

Wikipedia:Teahouse

Add topic

Latest comment: 50 minutes ago by AllAboutProcess in topic Copyright issues



Welcome to the Teahouse!

Your go-to place for friendly help with using and editing Wikipedia.

Ask a question (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Teahouse&action=edit§ion=new&dtenable=1>)

[Question forum](#)

[Meet your hosts](#)

[Articles to improve](#)

Can't edit this page? ; a volunteer will visit you there shortly!

New to Wikipedia? See our [tutorial for new editors](#) or [introduction to contributing page](#).

Note: Newer questions appear at the bottom of the Teahouse. Completed questions are archived within 2–3 days.

To read the newest questions, [skip to bottom](#) • [About the Teahouse](#)

Assistance for new editors unable to post here

The Teahouse is occasionally semi-protected, meaning the Teahouse pages cannot be edited by unregistered users (users with temporary accounts), as well as accounts that are not confirmed or autoconfirmed (accounts that are at least 4 days old with at least 10 edits on English Wikipedia).



This section is pinned and will not be automatically archived.

However, you can still get direct assistance on your talk page. ; a volunteer will reply to you there shortly.

There are currently 0 user(s) asking for help via the {{[Help me](#)}} template.

[**Teahouse volunteers:** If you have helped such a person, please don't forget to deactivate the request template.]

Approval of Not Just Bikes' statements?

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [12 comments](#) | [7 people in discussion](#)

Original title of this thread: *Could the existence of Not Just Bikes Wikipedia article, accompanied by the lack of those of some educational YouTubers with more subscribers, gives the wrong impression that Wikipedia community approves of Not Just Bikes' statements?* — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [Toarin](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) 09:56, 12 July 2026 (UTC)

↓ Moved from [Talk:Not Just Bikes § Could the existence of this Wikipedia article, accompanied by the lack of those of some educational YouTubers with more subscribers, gives the wrong impression that Wikipedia community approves of Not Just Bikes' statements?](#)

Also, for someone who generally agrees with the overall messages of his channel, some of his videos, to me, made a few claims that might not be WP:DUE. Such as saying that “American trucks” are murder machines ^[1] or that [footbridges](#) would almost always be a bad idea.^[2]

References

1. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jN7mSXMruEo>
2. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_ByEBjf9ktY&t=1386

Notes: 1. Should the Wikipedia community approves of those statements, I'd be more than happy to have them used as sources in appropriate articles.

2. “by the lack of those of some educational YouTubers with more subscribers” was in reference to [Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Kyle Hill \(YouTuber\)](#), an AfD that was closed in Jan 2026. [Toarin](#) ([talk](#)) 12:53, 7 July 2026 (UTC) [Toarin](#) ([talk](#)) 06:52, 12 July 2026 (UTC)

I dont thinl having an article on some subject should ever be taken as endorsement, especially we have articles on much worse people and things.

Subscriber count is a poor indicator of notability as it barely takes a second to hit subscribe to a youtube channel and we are looking for substantial coverage from reliable sources. -- [D'n'B-ι](#) -- 07:26, 12 July 2026 (UTC)

> I dont thinl having an article on some subject should ever be taken as endorsement, especially we have articles on much worse people and things.

That is a strong argument. Although I think that for many of the times, such things are labeled accordingly to not be endorsed. Such as entries in [Category:War crimes committed by country](#)

Having an article on a particular subjects does certainly not imply endorsement. After all, we have articles on [Adolf Hitler](#), [Joseph Stalin](#), many serial killers, etc etc. That's not to say that the article is written from a neutral point of view right now, that would be a separate, and potentially valid criticism (though I haven't read the article). {{[GearsDatapacks](#)|[talk](#)|[contribs](#)|[in solidarity](#)}}

07:57, 12 July 2026 (UTC)

No. Having an article on [nazism](#) doesn't mean we approve nazism. Yes, [Godwin's law](#), I know.
[sapphaline](#) ([talk](#)) [10:51, 12 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I don't know about other Wikipedia editors but the feeling that such an opinionated person have an article on Wikipedia but the Wikipedia editors like us are expected to not be opinionated in their editings is such so demoralizing. [Toarin](#) ([talk](#)) [07:40, 12 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

If reliable independent sources say it's a war crime, or a bad YouTube channel, then we can say that. If you have a reliable source criticizing this channel, for example, it would be reasonable to include in the article. But we're not allowed to put in our own opinions.

This may not suit you, which is fine. There are good places for well written opinion pieces: this just isn't one of them. [M kuhner](#) ([talk](#)) [07:50, 12 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I have abridged the original, wordy title of this thread. -- [Hoary](#) ([talk](#))^{WWU} [08:08, 12 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Toarin, any editor of any encyclopedia must be neutral and objective, and state facts rather than opinions. If you are unable to be objective, then on Wikipedia you should not edit on subjects you have strong opinions about. Save your strong opinions for social media, blogs, or off-wiki conversations. [Softlavender](#) ([talk](#)) [11:46, 12 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I understand that you are concern that I might be too opinionated to be objective on Wikipedia. But be assured that I always intended to be objective on Wikipedia. Pretty much the only reason I started this thread is to make sure that it'd be okay to disregard what I believe might cause factual inaccuracy down the line. [Toarin](#) ([talk](#)) [17:10, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I think you may be confusing "considered a reliable source" with "has a Wikipedia page." Like most YouTube channels, this one is unlikely to be considered a reliable source: information taken from it can't be used to support other articles unless it can be shown that the channel owner is a recognized expert. But Wikipedia has lots of articles on unreliable sources, for example the articles on OnlyFans, IMDB, or Breitbart. Existence of an article is not an endorsement: all it says is that the subject is notable (in the Wikipedia sense).

If you find anything sourced to this channel that you feel is inappropriate, feel free to either boldly remove it, or start a Talk page discussion.

Thanks for your concern about accuracy! Questionable sources are always worth keeping an eye on. [M kuhner](#) ([talk](#)) [20:40, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Your response is highly appreciated. Thank you very much. [Toarin](#) ([talk](#)) [16:08, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Can I claim a band page

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [16 comments](#) | [11 people in discussion](#)

Hi, just wondering if an official member or manager can make edits and adjust a band wiki page. Trying to clean an article and remove information [Miau deem](#) ([talk](#)) [14:04, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hi [@Miau deem](#). We highly discourage conflict of interest editing, and you must declare the conflict of interest by following the instructions at [Wikipedia:Conflict of interest](#).

If you wanted to make substantial edits to the page once you have declared that conflict of interest, please do so via the [Wikipedia:Edit Request Wizard](#) which will allow your proposed changes to be reviewed by uninvolved editors. [qcne](#) ([talk](#)) [14:18, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

If you are the manager, you must disclose as a paid editor, see [WP:PAID](#). [331dot \(talk\) 14:53, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

not a manager Im a member of the band, I want the information updated to what we want, or we want the article REMOVED. We DONT want this information representing us, its incorrect information. [Miau deem \(talk\) 15:10, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

What is the band article? [qcne \(talk\) 15:11, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Not clear how Ironstone (band) pass the criteria at [WP:NBAND](#)? [Theroadislong \(talk\) 15:15, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hello, @Miau deem, and welcome to the Teahouse.

I'm afraid you have it backward: Wikipedia has very little interest in what the subject of an article wants it to look like.

An article belongs to Wikipedia (not to the subject), and should be mostly a summary of what people wholly unconnected with the subject have chosen to publish about the subject - good and bad - and not what the subject or their associates say or want to say.

As a member of the band, you are welcome to make suggestions for edits to the article, but if these are at all promotional - i.e., they read as what the band want people to know about them - then they are unlikely to be implemented.

As for deletion: you are welcome to nominate an article for deletion *according to Wikipedia's deletion policy*; but "We don't like it" is not an adequate reason.

[ColinFine \(talk\) 16:04, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

That's fair, is it possible to remove a line of info, even if the sources match the text behind it ? [Miau deem \(talk\) 16:07, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Barring other compelling reasons, no: you cannot remove something just because you'd rather not see it there, if it is supported by a reliable source. This is one of the reasons why an article about yourself isn't necessarily a good thing. -- [DoubleGrazing \(talk\) 17:35, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

@Miau deem: Wikipedia is not social media and we do not permit a subject to "claim" a page - quite the opposite, actually. You're welcome to raise specific objections to the content on the article talk page, but as a member of the band you shouldn't be editing the article. —[Jéské](#)

[Couriano](#) ^v[^] [^]^v [Object Class: Drygioni](#) [15:18, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

@Miau deem It seems based on a prior edit summary that you're talking about this issue; [Removed references to Anne Warren as she wishes to remain anonymous in songwriting contributions.](#)

If that is the case, you need to take up that issue with the sources reporting the info about Warren, not with Wikipedia.

The info that Warren was the band's manager and co-wrote songs with Edward Warren is already publicly accesible [here](https://www.apraamcos.com.au/works-search?works=true&title=Bound&writer=&performer=Ironstone) (<https://www.apraamcos.com.au/works-search?works=true&title=Bound&writer=&performer=Ironstone>), [here](https://webarchive.nla.gov.au/awa/20200615040916/http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/176601/20200613-0000/heavymag.com.au/new-music-from-ironstone-2/index.html), (<https://webarchive.nla.gov.au/awa/20200615040916/http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/176601/20200613-0000/heavymag.com.au/new-music-from-ironstone-2/index.html>) and [here](https://metalmagnitude.com/interview-ironstone/) (<https://metalmagnitude.com/interview-ironstone/>) (which are the links used to source the various claims about her on the Wikipedia article). I would suggest you reach out to these various publications and ask that they remove this information. [Athanelar \(talk\) 17:31, 13 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

@Athanelar Your response confused me, because even if those sources *were* all persuaded to participate in some sort of attempt to cover up this already published (and presumably already well-known) information, it still is what those reliable sources said when that part of the article was written.

In cases where a reliable, duly-cited source is no longer accessible, isn't it Wikipedia's policy to keep the statement as it is? (And shouldn't such a policy *especially* apply in cases where already-public information is being intentionally suppressed by the subject themselves?) [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 00:43, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

My point was moreso that it's no good coming and complaining to Wikipedia about it if that information has already been made available in other places. There's a lot of work to be done cajoling cats back into bags. [Athanelar \(talk\) 03:49, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Cat-cajoling is hard work, but learning afterwards that your next task involves pounding sand is not inspiring either. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 05:09, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@Miau deem](#) You'll find that in (almost) any encyclopedia's rules, what someone wishes to be said about them doesn't matter. Saying "she wishes to remain anonymous" doesn't mean much. The encyclopedia doesn't ask for Joe Biden's approval, or Donald Trump's approval, over anything said about them. [David10244 \(talk\) 04:27, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Perhaps look if there are other, more specific, wikis, where there is slightly more flexibility as to such matters. (Wikia/Fandom for starters.) [Jackiespeel \(talk\) 19:45, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Can I, a Wikipedian, write essays regarding Wikipedia administration and page-writing as subpages of my userpage on Wikipedia?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [9 comments](#) | [6 people in discussion](#)

For example I want to write [User:Unopened VHS tape/Just because a word is in a fictional title doesn't mean you can put it in a real-life category](#), which will say things like:

Just because it is fictional and sounds like a real name doesn't mean you can put it in a category for real-life objects. [Winx Club](#) does not belong in [Category:Clubs and societies in Italy](#) and [Kikiwaka](#) does not belong in [Category:Campgrounds in the United States](#). [WKRP in Cincinnati](#) does not belong in [Category:Radio stations in Cincinnati](#).

This seems suitable for Wikipedia, so is this okay? Thanks for letting me know. Not sure what kind of category for my userspace subpage this would belong in and be suitable in.

I want a shorter subpage title for it too, sorry if it's too long. [Unopened VHS tape \(talk\) 23:39, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Yes, [Unopened VHS tape](#), you are perfectly free to write that sort of essay. Go for it. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 23:44, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

what kind of categories are suitable for that kind of essay? And what if it actually moves to a Wikipedia namespace later because it is good? [Unopened VHS tape \(talk\) 23:50, 14 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I think this tends to be a long process where other editors read the essay, decide they have a use for it, start mentioning it (which they can do even if it's in your userspace), and after a while it seems so useful it gets moved to the WP namespace. I am incubating one myself and hoping eventually for this, but it takes time and you can't really push it.

Be aware that we don't own anything on Wikipedia, including our essays: if other people notice it, they can edit it.

Do not put categories on your essays (see [WP:CATNODRAFT](#)). Categories (except "[user categories](#)" which categorize user pages) are generally for encyclopedia

articles only. Otherwise your page will show up in lists of encyclopedia articles in that category, which we don't want (and it risks having someone delete it as a nuisance).

