel words and they violate Wikipedia. The only proper and acceptable wording is "She says" or "She has stated" or something similar. But when an editor takes it upon themself to add the element of doubt they are adding their opinion to the article--especially when there is a reliable source that points out that she spoke Italian to the Pope in the Vatican and she spoke Italian to the children at the Rome hospital. See Here: Melania Trump speaks Italian with hospitalized children in Rome (<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/melania-trump-speaks-italian-with-hospitalized-children-in-rome/article/2624011>). Klaua Frisch has been adding the weasel word "claimed" to the article and he needs to stop.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 16:47, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Read my following edit (18:22) and stop roaring around (capitals) and attacking others personally. IMO the problem here is that you edited the article twice because of alleged weasel words and thereby changed correct wordings into false ones. The source you are bringing here again has been discussed above. Your second edit concerning the lawsuit has not been discussed yet, but I think it is clear that a lawsuit cannot state facts like this one (which was later withdrawn) but just claim something. – If you give up pinging just to accuse me, than there might be no reason for me to show up here again. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 18:07, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Just talking about something does not change the fact that there is a reliable source indicating that Melania Trump was seen by reporters speaking Italian to the Pope in the Vatican and she was seen speaking Italian to children in a Rome children's hospital. This is a fact that cannot be ignored by the editors. This a reliable source. You cannot add the word "claim" to the article, that is a weasel word and it is adding your opinion and it is not appropriate.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 18:13, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

As has been stated(!) in this discussion (which you obviously still haven't read), it was her *spokeswoman* who who said that she spoke Italian. Up to now we don't have any independent evidence for that. And this is consensus here, not my personal opinion. Now discuss this with the other guys here and **stop pinging me!** I am not the one who is on a mission here. And I didn't add any words to the article in recent times and I'm currently not allowed to do it because I am kind of a guest with only about 100 edits in en.WP. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 19:23, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

BTW: There has been another, similar edit by SlackerDelphi changing "the lawsuit claimed" to "the lawsuit stated". (Look for "weasel word" in the history.) Maybe I misinterpreted his statement I just referred to. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 18:22, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

Perhaps it should be worded "she asserts that she speaks..." This way all the burden of proof goes to her. — **Myk Streja** (*who?*) 21:03, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

As this is no court case no "burden" is needed. "She declares to speak..." is absolutely adequate and correct in this case.--Joobo (talk) 22:51, 18 June 2017 (UTC)

Let me reword it this way: "She declares to speak..." is very poor English. The correct way to make the statement would be "she declares that she speaks..." or perhaps "she claims to speak..." or even "she asserts that she speaks...". No matter how you say it, she is the one testifying to her ability to speak several languages. — **Myk Streja** (*who?*) 03:25, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

The proposed (and prior) wording is "She declares speaking X, Y, Z"; I do believe that's proper grammar, whereas "She declares to speak X, Y, Z" wouldn't be. "She claims" puts more doubt in the assertion, I wouldn't recommend it. — JFG <sup>talk</sup> 04:45, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

## First First Lady to speak Fluently in two or more languages is a false statement

Over and above the issue of how fluent MT is in these 6 languages (*the source interview shows her to be making very basic mistakes in English, so the claim appears to be MT herself*), who is the authority that says no prev. president's wife spoke two foreign languages? It is not that long ago that Latin/Gk and French/Italian were regarded as 'basic' sound education. Were no previous first ladies given a classical education? Pincrete (talk) 19:03, 19 June 2017 (UTC) ... .. ps "She declares to speak..." is very strange phrasing, "she claims to be fluent", "she says she is fluent", "in an interview with ZYX, she said she was fluent" etc are all possible. ... .. pps I could have a simple chat with kids or the Pope, but that does not make me fluent in Italian! The source is herself or her spokesperson. Pincrete (talk) 19:03, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Once again, no one has stated that she is fluent in English or Italian or anything else. That is way off the point. Just because she says she speaks Italian does not mean that she speaks Italian fluently. This discussion about whether MT is fluent in anything is not relevant to this discussion. It is just another attempt to find something underhanded in MT's statement that she speaks a number of languages. Has the article ever stated that she is speaks fluent Italian? No. Has anyone ever made that statement? No. This is red herring. The discussion is about weasel words. And when an editor says, "She declares to speak \_\_\_\_\_" or "She claims to speak \_\_\_\_\_" then that editor is putting in an element of doubt into the sentence and going beyond the written statement of the reliable source. The reliable source says that she spoke Italian to the children at the Rome hospital (and at the Vatican) and that is what the article states. No more. Even if spoke Italian at a 3rd grade level she still spoke Italian. There should be no weasel words added to the article like "declare" or "claim". See: Wikipedia:WEASEL. The source for the Vatican and Roman hospital situations is the reporter of the reliable source, not MT or her spokesperson.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 19:21, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

