

Bigotry and Bias in Wikipedia --Examples of

The following is a growing list of examples of **liberal bias**, **deceit**, silly **gossip**, **bigotry** and **blatant errors** on **Wikipedia**. **Wikipedia** has been called the ***National Enquirer of the Internet***.^[1]

1. Desiré Dubounet's post on her identity have consistently been ambushed and replaced with malicious slanderous lies. Over a hundred of her posts on validating and verification of her life have been removed. We see here complete history on this [wikipedia for Prof Desire' Dubounet](#). All references here are verified. And when we compare to [Wikipedia malicious slander](#) we see how corrupt and bigoted Wikipedia can be. Libelous Lies and removal of posts smack of criminal libel.
2. <http://medicalexposeddownloads.com/PDF/Criticism%20of%20Wikipedia%20from%20Wikipedia.pdf>
3. <http://medicalexposeddownloads.com/PDF/Examples%20of%20Bias%20in%20Wikipedia.pdf>
4. <http://medicalexposeddownloads.com/PDF/Wikipedia%20is%20Run%20by%20Latent%20Homosexual%20Homophobics.pdf>
5. For over two years, **Wikipedia's** entry on **Richard Sternberg** has falsely stated that a journal "withdrew" a peer-reviewed **Intelligent Design** paper published in a journal that he edited.^[2] In fact, the journal never withdrew the paper. Using a double standard, **Wikipedia's** entry on **atheist Richard Dawkins** claims he is the "Simonyi Professor,"^[3] a position expressly requiring **peer review**. In fact, Dawkins has apparently not met that professorship's requirements of **peer review**.^[4]
6. **Wikipedia's** entry on the **Prodigal Son** devotes more words to obscure rock band and **liberal media** references to it (e.g., "'The Prodigal Son' is the Season 2 opener of the TV series Miami Vice, although it has virtually nothing to do with the parable itself.") than to the parable and its spiritual meaning.^[5]
7. **Wikipedia's** **gossip** and policy in favor of edits by anonymous IP addresses struck again: for over two weeks the entry on former **U.S. Supreme Court** Justice **Byron White** stated he was the father of former Cowboy great Danny White.^[6] The statement was utterly false, but misled everyone who read that.^[7]
8. **Wikipedia** displays pervasive bias in making **liberal** statements with citations that do not support the statements, as illustrated by its entry about **Conservapedia**.^[8] **Wikipedia** states that "Conservapedia has asserted that Wikipedia is 'six times more liberal than the American public', a statistic which has been criticized for its poor extrapolation and lack of credibility." But the two citations for this claim of "poor extrapolation and lack of credibility" are to articles that say nothing about extrapolation or credibility and instead tend to confirm the **liberal bias** on **Wikipedia**.
9. A user named **Richard Dawkins** apparently edited his own article on **Wikipedia**,^[9] and even linked to a DVD being sold from his personal website. Illustrating **Wikipedia's** favoritism towards **liberals**, it took a long time (well over a year after he first edited his own article)^[10] for anybody to confront this well-known **atheist** for this conflict of interest, despite being against **Wikipedia's** own rules.
10. Arbitration Committee Chairman Fred Bauder told the Wikien-1 mailing list in regards to **Michael Moore**, whose official website published attacks on a **Wikipedia** editor with an open invitation to vandalize **Wikipedia** [6] and was proposed to be designated as an Attack site, "Obviously we need to make an exception for prominent people whose viewpoint we support. And by the way, I am not joking. Writing this down in black and

white is important, if that is what we do in practice. And, if it not clear, I support him too, although I am not enamored of anyone's [propaganda](#). Even that which supports my own position." [7] When asked, "How, then, is this remotely compatible with NPOV?", the ArbCom chairman responded, "Not at all." [8] [Wikipedia](#)'s Neutral Point of View (NPOV), laid down by founder [Jimbo Wales](#) allegedly is "absolute and non-negotiable." [9][10] The editor Michaelmoore.com was urging its viewers to attack and harass is described as "a Fellow at the [American Enterprise Institute](#), a [conservative think tank](#)." [11]