[M kuhner](#) (talk) 03:59, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I think it's a bit less formal than that. I move most of my essays to WP-space right away and I've yet to hear any complaints about it. I think the general understanding is just that userspace essays are explicitly supposed to represent one's own opinions/gripes/etc and are generally not supposed to be edited by other users whereas projectspace essays are supposed to be a bit more generally applicable and are free for others to edit as they like. [Athanelar](#) (talk) 04:57, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

[Unopened VHS tape](#), you are indeed free to write that sort of essay. But have you often encountered examples of the misunderstandings (or misbehavior) that you hope to warn against? (I don't recall ever having done so.) -- [Hoary](#) (talk) [WWU](#) 🙌 02:09, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I am not sure. But some editors may have. But should the essay still exist as something I wrote about Wikipedia, and to not put a fictional thing on a real-life category? I think users can write things in subpages about Wikipedia. [Unopened VHS tape](#) (talk) 12:25, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Giving advice or warnings about things that are very unlikely anyway is, perhaps not surprisingly, the subject of a Wikipedia essay: [WP:BEANS TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 13:47, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

So you mean it's okay since WP:BEANS exists? If so, can I put a template that my entry would be a humourous entry and not a category since it's my subpage? [Unopened VHS tape](#) (talk) 13:53, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Thin spaces and hair spaces

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [6 comments](#) | [5 people in discussion](#)

Awhile back, someone told me that it's appropriate to insert a thin space or hair space when text collides with a citation, which happens most often when the text is italicized, like this: *July 2026*^[1]. The insertion of the space creates a more pleasing appearance, like *July 2026*^[1] or *July 2026*^[1].

When another editor reverted my insertion of a hair space today, I went to the MOS to find out what it says, and I cannot find anything about using thin and hair spaces in mainspace articles. Was I misinformed? Should I not use them?

[OrdinaryOtter](#) (talk) 01:46, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I couldn't see it in MOS either, but I did find [Help:Advanced text formatting#Adjusting spaces for kerning between letters](#), which says that one could be used, but implies (to me at least) that text should be rewritten to use a comma (or similar) instead? In solidarity, [nil](#) ^{nz} 02:44, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Thanks for the reply. I found that page too, but at the top it says, "This text formatting is **not suitable for mainspace articles**". [OrdinaryOtter](#) (talk) 02:59, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I love me some style micromanagement, but it seems to me that something like that should be addressed via a change to wikipedia's stylesheets. That's the only way to guarantee consistency without deploying a bot/army of typographical gnomes. However, I have no idea how such a change could be proposed (or if it's technically possible). [Gebble](#) (talk) 13:56, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Such changes can be proposed at [WP:Village Pump](#). If anyone is thinking of doing so, I'd conduct a careful search there first: it is *very* easy and a bit embarrassing to propose something that's already been discussed to death.

I suspect, though, that the person who wrote "not suitable for mainspace articles" had a reason, perhaps a subtle one. It's necessary to consider the impact on the mobile interface; on visual and source editing; on searches; probably other things I know nothing about. [M kuhner](#) (talk) 14:40, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I think the exact problem you've mentioned is considered less bad than the fix you've mentioned - basically "of course you're right, but it's not worth it". We do make an effort (by one means or another), when a sentence ends with a single quotation mark directly followed by a double quotation mark, to put a thin space (not hair space) between those, but I think it's safe to say that that one is a worse problem (because it looks confusing rather than unattractive) and is also less frequent, making it a better candidate. It's possible that the hair space, having no "official Wikipedia use" that I know of, stood out to the other editor partly because we don't see them much.

If your point could be fixed automatically every time, in a way that's "technically cheap" (not wasting time or memory when it runs and not disrupting anything else), then I agree it would make Wikipedia look slightly better. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 13:36, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

References

1. "Main Page" (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Main_Page&oldid=1358980925), *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*, 2026-06-12, retrieved 2026-07-15

Multiple sandboxes

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [7 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

How can i make multiple sandboxes? Im planning on making different articles using it. Cheers! [SomeRandomGuy3523](#) (talk) 08:16, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Just create your content in your userspace. For example, [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/article1](#), [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/article2](#), or [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/whatever](#) [Meters](#) (talk) 08:50, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Or create the drafts in draftspace. See [Wikipedia:Drafts](#) [Meters](#) (talk) 08:57, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Your userspace is [User:SomeRandomGuy3523](#) and any page name starting with [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/](#) where the slash gives subpages. You can also click [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/sandbox](#) and then "(Redirected from ...)" at the top to edit the existing sandbox. The only special thing about [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/sandbox](#) is that the interface has a "Sandbox" link to it. Any userspace page can be used in the same way whether or not the name contains "sandbox". The bottom of your contributions has a "Subpages" link to list all subpages in your userspace. I see you made [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/sandbox/192nd Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment](#) two weeks ago. [PrimeHunter](#) (talk) 13:56, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I think as long as it's not a blatant waste of WP resources, you should feel free to have as many sandboxes as you need. For example, I'm drafting a draft in one subpage and keeping notes on sources for that draft in another subpage, so I can have them side-by-side on my screen. I'm also rewriting an article section in a different subpage so I can point to it later when proposing the change. I can't imagine anyone could object to you keeping your work organized as long as it's contributing to the Wikipedia project. [Gebble](#) (talk) 14:06, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I've just made a sandbox page with the name [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/104th Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment](#). Is this still the right way? I still have to make sure whether I'm doing this the right way or not. Cheers! [SomeRandomGuy3523](#) (talk) 08:49, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

[@SomeRandomGuy3523](#): [User:SomeRandomGuy3523/104th Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment](#) starts with [User : SomeRandomGuy3523/](#) so it's fine. [PrimeHunter](#) (talk) 23:36, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

What to do in such tasks?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [5 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

I was recommended through suggested edits to work on [1890 in philosophy](#), however, I have never seen a page like this. What/how should I work on it? The suggested edits said to find references for it.

Thanks. [Idr888](#) (talk) 12:19, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

You can read up on list-type articles at [Wikipedia:Stand-alone lists](#), but honestly, the newcomer tasks are problematic and often not actually easy for beginners. I'm not sure that even needs to be an article at all. It's easier to look for very minor edits to work on at first, such as copyedit or specific claims that are missing citations, rather than entire articles. [ChompyTheGogoat](#) (talk) 12:50, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

My first "intermediate" Newcomer Task turned out to point at an article that needed a complete rewrite, and in fact ought to be merged to a different article: the "five minutes" it mentioned turned out to be a month. I suggest browsing a bunch of tasks to find one that looks more reasonable, or else examining articles you're interested in and seeing if you can find one that needs help.

List articles are a minefield, the last place I'd suggest starting to be honest. [M kuhner](#) (talk) 20:28, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

This has some good info. Typos are a great way to dip your toes without needing to understand how sources or formatting work.

[Wikipedia:Typo Team](#) [ChompyTheGogoat](#) (talk) 20:44, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Thank you [@ChompyTheGogoat](#) and [@M kuhner](#). I shall leave it for now. I have developed some understanding of the [WP:RS](#), [WP:GNG](#), [WP:V](#), and some other fundamentals (which are increasing day by day.) You guys are right. I did feel a huge leap in the level of work from finding references to a page, I didn't know can exists. I will look into your recommendations and start there.

Thanks. [Idr888](#) (talk) 10:09, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

New Article TalentoCubano.Net

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [11 comments](#) | [5 people in discussion](#)

Hi, I am new here. Trying to add some information that I think is important for Cuban history but I am personally entangled with some of this and I know it is discouraged but I believe nobody cares enough so I am doing it.

Just need more experience people to see what I am doing and tell me if this is possible or if I am wasting my time.

Any advice will be very appreciated.

Draft: TalentoCubano.net

Thank you very much!

AAMonzonC (talk) 14:46, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Your draft doesn't seem to meet the notability requirements and also seems to be largely AI generated, which is not allowed. Athanelar (talk) 17:21, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Can you explain me a little bit more? How many independent sources do I need talking about the subject? I use AI only to find errors and avoid my COI but I write myself?

Thank you for your help AAMonzonC (talk) 19:42, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Roughly three independent, substantial, reliable sources.

You cannot avoid COI with AI. COI means you have a relationship with the subject of the article, and if that's true, it remains true. Please be aware that AI use for anything but very basic spellchecking is not allowed on Wikipedia (the policy is at WP:NOLLM). I fear that something in your article writing process is using LLM, perhaps without your knowledge. Most grammar checkers are LLM now, for example. The article has a distinct LLM flavor that would not just come from error checking. I suggest rewriting in your own words. It's okay if your English is not perfect: that's much easier to fix than LLM text. M kuhner (talk) 20:25, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

What I mean is, I ask AI if my writing feels like non-objective and bias because of my conflict of interest, then I let AI advice on how to better structure my sentences but everything starts with my own words. I would really love to understand how Wikipedia decides if an article has LLM flavor or not.

I can see it is really complicated to bring new info to Wikipedia. Especially for people who lived under any type of oppressive system that didn't make free press easy, this is a nightmare and some existing articles make no justice to reality. I understand but now I see the limits of Wikipedia.

Thank you for your reply AAMonzonC (talk) 21:34, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

There are detailed guides on how LLM text can be detected, but we don't point to them because the symptoms are not as important as the underlying problem. LLM does not have understanding and frequently writes things that are not true. It can also have serious biases. These things are difficult to fix, which is why LLM use is not allowed.

If the author of an article hides the signs that let us know it is LLM, but does not fix issues like false claims and made-up sources, this makes the encyclopedia worse, not better.

I agree that there are a lot of articles that badly need improvement, and I value your perspective. I hope you stay! Your English is fine; it does not need to be made "pretty" by LLM. M kuhner (talk) 22:04, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I will stay because there is a lot about my culture that is unknown and worse, it gives the bad guys the chance to control some narratives that make a lot of people live in real misery.

I understand how AI models can get confused and hallucinates things trying to answer but I believe the substance of the content should prevail over if AI was used or not. Again, thank you very much for your help. AAMonzonC (talk) 13:31, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

A person's bias (which is natural and unavoidable) is never fixed by any kind of tool, because bias is not in the words - it's in the decisions the person makes. In this case, for example, your bias already shows because you're the one who is working on this topic when no one else was doing it. And it's *good* that you're biased! Otherwise you'd have no opinions about anything.

Except it means you can't make final decisions on Wikipedia about things you're biased about. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · [talk](#)) [04:30, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you for your answer. Of course I am part and I understand other people need to review and make the decision so we can have an impartial Wikipedia. I am fine with that.

When I write "The AP article was part of a campaign orchestrated by the Cuban political police" which is not easy to prove but plain truth, the AI tool says, "there is no evidence contained on any of the articles we have on file that sustain this allegations, you should rather limit the sentence to the date AP published the article" so I think it is a great helper in protecting the article against my rage and ego. [AAMonzonC](#) ([talk](#)) [13:41, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hey [AAMonzonC](#). I'm not the most experienced with neutral language but I've recently been practicing with edits removing promotional language. You can ask for me to check your latest edit for neutrality anytime on my talk page. Other editors are better at this than me but I should still be able to help. [Wik206](#) ([talk](#)) [03:04, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you very much!

I get a little lost with all this text blocks but I will try.

Thanks! [AAMonzonC](#) ([talk](#)) [13:48, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

What happened to the Highlight Duplicate Links tool?

Latest comment: [3 days ago](#)

[5 comments](#)

[3 people in discussion](#)

I have been using the Highlight Duplicate Links tool for about 15 years. It helps with the MOS that says "But as a rule of thumb, link only the first occurrence of a term in both the Lead and Body of the article." The tool has always kept the Lead separate from the Body of the article, so something like "[American Civil War](#)" could be Wikilinked in the lead and in the body of the article. Someone just added a few new links to [3rd West Virginia Cavalry Regiment](#), so I used the Highlight Duplicate Links tool to make sure they were not duplicate links. The tool is now treating the Lead (I call it the Intro) as if it was part of the Body of the article, so it has over a dozen "duplicate links". This makes the tool somewhat useless. What is going on? [TwoScars](#) ([talk](#)) [16:21, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hi [TwoScars](#). User:Evad37/duplinks-alt.js hasn't been edited since 2024 but Wikipedia articles have switched to the Parsoid parser where some things don't work as before. If you click "Switch to legacy parser" first on an article (it should be in the same menu) then it appears to work there but I'm not familiar with the script. I don't know how to update it so it works in Parsoid.

[PrimeHunter](#) ([talk](#)) [17:08, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[PrimeHunter](#) - thanks for the quick response. Your workaround works for me! Is there a reason I should otherwise use the new parser (Parsoid)? [TwoScars](#) ([talk](#)) [18:22, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I'm not sure of the effect on other things and mw:Paroid will probably become the only parser at some time. Evad37 rarely edits but kaosflux can edit the script and fixed a similar issue at [User talk:Evad37/duplinks-alt.js#Update for mw:Heading HTML changes](#). Can you help again? [PrimeHunter \(talk\) 20:28, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)
I don't mind pushing a change, but someone needs to write it. Someone can request help at [WP:VPT](#) - file an edit request and give me a ping if anyone would like. — [kaosflux](#) ^{Talk} [22:13, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Can you request copyedit for a draft?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [7 comments](#) | [5 people in discussion](#)

I am curious if you can request copyediting for a draft? For example, [Draft:Death of Lindsey Graham](#). [~2026-39968-19 \(talk\) 18:01, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

There's no specific venue to request this, although I suppose you could. But why not be bold and do it yourself? It'll be quicker and be done. If you really can't... [Wikipedia:WikiProject Guild of Copy Editors](#) might be able to help you out, as can relevant WikiProjects to the article (like [Wikipedia:WikiProject Politics](#)). Although there is no guarantee something will happen.

