

Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 7

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 6

Archive 7

Archive 8

Contents

- 1 Alma mater
 - 1.1 RfC
- 2 Religion in infobox
- 3 Who is Hank Siemens??
- 4 First to Speak English as a Second Language?
- 5 Requests to cover "birtherism"
- 6 Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 21 September 2017
- 7 Photo
- 8 Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 15 October 2017
- 9 Philanthropy
- 10 Half-stepmother
- 11 Can Wikipedia start a new Melania Trump page?
- 12 Birther section
- 13 Plagiarism - Joe Biden 1988 speeches
- 14 Source cited claiming Melania's parents were relocated to NYC does not actually mention this.
- 15 Melania Trump languages
- 16 Excessive protection
- 17 New section on Melania Trump birther views
- 18 Semi-protected edit request on 19 January 2018

Alma mater

*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.*

SlackerDelphi and I seem to be at odds over including the University of Ljubljana in the infobox. I know what an alma mater is so no one has to lecture me on that. With that said if that's going to be included in the infobox I think we should add that she was withdrawn right after it considering she dropped out after a year. Any thoughts?—

Fundude99^{talk to me} 04:27, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

I don't see the need. In my view, the alma mater parameter, unlike |education=, is about university attendance, not completion of a specific degree. Rebbling 11:58, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

NAC: Yuck. There is no right way to handle this. The RFC was closed as No Consensus by an involved editor after less than 30 days. The closure was then undone, but the RFC tag had been pulled, so that the RFC was no longer being publicized by the bot, and there is still no consensus. It hasn't been 30 days, but it is unlikely that that will change after the RFC tag has been pulled. There is still no consensus. There are arguments made both ways about the definition of *alma mater*, but that is because the term is ambiguous. What is clear is that the body of the article should state that she attended but did not graduate; that was never in dispute. So we are right back where we started, with No

Remove alma mater parameter (or failing that, include a note that Trump withdrew). @Fundude99: the parameter under discussion is based upon the one in Template:Infobox_person#Parameters, which is described thus:

*"This parameter is a more concise alternative to |education=, and will often consist of the linked name of the last-attended higher education institution. **It is usually not relevant to include either parameter for non-graduates**, but article talk page consensus may conclude otherwise, as perhaps at Bill Gates."*

Consensus. We can leave it alone, with the field left in the infobox, or another RFC can be run, with a note that snow in July and August is very rare both in Washington and in Slovenia. Yuck. Robert McClenon (talk) 03:39, 9 July 2017 (UTC)

There is no consensus here that the parameter is appropriate for Melania Trump, and accordingly I agree with you: it should be removed from the article. zazpot (talk) 13:06, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

I agree. There is no consensus to remove the name of the university. It has been a stable part of the article for years and Fundude99 and Zazpot have not acquired the required consensus to remove it. As the Wikipedia guidelines point out it comes down to the talk page and neither Fun or Zaz have made a sufficient case to change the long-term consensus.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 15:19, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

I think we should only include if we mention that she withdrew, otherwise just remove it. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 15:45, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

If its has been a stable part than this was because everybody believed in the false information by Ms. Trump herself that she earned a degree, that is *finished* the study. Now that it is clear that she failed already in the first year (which was BTW quite common in this peculiar faculty) there is no obvious reason to keep it in the box. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 16:57, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

RfC

NOTE: I've reverted a (presumably good-faith) 'no-consensus' closure by the OP. As a general rule, RfC's are kept open at least a month (and even then are only closed when commentary has slowed to a trickle), unless there is a landslide/WP:SNOW result in the comments!/votes. We can afford to wait for further contributions; there is WP:NORUSH here. Also, it is generally considered inappropriate for an involved party to the dispute to close a discussion themselves (especially the OP--though it does seem that Fundude99 opened the discussion more to be helpful than because of a particularly strong attachment to one approach or the other). It also seems to me that the opinions do seem to be leaning more in one direction than the other; though I personally would not feel comfortable calling it in one direction or the other at this point, I think a consensus probably will form with a little more time. *Snow let's rap* 21:35, 27 June 2017 (UTC)

```
| alma_mater = University of Ljubljana
```

Should the alma mater parameter be included in the infobox even though she did not graduate?—Fundude99^{talk to me} 19:01, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

- **Comment** – The question should not be limited to this BLP but to these articles in general, as there are many articles of individuals who have withdrawn from studies, however all articles are handled differently. Some do not mention the Alma matter, some do mention the Alma matter and some do mention them with the addition of a withdrawn. A general answer should be found how to include such info, not only for this article.--Joobo (talk) 21:39, 14 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes**, I think the information should stick to the infobox, however with the detail of a withdrawal. This additional information then should be added in many other BLP articles as well.--Joobo (talk) 09:28, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

