



## Who sponsors Wikipedia?

Price System analysis from: [Technocracy technate information site](#)

Open source information Nov-2009 more

information [Knol information Technocracy technate](#)

[design](#)

Is Wikipedia/Wikimedia foundation funded by special interest groups? A list are major donors to Wikipedia below [Financial Reports Wikimedia Foundation](#)

[Alfred P. Sloan Foundation](#) ([Press release](#))

[Omidyar Network](#)

Stanton Foundation ([Press release](#))

[Arcadia](#)

[Richard Lounsbery Foundation](#)

[Open Society Institute](#) (George Soros founder)

Example of this type of influence and its perspective which is based on the Neo-classical economic/Price System approach:

### **"Economic Institutions, Behavior and Performance" -**

"The Foundation is developing a new program focused on the structure, behavior, performance, and regulation of firms, markets, and related institutions. Initially, this program will tackle issues associated with financial markets, regulatory mechanisms to improve market performance, health care financing and management, corporate governance, and energy markets." Source... [Alfred B. Sloan Foundation website](#)

Comment on, 'media literacy', a term which must include as part of its definition an understanding of how media works-, from where information comes from, and the method of presentation for content.

It isn't too difficult to conclude that a majority of media consumers are illiterate, at least in the sense that they don't understand the process that creates the information they consume.

And therein lies a danger: ignorance discourages skepticism and makes one vulnerable to manipulation. Further, it leads to decision making without rational standards.

Drawing lines between facts, beliefs, and opinions, encourages a healthy skepticism which is critical to rational thinking. And therein is a problem with Wikipedia, its process lacks the kind of standards that allow us to trust media content, even as its presentation format encourages you to trust it.

Therefore, a line must be drawn between Wikipedia and the presentation of factual material, in a way that is analogous to the line we draw between anecdote and scientific conclusion. The influence of financial contributors to Wikipedia connected to special interest groups also affects aspects of presentation. This would be most connected to economics and cultural articles for which large foundations have vested interests, and have contributed large amounts of money to Wikimedia. These large foundations supply Wikipedia with significant operating capital.

The special interest groups that fund Wikipedia no doubt have some influence in the presentation of information on Wikipedia. [Some basic facts on special interest groups.](#)

Conferring equal status on Wikipedia to that of accurate journalism?... doing so suggests to media consumers that they need not be skeptical of Wikipedia.

An example of a top notch peer reviewed topic edited encyclopedia? [About Encyclopedia of Earth](#)

Examples of media from E.o.E.

[Net Energy Analysis](#)

[N.RoegenEnergy and economic myths \(historical\)](#)

[Biophysical economics](#)

[Environmental and ecological economics](#)

[Neoclassical, institutional, and marxist approaches to the environment-economic relationship](#)

[Neoclassical economic theory](#)

[Soddy, Frederick](#)

[Lotka, Alfred James](#)

[Industrial ecology](#)

**Wikimedia Foundation** Board of Directors includes: Jimmy Wales (Chairman Emeritus) and Michael E. Davis (Treasurer). Wikimedia Foundation also enjoys the services of a former Board member, who remains a member of the Communications Committee of the Wikimedia Foundation and also chairs the Foundation's Advisory Board: Angela Beesley.

Contrast the above list of individuals with a list of key players at the for-profit **Wikia, Inc.**: Jimmy Wales (co-founder), Michael E. Davis (Treasurer and Secretary), Angela Beesley (co-founder and vice president for community relations)

[Wikimedia Foundation board](#)

### **What is the future of Wikipedia?**

Research, by Felipe Ortega, at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos in Madrid, found that tens of thousands of Wikipedia editors were no longer contributing - and were not being replaced.

Mr Ortega, who created a program analyzing the editing history of more than three million Wikipedia contributors, told The Times: 'If you don't have enough people to take care of the project it could vanish quickly.

'We're not in that situation yet. But eventually, if the negative trends follow, we could be in that situation.'

He said contributors 'don't feel the spirit of the first years'.

He added: 'The articles are very tightly controlled by others now, and that makes it hard to jump in and contribute.'

Andrew Dalby, author of *The World And Wikipedia*: Has said it was also becoming more difficult to contribute.

'There is an increase in bureaucracy and rules,' he said.

'Wikipedia grew because of the lack of rules. That has been forgotten.

[Volunteers Leave Wikipedia](#)

For a copy of this file [Who Controls Wikipedia? Price System Analysis](#)