[jolielover♥](#) ^{talk} [18:05, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

My bad - forgot about templates. Add [Template:Copy edit](#) to the article. I've done it for you. Again, no guarantee it'll be done as all maintenance templates have backlogs, but at least someone can see the issue. [jolielover♥](#) ^{talk} [18:11, 15 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@~2026-39968-19](#): As someone who helps with the GOCE from time to time, I expect it to not be touched for months or even a year given the backlog. You can submit a request at [Wikipedia:WikiProject Guild of Copy Editors/Requests](#); it will likely still take some time (though not as much as putting it in the backlog). If you do decide to go this route, please remove {{copy edit}}. — [Tenryuu](#) (•) [00:43, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I've done most of the copyediting, and removed the copyedit template, but if anyone feels as though it still needs additional work, feel free to add the template back in. Cheers, [shadestar](#) ^(talk) (any/all) [In solidarity. 03:11, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

We already have an article on Lindsey Graham. He died from natural causes, aged 71. What would kustify a sepatate article on his death? [Maproom \(talk\) 08:02, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Yeah, about the article itself I doubt it'll survive AfD. Really, only top politicians like the President, and cases where the death itself is unnatural (e.g homicide). [jolielover♥](#) ^{talk} [11:13, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Need help submitting a biography draft that is blocked by the edit filter

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [8 comments](#) | [6 people in discussion](#)

Hello! I have completed a biography draft at [User:Colette Leinman/sandbox](#). I collaborated with the subject in preparing the article, using published reliable sources, and I'm aware this may be considered a conflict of interest. I attempted to move the page to both the article namespace and the Draft namespace, but the automated

edit filter blocked every attempt. Could an experienced editor please advise on the correct next step or help move it into the Draft namespace for independent review? Thank you very much. [Colette Leinman \(talk\)](#) 18:06, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

[Colette Leinman](#) I have placed it in draft space. I'm not sure what would have been preventing you from moving it, but it's all good.

If you are not Colette Leinman, you must immediately change your username, please go to [Special:GlobalRenameRequest](#) to make a change request. Please read(or have her read) the [autobiography policy](#) as well as [why an article is not necessarily desirable](#). [331dot \(talk\)](#) 18:13, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Thank you very much for moving the draft into Draft space. I really appreciate your help. Just to clarify, this is Colette Leinman's own Wikipedia account. We created it together, and I have been assisting her in preparing the draft using published reliable sources.

Thank you again for your help moving it into Draft space. [Colette Leinman \(talk\)](#) 18:41, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

[@Colette Leinman](#) Then I'll point you to [WP:NOSHARE](#). [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\)](#) 19:30, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Hello, [@Colette Leinman](#).

From your response it sounds as if you (and Leinman) are making the common mistake of assuming there is any connection between a Wikipedia account and a Wikipedia article.

You have logged in to the account name "Colette Leinman". If you are not Colette Leinman you should immediately cease using that account, and either edit anonymously or (preferably) create your own account.

An article about Colette Leinman is entirely separate from that account (or any account) and may be edited by almost any editor in the world - except that there are restrictions on Colette Leinman or her associates editing it, whatever account they may be using.

Once such an article has been accepted into Wikipedia, Leinman and her associates should not edit it, but instead should use the [edit request wizard](#) to request a {{COI edit}}.

While it is in draft, the subject or her associates may work on it and edit it; but should make clear their [conflict of interest](#).

Wikipedia has little interest in what the subject of an article says or wants to say about themselves, or what their associates say about them. Wikipedia is almost exclusively interested in what people who have no connection with the subject, and who have not been prompted or fed information on behalf of the subject, have chosen to publish about the subject in [reliable sources](#). If enough material is cited from independent sources to establish [notability](#), a limited amount of uncontroversial factual information may be added from [non-independent sources](#).

This makes the already very challenging task of creating a new Wikipedia article even more difficult for editors with a COI; and writing an autobiography in Wikipedia is so monumentally difficult that very few people have ever done it successfully, and we strongly discourage people from attempting.

My earnest advice to new editors is to not even *think* about trying to create an article until you have spent several weeks - at least - learning about how Wikipedia works by making improvements to existing articles. Once you have understood core policies such as [verifiability](#), [neutral point of view](#), [reliable](#), [independent sources](#), and [notability](#), and experienced how we handle disagreements with other editors (the [Bold, Revert, Discuss cycle](#)), then you might be ready to read your first article carefully, and try creating a draft. If you don't follow this advice but try to create an article without this preparation, you are likely to have a frustrating and disappointing experience with Wikipedia. [ColinFine \(talk\)](#) 19:31, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Link: [Draft:Colette Leinman](#). [331dot \(talk\)](#) 18:14, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

I have declined your draft for lack of independent sources and I have tagged your user page for speedy deletion because it is totally inappropriate, blatant advertising with a spam link to purchase your book and links to your CV and website. [Theroadislong \(talk\)](#) 20:14, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

A link to the "official" website is the norm, and such a website routinely provides a CV. And so I'm not rushing to delete. However, this draft shows obvious signs of having been concocted by an LLM; so perhaps I should. -- [Hoary \(talk\)](#)^{WWU} 🗑️ 08:17, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Request to move draft to mainspace — Luis Zilveti

Latest comment: [3 days ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

Hello, I requested several weeks ago that my draft [User:Marcosandreszs/Draft](#) about Bolivian painter Luis Zilveti be moved to [Luis Zilveti](#) in mainspace. The request was posted on the draft's talk page but I have not received any response.

I have declared a conflict of interest on my user page (Luis Zilveti is my father). The article already exists in and on Wikipedia.

Could someone help move it to mainspace? Thank you. [Marcosandreszs \(talk\)](#) 21:19, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

Since you have a conflict of interest, you must go through Articles for Creation. Press the "Submit the draft for review!" button near the top, and wait for someone to review it. [{{GearsDatapacks|talk|contribs|in solidarity}}](#) 21:38, 15 July 2026 (UTC)

What should we do on Wikipedia about voice actors without their own pages?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

For example, Eric Schwartz (an American) is the narrator of [Animal Atlas](#) and has his own comedy shows, and it is described in some sources. The actor Jennifer Seguin which I already made a redirect for before was in [Caillou](#) and the [Winx Club](#), and Helena Evangeliou appeared in [Arthur \(TV series\)](#) and [Winx Club](#) (most Quebecoise voice actors are usually either in [Caillou](#), [Arthur \(TV series\)](#), [Sagwa](#), the Chinese Siamese Cat, [PopPixie](#), [Winx Club](#) and appeared from the 1990s-2010s (Arthur as an exception). What should we do with Americans from [Bellum Entertainment Group](#) productions or Quebec voice actors, many listed in articles I described? [Unopened VHS tape \(talk\)](#) 01:18, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

What we should do is find out which of them are notable, if any, and create articles on them. The ones that aren't notable don't need articles. Cheers, [shadestar](#) ^(talk) (any/all) [In solidarity](#). 03:01, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

A large percentage of actors who use more than just their voices don't have articles here, so I'm not surprised to learn that there are many voice actors who don't have articles. You might choose one who you guess is "notable" (as defined by and for Wikipedia), and then do search

for reliable, in-depth information about that person (independent of him or her). If, after searching and finding, you're confident that this person really *is* "notable" and that you can create a draft that will *demonstrate* this notability, then create and submit a draft. But in preparation for this you'd better have plenty of experience of improving existing articles. -- [Hoary](#) (talk)^{WWU} 🗨️ 05:55, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Hello, [@Unopened VHS tape](#).

Please note that nobody in the universe "has their own Wikipedia page".

I am aware that people talk informally about "having a page", and I have been castigated here before for being pedantic about this.

But I believe that talking about people "having a Wikipedia page" is symptomatic of a way of thinking that misunderstands how Wikipedia works, and is behind a huge proportion of the problems at [AFC](#), in that it suggests that:

- An article about somebody belongs to, is normally created by, and is controlled by that person; and
- An article about somebody is in some way for their benefit.

The first of these is absolutely false. The second is often incidentally true, but is no part of of Wikipedia's purpose (and sometimes the reverse is true and the Wikipedia article is to their detriment: typically, something that the person wants not to be widely known, but has been reported in reliable sources, is made available to a wider audience through Wikipedia).

[ColinFine](#) (talk) 14:11, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Unrecognized separatist state

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#)

[7 comments](#)

[5 people in discussion](#)

*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.*

If this is an issue, then, as [CoffeeCrumbs](#) reminds us below, it's one that's broadly related to politics, ethnic relations, or conflicts of Armenia and/or Azerbaijan, and thus it's [not up for discussion](#) by editors using accounts (such as temporary accounts) that lack "extended-confirmed" rights. -- [Hoary](#) (talk)^{WWU} 🗨️ 00:41, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

I have been editing the Wikipedia article about Hasan-Jalalyan, the historical Prince of Khachen, but my edits are constantly being reverted. Even if you deem the provided information incomplete or insufficient, it is highly inappropriate to list or permit 'Artsakh'—a separatist entity unrecognized by the entire international community, including Armenia during recent peace talks—as Hasan-Jalalyan's country. Hasan-Jalalyan was a historical figure who lived in the modern-day Karabakh region, which is internationally recognized as the sovereign territory of Azerbaijan under UN resolutions and international law.' [~2026-39765-91](#) (talk) 04:03, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

On this edit (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Hasan-Jalalyan&diff=1364372652&oldid=1364370115>): I don't understand either "Azerbaijan (historic province)" (a province of what?) or the reference [Voice of the Publisher \(SCIRP\) / ResearchGate ResearchGate - On the Origin of the Albanian Arsacids Dynasty PDF](#) (author(s)? original publication details? URL?). ~~Perhaps you could explain one or both on Talk:Hasan-Jalalyan (which hasn't been used for over a decade) — but anyway, not here in the "teahouse".~~ -- [Hoary](#) (talk)^{WWU} 🗨️ 06:46, 16 July 2026 (UTC) As [CoffeeCrumbs](#) points out, this is

not up for discussion by those using accounts that don't have "extended confirmed" (or higher) rights. -- [Hoary](#) (talk) [WWU](#) [👉](#) 00:41, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

[@~2026-39765-91](#) We list peoples' and organisations' country as whatever country they were part of or associated with at the time of their existence. The [Knights Templar](#) for example have their headquarters listed as the [Kingdom of Jerusalem](#), not the modern-day internationally recognised [State of Israel](#). [Athanelar](#) (talk) 06:53, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Thank you for your response. However, writing 'Artsakh' in that section is still separatism. In the lower section, 'History of Artsakh' is written. It can only be 'History of Karabakh' because the name 'Artsakh' is not an official name. I cannot talk to the wind in a place that has been inactive for 10 years. Even though the Arsakid dynasty is of Iranian origin, they are called Armenian, which is not correct [~2026-39765-91](#) (talk) 16:54, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Have you tried a message on the Talk page of the editor who is reverting, asking for their reasons? Maybe they will engage there. If not, the steps in [Wikipedia:Dispute resolution](#) could be helpful. This page shows when and how to escalate an editing conflict that you can't resolve. [M kuhner](#) (talk) 18:15, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

You shouldn't be making any of these edits at all. Topics **broadly related** to politics, ethnic relations, or conflicts of Armenia and **or** Azerbaijan are limited to only extended-confirmed editors. As an anonymous editor, you are not eligible for extended-confirmed rights on Wikipedia; you will need to register an account and make 500 constructive edits and be a member for at least 30 days to get extended-confirmed user rights. [CoffeeCrumbs](#) (talk) 21:55, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

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

hi here

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

started fixing edits, what articles can I do [1hma1ifImceL9d1dT5et](#) (talk) 04:58, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

See the task center. [Versions111](#) (talk • contribs) 11:06, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

If you have a favorite hobby, animal, geographic area, etc. you can also look at articles in that topic. You probably won't have to look too far to find articles that need improvement, and it is easier to see this (and find solutions) in your areas of interest.

You could also look at a WikiProject in one of your areas of interest, if it exists (search "WP:WikiProject MyHobby"). Many WikiProjects have to-do lists.

