

文化: 维基百科编辑战争

Culture: Edit Wars on Wikipedia

文章来源: 摘自 2023 年 1 月 22 日《大西洋月刊》 **适用领域**: 维基百科、文化战争、破除污名化

单元要点: 了解维基百科的编辑方式和近期做出的改变, 积累和事物变化相关的变

大, 学习用具体的表达介绍事物的演变过程。

精读预习

1. 听录音,填空(每个空格填写一个单词,含连字符的单词算一个)。

The Culture Wars Look Different on Wikipedia

be her name going forward, and she/her would be her ___

The site is tackling more controversial edits, the results of which can ______ across the internet.

(1) For more than 15 years, Wikipedia discussed what to call the third child of Ernest Hemingway, a doctor who was born and wrote books as Gregory, later lived as Gloria after undergoing genderaffirming ______, and, when arrested for public disorderliness late in life, used a third name, Vanessa. Last year, editors on the site finally settled the question: The Gregory Hemingway article was deleted, and its contents were moved to a new one for Gloria Hemingway. This would

(2) Wikipedia's billions of facts, rendered as dry prose in millions of articles, help us understand
the world. They are largely the brain behind Siri and Alexa. They have been integrated as official
fact-checks ontheory YouTube videos. They helped train ChatGPT. So,
unsurprisingly, when you search Google for "Gregory Hemingway," it follows Wikipedia's lead: You
are told about Gloria instead.
(2) In Wikingdia's early days the question of what to call Cloria Hamingway would have been
(3) In Wikipedia's early days, the question of what to call Gloria Hemingway would have been
treated as a quick mission to locate a fact in publications such as <i>The New</i>
York Times. Joseph Reagle, a Wikipedia expert at Northeastern University, told me the site has an
inherent "," faithfully reporting whatever secondary sources say about a
subject.
(4) But in recent years, something has begun to change. Wikipedia's editors are no longer simply
citing dated sources; instead, they are out how someone would want to be
understood. But even though these deliberations touch on some of the most controversial issues
around—and reach conclusions that reverberate far beyond Wikipedia's pages—they are
shockingly and thoughtful for the internet today.
(5) The breakthrough idea of Wikipedia was supposed to be its biggest vulnerability. "The
anyone can edit" threw open the gates to whoever had something to
contribute, turning Wikipedia into one of the most visited websites on the internet. But who was
to trust something "anyone" may have written? The site definitely has inaccuracies; any student
working on a research project has gotten a spiel about how Wikipedia will lead them
(6) Of course, only a tiny percentage of Wikipedia's visitors actually take up the offer to contribute.
There are campaigns to draw in new editors, especially given that the existing ones
heavily white and male, but the most reliable motivation for getting involved
seems to be the urge to fix something wrong as opposed to create something new. Articles typically
start off small and, perhaps even inaccurate, and are steadily improved and
corrected.
(7) The desire to fix something wrong—in this case, articles that have not kept up with the times—
is meant to play out on an article's "Talk page," a companion page dedicated to discussing edits.
Take the debate over Gregory versus Gloria. Last February, Hemingway's Talk page fielded a
proposal on what name to use. There was a week of debate, long discussions in which a dozen or
so editors with how Hemingway would have wanted to be perceived.