- **No.** Per my reply above, the alma mater parameter should not be included, because she did not graduate. Failing that, the parameter's value should note that she withdrew. Also, I support Joobo's view that this question ought to be resolved generally in the English Wikipedia. zazpot (talk) 21:49, 14 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes** -- looking back at first ladies back to Kennedy, they all list their Alma Mater, except those with multiple degrees (so no one alma mater) Clinton and Obama list "Education", and Betty Ford who was a dancer and did not go to college. Alma Mater is wikilinked in the template to the definition as the school attended, your nurturing mother school, and whether or not graduated is not in issue, see also the example of drop-out Barbara Bush. Markbassett (talk) 00:49, 15 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No:** Neither Mark Zuckerberg nor Bill Gates include it since they also dropped out. Had they stuck with it, not only would they be getting a better salary and a chance for a raise, but they'd have their alma mater listed. If they go back and finish we can list it. --Light show (talk) 01:34, 15 June 2017 (UTC)

Light show - this is a different WP:IB. This RFC is for infobox Officeholder (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template:Infobox_officeholder), which at the Federal level seems to always have Alma Mater if applicable. Gates and Zuckerberg use infobox Person (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template:Infobox_person), which seems to seldom use the field Alma Mater. Markbassett (talk) 04:18, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

- **Yes** (*Summoned by bot*) Per MarkBassett. neither Zucky or Gates are first ladies. d.g. L3X1 (distant write) evidence(12:50, 15 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No** - per the description of the parameter, which sets a good rule of "do not include non-graduates unless there is a special reason to do so". I don't see any special reason to include Melania Trump's education at the University of Ljubljana, particularly considering she was there for only a year and nothing of note happened as a consequence of her time there. Cjhard (talk) 13:21, 15 June 2017 (UTC)

Cjhard - I think you're not at the guidance for this WP:IB Officeholder (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template:Infobox_officeholder), that looks like a snip from for Person (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template:Infobox_person) "Alma mater. This parameter is a more concise alternative to education, and will often consist of the linked name of the last-attended higher education institution. It is usually not relevant to include either parameter for non-graduates, but article talk page consensus may conclude otherwise, as perhaps at Bill Gates." So again, for Talk page consensus I'm pointing out that Officeholder precedent seems that all Federal officolders I look at (Ambassador, Representative, President, First Lady...) pretty much list this. It seems First Lady name colleges rather than any finishing school, (though Florence Harding lists a Conservatory of Music,) starting with Grace Coolidge. Colleges is also mentioned in the IB archives as an intent, Drop-out Barbara Bush lists one also, so I think follow consistent format and precedent says to put it in. The archives at the template, particularly 19 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template_talk:Infobox_officeholder/Archive_19#Alma_Mater) and 17 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template_talk:Infobox_officeholder/Archive_17#Alma_mater) talk about it more, but in the end seems left to consensus about. Since it seems good to mention all this in that article, I will ping there a bit and maybe get more folks here. Markbassett (talk) 05:00, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

- **No** Summoned by bot. I agree with Cjhard above that the parameters should be followed. Coretheapple (talk) 18:47, 15 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes** Per MarkBassett. There a tons of Bios that have the alma mater listed, regardless of whether they graduated or not.--SlackerDelphi (talk) 19:34, 15 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No** – Insignificant information in her case. — JFG ^{talk} 14:40, 16 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes** – One does not need to graduate from a school for it to be an alma mater. The definitions of "alma mater" I've found only refer to the act of having attended a school, not actually graduating from it - and I don't think you can assume that graduation is implied by the word "attended". Willard84 (talk) 20:11, 16 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes- BUT...** -- looking back at first ladies back to Kennedy, they all list their Alma Mater, The fact she did not graduates should be noted. Elmmappleoakpine (talk) 21:30, 16 June 2017 (UTC)

- **Yes** – Firstly, I'm seeing a lot of WP:OTHERSTUFFEXISTS here which I don't find too convincing. As per Willard, every definition I came across says "attended". She attended, so seems straight forward to me. I do think it is worth noting the fact she didn't graduate. Like a "(did not graduate)" after it, or something. Drewmutt (👉👈) talk 01:30, 17 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Leaning no:** As a matter of common usage, the phrase "alma mater" is almost always utilized in a context where it denotes the institution from which a person graduated. Clearly there is some variability in this regard (including in some formal definitions), but my inclination is that we shouldn't mention an institution as an individual's alma mater in an infobox (where it does not have proper context) if it is fairly likely to give a false impression to a significant number of our readers. Her enrollment at the university lasted less than a year and is in no way tied to her notability as an encyclopedic subject; this both strains even a generous interpretation of the meaning of the term and any weight argument for prominent inclusion in the lead infobox. I suppose the proposed compromise solution of including an "(attended, did not graduate)" parenthetical is one way to go, but it seems awkward and superfluous to me.