I recommend staying away from highly charged topics such as politics, religion, ethnicity, or sports controversies. You'll get a gentler reception in other areas, and for some of those newcomers actually are not allowed to contribute due to extreme touchiness of the topic. [M kuhner](#) (talk) 17:50, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Creating my first article

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [5 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Right now I am creating a draft article on Croftmalloch Primary School in Whitburn so any tips for it? (I think it is notable as it has won the gold sports award gold rights respecting School award and digital schools Scotland award) [Icantthinkofausername12345](#) (talk) [07:22, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

You or I may think that it's notable, [Icantthink...](#), but the question is of whether it's notable according to one or more of [Wikipedia's relevant criteria for notability](#). My tip? Forget this draft, for three or four months. During that time, improve existing articles. Then apply your experience of making those improvements to the development of [Draft:Croftmalloch Primary School](#). -- [Hoary](#) (talk) ^{WWU} [07:55, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

ok thanks for that tip :) [Icantthinkofausername12345](#) (talk) [08:19, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)
[Icantthinkofausername12345](#), I suggest that you read [Wikipedia:Articles for deletion/Common outcomes#Schools](#). I have been participating in deletion debates and offering advice to new editors for about 15 years. Articles about primary schools rarely survive unless the school in question is indisputably historic or of architectural significance. The vast majority of primary schools do not meet those standards. [Cullen328](#) (talk) [00:35, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Ok thanks ill read it the now [Icantthinkofausername12345](#) (talk) [06:32, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

How can I make redirections?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

I think it would be good to make redirections from "English agreement", "English concord", and "Concord in the English language" to "Agreement in the English language" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agreement_in_the_English_language). How can I do it? Can someone help me with it? [~2026-40015-87](#) (talk) [07:52, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

How can you do it? First, you have to be a "confirmed" or "auto-confirmed" editor. And then, you follow the recipe in [Wikipedia:Redirect](#). -- [Hoary](#) (talk) ^{WWU} [08:05, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

You can do it by using WP:Maker, the easiest way to make redirects. However, you must create an account, and become an "auto-confirmed" account (account must be 4 days old, and make at least 10 edits). If you're not "auto-confirmed", you have to request it. [Versions111](#) (talk • [contribs](#)) [11:03, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Use a image on other wikis that is not on commons

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

Hello. So i tried using [Nirvana \(band\)](#)'s photo on the other wiki, but it is not an uploaded on commons and have some label of so-called "fair use". Is there a way i could use it? I'm not familiar so much with these copyright stuff [WolfCapitan \(talk\) 09:16, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@WolfCapitan](#) I don't think [File:Nirvana band all 3 members.jpg](#) passes en-WP:s non-free rules either, but we'll see. In general, other WP:s don't accept fair-use like en-WP does, but possibly there are expemptions. You'll have to ask on that WP. [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\) 11:01, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Presumably it would depend on copyright laws for that country, although I'm not sure how it works with WMF overall. [ChompyTheGogoat \(talk\) 11:15, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@ChompyTheGogoat](#), it may depend on local copyright laws, but ultimately it is a community decision of that particular Wikipedia whether or not to accept non-free material. [ColinFine \(talk\) 14:14, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

What does one do with an article like this?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

[Euro gold and silver commemorative coins \(Germany\)](#)

Should it be renamed to List of euro gold and silver? Should it be merged to an article about German commemorative coins? Something else? [TurboSuperA+^{\[talk\]} 09:20, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

If you expand the panel at the foot of the article, you will see that this is one of 19 articles, all with the same form of title, specifically about *Euro* gold and silver coins, and that there are 22 articles about *pre-Euro* gold and silver coins, including one about Germany's.

What, then, is the reason for doing anything different with *this* article? {The poster formerly known as 87.81.230.195} [~2026-36805-68 \(talk\) 12:54, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

OK, modified question: What do we do with 22 such unsourced articles? [TurboSuperA+^{\[talk\]} 13:10, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

My recommendation for a large group of problematic articles with a clear merge target would be to open a case at [WP:Articles for deletion](#) (which, despite its name, also handles merges) and use the [WP:BUNDLE](#) approach to put all of the proposed merges into that single case. It's a bit of a project and no one will blame you if you don't, but that's been a useful approach in other such cases. You might discuss the idea on the Talk page of your proposed merge target first. (I think it's less useful to discuss it on the too-narrow pages, because probably no one is watching those). My advice on merge proposals is to be positive you have the right target first, but then don't hesitate to try it. I had a successful merge proposal my first month on Wikipedia. [M kuhner \(talk\) 17:44, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

When can a book be added

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#)

[2 comments](#)

[2 people in discussion](#)

Would it be premature to add an upcoming book (available for pre-order) to an author's existing articles if it's already been independently reviewed? I know a standalone article wouldn't be justified until it's actually out, but is the bar is lower for a brief mention? [ChompyTheGogoat \(talk\) 11:14, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

As a lifelong book collector (and former professional book editor) who also actively researches for another book-oriented website, I have naturally paid some attention to the question in a Wikipedia context.

In my experience it is not uncommon on Wikipedia to add as-yet-unpublished books to an author's bibliography (marking them as "(forthcoming)" or similar), and if you have a Reliable source to cite (such as a published review), that should be entirely sufficient justification. It is very rare (though not completely unknown) for a book already reviewed and/or on a publisher's 'forthcoming' catalogue to *not* duly appear, after which the entry can be updated. {The poster formerly known as 87.81.230.195} [~2026-36805-68 \(talk\) 13:05, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Dead vs. Deviated Links?

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#)

[2 comments](#)

[2 people in discussion](#)

Hello,

I'm attempting to do a clean up of references for an article and finding archived pages where necessary - For the URL status, what's the difference between a dead link and a deviated link? Additionally, if a link redirects to another domain, is that still a live link? (Eg. information moved between government sites) [Pondoro987 \(talk\) 12:15, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@Pondoro987](#) See [WP:Linkrot](#) for some general advice. The policy part is that the citation(s) need to [WP:verify](#) the content of our article. So if government websites have moved around, it is OK to change the URL when you have checked the new URL backs up the quoted content. [Mike Turnbull \(talk\) 17:22, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Advice on Conflict of Interest policy

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#)

[4 comments](#)

[3 people in discussion](#)

Hi,

I would like to ask an for advice on [WP:COI](#) from experienced wikipedians. I would like to edit some pages where I could be considered a subject-matter [expert](#). I don't consider myself to be in COI on the pages in question: I have no published material that could be cited (no [WP:SELFCITE](#)), none of the articles are about myself or people I know (no [WP:SELPROMOTE](#)), I have no direct financial ties to any of the article subjects and am not being paid to edit Wikipedia. The only reason I'm in any doubt is the exact boundary of [WP:EXTERNALREL](#) is a bit fuzzy:

Any external relationship—personal, religious, political, academic, legal, or financial (including holding a cryptocurrency)—can trigger a COI. *How close the relationship needs to be before it becomes a concern on Wikipedia is governed by common sense* (emphasis mine).

My role in the subjects at hand is very minor, although I spend a significant portion of my professional life contributing to them, and am professionally acquainted with a couple of the people cited as sources.

Is it acceptable to edit articles in such conditions? I feel like I could make valuable contributions to articles that could really use them. Should I disclose my ties to the article subject? Doing so is difficult without identifying myself, which I'd rather not do.

I'd also be willing to share more details privately, if helpful. —[ToadalChaos](#) (talk) 12:39, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Hello, [@ToadalChaos](#).

With [expert editors](#), the easy trap to fall into is either citing one's own published work (which is a COI, as you referred to above), or incorporating your own uncited view, argument, or conclusion into the text (which is original research).

Perhaps a more subtle risk would be cherry-picking sources which agree with your ideas and ignoring those which don't - but really, that is a risk for any editor, expert or not.

So I would say that in the circumstances you have outlined, there is no COI - though, like the vast majority of questions asked here, it is difficult to answer in the abstract rather than a specific case. [ColinFine](#) (talk) 14:21, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Thanks [@ColinFine](#) for your helpful answer! Based on your reply I'm already a bit more comfortable going ahead. [WP:SELF CITE](#) is a non-issue at the moment, and I'll do my best to avoid [WP:OR](#).

To be a bit more concrete: the articles in question are the ones for on-going [ESA](#) interplanetary spacecraft and space observatories. Short-term the one I'm planning to work on some more, and which instigated this question, is [BepiColombo](#). If you want, I could ping you to review larger changes, though the aspiration is also to [WP:GAN](#) the article at some point. —[ToadalChaos](#) (talk) 15:36, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

That article has [158 page watchers](#), so your approach is fine: basically the process is to [WP:Be bold](#) until someone objects and [WP:Reverts](#) your edit(s). See [WP:BRD](#) for the full process. [Mike Turnbull](#) (talk) 17:18, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Sandaig Bay

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

There are two Articles on Wikipedia. One has the above title, and the other is "Glenelg, Highland; Sandaig and Camusfearna". There are cross-references. "Sandaig" in the second Article refers to the Sandaig Islands, about 14km north of Sandaig Bay. However, in the section headed Geography, all but one sentence in the Sandaig Bay article actually relate to Sandaig Islands.

This is the first time I have ever wanted to suggest an amendment to a Wiki page, and so I have no idea how to proceed. I would appreciate some advice aimed at a newcomer. I could provide new text for the Geography section of the Sandaig Bay article if desired. [~2026-39921-53](#) (talk) 13:40, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Hello, [@~2026-39921-53](#), and welcome to the Teahouse.

Wikipedia is the encyclopaedia that anybody can edit. So, for most articles, if you think you can improve them you can simply go ahead and do so - edit the article, and make sure you leave an edit summary that will be helpful to other editors.

If somebody disagrees that your edit is an improvement, they may revert it. They will often leave a message on your user talk page to say they have done so, and perhaps explain why; but there is no requirement on them to do that.

If that happens, and you still think that the article can be improved, the place to open a discussion is the article's talk page (eg Talk:Sandaig Bay - which seems to have an old discussion of something similar to your point, though I'm not sure if it is the same thing or not). This whole process is all described in BRD.

If you are not clear what change is desirable, or you think your suggestion might be controversial, you can *begin* by opening a discussion on the talk page.

An important thing to note is that as long as you are editing in good faith, you need not worry about making mistakes, or about other editors disagreeing with you: that's how collaborative editing works. ColinFine (talk) 14:29, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Thanks, Colin, that is very helpful - and reassuring! Just to let you know that the discussion in Talk:Sandaig Bay is exactly the same point as mine, but nothing seems to have happened. At least this will give you some confidence in my changes.

I have today submitted my changes to the Sandaig Bay article, and await reaction. There are a few things I do not know how to do - e.g. check the relevance of the References, and delete or correct the list of islands in the box to the right - but no doubt they can be sorted. (Another one is turning appropriate words or phrases into links.)

I have not yet made any edits to the other article, "Glenelg, Highland ...", though I will do so if you think this desirable. One issue is that I would be adding quite a lot of geography to what is now a rather short paragraph about Gavin Maxwell, which might unbalance it. Is that OK by you? If I am honest, I think there should be a new article, called either "Sandaig Islands" or "Sandaig and Camusfearna" (with appropriate changes to the "Glenelg ..." article), but at my current level of experience I do not think I should volunteer.

Two more general points. (1) Presumably I need to set up some sort of ID page? My name is David Purchase, and I am a UK citizen with (among other things) a strong interest in hillwalking and maps. (2) Is there a way of 'flagging' this discussion so that I can find it more quickly? ~2026-39921-53 (talk) 17:47, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Beside the title of this discussion, are you able to see a little menu? (I see a three-dots type of menu, but I'm on my phone, and a real computer screen may show things differently.) Anyway, if you see a menu there, "Copy link" should be one of the items. And if you visit that link, you can immediately bookmark it in your browser's menu, thus saving it for later. TooManyFingers (he/him · talk) 18:51, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

edit request page help

Latest comment: 2 days ago

5 comments

4 people in discussion

I want to update a university's history section and I've tried doing it before and my edits have been denied. I am now going through the talk page and submitting an edit request. i don't want my edit access to be blocked after trying to do this previously, but I want to do it the correct way. Can anyone offer me suggestions? Liatgreen17 (talk) 16:23, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

All Wikipedia content must be backed up by reliable sources. Your edits seem to be mostly unsourced, which is why they have been reverted. If you can't find a reliable source covering the

information you want to add, it can't be added to Wikipedia. {{GearsDatapacks|talk|contribs|in solidarity}} 16:59, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

I was sourcing some of the history to a youtube video using information sourced by the university archives. Is that okay? [Liatgreen17](#) (talk) 17:02, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Hi @Liatgreen17: that source (the YouTube video) may be okay, in the sense that it is the university telling the world about itself on its own YT channel, which is not fundamentally different to its own website. However, we don't really want to repeat what they've said, because we have no interest in what a subject wants to say about itself, and we certainly don't want to be turned into a comms channel for this university. Some of the content you were trying to add was distinctly promotional in tone ("[The university's mission is to provide an innovative, global and personalized education that enables students to realize their potential](#)", that sort of stuff), which is not appropriate for an encyclopaedia.

Your edits also made rather sweeping wholesale changes to the article, including removing existing sources and adding new unreferenced content, neither of which is usually a good idea. It would be easier and safer, whether editing the article directly or making edit requests, to make small, incremental changes, in each case clearly supported by a citation to a high quality source. That works better than large changes, where it only takes someone to object to a small part of what you're editing/requesting for the whole thing to be reverted or declined. -- [DoubleGrazing](#) (talk) 17:16, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

That was very helpful, thank you. I made an edit request on the talk page and added two paragraph into the beginning section that provide more detail about the founding of the university. The new language is not editorialized, so hopefully it will be accepted and I can continue to expand the section in increments. [~2026-40226-95](#) (talk) 17:20, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Finding Sources

Latest comment: [12 hours ago](#)

[8 comments](#)

[6 people in discussion](#)

Is it okay to use [LLMs](#) to find sources for articles? I am aware of the concerns about using AI to actually write articles, but is there any problem with using it to find sources? Just asking in case, because I don't want to do anything that violates policy or that is potentially unethical. Thanks! [Tufflikethat](#) (talk) 18:13, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

If you're using an LLM *off-Wiki* to look for sources, that's your affair. But you should carefully investigate any source thus found before you place it anywhere on Wikipedia, because AI/LLMs *frequently* hallucinate non-existent sources, *and* cite real sources that actually have no mention of the facts they supposedly support or contain. They also, as I have found by experiment, readily proffer as fact things said in fictional works that are not true in the real world.

However you find sources, it is *your responsibility* to check them before use.