(8) The discussion ended with a	hung jury: seven editors	s for Gloria, seven for Gregory. An
experienced editor, Sceptre, steppe	ed in and ordered the artic	cle to be renamed. The decision was
appealed, and an	concluded that Scept	re had made a tough call that was
ultimately reasonable. On the bigg	gest social-media sites, suc	ch a decision might have descended
into endless In	stead, everyone has respe	cted the outcome and moved on. The
article hasn't been touched in five n	months.	
(9) Exactly how these deliberations	s play out is different from	article to article, but what's changed
is that Wikipedia is no longer autor	matically	the decision to a judgment of the
past. Wikipedia's editors have begi	un grappling with tough, ε	even existential questions that might
have traditionally been the	of historians i	rather than encyclopedias.
(10) There has been an attempt to i	interrogate understanding	s of the past by renaming the articles
about a series of places whose na	mes contain squaw, includ	ding the California valley where the
1960 Winter Olympics were held.	On occasion, editors would	ld propose such a move, noting that
squaw is considered a	against Native Am	ericans. Others would say that as an
encyclopedia meant to be helpful t	o people, Wikipedia shoul	d use the most common name. "The
Olympic Games of Squaw Valley" ar	rein th	ne past, so how can the name "Squaw
Valley" be removed?		
		nt said it would begin the process of name the article about the California
(12) Wikipedia has long represente	ed a fundamentally unique	e form of information production—it
isn't based, or t	top-down like Britannica. '	That's not to say that it's perfect; the
site has all the secret hierarchies, o	obscure rules, and confusion	on we'd expect. At times, it has been
		dits, what it means to be a Wikipedia
editor is changing too. By wading in	ıto factual	instead of deferring to secondary
sources, editors have assumed a	a new level of authority	The results will be choppy and
; proposals for t	tweaks will come from ord	linary readers and editors who have
been moved by offense, and question	ons will be decided throug	gh deliberation, often with great self-
seriousness.		
(13) After all, these small decision	s do have real consequen	ces. Wikipedia results spread across
the internet, often influencing wha	t we think of as reality. Inc	leed, Google "Squaw Valley," and you
	-	gest the question "Does Squaw Valley
still exist?," which it answers with	a Wikipedia	explaining that it remains but
that the name has been changed "d	lue to the derogatory	of the word 'squaw.'"

2. 阅读文章后,请用英语回答下列问题。
(1) What is the major change that Wikipedia editing has undergone in recent years?
(2) According to the article, did the breakthrough idea of Wikipedia become its bigge vulnerability?
(3) According to paragraph 12 and 13, what are the influences of the change of Wikipedia edits'

精读(1)

The Culture Wars Look Different on Wikipedia

The site is tackling more controversial edits, the results of which can reverberate across the internet.

(1) For more than 15 years, Wikipedia discussed what to call the third child of Ernest Hemingway,

a doctor who was born and wrote books as Gregory, later lived as Gloria after undergoing gender-

affirming surgery, and, when arrested for public disorderliness late in life, used a third name,

Vanessa. Last year, editors on the site finally settled the question: The Gregory Hemingway article

was deleted, and its contents were moved to a new one for Gloria Hemingway. This would be her

name going forward, and she/her would be her pronouns.

(2) Wikipedia's billions of facts, rendered as dry prose in millions of articles, help us understand

the world. They are largely the brain behind Siri and Alexa. They have been integrated as official

fact-checks on conspiracy-theory YouTube videos. They helped train ChatGPT. So, unsurprisingly,

when you search Google for "Gregory Hemingway," it follows Wikipedia's lead: You are told about

Gloria instead.

(3) In Wikipedia's early days, the question of what to call Gloria Hemingway would have been

treated as a quick mission to locate a fact in established publications such as *The New York Times*.

Joseph Reagle, a Wikipedia expert at Northeastern University, told me the site has an inherent

"conservatism," faithfully reporting whatever secondary sources say about a subject.

(4) But in recent years, something has begun to change. Wikipedia's editors are no longer simply

citing dated sources; instead, they are hashing out how someone would want to be understood.

But even though these deliberations touch on some of the most controversial issues around—and

reach conclusions that reverberate far beyond Wikipedia's pages—they are shockingly civil and

thoughtful for the internet today.

(5) The breakthrough idea of Wikipedia was supposed to be its biggest vulnerability. "The

encyclopedia anyone can edit" threw open the gates to whoever had something to contribute,

turning Wikipedia into one of the most visited websites on the internet. But who was to trust

something "anyone" may have written? The site definitely has inaccuracies; any student working

on a research project has gotten a spiel about how Wikipedia will lead them astray.

(6) Of course, only a tiny percentage of Wikipedia's visitors actually take up the offer to contribute.

There are campaigns to draw in new editors, especially given that the existing ones skew heavily

white and male, but the most reliable motivation for getting involved seems to be the urge to fix

something wrong as opposed to create something new. Articles typically start off small and stubby,

perhaps even inaccurate, and are steadily improved and corrected.