Just as an aside, neither A) the infobox's recommendation against inclusion, nor B) the OTHERSTUFF arguments based on the fact that other First Lady articles include this field are particularly compelling here; this is clearly a WP:LOCALCONSENSUS issue, dependent upon the impressions of the editors of this particular article as to how to most accurately represent Mrs. Trump as an encyclopedic topic. Snow *let's rap* 04:46, 17 June 2017 (UTC)

- **No** per Snow Rise. Nikkimaria (talk) 13:01, 17 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No** for obvious reasons. It was obviously not nourishing, in any agreed meaning of the term. scope_creep (talk) 13:13, 17 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Yes** According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary an alma mater "*is a school, college, or university which one has attended or from which one has graduated*". If it has been referred to by a reliable secondary *and* a reliable primary source, there is an obligation to report it in an infobox. If the information of why she didn't finish is not inflammatory or provocative, that should be included in parenthesis. — Myk Streja (*who?*) 21:06, 17 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No** one is not an alumni of a university unless one graduates from it. If I attend University X and then fail all my courses and flunk out - I can hardly call that university my alma mater. About the formal definitions, they're not very unanimous on this. dictionary.com gives "a school, college, or university at which one has studied and, usually, from which one has graduated." I suppose in the very strict sense one could argue alma mater = University of Ljubljana is justified in this case, but I'd still prefer to word it differently. Something like "attended University of Ljubljana" instead. Banedon (talk) 03:43, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

And this is why it needs to be discussed. Oxford Dictionary (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/alma_mater); Merriam-Webster Dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/alma%20mater>); Cambridge Dictionary (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/alma-mater>); even Urban Dictionary (<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=alma+mater>) all state that the definition of *alma mater* is the school a person **attended**. That is a fact. We cannot ignore that she can claim her alma mater. We cannot in good faith ignore this fact. Preferences do not figure in this. Now, is this fact notable enough to warrant placing in the infobox? I really don't think we have a choice. Just because there are some out there who would like to give alma mater a prestige it doesn't deserve doesn't mean we have to ignore the fact that *she got into college* in the first place. It sounds more like some here want to take some of the shine off of Mrs. Trump. — Myk Streja (*who?*) 04:22, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

Why make such a big deal over that one word though (two to be precise)? By all means say in the infobox that she attended the University of Ljubljana, just don't use the word 'alma mater'. One could easily write something like, "Education: University of Ljubljana (attended)" and I don't think anyone would object to that. Banedon (talk) 04:34, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

- **Yes** - Include and make note that she did not finish in the body. Meatsgains (talk) 15:39, 19 June 2017 (UTC)

- **No:** This rehash. We've been over this before many times. The answer is always "no" because a) it's trivia (policy: WP:NOT#INDISCRIMINATE); b) it's a misrepresentation (*alma mater* indicates graduation); and c) it's a WP:NPOV problem, a form of "peacock" aggrandizement of the subject. —SMcCandlish ☺ ☎ ✎ ≥^∅_∅^≤ 20:48, 19 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Leaning no** Bill Clinton didn't finish Oxford, but it is widely known and reported that he went there, so omission in his case would be strange. MT's period at Uni does not seem to be sufficiently significant to warrant inclusion in the infobox. Pincrete (talk) 07:07, 20 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No.** The critical issue for me is whether the (brief, in this case) college attendance plays a significant role in the subsequent life events that have conferred notability. (And not what other First Lady bio pages have, per WP:OTHERSTUFF.) In this case, it clearly does not. --Tryptofish (talk) 16:15, 21 June 2017 (UTC)
- **No.** I've been following this and it's very interesting. I'm fairly well educated and yet I always thought that *alma mater* meant that you graduated from that school. I'd bet that most people think that as well. So I'm surprised to learn otherwise. That said, I'm going along with the thoughts of those that voted "No". BTW, I'd like to see the "Alma mater" in the info box changed to "Education". Gandydancer (talk) 17:38, 21 June 2017 (UTC)
- **Fundamental Question** - so regardless of the outcome of the RfC. Does this outcome then just counts for this particular BLP article or also for others? As already pointed out there are multiple other cases where Individuals did not finished their studies, however it is handled differently each time. Sometimes there stands *alma matter*, sometimes it says something like *alma matter (withdrawn)* or *(drop out)* and sometimes it is taken out of the infobox. --Joobo (talk) 22:23, 27 June 2017 (UTC)

To answer your question, Joboo, the consensus here can only govern for this particular article, as this is a type of editorial matter handled through WP:LOCALCONSENSUS. The editors of each individual BLP must decide for themselves how to proceed on the matter. Sometimes guiding advice is put together on the talk pages for particular templates, but these recommendations operate as just that: recommendations (See WP:Advice pages for further detail on the limitations of these discussions when it comes to guiding editorial decisions on particular articles). The only way to create a broader standard for a large category of articles/templates is to hold a consensus discussion through a centralized community forum (for example, WP:CD or the WP:Village pump--or in some cases a policy talk page). For a good example of this, there is an RfC on WP:VPP right now regarding the "religion" field in certain classes of infobox. Snow *let's rap* 05:59, 28 June 2017 (UTC)

Agree with User:Joobo regarding the application of this verdict to other user pages. I don't know if this specific discussion/vote had this in mind, but he is right that this problem often appears on other pages. It would be nice to establish some standardised criteria as to what constitutes, or justifies, insertion of one's educational institution in their infobox.