Sorry if this sounds 'stern', but dealing with fake facts and sources created by so-called AI can potentially waste a lot of our time, and yours. WP:LLM and some of the linked essays, etc. at WP:AIDIR, including WP:LLMSEARCH, are worth studying if you haven't already. Hope this helps. {The poster formerly known as 87.81.230.195} [~2026-36805-68](#) (talk) 21:09, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

I agree with the preceding comment. It is solely your responsibility, and it is a serious one, to determine whether any given source is reliable and whether or not it actually verifies the assertion in question. This applies to sources found with AI/LLM tools just as it does with sources found through conventional Google searches, library books, or books from your

own shelves or found at a used book store. *Do not believe* any assurance by an AI tool about the quality of a source. Verify it yourself. Determining the reliability of any given source is one of the most important skills of an encyclopedia editor. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 21:52, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Using an LLM for this gives basically the same result as asking a really stupid person to do it. The differences: the LLM is faster, and the LLM is programmed to conceal its own stupidity. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 23:47, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

If AI comes up with sources that *do* turn out—after an editor’s investigation—to meet Wikipedia’s usability criteria, can we really say that using an LLM to find sources “gives basically the same result as asking a really stupid person to do it?”

I think Colin’s reply well represents an approach that most in the scientific fields would agree with ... which leaves the door open to different approaches of gathering information but uses rigorous standards of verifying it. [Augnablik \(talk\) 05:09, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

If AI comes up with sources that do turn out—after an editor’s investigation—to meet Wikipedia’s usability criteria, can we really say that using an LLM to find sources “gives basically the same result as asking a really stupid person to do it?”

Yes - absolutely. The stupid person will retrieve some good items too. It's not different. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 18:45, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

As an educator, I can assure you that even an idiot can sometimes find a decent source. But what I stress to students like yourself is that the process of searching for sources often reveals context, and for this reason they should "map" their research process. In searching a topic, one may find that scholars and journalists hold different views than what one imagined. This is especially rewarding on Wikipedia. Using a LLM search engine can skip a lot of that process and filter out the conversations and debates that made a topic worth writing about in the first place, in favor of strictly answering your prompt. It would be like walking through a forest and looking only at the dirt trail you're hiking. One may not always need that context, but my point is that the risk is greater than just verifiability. As a high school student who obviously cares about their intellectual development, I think you can do yourself a disservice relying on LLMs. You wouldn't ask a robot to lift weights for you; you shouldn't ask a LLM to do your thinking for you (because research *is* thinking!) [Gebble \(talk\) 15:53, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you, this helped a lot. Yes I have really taken up Wikipedia to further myself, so I guess skipping the process of finding sources would be like shooting myself in the foot! [Tufflikethat \(talk\) 10:21, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Programming Notability Guidelines

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#)

5 comments

4 people in discussion

Hello. I am a programmer who recently learned about the Wikipedia controversy surrounding the Odin programming language. Like many others, including the author of this blog post (<https://katamari64.se/posts/2026/odin-wikipedia/>), I believe the decision to remove Odin’s article from Wikipedia was a mistake.

I believe that programming languages should have a lower threshold for notability than many other topics. Programming is already a relatively niche field, and programming languages outside the mainstream are an even smaller subset. Requiring the same level of coverage as broader topics can make it difficult for notable languages to be documented on Wikipedia, even when they have active communities, practical use, and technical significance.

I believe that creating a subject-specific notability guideline for programming languages, with criteria better suited to the field, would improve Wikipedia as a resource for information about programming languages. [SpyC0der77Alt \(talk\) 18:16, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

would improve Wikipedia as a resource for information about programming languages. That's not really what Wikipedia's supposed to be for, though. We're an encyclopedia, the idea that we should lower our barrier for entry for topics in a specific field needs to be fairly robustly justified, and "because people within our niche want people to know more about our niche" isn't really a strong reason. [Athanelar \(talk\) 18:29, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[SpyC0der77Alt](#), I disagree that computer programming languages should have a lower threshold for notability than many other topics. Programming languages are not inherently more important than other aspects of human knowledge. The General notability guideline has for decades proven to be an incredibly useful tool for maintaining quality control and keeping junk out of the encyclopedia. Most special notability guidelines are just shortcuts to help determine whether or not a given topic is *likely* to meet the GNG if a deep search for sources was conducted. The actual exceptions to the GNG are very limited. Wikipedia is a fantastic accomplishment but it is not the only useful reference source on the internet. You, along with like minded people, are free to create a programming language wiki that would start with existing Wikipedia articles in that topic area and include new content written in compliance with looser guidelines tailored to lesser known programming languages. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 22:07, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@SpyC0der77Alt](#) You may or may not find [Why Wikipedia's Highway Editors Took the Exit Ramp \(https://slate.com/technology/2023/12/wikipedia-road-highway-editors-wiki-railfans-roadgeeks.html\)](https://slate.com/technology/2023/12/wikipedia-road-highway-editors-wiki-railfans-roadgeeks.html) interesting. [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\) 05:24, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

That said, while I agree with [Cullen328](#), you may consider asking for more input in places like

- [Talk:Programming language](#)
- [Wikipedia talk:WikiProject Computing](#)
- [Wikipedia talk:WikiProject Computer science](#)
- [Wikipedia:Village pump \(idea lab\)](#)

My suggestion is that you pick *one* of those places for the actual discussion (Teahouse doesn't fit that well for an extended discussion), and then WP:APPNOTE in the other places, or more/others if you like. Hope this helps some. [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\) 07:44, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Found a topic that is stated as fact but seems to be a >10yr old terminology proposal by one laboratory only; page also seems to be created by that lab

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

[Toxungen](#)

I found the above page linked to on Reddit. It is also linked to on the [Venom](#) page. There are many references in the article, which is well written, but there's a problem: no-one seems to use the term apart from one lab. This lab published a paper in 2013 and it is referenced heavily in the wiki article. In that paper, they propose using the term "Toxungen" (see the page) and I think it's probably a useful distinction. Unfortunately, going through the references, only a couple of other papers following the publishing of the original have used the term and

they have all been by a contributing author to the original paper. I found a brief article on Natural Geographic Online about the term, but again, it's quoting from one of the original publishers. Lastly, looking at the page history, it seems that the Wikipedia article was written (and is maintained in a fashion) by one of the authors of the paper.

I don't know what is appropriate in this circumstance and I haven't found any immediately appropriate guidelines.

Negatives: The wiki article gives the impression that a scientific term is in established use; in fact, it is in very narrow use by one group, which is the one that has made the article.

I'm not sure what the appropriate step should be (if any). Could it be as simple as adding that the terminology is "proposed" on the page? Is that unnecessary? Does it matter that the wiki article author was involved in the creation of the term? Is the entire page unnecessary and a simple sentence on the venom page about a proposed additional term?

Any thoughts? Thank you! [Orkran Drow](#) (talk) 19:02, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

I think one main consideration is figuring out whether [WP:OR](#) applies to this article, and if it does, how deeply it applies. If the entire basis of the article is [WP:OR](#), then the article should never have been written, *but* if it has later gained support from reliable secondary sources we should find those and show them instead of deleting it. But if there are still too few reliable secondary sources, then calling it "proposal" can't work - deleting the whole article would be the right thing to do. Wikipedia rejects proposals that haven't already been published by several secondary sources. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 00:02, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Idk what to do with my draft

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

I'm done editing on [Draft:999 \(number\)](#), but the problem is that I don't know what to do with it now because I can't submit it and move to mainspace. What do I do? [Budew1234](#) (talk) 19:35, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

[@Budew1234](#): Add {{subst:submit}} to the top of the draft to submit it for review [RudolfRed](#) (talk) 19:50, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Okay thanks! [Budew1234](#) (talk) 19:54, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

What does MOS:NOETHNICGALLERIES mean and why was it adopted?

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

Hi, I guess MOS:NOETHNICGALLERIES is meant to say we shouldn't use groups of photos to illustrate what people of a certain ethnicity look like. I'm not trying to relitigate any consensus the community arrived upon, but I was just curious why having photos - even group photos - of ethnicities is acceptable, but having multiple

(theoretically better and more illustrative) is not? Thank you [~2026-37166-79](#) (talk) 19:47, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Linked from the MOS you quote is this footnote: See the [2016 RfC](#) and [2016 Administrators' noticeboard RfC close review threads](#) for the most recent consensus discussion on the topic. That discussion should contain what you want to know (the first few comments in the 2016 RFC should give you a good overview of the issues). I'd summarize as "cause of endless trouble; not worth it." [M kuhner](#) (talk) 20:56, 16 July 2026 (UTC) (improved by me 20:59, 16 July 2026 (UTC))

As someone who participated a bit, yeah. Should Americans include [Sitting Bull](#) and [Michael Jackson](#)? Should Austrians and/or [Germans](#) include [Adolf Hitler](#)? [Gråbergs Gråa Sång](#) (talk) 04:41, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

... more broadly, should "categories-people-didn't-voluntarily-choose" articles include any pictures at all ... I think they shouldn't. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 05:56, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

CNMall41

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

this guy repeatedly undid my edit [~2026-39841-21](#) (talk) 20:14, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

You keep removing the submission template. They are just adding it back in. [SiliG](#) (Hi! Want to talk?) 20:37, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Just do not remove the submission template to the draft. [SiliG](#) (Hi! Want to talk?) 20:41, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Usage of descriptors in Wikipedia articles

Latest comment: [2 days ago](#) | [9 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

[Kabughoemma](#) (talk) 20:23, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

Heelo everyone, I have edited a page about [Fresh Kid UG](#) but in its lead there is a statement that known as the younger rapper in Uganda something like that but now he is a teenager and soon becoming an adult. Does that still count because now in Uganda there are many known young stars than him so that becomes not a fact that he is the younger there is [Baby Zoe](#) too and others, what could be done in such cases, I also had a thought of not putting children in the encyclopedia until turn adult age depending on thier country since subjects are deeply researched before approving thier pages. Thank you. [Kabughoemma](#) (talk) 20:27, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

I recommend changing the statement to one that will not constantly need updating. Something like "At the start of his career he was (whatever age) and was the youngest rapper in Uganda." If that is true, it will stay true forever, which is much better than writing something that (as you point out) will only be true for a short time. [M kuhner](#) (talk) 20:51, 16 July 2026 (UTC)

I support this idea, thank you [Kabughoemma](#) (talk) 20:54, 16 July 2026 (UTC)
[Kabughoemma](#), [Fresh Kid UG](#) just turned 14 a couple of weeks ago. It is entirely appropriate and accurate to mention his youth in the lead. I express no opinion about whether he is notable

since I am not familiar with popular music in Uganda. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 20:46, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Heelo, I was meaning entirely on the statement in the lead describing him as the known younger musician yet now in Uganda there are many young ones than him, so that description should change. [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:49, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Now even after reaching 20 years, he will still be called young musician.

[Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:51, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I think that M kuhner makes a good suggestion. [Shirley Temple](#) is still best known as a child actress even though she died 12 years ago at age 85, and had major accomplishments as an adult. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 21:06, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thanks [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 21:11, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Which capitalization convention do I use when a Cree word is used as the subject's English name?

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#)

| 4 comments

| 4 people in discussion

I am considering making a page for a local community center. I'm confused on how I would refer to it on English language Wikipedia, because the title of the centre is "[mâdawêyatitân centre \(https://www.regina.ca/parks-recreation-culture/community/mamaweyatitan-centre/\)](https://www.regina.ca/parks-recreation-culture/community/mamaweyatitan-centre/)" which is in Cree. English language sources refers to it the same way that it is in Cree.

I am confused about whether I should apply capitalization to the title. Cree does not use capitalization, and the proper name of the centre is in lower case. However, typical English language convention would suggest this centre should be capitalized due to it being a proper noun. My gut feeling says to leave it lowercase because it is a borrowed term from Cree, but I want a second opinion.

I was not able to find an answer from [WP:ENG](#). [Malle Yeno \(talk\) 21:00, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

There is a whole lot of information at [WP:Manual of style § Capital letters](#). However I don't see a clear answer to your question there, alas, except to say that if it is referred to by all (or almost all) of the sources in lower case, it should likely be in lower case. [M kuhner \(talk\) 21:41, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

There is maybe even more information at [MOS:CAPS](#) - but even there, I don't see anything that's guaranteed to be relevant in this situation. There is a reminder to use English titles on articles, but there is no common English name for this, because English has been using the Cree name; therefore putting the Cree name *is* "using English" - to the best of our ability. In my opinion, writing something in Cree but using English-style capitalization is not a good idea. When we quote German or French, we follow German-style and French-style capitalization because that's how it's done, and I think this should operate in basically the same way. In English we write *delicatessen*, not *Delikatessen* capitalized as a German noun - but that's because "delicatessen" has become an English dictionary word, and "mâdawêyatitân" is not (not yet anyway) an English dictionary word. (By which I mean I think we shouldn't try to apply any English rules to it.) [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 22:37, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Regarding what those above have said, see also [bell hooks](#) whose pen name (and thereby article title) we render in lowercase, against English naming convention, due to that being her preference and the [common use of her name](#). Calling the article [mâdawêyatitân centre](#) (or with

an uppercase C, if appropriate) should be fine provided that's what the preponderance of sources use. [Athanelar \(talk\) 04:58, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Volunteer guidance wanted: patented Bible-research system and Wikipedia notability

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Our nonprofit is seeking volunteer guidance from someone familiar with Wikipedia notability, reliable sourcing, or Articles for Creation. The subject involves a patented Bible-research system: U.S. Patent No. 12400087, described as a “method and system for deriving Divine messaging to humanity,” along with a related patent-pending project called Scientific Proof of God (SPOG). We understand that Wikipedia is not for promotion and that a patent, nonprofit status, or our own website is not enough to establish notability. We are looking for help evaluating whether independent reliable sources exist, what type of additional coverage would be needed, and what the proper conflict-of-interest process would be if a neutral draft is ever appropriate. We would appreciate guidance from anyone interested in the intersection of Bible research, patents, digital humanities, computational text analysis, or religious studies. [Don K Juravin \(talk\) 23:01, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Essentially, the question is this: Have reliable sources, without any connection to your organization and without any prompting or consultation from you or your associates, written their own lengthy explanations and opinions of your product? [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 23:28, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

(Note that "a connection to your organization" is to be taken very broadly; a reasonable suspicion that someone may have been in contact with your organization is enough to disqualify them from being regarded as neutral.) [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 23:34, 16 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I have blocked this as a compromised account per posts at [User talk:Don K Juravin](#). There are indications of willingness to circumvent Wikipedia's policies and guidelines. It is not at all clear that Juravin is in control of this account. [Cullen328 \(talk\) 00:21, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

How to request merging/moving of Draft:Death of Lindsey Graham?