11. [Wikipedia](#) heavily promotes [liberals](#) in inappropriate places. Go to Wikipedia's entry on [Boy Scouts v. Dale](#), a [conservative Supreme Court](#) decision, and for months you'd see a top-screen promotion for "gay/lesbian rights advocate" Evan Wolfson with a claim that he is "one of the '100 most influential people in the world.'" [11] [Wikipedia](#) eventually removed that [liberal](#) promotion, but kept its inappropriate emphasis on this attorney who, by the way, lost this case. [12]
12. [Wikipedia](#) has once again deleted all content on the [North American Union](#) [12]. The old pages are inaccessible, and re-creation is blocked.
13. For a long time [Wikipedia](#) led with a falsehood in describing [Conservapedia](#): "Conservapedia is a wiki-based web encyclopedia project with **the stated purpose** of creating an encyclopedia ... supportive of ... **Young Earth creationism**." [13] That was defamatory in attempting to smear [Conservapedia](#) in front of [Wikipedia](#)'s [evolutionist](#) audience. [Wikipedia](#) also welcomes edits by anonymous IP addresses to the [Conservapedia](#) and other entries, resulting in frequent defamation.
14. [Wikipedia](#) has a lengthy entry on "Jesus H. Christ," [14] a term that is an idiotic mockery of the [Christian faith](#). [Wikipedia](#) calls the term "often humorous," "joking" and "comedic", and relishes in repeating disrespectful uses of the term, without admitting that the phrase is an anti-[Christian](#) mockery. Meanwhile, [Wikipedia](#) does not describe mockery of any other religion as "humorous".
15. The [Wikipedia](#) article on [Eritrea](#) refuses to concede that [Eritrea](#) is a one-party state. [15] Another example of [Wikipedia liberal bias](#): "Oh, they aren't really a dictatorship, their charter specifically denies it!"
16. [Wikipedia](#) often inserts bias by downplaying a [liberal](#) outrage or fallacy amid thousands of words of nearly irrelevant information. For example, no one credibly disputes that [liberals](#) forced [Larry Summers](#) to resign as president of [Harvard](#) because he dared to suggest that the under-representation of women in math, science and engineering may be due to innate differences between women and men. [16][17] But the verbose entry for Larry Summers on [Wikipedia](#) implies that his obscure other positions were more important in causing his ouster. [18]
17. [Wikipedia](#) welcomes and allows edits by anonymous IP addresses, which results in rampant vandalism that is overwhelmingly [liberal](#). Credible wikis, including [Conservapedia](#), do not permit editing by anonymous IP addresses.
18. For nearly two months, from at least as early as July 15 through September 9, 2007, [Wikipedia](#) classified its critics, including [Conservapedia](#), as "Fanatics and Special Interests." [19]
19. [Wikipedia](#) has two million entries, but not one for [liberal](#). Users who go to that term are *redirected* to the Wikipedia entry on [liberalism](#) that conceals the [liberal](#) support of [gun control](#) and taxpayer funding of [abortion](#), and [liberal](#) censorship of [prayer](#) in [public school](#). [20]
20. [Wikipedia](#), its own entries (including talk pages) filled with smears and [deceit](#), features an entry on "deceit (album)" that gushes with a description of it as "austere, brilliant and indescribable" music that is "post-punk". [21] The word "deceit" has no entry on [Wikipedia](#). It was *redirected* to a different term having a different meaning, and then this redirect

was changed 7 times in two days in response to this criticism here.^[22] Even now it lacks a clear definition and the numerous examples provided in the entry on [deceit](#) here.

21. [Wikipedia](#) promotes suicide with 21,544 entries that mention this depravity, including many entries that feature it (Conservapedia will not provide citations to the more depraved entries on this subject at Wikipedia as Conservapedia affirms the [sanctity of life](#)). For example, Wikipedia referred to it needlessly in the very first sentence of distinguished jurist Henry Friendly's entry,^[23] and Wikipedia's entry about [Zerah Colburn](#) ended with a claim that his distant *nephew* committed suicide.^[24] After this criticism appeared here, these two entries were fixed (and in the case of Friendly, reinstated before being fixed again); there has been no system-wide removal of this bias on [Wikipedia](#). In yet another example, [Wikipedia](#) has an entry for "suicide by cop"^[25] to discuss attacking a police officer to provoke a suicide, citing an unpublished PhD thesis at an obscure university.
22. [Wikipedia](#) uses guilt-by-association far worse than [Joseph McCarthy](#) ever did. [Wikipedia](#) smears numerous persons and organizations by giving the false impression that they are associated with the [John Birch Society](#) (JBS). Examples have included:
 - o pro-life Congressman [Jerry Costello](#), merely because JBS gave him a favorable rating^[26]
 - o anti-communist Fred Schwarz, merely because JBS agreed with him^[27]
 - o the conservative [Association of American Physicians and Surgeons](#), by repeating a **40 year old** newspaper claim that some of its leaders once belonged to the JBS^[28]
 - o conservative baseball pitcher Dave Dravecky, a cancer survivor, merely because a newspaper claimed he once belonged to JBS^[29]
23. In response to this criticism, Wikipedia removed ... only the smears against the more [liberal](#) targets, such as the [Democrat Jerry Costello](#), or the less influential entries, such as the deceased Fred Schwarz. Wikipedia left intact the smear against the most influential group. After removal of the smear against Costello, it was then was reinserted before being removed again.
24. [Wikipedia](#)'s last sentence on [Human Life International](#) claimed that a killer "confessed that pamphlets (sic) from the group led" him to kill. This is a complete lie designed to smear a [conservative](#) group. But this was approved by [Wikipedia](#) and remained for over a month.^[30]
25. A devastating critique of [Wikipedia](#) by [Fox News](#) describes the impact of [Wikipedia](#) smears on popular golfer Fuzzy Zoeller.^[31]
26. Smears in [Wikipedia](#)'s entry on [U.S.](#) Congressman Steve LaTourette were totally false.^[32]
27. "[Larry Sanger](#), who founded [Wikipedia](#) in 2001 with [Jimmy Wales](#) only to leave shortly afterwards, said that even as far back as 2001 the [Wikipedia](#) community 'had no respect for experts.'"^[33]
28. The Wikipedia entry for [homosexuality](#) is adorned with the a rainbow graphic but fails to mention the following: the many [diseases](#) associated with homosexuality, the high promiscuity rates of the homosexuality community, the higher incidences of [domestic violence](#) among homosexual couples compared to heterosexual couples, and the substantially higher mental illness and drug usage rates of the homosexuality community. In addition, the Wikipedia article on homosexuality fails to mention that the American Psychiatric Association issued a fact sheet in May of 2000 stating that "...there are no replicated scientific studies supporting a specific biological etiology for homosexuality."^[34]
29. Wikipedia's article on [atheism](#) fails to mention that [American](#) atheists give significantly less to charity than American [theists](#) on a [per capita](#) basis.^[35] Wikipedia's article on

atheism also fails to mention that [Christianity and not atheism was foundational in regards to the development of modern science](#). Wikipedia's article attempts to associate atheism with scientific progress.^[36]