- Maybe a re-vote would be better, if an admin could move this discussion to a more-broad wikipedia page where other participants can voice their opinion.

*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.*

Religion in infobox

Due to Melania's Catholicism being relevant enough to be included in the main article, I think it should be included in the infobox. Volvlogia (talk) 18:12, 30 June 2017 (UTC)

I'd lean towards no, given the current lack of relevancy which her faith has to both her general notability and the overall content of this article. That said, this is admittedly a borderline case. The relative rarity of Catholic First Ladies (and of First Ladies whose religion differs from that of their husbands even to the extent of straddling the protestant/catholic divide) arguably makes this more relevant than the factoid appears at first blush, even when we consider that Mrs. Trump kept this information under wraps until

relatively recently, and we don't have a whole lot of sourcing to suggest that this is an important part of her image, notability, or personal make-up. On the overall balance, I'd suggest her religious affiliation is probably not relevant enough to be wedged into an already busy infobox at this time, but it wouldn't take much more in terms of future developments in coverage of her religious views to tip the balance. *Snow let's rap* 20:40, 1 July 2017 (UTC)

No – Site-wide guidelines discourage mentioning religion in infoboxes, unless the subject is a member of a religious order or is involved in religious discourse. Melania Trump is neither, so that her personal religious upbringing amounts to trivia. — JFG ^{talk} 21:21, 1 July 2017 (UTC)

She was allegedly baptised in the Catholic Church but she has never said she is still Catholic. Media (especially Italian media) started spreading that she is a Catholic as a proven fact just because she was dressed black and she acted ceremoniously when she met with the pope, but this behaviour does not prove that she is a believer in the Catholic Church. She would have adopted appropriate etiquette meeting with any other religious authority.--82.53.211.108 (talk) 13:21, 20 July 2017 (UTC)

Who is Hank Siemers??

Who is Hank Siemers?? Why is there lots of gossip on the web about this.

Are there any good sources on this, or just hearsay?? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.189.213.131 (talk) 18:35, 30 July 2017 (UTC)

Do you want to make it clearer what you are talking about? --MelanieN (talk) 19:42, 30 July 2017 (UTC)

First to Speak English as a Second Language?

I thought Hannah Van Buren, like her husband, had Dutch as her mother tongue. Can someone verify this? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 71.241.138.246 (talk) 22:53, 14 June 2017 (UTC)

This doesn't matter here because she died before her husband became President. She wasn't a FLOTUS. -Klaus Frisch (talk) 22:57, 16 June 2017 (UTC)

Very doubtful that English is Melania's second language. If it's known fact that English is her second language, the claim needs a clear authoritative source. Otherwise, the claim needs to be reworded to factual, such as "the first to not speak English as her first language." 96.42.57.164 (talk) 15:18, 13 July 2017 (UTC)

As suspected, English was not her second language. According to the article in Marie Claire, "English is not Melania's first language. In fact, it's actually her fifth". I'll clean up the text. 96.42.57.164 (talk) 22:38, 12 August 2017 (UTC)

No, I won't correct the text. Someone has taken it upon him/herself to lock it, so the inaccuracy that English is Melania's second language is enshrined in the article until someone with access takes the trouble to change it. What the goal is of freezing in inaccuracies is beyond me, folks. 96.42.57.164 (talk) 22:48, 12 August 2017 (UTC)

I'm going to change it to "the first for whom English is not her first language". --MelanieN (talk) 03:42, 13 August 2017 (UTC)

Well done. Thanks. 96.42.57.164 (talk) 01:15, 18 August 2017 (UTC)

Requests to cover "birtherism"

Nice article here on the background:

<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/09/10/opinions/why-trump-clings-to-birtherism-dantonio/index.html> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 09:50, 14 September 2017 (UTC)

Can someone add in a section covering Melania Trump's birther and racist views of Obama.

Includes interview with Joy Behar in 2011??

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sSTx1ZODEcQ>

This is clearly quite important historically, given that she has not spoken out on other occasions.

It shows she has not been apolitical.

So why is this not in the profile?? Is there a reason that this has not been included on the profile, is it too controversial for Wikipedia, or are there special rules for First Ladies? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.189.213.131 (talk) 18:38, 30 July 2017 (UTC)

Plenty of sources and video, and worth compiling for historical context. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.189.213.131 (talk) 18:33, 30 July 2017 (UTC)

This was extensively discussed in June 2017, see Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 5#That the First Lady of the United States took to the public stage to promote birther conspiracies is notable enough for inclusion. There was no formal consensus about whether to include it in the article. The discussion kind of wound down, with four in favor of including it and five opposed. --MelanieN (talk) 19:40, 30 July 2017 (UTC)

That is ridiculous, who were the four versus the five. It is clearly a major element in her profile, when she was very political. Compare and contrast with Rosalyn Carter profiles - she sat in Carter cabinet meetings, and that is important historically.