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [4 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

I would like to request that Draft:Death of Lindsey Graham is merged/moved to Draft:Death and funeral of Lindsey Graham. A funeral will definitely be held for him next week and I think Draft:Death and funeral of Lindsey Graham is a better name for the draft than Draft:Death of Lindsey Graham. Could someone please request a merge of this draft or move the draft to Draft:Death and funeral of Lindsey Graham? I am a temporary account so therefore I don't have the ability to move it. Thank you! [~2026-40279-72 \(talk\) 00:02, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Unless major unexpected news events happen during his funeral, it is wrong to put it into the title. Most dead people have funerals - funerals are usually not important enough to have their own article.

And the draft you're referring to is already unlikely to ever get published, because he did not die in an unexpected way. His death will most likely just be one or two little sentences in the article about him. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · [talk](#)) [00:12](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

I agree with [TooManyFingers](#). A 71 year old man died of a well known medical condition, the same one that killed actor [John Ritter](#). His death is already covered thoroughly in his biography. I fail to see why a separate article about his death is called for. [Cullen328](#) ([talk](#)) [03:11](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Which is the exact same advice this editor was given when they asked about making this draft in the first place. [Athanelar](#) ([talk](#)) [04:52](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Regarding [Draft:Srinivasa Mangapuram](#)

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

I would appreciate uninvolved input on whether [Draft:Srinivasa Mangapuram](#) appears suitable for mainspace under [WP:NFF](#). The film has an announced release date later this month, multiple independent sources covering production and casting, and an official trailer. I am interested in understanding current community expectations for unreleased film articles rather than discussing any individual editor's actions. [Wikipicked](#) ([talk](#)) [04:33](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Reason for asking is, the film is due for release this month and has coverage from TOI, Cinema Express, NDTV, etc. Another editor moved it to draft citing [WP:NFF](#). I would like to know whether this draft currently satisfies expectations for mainspace under NFF? [Wikipicked](#) ([talk](#)) [04:34](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

You have submitted your draft for review already. An approved AfC reviewer will look at it in due course and see whether it meets the relevant requirements. As it says on the notice at the top of the page, **This may take 3 months or more, since drafts are reviewed in no specific order**. Be patient and edit something else in the meantime, there's [no rush](#) to get your article published. [Athanelar](#) ([talk](#)) [04:46](#), 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Biographical Notability

Latest comment: [19 hours ago](#) | [6 comments](#) | [4 people in discussion](#)

One of the notes that I got on a rejection was something to the effect of “This article was written based on what the subjects employer has written about them”. The comment then directed me here to the sandbox to learn more about biographical notability regarding the rejected subject.

The problem is, not one single source that was cited was from the subject’s employer (please see linked below). Is there anyway to check to see if someone has biographical notability despite previous rejections? Based on the 12 links below (and there are more) as well as this subject being mentioned (but not cited) in other people’s Wikipedia’s,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2015_Connecticut_Senate_23rd_district_special_election

it would seem that this subject has not been written about by his employer, or anyone that he employs.

Extended content

Logoyogo (talk) 04:56, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Before anything else, if you are writing about yourself or someone with whom you have a connection (job, family, anything like that) you *must* disclose that conflict of interest following the rules at WP:Conflict of interest. We strongly discourage people from writing articles about themselves; it is very difficult to do well, since you have to set aside everything you personally know and only write about what outsiders say.

I presume the article subject is Kennard Ray? Your first source is not usable because it reports only a charge, not a conviction, and it is very seldom appropriate to report on those.

Several of the others are effectively interviews. While they are compelling stories, Wikipedia in general is not interested in what people say about themselves, only in what reliable independent sources say about them.

I think there may be an article possible here. I recommend identifying 2-3 reliable, independent secondary sources and asking for comment just on those (feel free to post on my Talk page).

You really need things that are not just repeating information from the subject, but have independent analysis. Be sure to polish the article well *before* submitting it, to get it the best possible hearing. (Well polished articles also get reviewed faster!) **M kuhner** (talk) 05:22, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Yes you are correct I am the subject. I actually thought I was doing the COI correctly, but may have been mistaken.

I can totally understand why it is frowned upon for someone to write an entry on themselves, as you said it is hard, if not impossible to be objective.

However, when reading a Wikipedia entry, seeing that I've been mentioned, but not cited I wanted to fill in the blank and close the loop on that particular wiki and possibly others.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2015_Connecticut_Senate_23rd_district_special_election

Because I am still new to Wikipedia and also, as you've pointed out, clouded possibly by writing about myself, it's a bit hard for me to distinguish which articles are essentially interviews and which are considered reliable independent secondary sources. The 12 that I originally selected were chosen because I believed that they were independent, secondary sources. If you would be so kind to scan through to suss out whether or not there or are 2 - 3 that could be considered that would be extremely appreciated.

<https://connecticut.news12.com/2024/06/18/ct-pardons-day-teaches-lessons-in-clearing-criminal-records/3DmTVaY2xylmW8wFrqDPHL> Logoyogo (talk) 05:52, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

In order to save some scrolling, I've "collapsed" your list to "Extended content [show]", Logoyogo. Clicking "show" shows it, of course. -- **Hoary** (talk) ^{www}👍 07:20, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Mostly, if they quote your words at all, it's an interview. There are exceptions to that. [Edited to add: The main exception is when they never consulted you about the article, and they simply looked up an old quotation somewhere.]

If you met with ~~their reporter~~ anyone in relation to that article, it's always an interview.

If they copy or paraphrase an interview ~~that was done by others~~, it's still an interview.

[Edited to add: It doesn't matter who did the interviewing.] **TooManyFingers** (*he/him* · talk) 18:33, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Thank you so much for the clarification. Very much appreciated. Logoyogo (talk) 03:00, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Cannot publish

Latest comment: [18 hours ago](#)

[7 comments](#)

[6 people in discussion](#)

I have worked diligently to create an original article, photos are either mine or produced in 1904. I have all citations, article entirely authentic and legitimate, yet get this message: Commons no longer allows new users to upload PDF files. This decision was reached because by far most attempted uploads of PDFs by new users turned out to be either copyright violations or out of scope. If you were not the original file designer or photographer, that original creator may need to provide an appropriate license on their official website or public-facing social media, or may send the file and permission via VRT with a carbon copy to you. If you cannot get a compliant license, it is possible that the file may still be uploaded to the relevant wiki in compliance with their local rules. If this upload is your own work, or is someone else's appropriately licensed work, and is within Commons' scope, please go to the page Commons:Abuse filter and click the report an issue with an abuse filter button near the top of the page.

Not trying to anything but preserve history of a historic home. Is there any way I can do this? [SweetDahlia \(talk\)](#) 05:05, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

The PDF we're talking about - is it your full article in PDF format? On Wikipedia, you have to re-type everything by hand into the Wikipedia window. And when you're done, if the article gets accepted, it's able to be edited and improved by every random person who comes along. That's how this place works. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\)](#) 05:30, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

My best guess is that you can stop being a "new user" at Commons by making at least 10 useful edits and being registered for at least 4 days after your first edit. You might look for an article in your area of interest--historic homes in your region, perhaps?--and see if you can improve it. You should also be considering what article those pictures could improve. Wikipedia is not an archiving site: it's an encyclopedia, and is looking for pictures to illustrate articles. An article about the town where the house stands, or about a notable person associated with it, would be a possible target.

Thanks for your efforts here! Good historical photographs are exceptionally valuable and we appreciate you persisting even though the process is harder than expected. (Unfortunately it has to be, due to deluges of bad-faith material.) [M kuhner \(talk\)](#) 05:31, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Are you trying to upload your *article* to Commons in PDF form, or just your photos? I don't see any draft or article creation in your account history here on Wikipedia. [Athanelar \(talk\)](#) 07:01, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

[@SweetDahlia](#): please note that when you're uploading content as your "own work", that means you must have actually created the work yourself (taken a photograph with your own camera, etc.), not that you've taken a screenshot or otherwise replicated someone else's work. Even if the images you're claiming as your own work aren't in copyright anymore, you still shouldn't claim as yours something that isn't. -- [DoubleGrazing \(talk\)](#) 07:41, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Yes, I selected that they were someone else's photos, and then selected that they were taken before 1931. [SweetDahlia \(talk\)](#) 23:51, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

An editor from Commons here: if you are trying to upload a set of photos, please upload each of them to Commons as a separate image file (e.g. in JPEG format), not as a single PDF file. [Omphalographer \(talk\)](#) 04:40, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Notable people with few or no sources

[Kabughemma](#) (talk) 05:31, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Heelo, I have drafted a page about [Draft:Fyno UG](#) however there are few sources but the man is notable and significant in Uganda. He has written many songs for notable artists who have pages here and also he has hit songs but there are few sources about him. Can Wikipedia host a stub about him or he doesn't merit to be included. I will be happy with any feedback.

[Kabughemma](#) (talk) 05:33, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

"Few sources" means *exactly* the same as "not notable". [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 05:59, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

in Uganda, its hard to get publicity because you're popular and most people here with pages paid for coverage just know. I personally I have ever worked for [Sudhir Ruparelia](#) and he pays bloggers and news publications that publish about him weekly so there are people without money who can't do that and they are notable in the country. [Kabughemma](#) (talk) 06:09, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

[@Kabughemma](#) This is unfortunately one of Wikipedia's systemic biases. We require reliable, independent sources to demonstrate notability; so subjects in regions where such coverage is not widely produced end up underrepresented. Still, that is not grounds for an exception to our requirements. See [WP:No special considerations](#). [Athanelar](#) (talk) 06:27, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

I have got it but I think a stub atleast for his work. Any suggestions.

[Kabughemma](#) (talk) 06:33, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Stubs don't have any less of a notability requirement than full articles; stubs just exist in cases where notability is demonstrable but there isn't much information to write down. [Athanelar](#) (talk) 06:45, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Really, [TooManyFingers](#)? Three is what I'd call "few". If a putative article subject has three sources, and all three are thoughtfully written and informative about the subject's claim to notability, and the three are independent of the subject and of each other, then an article can probably be written.

[Kabughemma](#), perhaps you could -- here, in this teahouse thread -- give links to the three best sources. -- [Hoary](#) (talk) ^{WWU} 06:35, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

here are they and I have also found that his song Che Che can get a Wikipedia page since it got significant coverage than him for its success.

<https://www.galaxyfm.co.ug/2026/02/11/essanyu-kapeke-akukumbye-awards-mu-zzina-awards-2025-2026/>

<https://www.sqoop.co.ug/201712/features/fyno-bothered-compared-ziza-bafana.html>

<https://nilepost.co.ug/entertainment/252616/fyno-ug-to-headline-fourth-edition-of-ndeku-nyama-choma-festival>

<https://exclusive.co.ug/fyno-calls-out-fellow-musicians-for-his-struggles/>

<https://mbu.ug/2025/02/12/fyno-ug-reveals-struggles-as-a-songwriter-in-the-ugandan-music-industry/> [Kabughemma](#) (talk) 06:45, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

The GalaxyFM source is just a record of him receiving an award; this does not confer notability unless the award is itself notable, which is usually limited to major international awards like the [Grammys](#) for instance.

The sqoop source is an interview, it is therefore not independent of the subject and cannot be used to demonstrate notability.

Likewise for the Exclusive and mbu.ug sources.

The Nilepost article has no significant coverage.

None of these are suitable sources to demonstrate notability.

[Athanelar](#) (talk) 06:49, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

okay, thank you for the feedback [Kabughoeffma](#) (talk) 06:56, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

You're right about the word "few". In the context of what Kabughoeffma was saying, I took "few" as extremely likely to be a euphemism for "none", since no good ones were mentioned. [TooManyFingers](#) (*he/him* · talk) 18:23, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

That guy his song [Draft:Che Che](#) is more notable than him [Kabughoeffma](#) (talk) 19:02, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

AfC: Kennard Ray — New Draft

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

I took a shot at a new draft, citations included:

[Full text of draft removed]

[Logoyogo](#) (talk) 06:48, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

[Logoyogo](#), I have removed the full text of your draft which you pasted here; the Teahouse is not the place to submit drafts to AfC. I see you previously submitted this draft at [Draft:Kennard Ray](#) but it was deleted after 6 months because it had gone unedited for that time. If you want to recover the draft and submit it for review, please head over to [WP:REFUND](#), or else if the text you submitted here is entirely new, recreate it as a new draft at [Draft:Kennard Ray](#) using the [WP:Article creation wizard](#). [Athanelar](#) (talk) 06:52, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

"location map definition" error

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

An error "Lua error in Module:Location_map at line 562: Hertfordshire is not a valid name for a location map definition" has crept into the [Water End Swallow Holes](#) article. Looking back at the past history, it is apparent in older versions, when it definitely did not manifest itself.