30. Wikipedia's entry on [liberal](#) former Vice President [Al Gore](#) contains no mention of the drug charges against his son.^[37] But Wikipedia's entry on [conservative](#) Vice President [Dick Cheney](#) prominently mentions his adult daughter's sexuality.^[38]
31. Wikipedia's entry for seven weeks about [Thad Cochran](#),^[39] a conservative Republican member of the [U.S. Senate](#), smeared him with an offensive, unsupported quotation not of Cochran, but of a Democratic Mississippi governor for whom Cochran's mother campaigned when Cochran was age 14. The unsupported quote was never spoken or endorsed by Cochran, but Wikipedia featured it near the top of Cochran's entry to mislead the reader into thinking Cochran is somehow a racist.
32. Wikipedia smears prominent [Christian conservatives](#), including [James Dobson](#) and [D. James Kennedy](#), with an allegation that they are part of a grand scheme Wikipedia calls "Dominionism".^[40] The term was made up by [liberals](#) and this conspiracy theory has no factual basis, but Wikipedia smears these [conservatives](#) with elaborate templates in their own entries depicting them as part of this fictional scheme.^[41] This edit [\[13\]](#) calls Eagle Forum dominionist, even though there is not even any source that says so.
33. Wikipedia's entry about the anti-[Christian](#) and anti-[Semitic H.L. Mencken](#) praises him profusely because he, Wikipedia's words, "notably assaulted America's preoccupation with [fundamentalist Christianity](#)".^[42] After 3,500 words of adulation, Wikipedia then buries a concession that Mencken "has been referred to as anti-Semitic and misogynistic."^[43] Wikipedians like Mencken's hostility to religion too much to admit that his biographer (Terry Teachout) and his close Jewish friend (Charles Angoff) described him as racist and anti-Semitic.^[44]
34. Wikipedia's entries about the 2007 Masters^[45] and its champion [Zach Johnson](#),^[46] who won an upset come-from-behind victory against Tiger Woods, omitted any reference to Johnson's public statements crediting his [faith](#) in [Jesus Christ](#) for strengthening him as he overcame enormous odds to prevail. Months later, after criticism here, Johnson's attribution to [Jesus Christ](#) was included, but with the [Wikipedia](#) trick of placing it late in a wordy entry so that few are likely to see it, and even then with a silly "citation needed" to suggest that the quote may not be true.^[47]
35. Wikipedia asserts that "One 1987 estimate found that more than 99.84% of almost 500,000 US scientists in the earth and life sciences supported evolution over creation science."^[48] This statement is false, but Wikipedians won't correct it and it has been repeated thousands of times by other [liberals](#) in reliance on Wikipedia.^{[49][50]} The truth is that 700 scientists signed a statement rejecting evolution, but evolutionists then made the illogical claim that every other scientist must support evolution.^[51] Under that reasoning, if 1000 persons signed a statement opposing President [George W. Bush](#), then nearly 300 million Americans must support him! Funny how Wikipedia does not claim that.
36. The 5,400-word Wikipedia entry on The John Birch Society^[52] attempts to smear unrelated [conservatives](#) who had nothing to do with the society, simply by calling them "allies". Under that reasoning [Ronald Reagan](#), [Pope John Paul II](#), and [George W. Bush](#) should also be in that entry! And this is by a resource that criticizes [McCarthyism](#)???^[53]
37. Wikipedia has a substantial anti-intellectual element, as reflected by silly administrator names and nonsensical entries. Check out Wikipedia's entry for "duh": "Duh is an American English slang exclamation that is used to express disdain for someone missing the obviousness of something. For example, if one read a headline saying 'Scientific study proves pain really does hurt' or 'New reports show death is bad for one's

health', the response might be 'Well, duh!'"^[54] How about a new slogan: *Wikipedia: well, duh!*

38. Wikipedia recently moved further away from Judaeo-Christian beliefs by complaining that "[t]he average Wikipedian ... is from a predominantly Christian country" and that Wikipedia was built on Christian encyclopedias and "the Jewish Encyclopedia."^[55] At the same time, Wikipedia complains about the "enormous significance" given by entries to "Al-Qaeda attacks on the U.S., UK and Spain, killing slightly over 3,000 people."^[56]
39. Wikipedia has a banner to criticize an American treatment of a topic: "The examples and perspective in this article or section may not represent a worldwide view of the subject."^[57] "A worldwide view" is fictional [liberal](#) terminology for [globalists](#).
40. Though Wikipedia is non-profit, the Wikia project of its co-founder is very much for-profit and has raised millions of dollars in investments. Already Wikipedia has been criticized for favoring Wikia. When Wikipedia community voted 61-39% percent to treat all links to other sites equally by removing nofollow (Google-ignored) tags for all of them, the Wikipedia co-founder overruled this decision and Wikipedia now favors Wikia in its treatment of nofollow tags.^[58]
41. Wikipedia is sympathetic to Fidel Castro in its entry about Cuba.^[59] Wikipedia blames President Dwight Eisenhower for choosing "to attend a golf tournament" rather than meet the revolutionary Castro in 1959, and then Wikipedia claims that Castro became a communist because of the American-backed Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961. Conservapedia tells the truth up-front: "Cuba has been ruled by a communist dictator named Fidel Castro since 1959."^[60]
42. Often Wikipedia's biased assertions are unsupported by its citations. For example, the Wikipedia entry about Conservapedia states that it "has come under significant criticism for alleged factual inaccuracies."^[61] But check out Wikipedia's cited source for that statement: its citation does not identify a single factual inaccuracy on Conservapedia.^[62] Thus Wikipedia relies on a factual inaccuracy to accuse someone else of factual inaccuracies!
43. [Liberal](#) icon [Bertrand Russell](#) receives glowing adoration on Wikipedia, which calls him "a prophet of the creative and rational life," "one of the world's best-known intellectuals" whose "voice carried great moral authority, even into his mid 90s."^[63] After 7,700 words about [Bertrand Russell](#), [Wikipedia](#) finally mentions Russell's support of the communist revolution, but pretends that Russell quickly opposed it. Instead, Russell wrote that "I believe that [Communism](#) is necessary to the world, and I believe ... Bolshevism deserves the gratitude and admiration of all the progressive part of mankind."^[64]
44. [Conservapedia](#) allows greater and easier copying of its materials than [Wikipedia](#) does, but Wikipedia's entry about [Conservapedia](#) claims that its policy "has led to some concerns."^[65] And who supposedly had these concerns? In Wikipedia's citation, it was only the founder of Wikipedia in trying to find a way to criticize Conservapedia!^[66]
45. April 24th was the anniversary of [Operation Eagle Claw](#), which was President [Jimmy Carter](#)'s failed attempt to rescue American hostages in Iran. The Conservapedia [entry](#) explains Carter's political motivation for this. But the Wikipedia [entry](#) omits Carter's political motivation and instead implies that this bad luck cost Carter the election.^[67] In fact, Newsweek did not even mention this after July 14th, and Reagan beat Carter for reasons other than bad luck.
46. Wikipedia's entry on James Monroe^[68] omits any mention of how he was a conservative and omits Monroe's veto of a key appropriation on the Cumberland Road Bill, when Monroe stated that "congress does not possess the power under the constitution to pass such a law."^[69]
47. Polls show that about twice as many Americans identify themselves as "conservative" compared with "liberal", and that ratio has been increasing for two decades.^[70] But on