精读(1)练习

1.	请翻译下列表达。				
	在产生巨大反响 充分讨论			商议、深愿	
(5)	使某事向某人开放		_ (6)	误导某人	
(7)	使某人参与		_ (8)	而不是	
2.	请翻译下列原文句子。				
(1)	In Wikipedia's early d treated as a quick mis <i>Times</i> .				
(2)) But even though the around—and reach co shockingly civil and th	onclusions that rever	berate	far beyond	

3.	请运用括号中的表达写出了	下列旬子。
J.	相处用油与油料及当山	1.21.11

(1)	维基百科是全网浏览量最大的网站,它的特点是人人都可以参与编辑,但正是这个突破性的想法成了它最大的弱点。(most-visited, feature, breakthrough, vulnerability)
(2)	经过几天的讨论,百科全书的编者们终于就如今显得过时的内容达成一致,并删除了一些可能会误导读者的不实描述。(deliberation, dated, astray)

精读(2)

(1) The desire to fix something wrong—in this case, articles that have not kept up with the times—is meant to play out on an article's "Talk page," a companion page dedicated to discussing edits. Take the debate over Gregory versus Gloria. Last February, Hemingway's Talk page fielded a proposal on what name to use. There was a week of debate, long discussions in which a dozen or

so editors grappled with how Hemingway would have wanted to be perceived.

(2) The discussion ended with a hung jury: seven editors for Gloria, seven for Gregory. An experienced editor, Sceptre, stepped in and ordered the article to be renamed. The decision was appealed, and an administrator concluded that Sceptre had made a tough call that was ultimately reasonable. On the biggest social-media sites, such a decision might have descended into endless mudslinging. Instead, everyone has respected the outcome and moved on. The article hasn't been touched in five months.

(3) Exactly how these deliberations play out is different from article to article, but what's changed is that Wikipedia is no longer automatically outsourcing the decision to a judgment of the past. Wikipedia's editors have begun grappling with tough, even existential questions that might have traditionally been the domain of historians rather than encyclopedias.

(4) There has been an attempt to interrogate understandings of the past by renaming the articles

about a series of places whose names contain squaw, including the California valley where the

1960 Winter Olympics were held. On occasion, editors would propose such a move, noting that

squaw is considered a slur against Native Americans. Others would say that as an encyclopedia

meant to be helpful to people, Wikipedia should use the most common name. "The Olympic Games

of Squaw Valley" are embalmed in the past, so how can the name "Squaw Valley" be removed?

(5) In September, when the federal government said it would begin the process of officially

scrubbing squaw from place names, a proposal to rename the article about the California valley

succeeded. Case closed.

(6) Wikipedia has long represented a fundamentally unique form of information production—it

isn't credentials based, or top-down like Britannica. That's not to say that it's perfect; the site has

all the secret hierarchies, obscure rules, and confusion we'd expect. At times, it has been a vector

of misinformation. But as the site takes on thornier edits, what it means to be a Wikipedia editor

is changing too. By wading into factual dilemmas instead of deferring to secondary sources, editors

have assumed a new level of authority. The results will be choppy and contradictory; proposals

for tweaks will come from ordinary readers and editors who have been moved by offense, and

questions will be decided through deliberation, often with great self-seriousness.

(7) After all, these small decisions do have real consequences. Wikipedia results spread across the internet, often influencing what we think of as reality. Indeed, Google "Squaw Valley," and you don't see the term at the very top. Google does, however, suggest the question "Does Squaw Valley still exist?," which it answers with a Wikipedia excerpt explaining that it remains but that the name has been changed "due to the derogatory connotations of the word 'squaw.""

精读(2)练习

1. 请翻译下列表达。

(1)	与时俱进	 (2)	专用于的	
(3)	诽谤、中伤 n.	 (4)	尽力解决	
(5)	使永垂不朽 vt.	 (6)	听从、顺从	
(7)	取得权力	(8)	等级制度 n	

2.	请翻译下列原文句子。
(1)	Wikipedia's editors have begun grappling with tough, even existential questions that might have traditionally been the domain of historians rather than encyclopedias.
(2)	The desire to fix something wrong—in this case, articles that have not kept up with the times—is meant to play out on an article's "Talk page", a companion page dedicated to discussing edits.
3.	请运用括号中的表达写出下列句子。
(1)	关于跨性别者是否能够参加奥运会的讨论尚未得出结论,而被认为创造了一个魔法世界的 J·K·罗琳却因疑似是"恐跨性别者"陷入了批评之中。(a hung jury, perceive sb. as descend into, transphobic)
(2)	通过允许员工做决定,而不是执着地使用自上而下的管理方法,公司恢复了活力,并在动荡的市场中取得了优势。(by instead of, top-down, choppy)
_	

写作练习

请按照课程视频要求完成相应写作练习。	

泛读文章

Are We in a Recession? Don't Ask Wikipedia

(1) The swirling controversy over how to define the term "recession" has now hit Wikipedia. After

partisans engaged in a furious editing duel of the relevant pages, Wikipedia suspended most

changes to the entry for "recession" as well as "business cycle." Depending on one's politics, the

decision represents either a last-ditch effort to preserve the site's neutrality or a caving to

ideological interests. Whichever side you're on, you should be glad the fight is being fought - and

confident that it will soon blow over.