Can anyone spot the problem, please? [Langcliffe](#) (talk) 07:05, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Basically, the problem was that you were wikilinking the value of `area_of_search` parameter, which caused the error. I've fixed it. — [Raihanur](#) (talk) 08:49, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Proper Styling Guideline to Indicate Neighborhoods, with sub-

neighborhoods on municipality articles

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [1 comment](#) | [1 person in discussion](#)

I recently edited the article on the [City of North Miami Beach, FL](#) and specifically the *City districts and neighborhoods* section for the [List of communities in Miami-Dade County, Florida](#). I focused on adding information for the previously mentioned municipality as I was able to source and reference primary sources to a sort of standardized existence to the names and borders of these neighborhoods. My issue comes to how the placement of these links should look like as it currently seems to break the articles subheading hyperlink. Also with the latter onto the second article, I am wondering the what the style guidelines are for the addition of *sub-neighborhoods* to the article.[Streetbuilding \(talk\) 07:40, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Adding population to infobox: Belgium Municipality

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [6 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

Hello,

On the [Dilbeek](#) page I wanted to update the population numbers to the official population on 2025-12-31, but as I try to edit the infobox, I can't seem to change the population as it doesn't appear while updating the infobox. This happens when using the source editor and the visual editor. What am I doing wrong? [KikiKenny \(talk\) 08:00, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@KikiKenny](#); You aren't doing anything wrong, the infobox is just pulling its data directly from Wikidata to keep things consistent across different language sites. To update the population, you just need to click "Wikidata item" in the right sidebar of the [Dilbeek](#) page (or just click [Dilbeek \(Q641134\)](#)), scroll down to the population section, and add the new figure there. Make sure to include the "point in time" as well, and add a link to your source. Once you save it on Wikidata, the change will automatically filter through to the Wikipedia article. — [Raihanur \(talk\) 08:30, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you [@Raihanur](#)! This is maybe out of the scope of this question but the Wikidata page is semi-protected, so I don't think there's any way to edit the data? [KikiKenny \(talk\) 08:34, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Since the Wikidata item is semi-protected, your best option is to submit an edit request on its discussion page. Alternatively, you can just reply to me here with the link to the source and the figure, and I would be happy to update it on Wikidata for you. For future reference, you will automatically gain the ability to edit semi-protected Wikidata items yourself once your account is at least four days old and you have made at least 10 edits on Wikidata... — [Raihanur \(talk\) 08:42, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you so much! The link is: <https://dilbeek.incijfers.be/mosaic/demografie> and the figure is 45.180 inhabitants with a density of 1.089 km2. [KikiKenny \(talk\) 08:47, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

✓ **Done**, you're welcome! — [Raihanur \(talk\) 08:55, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Summary of editing

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#)

[3 comments](#)

[2 people in discussion](#)

hi i have edited a page but during the summary of editing i have not edit the url instead of that i have write that 'i have edited this information ' so i want to know how to change that [MK231206 \(talk\) 10:55, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

The request immediately above is your second edit to en:Wikipedia, MK231206. If you're saying that you want to change your summary for your first edit (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=GMERS_Medical_College_and_Hospital,_Valsad&diff=prev&oldid=1364575177), then no, you can't change it. If on the other hand you're saying that you want to edit the URL that the article currently provides, then yes, you can edit it, as part of (or the whole of) your second edit to the article. -- [Hoary \(talk\)](#)^{WWU} [11:21, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you for helping me. [MK231206 \(talk\) 11:26, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

2026 United States Senate Election in Michigan

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#)

[3 comments](#)

[2 people in discussion](#)

Haley is not really that electable candidate. Can we ask for a cleanup to make it less bias and more neutral explaining each flaws instead of staying Haley is a moderate female candidate since Elssa and Gretchen won. They won but Haley is not really that popular candidate, because most of the younger voters disliked her and was in favor of more progressive, working-class candidate like Abdul.

In fact, the moderates were losing the votes as we can see how Elssa Slotkin only won by a few margins. What I am saying is that we need to make it less bias towards Haley Stevens. Another thing is Abdul El-Sayed is polling better against Mike Roger's than Haley Stevens.

[2026 United States Senate election in Michigan](#) [~2026-36361-89 \(talk\) 15:14, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Sources; <https://www.notus.org/2026-election/haley-stevens-michigan-senate-primary-mcmorrow-el-sayed>

<https://www.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/columnists/kaitlyn-buss/2026/04/25/michigan-democratic-party-progressive-future-young-voter-turnout-stevens-el-sayed-mcmorrow-conventio/89748706007/?gnt-cfr=1&gca-cat=p&gca-uir=false&gca-epti=z1113xxp000850l003050c000850u001554e1113xxv001454&gca-ft=223&gca-ds=sophi&gnt-djm=1>

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/what-one-campaign-rally-in-michigan-reveals-about-young-voters-right-now> [~2026-36361-89 \(talk\) 15:15, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Suggestions to improve a specific article should go on that article's Talk page. That way they will get attention from people working specifically on the topic, which will be much more useful. Please take the discussion there. [M kuhner \(talk\) 15:52, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Addition of home co-buying/co-ownership/co-purchasing

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [5 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Co-buying/co-purchasing/co-ownership appears in mainstream coverage as a growing part of how Americans enter homeownership, but it does not appear anywhere on Wikipedia. A US News & World Report article linked below gives a 2025 estimate of roughly 30% of buyers participating in some form of co-buying arrangement, which suggests this may be a notable trend. Before proposing any addition, I want to make sure the idea is supported by independent, high-quality sources and fits the scope of the article. I'd appreciate input on whether editors feel this level of sourcing is sufficient to consider including a brief mention of co-buying as part of current homeownership patterns on existing pages (i.e., "Homeownership in the United States" or as a new article).

This is what I drafted:

As of 2025, 30% of home purchases were a co-buy. With co-owning groups averaging 3.6 adults, the co-buy concept includes owning a home with friends and/or relatives. All co-owners will be on the title or deed. Not all persons have to reside in the home nor are they all responsible for the mortgage.

Here is the source:

<https://money.usnews.com/loans/mortgages/articles/what-you-should-know-about-co-owning-a-house> [Gwl80 \(talk\)](#) [15:58, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hello, [@Gwl80](#), and welcome to the Teahouse.

As with the immediately preceding question, the place to raise this sort of question is on the talk page of a relevant article (eg [Talk:Homeownership in the United States](#)) where people who have knowledge and interest in this subject are more likely to see it. [ColinFine \(talk\)](#) [17:40, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I shared it on that talk page, but no one was responding, so my mentor suggested it here.

Thanks for helping me learn though! [Gwl80 \(talk\)](#) [22:35, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@Gwl80](#) The nearest existing article I can find is Concurrent estate. Your new sources might be best if added there: that article has a number of deficiencies. [Mike Turnbull \(talk\)](#) [21:04, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Thanks! [Gwl80 \(talk\)](#) [22:34, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

mouseover of article vandalised?

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

hi i was reading this article https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2026_Clacton_by-election under Candidates, Unnamed and it talks about the monster raving loony party but when i mouse over it it says the party *was* a party and was affiliated with the nazi party? (i'm not making it up i looked at it on multiple browsers here is a picture <https://i.postimg.cc/htB6JLyP/wiki.png>) i looked in the article and there's nothing about this so i assume it's vandalism but i don't even know how it's possible/how to fix it? hope this is the correct place 'contact wikipedia' brought me here [Thegees \(talk\)](#) [18:04, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hello, @Thegees, and welcome to the Teahouse.

Thank you for pointing this out.

It was vandalism to the article Official Monster Raving Loony Party at 11:37 yesterday, reverted half an hour later at 12:06.

But because the information for mouseovers is cached, such edits can take a while to propagate. ColinFine (talk) 18:40, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Protected Editing

Latest comment: 1 day ago

| 18 comments

| 2 people in discussion

Kabughoemma (talk) 19:06, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Heelo, I am requesting if its possible to get articles have moved or created get semi edit protection from unregistered users and non autoconfirmed, am requesting. Kabughoemma (talk) 19:08, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Hello. I assume this is about your draft at Draft:Alpha Timez. You need to submit it for a review by clicking the "submit for review" button at the top. However, it is not likely to be accepted, because you have just summarized announcements of his activities, not critical analysis and commentary about him or his work.

I see that you took a picture of him. What is your connection to him? 331dot (talk) 19:11, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

It's not about him, about pages on mainspace not draftspace Kabughoemma (talk) 19:21, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Is it possible for me to request for for semi edit protection for articles have created on mainspace. Kabughoemma (talk) 19:23, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Please describe what your connection is to him.

Articles are not protected preemptively. There needs to be a demonstratable problem with vandalism or disruptive editing first, that lesser measures do not stop. Articles are not protect to lock them to a particular version of the article or to prevent others from editing them. 331dot (talk) 19:46, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

it's okay then. Kabughoemma (talk) 19:49, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Kabughoemma You appear to have taken a great many pictures of the people you have written about. Are they your clients? Note that disclosure of paid editing is a Terms of Use requirement, see WP:PAID. 331dot (talk) 19:50, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Mostly those photos are not on Internet, so I use them as own work since there is no copyright holder. Kabughoemma (talk) 19:52, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

I just get topics to write on and you those ones who's good images are online I put the source name. Kabughoemma (talk) 19:54, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

All images have a copyright holder. If you don't know who it is, you **cannot assume** that the copyright is compatible. You must **immediately without delay** remove the images and request their deletion from Commons as you have falsely claimed the copyright **potentially putting Wikipedia in legal jeopardy**. 331dot (talk) 19:55, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Please Could you help me with the deletion since it's late in East African Time and feeling sleepy. A humble

request. [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:10, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I suggest that you ask on Commons since that's where you need to request deletion. So, you're just picking topics at random to edit about? [331dot \(talk\) 20:13, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

yes I pick topics randomly those that are notable [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:15, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I have first removed them from articles (the images) [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:19, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

So it's just a coincidence that you're editing about topics that typically make use of marketing and PR services(musicians, politicians, and political parties)? [331dot \(talk\) 20:24, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

In Uganda political parties and musicians are the most notable with significant coverage and its where I know most. I follow politics alot. [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:28, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

just as Ugawood creates articles only about Films in Uganda [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:32, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Richest Ugandans on Wikipedia

Latest comment: [20 hours ago](#)

| 7 comments

| 3 people in discussion

[Kabughoemma \(talk\) 19:24, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Heelo, I noticed some richest Ugandans here like [Hamis Kiggundu](#) showing ranks from The Independent Uganda however the list of richest Ugandans was released by Bossip Africa and then these other publications republished the list, is it authentic?? Here is bossipafrika.com (<http://bossipafrika.com>) [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 19:27, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Here is the original list [1] (<https://bossipafrika.com/richest-ugandans-in-2026-bossip-billionaires-index/>) [Kabughoemma \(talk\) 19:33, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@Kabughoemma](#) On Wikipedia we would say that bossipafrika is a primary source. In general, we prefer secondary sources for the reasons explained at those links. Hence, if the other publications are reliable, e.g. because they have editorial oversight and are reputable news outlets, they are the best ones to cite. [Mike Turnbull \(talk\) 20:52, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

And yet they used this ones list, how does Wikipedia count this.

[Kabughoemma \(talk\) 20:55, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Some things on Wikipedia have not been done properly, and need to be corrected. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 22:43, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Yeah, I think even how we count notability for song writers should change just as Ministers are. If you write morethan 4 hit songs for other artists you become notable automatic. [Kabughoemma \(talk\)](#) 02:19, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Frank W. McCulloch

Latest comment: [1 day ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

I have an addition to the article on Frank W. McCulloch that will provide details about his life in Chicago from 1906 to 1949. I hope to have details on his life in Washington, 1949 to 1970, later this year. But I have no clue how to navigate the Wikipedia edit page. I am the older of Frank W. McCulloch's two sons.[Frank W. McCulloch W. C. Slim \(talk\)](#) 19:52, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Hi W.C. Slim!

If you are having trouble with the source editor, there's a help guide at [Wikipedia:Source editor](#). The Visual Editor might be easier.

If you are adding details about his life, they must be from reliable secondary sources like newspapers -- they can't be just details you know. Also, make sure to declare your conflict of interest (that you are related to him) in your edit summary and the page's talk page when you edit it.

Happy editing! *In solidarity*, [ΩmegaMantis](#)^(she/her) [🐞blather](#) | [📧spy on me](#) 20:00, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

Please help editing my page

Latest comment: [17 hours ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Hello, I am a new editor at Wikipedia. I am trying to write [\[\[Draft:Siamese–Cambodian Wars\]\]](#) and I need your help. My Wikipedia mentor [\[\[User talk:SakanaJohn126#How to get help from other editors on your draft|suggested\]\]](#) I post this feedback request. Your help at [\[\[Draft talk:Siamese–Cambodian Wars\]\]](#) would be appreciated! [SakanaJohn126 \(talk\)](#) 23:38, 17 July 2026 (UTC)

My advice is that, as a new editor, you not try to write an article at all, and especially not one about wars. A very major part of being a good editor is skill and experience in the kinds of interactions that happen on Wikipedia, and another is being intimately familiar with how Wikipedia's rules get applied. (The rules themselves are slightly less of a challenge, but people who think they know the rules are often in trouble because the rules are not applied in exactly the way they expected.)