Would you decide to leave out the battle of Stalingrad in a World War II profile, on the same basis. That is not rigorous enough. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 11:25, 31 July 2017 (UTC)

Birther comments about Obama....needs to be added into the political section, at some point, when this page becomes fair and balanced at some stage in the future. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 109.145.104.114 (talk) 16:35, 4 August 2017 (UTC)

<http://nypost.com/2017/08/06/senator-says-gop-should-have-shut-down-birther-movement/> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 10:57, 8 August 2017 (UTC)

Can someone add in a section on the history of Birtherism, why it happened, set in context.

Then can someone try and work out why Melania Trump agreed to get involved supporting Birtherism in public statements.

Is there some connection in her family history that would explain it, etc etc. Is there a history of racism in her family background in Slovenia?

Thanks. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 10:55, 8 August 2017 (UTC)

No and no. This 2011 story was abundantly discussed at Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 5#That the First Lady of the United States took to the public stage to promote birther conspiracies is notable enough for inclusion. Editors found no consensus to include Melania Trump's comments during the Joy Behar interview. No further cases of "birtherism" or alleged racism were reported in WP:RS. — JFG ^{talk} 03:38, 13 August 2017 (UTC)

This has come up three times in the past two weeks. Is there some off-wiki site urging people to do this? --MelanieN (talk) 03:45, 13 August 2017 (UTC)

~~I doubt it.~~ Could be some fringe blog or forum, no idea where to look. Or probably just the tabloid press clickbaiting away... — JFG ^{talk} 07:19, 13 August 2017 (UTC)

@MelanieN: And it goes on... Perhaps these reddit threads? [1] (https://www.reddit.com/r/pics/comments/6qwcw9/the_first_lady/)[2] (https://www.reddit.com/r/forwardsfromgrandma/comments/6r5e2k/fwd_if_melania_was_a_dumbocrat/) — JFG ^{talk} 14:02, 14 August 2017 (UTC)

Has Melania Trump ever retracted her racist birther views? If not, why not? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 109.146.243.202 (talk) 16:52, 13 August 2017 (UTC)

In addition, Jeff Flake has spoken out about Melania and Donald Trump, for their racist birther views.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/flake-trump_us_59873576e4b041356ec07163

Can someone also compare and contrast Melania Trump's racist birther comments, against events in Charlottesville? Any time that First Ladies get involved in politics - what ever you think about it - negative or positive - either birther comments, or condemning violence, worth mention in persons profile. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 11:31, 14 August 2017 (UTC)

I know whoever controls this page will not let any mention of Melania Trump's racist birther comments will not let it be included in her profile just yet, but for historical purposes the fact that she is now making comments about bigotry needs to be included.

Plus how does "hate in your hearts" compare to racist birther comments? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 11:58, 14 August 2017 (UTC)

I think it is clear that this wiki page needs to be more balanced.

It is always interesting to see when First Ladies have got involved politically.

For example, when Rosalyn Carter insisted on sitting in on President Carter's Full Cabinet Meetings - something that we look back at today, as quite odd.

The same is true for Hillary Clinton - she was involved in trying to craft a Healthcare Law during the Presidency of Bill Clinton.

So, I think that there has to be a view that given First Lady Melania Trump was involved in the birther movement, it is worth adding into her profile.

I will accept that whilst the page is controlled by Melania Trump fans at the moment - but in the long run, for historical purposes, the birther comments will make it onto the main page for Melania Trump - under a controversy section. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 11:24, 16 August 2017 (UTC)

Dear IP87, nobody "controls" any page on Wikipedia, see WP:OWN and WP:BOLD. Regarding your particular request, as noted above, this issue has been debated by many editors, arguing both for and against inclusion, see Talk:Melania Trump/Archive 5#That the First Lady of the United States took to the public stage to promote birther conspiracies is notable enough for inclusion. There was no consensus that this single utterance in a 2011 entertainment show bears any significance towards the Trump presidency. If you think that consensus may have changed, and this should now be considered more significant, please open an WP:RfC to request input from the wider Wikipedian community. Thanks for your attention. — JFG ^{talk} 14:26, 16 August 2017 (UTC)

Can someone add in some more background about the leading figures in the Birther movement- Joe Arpaio, Orly Taitz, Melania Trump, President Trump etc.

I am from UK, and we are trying to work out how the birther movement started.

I guess the main question, relating Melania Trump is, why did she go on national television and push the "racist birther" conspiracies about President Obama?

Senator Jeff Flake of Arizona has recently criticized Melania and Donald Trump for their role in the birther movement. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 12:14, 31 August 2017 (UTC)

Forget about Reddit, IP's, etc. -- this needs to be decided on the merits. I have looked at the archived discussion of this issue, and I see no consensus to exclude. I see heavy-handed dismissal of lots of RS coverage by less than a handful of editors. When I read the current article and I see nonsense like "Donald and Melania have never had a disagreement" and other similar *clearly* less noteworthy tidbits. The arguments against a brief mention of this are straw men. As if no person would ever disagree with his or her husband? As if a one-time hate speech is AOK because, why? We are obligated to portray the subject as RS describe her, and this is a little detail that gives profile to her actions and character. And please, if anyone replies to me, do not try to say that an objective simple recounting of her action is some kind of smear on her. It simply portrays how she conducted herself in a certain situation. And that's what bio's are all about -- showing the profile of the subject. **SPECIFICO** *talk* 15:25, 17 September 2017 (UTC)

President Trump now removing racist birther references...