Wikipedia, about three times as many editors identify themselves as "liberal" compared with "conservative".^[71] That suggests **Wikipedia is six times more liberal than the American public.**^[72] See also [liberal quotient](#).

48. Wikipedia awarded "good article" status^[73] to a biased description of liberal Balboa High School, saying it has "a progressively nurturing environment" undergoing "a steady renaissance marked by academic innovation."^[74] Nowhere in Wikipedia's 4,468-word description does it admit that half the 9th graders lacked proficiency on a statewide English test.^[75] Instead, Wikipedia editors apparently like how this public school converted its metal shop into a sex-based "health" clinic.
49. One can confirm that sex-related entries are attracting many to Wikipedia, including young viewers, by viewing [Wikipedia statistics](#). But Wikipedia gives no specific warning to parents or viewers about the pornographic images on popular pages, and Wikipedia would probably be disabled in many homes and schools if a proper warning were given.^[76]
50. Wikipedia's entry on the "Palestinian People" omits any mention of terrorism.^[77] Click on the PLO and you'll find no discussion of its connection to the massacre of innocent athletes at the 1972 Olympics in Munich.^[78] The Israel News Agency reports:

No where will you ever find Al-Qaeda, Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Hezbollah described as terror organizations by Wikipedia. Wikipedia will quote the US State Department or the United Nations Security Council as saying that they are terror groups, but Wikipedia itself will only describe these organizations as "militants."

51. Wikipedia features an entry on "anti-racist mathematics" that "emphasizes the sociocultural context of mathematics education and suggests that the study of mathematics (as it is traditionally known in western societies) does exhibit racial or cultural bias."^[79]
52. In the mid-20th century, a Soviet encyclopedia contained the assertion that Jesus was a myth.^[80] Wikipedia's entry on [Jesus](#) has the following: "A small number of scholars and authors question the historical existence of Jesus, with some arguing for a completely mythological Jesus."^[81] But no credible historian makes such a claim.
53. Wikipedia's entry for the [Renaissance](#) denies any credit to Christianity, its primary inspiration.^[82]
54. About 60% of Americans accept the account of the Great Flood in the [Bible](#).^[83] But enter "Great Flood" into Wikipedia and it automatically converts that to an entry entitled "Deluge (mythology)." That entry then uses "myth" or "mythology" nearly 70 times in its description.^[84] Its entry on "Noah's Ark" is just as biased.^[85]
55. Wikipedia editors are about 4 times as atheistic or non-religious as the American public. In a Newsweek poll in 2006, 92% of Americans said they believed in God and only 8% said they did not believe in God or didn't know. But among Wikipedia editors responding to a request for identification of beliefs, 35% described themselves in the categories of "No religion, atheist, agnostic, humanist, secular, other."^[86]
56. Wikipedia's entry on [abortion](#) reads like a brochure for the abortion industry. Wikipedia denies and omits the results of 16 out of 17 statistically significant studies showing increased risk of breast cancer from abortion.^[87] Wikipedia's entry also omits the evidence of abortion causing increased premature birth of subsequent children.^[88] Instead of providing these facts, Wikipedia blames women by declaring that "breast cancer elicits disproportionate fear in women!"^[89]
57. The Wikipedia entry for the [Voting Rights Act](#) contained (as of March 9-10) a call to participate in a political march to establish congressional representation for D.C.^[90] This is a longtime liberal cause prohibited by the [U.S. Constitution](#). A conservative entry like

that would be deleted by Wikipedia editors within minutes, but that entry remained until after it was criticized here.