I suggest you stick to editing existing articles, and save this idea for an article about wars until *much* later. Like, maybe next year. [TooManyFingers](#) ^{(*he/him* · [talk](#))} 01:15, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

That's excellent advice from TooManyFingers -- but [Draft:Siamese–Cambodian wars](#) already looks promising -- thanks in part to [Mathglot](#), the distinguished mentor. But [SakanaJohn126](#), what kind(s) of help do you believe/suspect that you need? Meanwhile, I'll look at just one relative clause: **when Tai peoples migration into mainland Southeast Asia and established their own states in territories on Khmer Empire land**. I think you mean "when Tai people migrated into mainland Southeast Asia

and established their own states within the Khmer Empire." However, I'm an Indochina ignoramus, so you should definitely not take my word for it. -- [Hoary \(talk\)](#)^{WWU}  [05:19, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

How to change my username?

Latest comment: [15 hours ago](#) | [7 comments](#) | [5 people in discussion](#)

Dear Sir/Madam, I am a new Wikipedia editor and railway photographer from New Zealand.

I have been using the username Ichibashi since around 2024. At that time, I mainly edited the Chinese Wikipedia because my English was not yet good enough to contribute to the English Wikipedia, and I did not own a camera. Since then, my English has improved, and I have started contributing to the English Wikipedia and uploading my own railway photographs to Wikimedia Commons.

I would like to change my username from Ichibashi to BayridgeG22, as this is the username I now use consistently and would like to be identified by when people see my photographs. I do not use the username Ichibashi on other platforms. I am also concerned that people might think the photographs on my Instagram were copied from Wikipedia, even though I am the original photographer, because the usernames are different.

I submitted a request through Special three days ago, but the request is still marked as "processing." I understand that volunteers handle these requests, but I was wondering whether this waiting time is normal.

I will be returning to school next week after the holidays, so I have only a couple of days left to continue editing before I need to focus on my exams. In the meantime, I am still editing under the username Ichibashi.

I also have one question: once my username is renamed, will all of my previous edits and uploads automatically be attributed to BayridgeG22, or will they continue to display under Ichibashi?

Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Yours sincerely, Ichibashi(BayridgeG22) [Ichibashi \(talk\)](#) [23:39, 17 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Your contributions will be moved to the new account, though your old account name will remain in the logs and on talk pages where you have signed your username. [45dogs \(they/them\) \(talk page\) \(contributions\)](#) [00:59, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

You might consider placing a message on your user page identifying yourself as the author of those older edits and uploads, after the name change goes through. [M kuhner \(talk\)](#) [02:03, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

The name change can take some time - volunteers and all that.

When a username is changed, the account history is retained under the new name. All of your past (and future) edits will be attributed to the new account name.

Places where your old signature appears on talk and discussion pages will not change their appearance - they will still show the old signature. Clicking on the links in your signature will go through a redirect so they will find you at your new user page, new user talk page, and your ongoing edit history. Making a note on your user page of the name change is certainly allowed - it may reduce some user confusion - but not particularly necessary, since most of the transition is handled automatically. — [jmcgnh](#)^(talk) [\(contribs\)](#) [05:02, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Ichibashi, there is another, simpler method that may work for you, but there is a caveat. As you have only a handful of edits, you can simply stop editing under this id, and create a new account and use only that one henceforth; no name change request needed. The caveat, is that your old posts will remain listed under your old name, and you **must not** go back to the old one. Or, you can request a username change. Mathglot (talk) 05:37, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Hi Mathglot,

I think I had uploaded some pictures on Wikimedia Commons already as Ichibashi. Since the purpose of changing my name is to let people know the author of those pictures is actually "BayridgeG22", if I delete my account, those pictures will be "Ichibashi"'s pictures, and it is quite hard to let those pictures relate to me. By the way, the files I upload to Wikimedia commons will also change once my username is changed, right?

Thanks, Ichibashi (talk) 05:50, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Ichibashi, right. A username change at Wikipedia (or at Commons) is global—it will change your username, and adjust your history, at all Wikimedia sister projects. You can see all your contributions at every project, including English Wikipedia, Commons, and two others, at this link (<https://guc.toolforge.org/?user=Ichibashi>).
Mathglot (talk) 07:27, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

COI-declared draft — request for independent review

Latest comment: 8 hours ago

| 3 comments

| 3 people in discussion

I have a declared conflict of interest: I am the subject of Draft:Sharon Gabay. The draft was declined for promotional tone; I have since removed the flagged language and resubmitted. Given my COI, I would be grateful if an experienced editor could look it over independently — and take it over if they find the subject worthwhile. The draft has 21 sources including Makor Rishon, The Jerusalem Post, Montreal Gazette and two Dominican newspapers. Thank you. SHARONGABAY2 (talk) 06:42, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

SHARONGABAY2, the subject has (you have) published six books. We aren't told anything about one of the six, but four are "listed in the National Library of Israel catalog". This is unremarkable: national libraries typically list vast numbers of books. It would help the inquisitive reader if you instead provided ISBNs and other publication details for each. What have photographers, photography critics, photography academics, newspaper arts reviewers and so forth who are unrelated to Gabay written about his exhibitions or books? When you have added such material to the draft, submit it for review. -- Hoary (talk)^{WWU} 🙌 08:03, 18 July 2026 (UTC)
@SHARONGABAY2 "Promotional tone" is not really accurate, even if they did use those words. Promotion is not a tone, though promoters do often use certain styles and tones. Promotion is anything meant to inform potential customers or potential business associates. Wikipedia writing doesn't do that; instead, it informs historians and anyone who's interested in history. The way to fix this is to make sure the article omits everything that customers and businesses might want to know, and is only of interest to history buffs. TooManyFingers (he/him · talk) 14:50, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Jemimah Ekanem

Latest comment: [13 hours ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

Please I want to ask if **Jemimah Ekanem** is notable for Wikipedia as a professor in Akwa Ibom State University. [Saxxxxxxy \(talk\) 09:17, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hello and welcome. Without knowing anything about this person, I would direct you to the [definition of a notable professor or academic](#). [331dot \(talk\) 09:27, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I genuinely want to become a much better person

Latest comment: [13 hours ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

I need help [~2026-40328-68 \(talk\) 09:30, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Wikipedia is not therapy. If you feel you have a genuine problem, please reach out to a therapist. This is the Teahouse, where volunteers answer questions about editing Wikipedia. Do you have such a question? Cheers, [shadestar \(talk\)](#) (any/all) [In solidarity. 09:40, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Maintenance template removal of the article "Divine Word College of Legazpi"

Latest comment: [8 hours ago](#) | [5 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Hello, I've been improving this article lately, searching and adding sources. May I ask when should be the maintenance template be removed? Because I honestly do not understand the "Help:Maintenance template removal" article. Thanks. [HegelianCk \(talk\) 10:33, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Also I see other articles like "University of Santo Tomas-Legazpi" which have almost no secondary source but has no maintenance template. [HegelianCk \(talk\) 10:45, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

You can add maintenance templates to it. And if you feel like the maintenance template no longer applies to the article, feel free to be bold and remove it. [jolielover♥talk 11:08, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Looking at the page, although it looks like the current template (too many references to primary sources) is solved, the big issue now is that it needs more citations, especially in the history section [jolielover♥talk 11:12, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

[@HegelianCk](#) It's not legitimate to compare just two articles in this way. Instead, you need to do a triple comparison: how it's done in article 1, how it's done in article 2, and what the Wikipedia standards say. If both articles are better than what Wikipedia requires, they can both be kept as they are. If both articles are defective according to Wikipedia, then they both need fixing. [TooManyFingers \(he/him · talk\) 14:30, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Would house arrest be imprisonment

Latest comment: [5 hours ago](#) | [2 comments](#) | [2 people in discussion](#)

Article: [Toluid Civil War](#)

Question: would house arrest be considered imprisonment? i got a source that a former khan died of illness in house arrest. [LordoftheCouches](#) ([talk](#)) [15:27, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

House arrest and imprisonment are not the same, and they can't be called the same either.
[TooManyFingers](#) ([he/him](#) · [talk](#)) [17:11, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Some things with similar enough titles - should these belong?

Latest comment: [2 hours ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

Example: [SuperSU](#), an [Android rooting](#) tool, is similar enough to the Wikipedia redirect title of [SuperS](#), an anime season title (as both have CamelCase, having uppercase letters directly after the word *Super*. SuperS' redirect link is also one letter removed from SuperSU) Likewise, [Tecno Mobile](#) is close enough to the redirect and name of [Tecna](#) (a fictional character) with a changed letter and added word, in that it's not named Techno/Tecna but Tecno/Tecna.

Since it relates to similar-enough titles on Wikipedia, and users have had subpages related to page titling, should I put this on a subpage or put on [SuperSU](#):

Not to be confused with [SuperS](#).

And for Tecno Mobile:

Not to be confused with [Tecna](#).

(they would be distinguished rather than disambiguation list).

Some technology software or even unrelated things are similar enough to the names of things in TV series and movies. In this case, unintentionally similar to names of things relating to *Winx Club* and *Sailor Moon*. There is also a video editing software named [Magix](#) but it was never named because of the city and planet in *Winx Club* (2004-2009). [WinX DVD Ripper Platinum](#) also has a similar name to *Winx Club*, but I think Distinguish would be there because of their similar titles.

[Unopened VHS tape](#) ([talk](#)) [15:32, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

I'm not certain how all of this works, but I believe part of the process is to make sure we're *not* protecting against mistakes that people aren't actually making very much. [TooManyFingers](#) ([he/him](#) · [talk](#)) [17:08, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hi [Unopened VHS tape](#). [Template:Distinguish](#) says: "point out to readers, who may have misspelled their desired title". I don't know either subject but I imagine the ending U in SuperSU is pronounced clearly and then SuperSU/SuperS doesn't sound like a likely misspelling to me. Tecno Mobile and Tecna also sound hard to confuse but maybe Tecna and Tekna (disambiguation) should be connected. [PrimeHunter](#) ([talk](#)) [20:21, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Mary E. Green Mansion Citation Help

Latest comment: [6 hours ago](#) | [1 comment](#) | [1 person in discussion](#)

The article: [Mary E. Green](#)

I'm pretty sure that Mary E. Green, while in her time living in Charlotte, Michigan, owned a mansion, and probably did some of the woodwork. Only her hobby of woodcarving is mentioned in the article, and not her mansion.

I couldn't find anything else on the subject besides two Facebook pages and a Weebly site, none of which seem like trustworthy sources. One of them claims Green was friends with a Mr. Tiffany (presumably Louis Comfort Tiffany) and did most of the woodcarving herself. It also claims that the property is now owned by Burkhead-Green Kilgo Funeral Home, but I cannot find anything on their website to back this up.

Can anyone help find a reliable source for this claim? [Thatbisexual \(talk\)](#) [16:54, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Problem with Fixing Citation Based on Wikidata Inside Infobox

Latest comment: [2 hours ago](#) | [3 comments](#) | [3 people in discussion](#)

The [2nd entry in references for Matlab](#) has a problem with "title". However, it is based on Wikidata and is inside the infobox of the article. How can that be repaired? [Starlighsky \(talk\)](#) [18:51, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Hello, [@Starlighsky](#), and welcome to the Teahouse.

I don't see what the problem is with the title, but the URL and title of that reference are both in [d:Q169478](#), and you should be able to edit them there.

However, it seems to me that the article has a much more serious problem, that, glancing through the list of references, I don't see a single one which appears to be an independent, reliable, in-depth discussion of MATLAB. Without some sources which meet *all* the requirement of [WP:42](#), the article does not establish that Matlab is *notable*. I am going to tag the article accordingly. [ColinFine \(talk\)](#) [19:27, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Answered at [Wikipedia:Help desk#Problem Fixing Citation at Matlab Article](#). Please only post a question in one place. [PrimeHunter \(talk\)](#) [20:07, 18 July 2026 \(UTC\)](#)

Copyright issues

Latest comment: [50 minutes ago](#) | [1 comment](#) | [1 person in discussion](#)

I have received this message:

please remember the essential rule of respecting [copyrights](#). **Edits to Wikipedia, such as your edit to [a page] may not contain material from copyrighted sources unless that text is available under a suitable free license.** It is almost never okay to copy extensive text out of a book or website and paste it into a Wikipedia article with little or no alteration,

I have no idea what "extensive" is. A sentence? A paragraph? A chapter of a book? I AM well aware of giving proper attribution to a source, and have spent much time finding suitable sources for information I want to post. If I can't find a source, I don't post anything. Would you prefer I stop that and work from my personal knowledge of the subject of the page? Do you want me to use quotation marks and stick with direct quotes from a source? May I paraphrase or not? Do you want me to cite a source at the beginning and at the end of the information? Truly don't know what to do with this. AllAboutProcess (talk) 22:05, 18 July 2026 (UTC)

Retrieved from "<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Teahouse&oldid=1364850334>"