<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/09/12/politics/kfile-trump-birther-biography/index.html>

<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/09/09/politics/donald-trump-birther/index.html>

This shows it is even more important to show that Melania Trump was also one of the key birthers along with President Trump.

<http://www.independent.ie/entertainment/banter/trending/watch-melania-trumps-interview-from-2011-demanding-to-see-barack-obamas-birth-certificate-35396580.html> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk • contribs)

This site is not going to allow anything critical of Melania Trump, including her racist birther views.

Can people suggest where else this information should be posted? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 12:39, 21 September 2017 (UTC)

Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 21 September 2017

[Large block of text not related to subject removed.] Jaydenl (talk) 19:53, 21 September 2017 (UTC)

? **Not done:** it's not clear what changes you want to be made. Please mention the specific changes in a "change X to Y" format. SparklingPessimist *Scream at me!* 19:56, 21 September 2017 (UTC)



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

Photo

It might be good to find a photo of her before her facial surgery; I believe her nose and some other features were significantly changed.

Septegram*Talk*Contributions 21:03, 7 September 2017 (UTC)

@Septegram: The photograph will have to be suitable for Commons, as a photograph of a person showing a non-notable facial surgery probably isn't fair use. In fact I was not even aware that it was confirmed she had facial surgery. --Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 14:52, 17 September 2017 (UTC)

I know of no evidence for this claim and could find none just now in a search. And it would be irrelevant even if true. If we have acceptably licensed photos of her in her younger days, of course we can use them, but this unproven claim (or should I say rumor) of facial surgery should not be mentioned. --MelanieN (talk) 17:21, 17 September 2017 (UTC)

Bojan Pozar: *Melania Trump. The Inside Story*. Ljubljana 2016, p. 234: "Shortly after she met Donald Trump she had several plastic surgeries, beginning to noticeably alter her face and body." --Klaus Frisch (talk) 07:28, 18 September 2017 (UTC)

One trivial mention seems undue to give it a large amount of the article, and it also doesn't seem notable enough for a photographic comparison under fair use. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 09:09, 18 September 2017 (UTC)

I saw a photo of her pre-cosmetic surgery, and the difference was pretty remarkable. However, I have no idea where to find the image again, let alone one that was not in copyright. I still think it would be a valuable addition to the page, but don't really have the time / energy to pursue it right now.

Septegram*Talk*Contributions 18:16, 19 September 2017 (UTC)

OK, I couldn't resist doing a bit of looking. This article (<http://www.express.co.uk/life-style/life/756142/Melania-Trump-plastic-surgery>) mentions "rumors" only, so it might be harder to get a verified photo than I thought (especially one that could be used on Wikipedia). Oh, well...

Septegram*Talk*Contributions 18:20, 19 September 2017 (UTC)

That is a tabloid isn't it? I think the book written by Bojan Pozar is a better source. We must still consider whether it is WP:UNDUE or not to include this, and we must verify exactly when she had the surgery if we include images. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 18:50, 19 September 2017 (UTC)

We have no idea whether Bojan Pozar is a reliable source or a scandal-monger. Both kinds of people write books. Without significant coverage by Reliable Sources we have no business even talking about this. --MelanieN (talk) 18:55, 19 September 2017 (UTC)

We can absolutely talk about it on the Talk page, even if it's just to determine whether it's notable and/or the challenges of finding a reliable source. I don't know if the Express is a tabloid or otherwise disreputable or not, frankly. It's just the first link I found, and it was pretty cautious about drawing conclusions (which could be a sign of a reputable, cautious publication, or the sign of a cautious law department that's tired of being sued).

Septegram*Talk*Contributions 17:40, 21 September 2017 (UTC)

Turns out that Wikipedia specifically includes the Express in its list of tabloid sources to be used with extreme caution. So, yeah, I wouldn't use that in an actual article.

Septegram*Talk*Contributions 18:26, 21 September 2017 (UTC)

I agree with what Emir said above. But I think that this Daily Mail article (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3279399/Will-Lady-Melania-Trump-s-extraordinary-journey-card-carrying-Communist-s-daughter-teenage-model-White-House-favorite-s-wife-revealed.html>) with many impressive pictures of young

Melanija, most of them from her first shooting with Stane Jerko (scroll down!), should be linked one way or another. --Klaus Frisch (talk) 20:05, 21 September 2017 (UTC)

I think that's a good suggestion and I have added it to the article as a reference. --MelanieN (talk) 18:19, 22 September 2017 (UTC)