(2) Although Wikipedia, one of the most visited sites on the web, repeatedly insists that its articles

should never be used as the sole source for any particular fact, the site's pages are increasingly

treated as authoritative in news articles and scholarly papers alike.

(3) The good news is that we've been down this road before.

(4) Locking Wikipedia pages to prevent partisan edits is nothing new. Joe Biden's entry is partly

locked after repeated episodes of what the site calls vandalism. So is Hillary Clinton's. So is Donald

Trump's page, which foes kept deleting in its entirety. And nobody will be surprised to learn that

the page designated "2021 United States Capitol Attack" is also partly locked. Fierce argument

rages even over what the page should be called.

14

- (5) Wikipedia's senior editors have also taken action when battles have erupted over issues other than electoral politics. In 2017, they locked Garfield's page (the cat, not the president) after a dispute over the cartoon character's gender exploded into "a 60-hour editing war." During Dave Gettelman's tenure as general manager of the New York Giants, edits to his page were suspended after vandalism by angry fans, one of whom altered Gettelman's job description to read "ruining" the team.
- (6) But if angry disputes and temporary suspension of editing are so common, why don't we remember them? It's because they always settle down.
- (7) We know this because social scientists, fascinated by Wikipedia's belief that we can successfully crowd-source even the most abstruse or technical knowledge, have spent years studying how the site is edited.
- (8) For example, researchers have long understood that Wikipedia edits tend to increase sharply in response to intense politicization of a current issue, as well as in response to other major social disruptions, such as the outbreak of disease. But no matter how large the initial flurry of Wikipedia alterations is when an event grabs the public's interest, over time the editing patterns regress to the mean.
- (9) On the other hand, although editing bots on Wikipedia engage in sustained and often destructive warfare, their influence may be waning. An analysis published in April 2022 reviewed all references added to Wikipedia articles through June 2019 and found not only a large upswing in sources denoted by such identifiers as ISBN or DOI, but also that the great majority of additions were made by human beings (that is, not bots) who were registered users (that is, not anonymous). In other words, no matter what fights are going on, the sourcing of actual facts seems to be getting better.

(10) In Wikipedia editing as elsewhere, the resistance lives. As the recent struggle over the

Unit 4

definition of recession reminds us, whatever one wishes to call the opposite sentiment lives as

well. The editors are volunteers. Some are experts, some are amateurs; some are calm, some aren't.

It's not surprising that major arguments sometimes break out, and can at times become petty and

vicious.

(11) But this inevitable truth shouldn't be discouraging. When knowledge is crowd-sourced, sharp

disparities of viewpoint should be considered something useful. A 2019 study in Nature Human

Behavior concluded that the best Wikipedia articles often result when the editors are politically

polarized - even when the articles in question are about not politics but science. After examining

the "talk" pages (where Wikipedians argue over content) the authors found that "ideologically

polarized teams engage in longer, more constructive, competitive and substantively focused but

linguistically diverse debates than teams of ideological moderates."

(12) Speaking of constructive, substantive, focused debate, where else do we find that online?

Perhaps lurking in all this data is a "median editor theory" under which articles will over time

move away from the extremes toward a consensus.

(13) It's unfortunate that the dispute over what constitutes a recession has grown so heated that

editing had to be suspended. But if history is our guide, cooler heads will soon prevail, Wikipedia's

entry will settle around a relatively neutral view, and those looking for a fight will move on to the

next newsy topic.

* 摘自彭博社 2022 年 8 月 2 日文章

16

泛读练习

(1) What does the author mean by saying "we've been down this road before"?
(2) According to the article, what are the research findings on Wikipedia's editing patterns and the results' reliability?
(3) According to the article, what is the belief of Wikipedia and why does it work?