*First lady Melania Trump spoke Italian with children during her visit to Bambino Gesù hospital in Rome on Wednesday, according to her spokeswoman Stephanie Grisham* Apart from being self-sourced, we have no idea whether this was more than a few basic phrases. Is it notable? Did she also say 'grazia' to the room-maid and 'bon giorno' to the doorman? Pincrete (talk) 07:37, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

The article here says "the first to be fluent in more than two languages". You could have known that if you had read the article and this discussion instead of permanently attacking others and telling us rubbish. -- Klaus Frisch (talk) 21:16, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

I have not been "telling us rubbish" as you say in your own particularly clumsy way. I have busting your chops for pounding your chest about being able to learn five or six words of another language in 2 hours and calling you out for your POV-pushing and your attempts to add weasel words to the article, both of which you have unsuccessfully attempted. I would remove the fluency bit because according to International Business Times: Melania Trump (<http://www.ibtimes.com/how-many-languages-does-melania-trump-speak-first-lady-knows-english-slovene-more-2480653>): *"joins several first ladies with foreign language skills. John Quincy Adams' wife, Louisa, knew Dutch, according to The Professional Interpreter blog. Richard Nixon's wife, Pat, knew some Spanish. Herbert Hoover and his wife, Lou, could speak Mandarin Chinese — and legend has it they often used the language in the White House to keep people from listening to their conversations."*--SlackerDelphi (talk) 01:19, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

She is not the first First Lady to be fluent in two or more languages. The question is not whether she is fluent or not. It is not up to us to decide--even though Klaus would like to have that power. The questions are: (1) Is she the first? (It does not look like she is) and (2) Is the Greta Van Susteren FOX News video a reliable source to support this claim? (No. There is no

discussion about other First Ladies and Greta does not even make that claim.) The answer to both questions is an undeniable "No." The two or more language fluency claim should be removed from the article. There is no reliable source to support it and it appears that at least three other First Ladies (Louisa Adams and Pat Nixon and Lou Hoover) seem to also be in the running for that title. It seems to be an example of someone just making something up and then grabbing a citation and slapping it on and the citation does not support the made up story. SlackerDelphi (talk) 01:38, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

I removed the fluency claim in the second half of the article because we don't know if she is first. The 1st First Lady to do this could be Adams, Nixon, or Hoover. We just don't know. Also, the citation provided to back up the fluency claim did not even mention the other three First Ladies and Van Susteren never stated that MT was the 1st First Lady to speak two or more languages fluently. In sum it was removed for: (1) lack of RS and (2) real possibility that another First Lady could have also have been fluent in two or more languages (a RS suggests three other possibilities). This is a completely different topic than the use of weasel words and POV-pushing.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 01:53, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

You don't have to go back far in history: Jackie Kennedy was fluent in French. "First First Lady to be fluent in two or more languages" is simply untrue. --MelanieN (talk) 02:03, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

Actually the claim that was just removed ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania\\_Trump&diff=786531109&oldid=786498339](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=786531109&oldid=786498339)) is "first First Lady to be fluent in MORE THAN two languages." That's actually possible, but not adequately sourced. --MelanieN (talk) 02:09, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

I'm the one who removed it. And thank you for the Jackie Kennedy fact. So that makes at least four other candidates for that title.-- SlackerDelphi (talk) 02:16, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

Agreed. Even if we take for granted that Mrs. Trump really does speak 6 languages fluently (which seems dubious but let's go with it for a second) then it is still unabashed WP:Original research/WP:SYNTHESIS to say that she is the first FLOTUS to speak more than one language. First off, I very, very, very much doubt that it is the case, but even were there no immediate evidence to suggest a previous bilingual First Lady, we'd still need a source that ***explicitly makes that exact claim***. *Snow let's rap* 03:17, 20 June 2017 (UTC)

Agree with Snow Rise -- **just follow the cites**. Considering how low Fluency is compared to native speaker in ILR scale, the "fluent in two or more languages is false" seems unlikely even if there is some evaluation somewhere .... Markbassett (talk) 20:38, 24 June 2017 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania\_Trump/Archive\_6&oldid=794618343"