Extended-confirmed-protected edit request on 15 October 2017

The term "Assumed office" is incorrect. Melanie Trump does not hold an office, she has a "role" as First Lady. See Michelle Obama's entry, it shows she had a "role." Change "Assumed office" to "Assumed Role" Inkyhuntsville (talk) 14:05, 15 October 2017 (UTC) Inkyhuntsville (talk) 14:02, 15 October 2017 (UTC)



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

✓ **Done** DRAGON BOOSTER ★ 15:03, 15 October 2017 (UTC)

Philanthropy

User:Galobtter removed the "philanthropy" section on the basis that it was "not major" (only one source) (http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&type=revision&diff=809296434&oldid=809296342), yet a little googling makes it easy to find more (http://www.newyorksocialdiary.com/legacy/socialdiary/2005/03_30_05/socialdiary03_30_05.php) sources (<https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/271384>) (also (<http://www.palmbeachpost.com/news/local/inside-look-president-trump-attends-red-cross-ball/yDAajQzFyYYcxy9w5Vz8BI/>)).Zigzig20s (talk) 08:17, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

She receives a lot of coverage. I wouldn't be totally opposed to one sentence on it, but still those are only mentions or at most a few sentences on her philanthropy. Galobtter (talk) 08:22, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

I found three more RS in 1 minute. We could probably many more on Newspapers.com, going back over many years. Would you please restore the subsection you deleted and add the three RS I provided above? Thanks!Zigzig20s (talk) 08:25, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

I've undone my edit, you can add the the three RS if you wish. Galobtter (talk) 08:29, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

✓ Resolved

Half-stepmother

There is no such thing as a half-stepmother; not even the stepfamily page lists this relationship. I am editing it to read "stepmother" as that is the correct term, regardless of the number of previous stepmoms there may have been. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Dusty relic (talk • contribs) 18:17, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

Can Wikipedia start a new Melania Trump page?

Can Wikipedia start a new Melania Trump page?

This page needs to mention the Racist Birther Views of Melania Trump and her husband. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.175.83.49 (talk) 11:16, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

This pages is clearly a hack job, and there needs to be somewhere to record all the elements of news that do not make Melania Trump look like an angel.

What is the next step for this?

What are the other language pages showing? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 109.146.132.178 (talk) 17:07, 20 October 2017 (UTC)

We won't start a new page, but we can fix this page if it has issues. You can click the links for the other languages to view them. This article does not say that she is an angel or that anyone has claimed she is an angel. Wikipedia is not WP:NOTNEWS, so keep that in mind too. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 17:19, 20 October 2017 (UTC)

This page needs to reflect when Melania Trump was or has been political. The one point she decided to get political, she entered the fray as a racist birther. Now her husband has again raised questions about Barack Obama.



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

There needs to be a page someone that reflects this, accepting that the current Melania Trump page is a hack job, and shows her as an Angel.... 86.175.83.49 (talk) 11:18, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

X Not done See WP:NOTFORUM. --MelanieN (talk) 11:30, 29 November 2017 (UTC)--MelanieN (talk) 11:30, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

Can someone add in a section on Melania Trump's birther views. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.175.83.49 (talk) 16:16, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

<https://www.teenvogue.com/story/melania-trump-supported-her-husbands-racist-birtherism-claims-on-tv> — Preceding unsigned comment added by 86.175.83.49 (talk) 16:20, 29 November 2017 (UTC)

For reference, this Teen Vogue article has been discussed at length a few months ago, and there was no consensus to include the "birther" material in Melania Trump's article. — JFG ^{talk} 16:09, 30 November 2017 (UTC)

Birther section

Can someone add in a section on Melania Trump's racist birther views?

Plus needs to be a mention of plagiarism in speeches? Link back to Joe Biden, who also used section from Neil Kinnock speech? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 13:21, 5 December 2017 (UTC)

Plagiarism - Joe Biden 1988 speeches

Wikipedia has listing for Joe Biden speech from 1988.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joe_Biden_presidential_campaign,_1988

Plus Barack Obama was accused of taking sections from Deval Patrick

Both well documented, so can someone add in similar section on Melania Trump? — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 13:24, 5 December 2017 (UTC)

Source cited claiming Melania's parents were relocated to NYC does not actually mention this.

The text reads:

"While they were dating, Trump relocated her family to New York, where her parents now live for most of the year.[41]"

The source for [41] is apparently: https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=19991202&id=Z_1OAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=fRQEAAAAIIBAJ&pg=2818,1649658&hl=en

This text does not mention Trump's relocation of Melania's parents.

I suggest this either be removed, or be correctly sourced. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 74.64.35.226 (talk) 06:37, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

I agree the citation ought to be removed. I'm also skeptical that it supports the other sentence for which it is cited: "In 2000, she appeared with Donald Trump while he campaigned for that year's Reform Party presidential nomination and modeled for the Sports Illustrated Swimsuit Issue."