58. Initially a Wikipedia admin named "Nearly Headless Nick" deleted, without explaining his decision, an entry about Conservapedia. Later, in response to publicity, Wikipedia posted a new entry about Conservapedia. Wikipedia's entry is filled with obvious bias, numerous errors, out-of-date citations, and self-serving false statements.^[91] For example, the Wikipedia entry made the absurd claim that Conservapedia says the "General Theory of Relativity" has "nothing to do with physics." Wikipedia's claim was completely false and unsupported by its citations. After this example was posted here, Wikipedia removed its error but has left other false and outdated claims in its entry, reflecting Wikipedia's pervasive bias.
59. Wikipedia's entry for conservative physicist [Edward Teller](#) promotes the liberal attempt to blame him for the government taking away the security clearance of [J. Robert Oppenheimer](#). Teller testified, "If it is a question of wisdom and judgment, as demonstrated by actions since 1945, then I would say one would be wiser not to grant clearance." Wikipedia first called this statement "damning", and after criticism here replaced its term with "problematic".^[92] In light of how multiple spies leaked secrets under Oppenheimer's supervision in the [Manhattan Project](#) and spying even worsened afterwards, Wikipedia's spin on Teller's statement is unjustified bias.
60. Wikipedia's entry for the [Association of American Physicians and Surgeons](#), a conservative group, features a rant against the group by a British journalist who was a former press officer for the leftist Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.^[93] The only cited credential for the journalist is that he works for a television "programme-production company," and there is no citation for any of the factual claims in his intemperate and misleading description of the group, which were prompted by an independent criticism in England of the journalist's own work. After receiving a complaint about this, Wikipedia trimmed this rant but still kept most of it, reflecting Wikipedia's bias. Preserving this unpublished diatribe is against Wikipedia policy (e.g., NPOV), but it Wikipedia administrators insist on keeping it. Wikipedia's entry also features another liberal journalist's swipe at AAPS from ... 40 years ago!
61. There is a strong anti-American and anti-capitalism bias on Wikipedia. In its description of the post-war [Bell Trade Act](#) of 1946, in which the United States gave the Philippines \$800 million in exchange for some free trade provisions, Wikipedia omits any mention of the \$800 million dollars and instead lambasts the "wrath of Father Capitalism."^[94] The agreement was approved by popular vote on the Philippines, but the Wikipedia article omits that fact also.
62. Wikipedia distorts the youthful acceptance of [deism](#) by [Benjamin Franklin](#) by never acknowledging that he later abandoned it. Wikipedia fails to admit the significance of how Franklin, near the end of his life, proposed the saying of prayers at the [Constitutional Convention](#) for divine intervention and assistance in the proceedings,^[95] an act contrary to the teachings of deism. Wikipedia also omits any acknowledgment of Franklin's praise of [Pilgrim's Progress](#) in his autobiography.
63. Wikipedia's entry on the Intelligent Design court decision in *Dover*^[96] distorts and omits the key facts that (i) the judge awarded over \$2 million in attorneys fees to the [ACLU](#)'s side (not \$1 million),^[97] (ii) the judge copied over 90% of his opinion from the [ACLU](#)'s briefs,^[98] and (iii) his opinion relied heavily on another decision that was subsequently reversed on appeal.^[99]
64. Gossip is pervasive on Wikipedia. Many entries read like the National Enquirer. For example, Wikipedia's entry on Nina Totenberg states, "She married H. David Reines, a trauma physician, in 2000. On their honeymoon, he treated her for severe injuries after she was hit by a boat propeller while swimming." That sounds just like the National

Enquirer, and reflects a bias towards gossip. Conservapedia avoids gossip and vulgarity, just as a true encyclopedia does.

65. Edits to include facts against [the theory of evolution](#) are almost immediately censored. On Conservapedia, contributions that meet simple [rules](#) are respected to the maximum extent possible.
66. Wikipedia has as its official policy the following: "If we are going to characterize disputes neutrally, we should present competing views with a consistently fair and sensitive tone." ^[100] Yet what does Wikipedia do in relation to its article on [Young Earth Creationism](#)? It currently offers an article on the topic under the category "Pseudoscience". ^[101] What reputable encyclopedia uses such a non-encyclopedic tone for an article in regards to creationism? The log on the article shows that Wikipedia has a history of using the pejorative term "pseudoscience" to disparage young earth creationism. ^[102]
67. Wikipedia removed and permanently blocked a page identifying its many biases. Wikipedia omits any meaningful reference to political bias in its 7000-word entry [Criticism of Wikipedia](#).
68. Wikipedia claims about 1.8 million articles, but what it does not say is that a large number of those articles have zero educational value. For example, Wikipedia has 1075 separate articles about "Moby" and "song". ^[103] Many hundreds of thousands of Wikipedia articles -- perhaps over half its website -- are about music, Hollywood, and other topics beneath a regular encyclopedia. This reflects a bias towards popular gossip rather than helpful or enlightening information.
69. The Wikipedia entry for [John Peter Zenger](#) links to an incorrect Wikipedia definition of "Philadelphia lawyer," which Merriam-Webster defines as a lawyer knowledgeable in "even the most minute aspects of the law." Wikipedia claims the term comes from the Zenger trial, but Merriam-Webster puts the first use of that term at over 50 years later. Wikipedia is simply unreliable.
70. Often key facts are missing from Wikipedia entries in favor of meaningless detail. Wikipedia's entry about [Indentured Servitude](#) is massive, but it omitted any reference to [Bacon's Rebellion](#), which was the turning point for the use of indentured servants in the New World! Finally, weeks after this glaring omission was noted here, Wikipedia added one line to its entry: "Indentured servants in Virginia supported Bacon's Rebellion in 1676." ^[104]
71. Unlike most encyclopedias and news outlets, Wikipedia does not exert any centralized authority to take steps to reduce bias or provide balance; it has a "neutral point of view" policy but the policy is followed only to the extent that individual editors acting in social groups choose to follow it. For example, CNN would ensure that Crossfire had a representative of the political right and one from the political left. In contrast, Wikipedia policy allows bias to exist and worsen. For example, even though most Americans reject the theory of evolution, ^[105] Wikipedia editors commenting on the topic are nearly 100% pro-evolution. ^[106] Self-selection has a tendency to exacerbate bias, as in mobs, where there are no restraints. [Gresham's Law](#) reflects the problem in economics of bad money driving out good in the absence of corrective action. As a result, Wikipedia is arguably more biased than CNN and other information sources.