I **propose** removing the reference named *Wadler2Dec* from both places in which it is used and putting in its place {{citation needed}}. When there's consensus for this, someone (or I) should use {{edit fully-protected}} to request that the change be made. Rebbling 14:20, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

The "Wadler2Dec" citation was linked to a sentence that has been removed by a recent edit: [The couple gained attention after a 1999 interview on *The Howard Stern Show*](#). We can either restore the sentence or move the citation to the appropriate place that mentions this interview. — JFG ^{talk} 22:01, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

Melania Trump languages

She speaks English, French, Italian, and German : I don't know about her German abilities, but she is definitively a very beginner in French and Italian. When she met the pope talking Italian, she needed a translator, and if you look the available videos when she speak French or Italian, she clearly only knows the basic phrases (like 'hello' or 'how are you', and even doing some mistake there in Italian) and she cannot possibly carry on a conversation with anyone in those languages. To be more fair and neutral, it should be written that she has *some basic notions* of French and Italian. Tobovs (talk) 11:12, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

Do you have sources saying that she is only a beginner in French and Italian? Otherwise, that's only WP:OR, which we can't include. — JFG ^{talk} 23:34, 8 November 2017 (UTC)

HI JFG, thank you for your answer. I do speak French and Italian fluently myself, and the fact is, when she came in France and in Brussels, she was not able to speak French except a few basic sentences (that anyone can learn in 3 min during the flight), same in Italia. You can look at this https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qxbeaFgDS_o for example. Except from her official biography, there is no proof that she can speak any other language than Slovenian and English. The encyclopedia should be neutral and report facts, instead of just writing what the white house communicators are telling. Tobovs (talk) 08:56, 9 November 2017 (UTC)

Still seems like WP:OR. The only thing we can do without a WP:RS is to consider text attribution. Emir of Wikipedia (talk) 11:37, 9 November 2017 (UTC)

I have edited the relevant sentence[3] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=815466625&oldid=815466538) to attribute her claims of language skills to herself, per the cited interview. Problem solved, until we get RS assessing her effective fluency level in various tongues... — JFG ^{talk} 00:35, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

Excessive protection

@Missvain: Today you first fully protected the page for two weeks,[4] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=813359015&oldid=813351379) then a minute later you configured pending changes.[5] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Melania_Trump&diff=813359129&oldid=813359050) Which did you really mean? Full protection looks excessive, as there was only one editor Anon9088 making many changes. I would rather have a discussion with them to find consensus; preventing everyone else from editing looks a bit excessive unless serious disruption happens. — JFG ^{talk} 22:12, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

It was a few days ago and it was an accident to two twice. I think it's best to have changes reviewed. This is a high profile spouse of a the president of the United States. I don't think it is a bad idea to have this protected in the wake of non-cited facts and the potential for disruptive activity. Missvain (talk) 22:18, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

Shit, when I tried to fix it I realize I fully protected it. GAHHH. Fixing it now. Missvain (talk) 22:19, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

Let me know if that works for you. I do think it is a good idea to review changes. Missvain (talk) 22:21, 8 December 2017 (UTC)

@Missvain: Yes, thanks for fixing the mistake. Pending changes look like an appropriate protection level. — JFG ^{talk} 00:37, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

New section on Melania Trump birther views

Can someone set up a new page covering Donald and Trump's racist birther views. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 87.224.32.138 (talk) 17:03, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

Thanks for the suggestion, but no. This has been discussed here many times. The consensus is that Melania made only a passing comment on the subject and it does not belong in the article. Donald Trump's birtherism is well covered at his own article. --MelanieN (talk) 17:24, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

@MelanieN: This IP editor seems rather obsessed with Melania's "birtherism" episode, as they initiated almost all requests to cover this singular theme over the last six months.[6] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=792580226)[7] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=794492521)[8] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=795463436)[9] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=795466087)[10] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=795775413)[11] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=798177773)[12] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=800565923) [13] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=801236719)[14] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=801722320)[15] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=813831201)[16] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump&diff=prev&oldid=815568670) Is some administrative action warranted, beyond just telling them to drop the stick? — JFG ^{talk} 18:59, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

Thanks for pointing this out. I knew this had come up over and over, but hadn't realized it was all coming from the same place. I placed a warning on their talk page. — Preceding unsigned comment added by MelanieN (talk • contribs) 19:22, 15 December 2017 (UTC)

By behavior, writing style, and geolocation, 86.175.83.49 (talk), 109.146.243.202 (talk), 109.145.104.114 (talk), and 86.189.213.131 (talk) appear to be part of this pattern as well. **Rebbling** 00:03, 16 December 2017 (UTC)

Semi-protected edit request on 19 January 2018

There is a grammatical error in the first sentence of the third paragraph of this article:

currently, it reads: In 2001, she obtained a became a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

"obtained a became a lawful" is incorrect; I would suggest removing "obtained a" and add a comma after lawful, to correct the grammar of the sentence.

In 2001, she became a lawful, permanent resident of the United States. Horsepodarsky (talk) 17:37, 19 January 2018 (UTC)

-  **Done** Thanks for pointing this out. --MelanieN (talk) 17:38, 19 January 2018 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Melania_Trump/Archive_7&oldid=829345237"



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