The above paragraph was posted on the Wikipedia entry for "Wikipedia", under bias, but its editors then illustrated their bias by replacing the above with this: "Objective [sic], or neutrally biased, articles present different opinions as equally legitimate regardless of validity, while unbiased articles focus on accuracy and validity. For example, the evolution article is not objective because it does not present creationism, a counter argument to evolution, as a valid scientific theory. However, this does not make the

article biased because evolution is an accepted scientific theory. CNN's Crossfire, on the other hand, was considered objective ... because it had representatives from the political right from the political left."

72. Wikipedia has many entries on mathematical concepts, but lacked any entry on the basic concept of an [elementary proof](#) until this omission was pointed out here.^[107] Elementary proofs require a rigor lacking in many mathematical claims promoted on Wikipedia.
73. The Wikipedia entry for the [Piltdown Man](#) omits many key facts, such as how it was taught in schools for an entire generation and how the dating methodology used by evolutionists is fraudulent.
74. Wikipedia allows the use of B.C.E. instead of B.C. and C.E. instead of A.D. The dates are based on the birth of [Jesus](#), so why pretend otherwise? Conservapedia gives the credit due to Christianity and exposes the [CE](#) deception.
75. Wikipedia's article on [Feudalism](#) is limited to feudalism in Europe and did not mention the feudal systems that developed independently in Japan and India until this defect was described here.^[108]
76. Wikipedia's article on the longest-serving and most powerful Maryland official in its history, [William Donald Schaefer](#), contains about 1900 words, but over two-thirds of those words (1400/1900) are devoted to silly gossip, outright vulgarity and National Enquirer-type material.^[109] 406 words, which is over 20% of the entire entry, is devoted to a silly dispute Schaefer had one day with the local newspaper!
77. Wikipedia's article about the late Senator John Tower includes a mean-spirited story whose only point seems to be to indicate the degree of his ex-wife's bitterness toward him. The article spells his wife's name incorrectly, and cites no source for the item. The item has been in that state since it was first inserted in May 2006.^[110] No real encyclopedia would print such silly gossip.
78. Wikipedia's entry for the [National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act](#) (NCVIA) reads like an advertisement for vaccine manufacturers, including unsupported and implausible claims about vaccination.^[111] Unsupported claims featured there include "Vaccine makers indicated they would cease production if their proposal for the NCVIA was not enacted" and "concern that the NCVIA may not provide an adequate legal shield." Wikipedia's entry omits references to leading pro-parent websites concerning vaccination,^[112] and instead Wikipedia's entry lists pro-government and pro-vaccine-manufacturer websites. Wikipedia's entry even includes this entire paragraph, which is unsupported and is little more than an advertisement for drug companies:

Public health safety, according to backers of the legislation, depends upon the financial viability of pharmaceutical companies, whose ability to produce sufficient supplies in a timely manner could be imperiled by civil litigation on behalf of vaccine injury victims that was mounting rapidly at the time of its passage. Vaccination against infectious illnesses provides protection against contagious diseases and afflictions which may cause permanent disability or even death. Vaccines have reduced morbidity caused by infectious disease; e.g., in the case of smallpox, mass vaccination programs have eradicated a once life-threatening illness.

79. Wikipedia displays an obsession with English social distinctions, such as obscure royalty, and with unexplained academic distinctions earned in the English college system, such as references to "double first degree." The entry on [Henry Liddell](#) illustrates this extreme form of Anglophilia that characterizes many entries in

Wikipedia.^[113] That entry fails to tell us when Liddell was dean of Christ Church, Oxford and has a grammatical error in its first sentence, yet describes in painstaking detail four obscure royal titles for Liddell's relatives and his "double first degree" in college. The casual reader of that entry wouldn't even notice a buried reference (well after a description of all the royal lineage) to Liddell's primary claim to fame: his daughter Alice inspired [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland](#). The arcane English descriptions in many Wikipedia entries may be due to its copying, verbatim, passages from the 1911 Encyclopedia Britannica. This copying was not disclosed in the debate in late 2005 about whether Wikipedia was as reliable a resource as the Encyclopedia Britannica.^[114]

80. Robert McHenry, former Editor-in-Chief for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, wrote about Wikipedia's bias and included this observation:^[115]

One simple fact that must be accepted as the basis for any intellectual work is that truth – whatever definition of that word you may subscribe to – is not democratically determined.

81. Bob Schmidt observed on the *Illinois Review*:^[116]

I just spent some time in Wikipedia checking if my recollections of its bias are correct. The bias is much worse than I had remembered.

I looked only at topics on business and information technology. Clearly there are enthusiasts for certain vendors who are spending a large portion of their time hyping technology in a way that makes their vendor look good in comparison to other vendors. They will set up a set of criteria for the definition of a product that their product will meet. They conveniently omit from the criteria anything that would detract from their favorite. In short, Wikipedia is not objective. It is accurate only within its selective use of facts that are convenient to promote a predetermined outcome.

Even for just one area of knowledge, it would take a major time consuming effort for a person or group to have an impact on reducing the bias and improving the accuracy of the entries.

82. Jimmy Wales, founder of Wikipedia, admitted the following understated bias in an interview in 2006:^[117]

"I would say that the Wikipedia community is slightly more liberal than the U.S. population on average, because we are global and the international community of English speakers is slightly more liberal than the U.S. population. There are no data or surveys to back that." [Conservapedia editor: why not? Wales admitted that only about 615 editors are responsible for over 50% of the edits on Wikipedia.^[118] Why doesn't Wikipedia survey these editors? Is this deliberate indifference to bias?]

83. Many people know how a prominent Tennessee journalist [John Lawrence Seigenthaler](#) was defamed for four months on Wikipedia before it was corrected. He described and criticized this in *USA Today*, concluding with the following:^[119]

When I was a child, my mother lectured me on the evils of "gossip." She held a feather pillow and said, "If I tear this open, the feathers will fly to the four winds, and I could never get them back in the pillow. That's how it is when you spread mean things about people."

84. What most people don't know is how many Wikipedia editors savaged [Seigenthaler](#) afterwards on a Wikipedia talk page for publicly criticizing the falsehoods about him:^[120]

"Mr. [Seigenthaler](#)'s attitude and actions are reprehensible and ill-formed," said one typical comment. "[He] has the responsibility to learn about his own name and how it is being applied and used, as any celebrity does on the Internet and the world-at-large. Besides, if there is an error whether large or small, he can correct it on Wikipedia. Everyone fails to understand that logic." Another wrote: "Rather than fixing the article himself, he made a legal threat. He's causing Wikipedia a lot of trouble, on purpose."

85. The co-founder of Wikipedia, Larry Sanger, described "serious and endemic problems" in Wikipedia in a document entitled "Toward a Compendium of Knowledge" (Spet. 2006). Sanger observed that Wikipedia editors do not enforce their own rules consistently or effectively and that it has become an "arguably dysfunctional community" unattractive to traditional experts. Sanger declared the Wikipedia community's response to the Seigenthaler incident to be "completely unacceptable."^[121]
86. Wikipedia's errors spill undetected into newspapers. A Wikipedia entry falsely stated that Rutgers was once invited to join the Ivy League. Although that false statement was eventually removed from Wikipedia, it was not removed before the *Daily News* relied on it in this story:

"You don't have to define your college with your football team, but Rutgers long ago decided to give it a try. Back in 1954, when it was considered a 'public Ivy,' Rutgers might have joined the fledgling Ivy League and altered its destiny. But the school declined the offer - arguably the dumbest mistake in its history. Ever since then, Rutgers has scrambled to prove itself worthy of playing football with the big boys." — Bondy, Filip. "They Can Finally Say They Belong Here", *New York Daily News*, 2006-11-10, p. 92. Retrieved on 2006-12-13.

87. Wikipedia's entry for [Johnny Appleseed](#), a Christian folk hero, omits a discussion of his strong faith and instead features baseless speculation about his health, a year of death different from that of his obituary, and a silly story designed to make a Christian preacher look foolish.^[122]
88. In an example of pro-homosexuality bias, the category allowing users to self identify as Heterosexual was [deleted](#) because it served no useful purpose, yet the exact same category for Homosexuals was [kept](#).
89. <http://medicalexposedownloads.com/PDF/Criticism%20of%20Wikipedia%20from%20Wikipidia.pdf>
90. <http://medicalexposedownloads.com/PDF/Examples%20of%20Bias%20in%20Wikipedia.pdf>
91. <http://medicalexposedownloads.com/PDF/Wikipedia%20is%20Run%20by%20Latent%20Homosexual%20Homophobics.pdf>

References

1. ↑ "And in that respect Wikipedia is no better than the National Enquirer. We don't quote the National Enquirer on television (unless [it's] for a documentary on aliens or some other conspiracy theory) so why would we do for Wikipedia?"^[1]
2. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Sternberg
3. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Dawkins
4. ↑ See [Richard Dawkins](#).
5. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parable_of_the_Prodigal_Son
6. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Byron_White&diff=159734800&oldid=154431838
7. ↑ <http://www.funtrivia.com/en/subtopics/Are-They-Related-213708.html>
8. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservapedia>
9. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:Contributions/RichardDawkins>
10. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:RichardDawkins
11. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Boy_Scouts_of_America_v._Dale&oldid=152256885 (quoting a 2004 [liberal](#) list by Time magazine).
12. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Boy_Scouts_of_America_v._Dale
13. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Conservapedia&oldid=160604712> (emphasis added).
14. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus_H._Christ
15. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eritrea>
16. ↑ <http://www.davisenterprise.com/articles/2007/09/14/news/114new1.txt>
17. ↑ <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A19181-2005Jan18.html>
18. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Larry_Summers
19. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Criticism_of_Wikipedia&oldid=144741567#Fanatics_and_special_interests
20. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Liberal&redirect=no>
21. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deceit_%28album%29
22. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Deceit&action=history>
23. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Henry_Friendly&oldid=151873451
24. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Zerah_Colburn_%28math_prodigy%29&oldid=147253074
25. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suicide_by_cop
26. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Jerry_Costello&oldid=142488803
27. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Fred_Schwarz&oldid=143791808
28. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Association_of_American_Physicians_and_Surgeons
29. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Dave_Dravecky&oldid=155924640
30. ↑ ^[2] Only in response to Conservapedia's criticism was the smear removed.
31. ↑ In addition to the [Fox News](#) report, numerous stories on the Internet describe the smears, which we will not repeat here. "The Wikipedia entry has since been cleansed of the remarks, first posted last August, then again in December before being removed January 2nd. However, several sites like Answers.com have copies of Wikipedia entries, and as of press time still had the defamatory content in place."^[3]
32. ↑ <http://www.cleveland.com/news/plaindealer/index.ssf?/base/news/1184402220217510.xml&coll=2>
33. ↑ <http://www.siliconrepublic.com/news/news.nv?storyid=single8794>
34. ↑ <http://www.cwfa.org/images/content/bornorbred.pdf>
35. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atheism>
36. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atheism>
37. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al_Gore
38. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dick_Cheney

39. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Thad Cochran&oldid=135420256](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Thad_Cochran&oldid=135420256) (revised only after being exposed on Conservapedia, but then the smear was reinserted again before being removed again)
40. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominionism>
41. ↑ See, e.g., [D. James Kennedy](#)
42. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mencken>
43. ↑ *Ibid.*
44. ↑ <http://cjrarchives.org/issues/2003/1/mencken-payne.asp>
45. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2007 Masters Tournament](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2007_Masters_Tournament)
46. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Zach Johnson&oldid=154500732](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Zach_Johnson&oldid=154500732)
47. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zach Johnson](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zach_Johnson)
48. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Level_of_support_for_evolution
49. ↑ <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20070519145312AACvfJA&show=7>
50. ↑ [Talk:Main Page](#)
51. ↑ "By one count there are some 700 scientists (out of a total of 480,000 U.S. earth and life scientists) who give credence to creation-science, the general theory that complex life forms did not evolve but appeared 'abruptly'." Martz, Larry & Ann McDaniel (1987-06-29), "Keeping God out of the Classroom (Washington and bureau reports)", Newsweek CIX(26): 23-24, ISSN 0028-9604
52. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The John Birch Society](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_John_Birch_Society)
53. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McCarthyism>
54. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Duh>
55. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject Countering systemic bias](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_Countering_systemic_bias) (later "predominantly Christian" was changed to "nominally Christian")
56. ↑ *Ibid.*
57. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Campaign finance](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Campaign_finance)
58. ↑ <http://www.techcrunch.com/2007/04/28/wikipedia-special-treatment-for-wikia-and-other-wikis/>
59. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuba>
60. ↑ [Cuba](#)
61. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservapedia>
62. ↑ <http://chronicle.com/wiredcampus/index.php?id=1910>
63. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertrand Russell](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertrand_Russell)
64. ↑ [Bertrand Russell](#)
65. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservapedia>
66. ↑ <http://www.thestar.com/sciencetech/article/190501>
67. ↑ Wikipedia states, "The operation was a failure, and had a severe impact on U.S. President Jimmy Carter's re-election prospects" [entry](#)
68. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James Monroe](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Monroe)
69. ↑ [James Monroe](#)
70. ↑ http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=444
71. ↑ Compare [Liberal Wikipedians](#) with [Conservative Wikipedians](#)
72. ↑ "Liberal bias" can be defined as the ratio of liberals to conservatives in a group, such that no liberals would equate to zero liberal bias. Wikipedia's ratio of 3:1 for liberals to conservatives is six times the ratio in the American public of 1:2 for liberals to conservatives.
73. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Good articles](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Good_articles)
74. ↑ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balboa High School %28San Francisco%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balboa_High_School_%28San_Francisco%29)
75. ↑ Jill Tucker, "Student Successes Defy Urban Trends," San Francisco Chronicle (Aug. 16, 2006).

76. ↑ Wikipedia merely has a general disclaimer that avoids any reference to its sexual images, pornography, and adult content.^[4]
77. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palestinian_people (the entry also contained an unjustified picture of children for sympathy purposes, but that was removed after criticism here)
78. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palestine_Liberation_Organization
79. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-racist_mathematics
80. ↑ <http://www.bede.org.uk/books/jmyth.htm>
81. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus>
82. ↑ Wikipedia has since updated its entry with a backhanded reference to Christianity, but even then not for inspiring the Renaissance but rather for providing subject matter for the works.^[5]
83. ↑ <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040216-113955-2061r.htm>
84. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Flood
85. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noah%27s_Ark
86. ↑ http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/List_of_Wikimedians_by_religion
87. ↑ <http://www.jpands.org/vol8no2/malec.pdf>
88. ↑ <http://www.jpands.org/vol8no2/rooney.pdf>
89. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abortion-breast_cancer_hypothesis
90. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Voting_Rights_Act
91. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservapedia>
92. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Teller
93. ↑ [The version](#) criticized above; [the note](#) left by dpbsmith on the article's discussion page; the [current version](#).
94. ↑ This phrase was removed from Wikipedia only after this criticism was posted here. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bell_Trade_Act
95. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Deist_thinkers
96. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kitzmiller_v._Dover_Area_School_District
97. ↑ [ACLU](#)
98. ↑ *Id.*
99. ↑ *Id.*
100. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view
101. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Young_Earth_creationism
102. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Young_Earth_creationism&action=history
103. ↑ Simply search "Moby" and "song" together on Wikipedia.
104. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Indentured_servant&diff=115675763&oldid=113879992
105. ↑ http://www.religioustolerance.org/ev_publi.htm
106. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Evolution>
107. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elementary_proof
108. ↑ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feudalism>
109. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Donald_Schaefer
110. ↑ [John Tower](#), revision as of Jan 25
111. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Childhood_Vaccine_Injury_Act
112. ↑ <http://www.909shot.com/>
113. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Liddell
114. ↑ http://news.com.com/Study+Wikipedia+as+accurate+as+Britannica/2100-1038_3-5997332.html
115. ↑ http://www.opendemocracy.net/media-edemocracy/wikipedia_bias_3621.jsp
116. ↑ http://illinoisreview.typepad.com/illinoisreview/2007/01/conservapedia_w.html
117. ↑ http://www.pbs.org/mediashift/2006/04/email_debatewales_discusses_po.html

118. ↑ http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/02/12/bias_sabotage_haunt_wikipedias_free_world/?page=2
119. ↑ http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-11-29-wikipedia-edit_x.htm
120. ↑ http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/02/12/bias_sabotage_haunt_wikipedias_free_world/?page=3
121. ↑ <http://arstechnica.com/articles/culture/citizendium.ars>
122. ↑ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Johnny_Appleseed