

Writing Irataba: On Representing Native Americans on Wikipedia

Magnus Pharaos Hansen

ABSTRACT Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia that anyone can edit, is simultaneously an experiment in anarchic knowledge production and a realization of the long dream of modernity: storing all human knowledge. It is also a battleground for the politics of representation and for creating and circulating realities and “Wikialities.” I ethnographically describe how Wikipedians, most of whom are white Anglo-Americans, negotiate the representation of Native Americans as objects of encyclopedic knowledge and how the sins of our anthropological forebears come back to haunt us in this process. In 2015, I participated in the collaborative writing of the article on Irataba or Yaratav, who was an important leader of the Mohave people of California and Arizona in the late 19th century. This process brought representational dilemmas to the fore in the negotiation between the inadequacies of historical and anthropological knowledge and Wikipedia’s policies establishing how to authorize and re-represent narratives. These dilemmas point out to us, as 21st-century anthropologists, that we have a responsibility for being the stewards of the knowledge created by anthropologists past as well as for correcting their mistakes and guiding the global public of readers and writers when they make forays into our traditional territories. [*Wikipedia, representation of Native Americans, public anthropology, history of anthropology*]

RESUMEN Wikipedia, la enciclopedia en línea que cualquiera puede editar, es simultáneamente un experimento en la producción anárquica de conocimiento y una realización del largo sueño de modernidad: almacenar todo el conocimiento humano. Es también un campo de batalla para la política de representación y para la creación y circulación de realidades y “Wikialidades”. Describo etnográficamente cómo Wikipedistas, la mayoría de los cuales son blancos, angloamericanos, negocian la representación de indígenas de los Estados Unidos como objetos de conocimiento enciclopédico y cómo los pecados de nuestros antepasados antropológicos vuelven a atormentarnos en este proceso. En 2015, participé en la escritura colaborativa del artículo sobre Irataba o Yaratav, un líder importante de los Mohave de California y Arizona a finales del siglo XIX. Este proceso puso de relieve dilemas representacionales en la negociación entre las deficiencias del conocimiento histórico y antropológico y las políticas de Wikipedia para autorizar y re-representar narrativas. Estos dilemas nos señalan, como antropólogos del siglo XXI y como salvaguardas del conocimiento creado por antropólogos pasados, que tenemos una responsabilidad para corregir los errores de los últimos y guiar al público global de lectores y escritores cuando ellos hacen incursiones en nuestros territorios tradicionales. [*Wikipedia, representación de los indígenas de los Estados Unidos, antropología pública, historia de la antropología*]

According to historian Alfred L. Kroeber, dreams, or visions, are “the foundation of Mohave life . . . there is no people whose activities are more shaped by this psychic state.”^[6] Irataba is known in their culture for having had an ominous and important one. While still a youth, he dreamed that he would one day become chief of the Mohave, and that this period would be marked by what the *Dream Person* described as “strange things” that no one in his tribe had ever experienced. Irataba was instructed that he should to not fear change, for only with his courage could he become head chief of the Mohave.

—Wikipedia, February 17, 2015¹

The preceding quote appeared in the February 2015 version of the Wikipedia article about Irataba (ca. 1814–1874), who was one of the main leaders of the Mohave people in the 1860s. In its description of Irataba’s youth, the quote relies on a representational strategy that is common in literary narratives—that of prophecy and foreshadowing, to set up a narrative of predestination. In the context of the article, as it was written in February 2015, this motif was a part of a larger theme. Irataba’s stated predestination to become “head chief” supported another literary motif of imagined predestination, namely, that which leads to the vanishing of Native American peoples as they are absorbed into modernity. This motif is the classical theme of “Manifest Destiny,” which anthropologists have at times embraced and more recently criticized and rejected, but which nonetheless remains a salient theme in cultural representations of Native Americans. The passage starts with an appeal to authority. It quotes anthropologist A. L. Kroeber, although here described as a historian, as a way to legitimize the idea that Mohave people depend on dreams to make decisions about the future. Rather than engaging with the tradition of anthropological knowledge that Kroeber participated in founding, the author of this paragraph recruits Kroeber to authorize the problematic narrative of predestination. The second sentence describes Irataba’s meeting with a “Dream Person” and introduces the predestination motif. This sentence was cited to Frank Waters’s (1993) fictionalized retelling of the lives of Native American leaders. Today this passage no longer appears in the article nor does the predestination narrative theme.

In this article, I describe the process of “writing Irataba.” The title refers to the process of writing the Wikipedia article titled “Irataba.” But metaphorically it also alludes to the historical process through which the living person Irataba was reduced to a written memory found in historical accounts. It is intended as a reminder that any process of representation is selective and always involves a degree of retrofitting the facts to a narrative arc that is at least partly pre-established.

Producing academic knowledge of Native American peoples has historically been almost exclusively the domain of the discipline of anthropology (Starn 2011). In spite of the many well-documented shortcomings of anthropological engagements with Native Americans, anthropologists have developed specialized perspectives, theories, methods, and strategies of representation to handle that task. Today, many

of these methods are used by indigenous anthropologists to produce representations of their own cultures. While today Native American scholars have better possibilities of raising their own voices within the academy and in the public debate, this was not historically the case, and for some periods Native voices are entirely absent except in the reports of anthropologists. Hence, I would argue that in spite of the shortcomings of early 20th-century salvage anthropology and its problematic alliances with agendas of settler colonialism at the time, anthropological accounts are often the most nuanced and culturally sensitive that exist for the period before the mid-20th century and also the most likely to include Native American perspectives.

Using the representation of Irataba as a case, I seek to show that on Wikipedia, knowledge originating from the discipline of anthropology is likely to be misrepresented in the absence of participation of specialists.

As a discipline, anthropology has specialized in providing the public debate with perspectives from peoples and places that might not otherwise be represented. The discipline also specializes in critically evaluating the political and ethical issues regarding how to represent those perspectives without incurring the fallacies of ethnocentrism. An audience of mainstream consumers of knowledge about minorities, however, tends to approach minority issues from the majority perspective, being relatively uncritical of sources that reproduce the biases of the mainstream view. They may even privilege perspectives that reproduce those biases and marginalize those that do not. As I will show, this risk is particularly present within Wikipedia because of the ideology of knowledge that the encyclopedic project adopts, which is focused on the representation of “facts” as verified by “reliable sources.” Taken together, these factors mean that unless Wikipedia has active participation of anthropologists or minority editors with training in accessing and representing knowledge about their culture in an academic manner, the encyclopedia is likely to systematically misrepresent minorities and exclude their perspectives. Such a misrepresentation will of course be damaging to the people whose lives, histories, and cultures are misrepresented, but ultimately it will also hurt anthropology itself if the discipline does not succeed in establishing itself as a source of authoritative knowledge about topics within its sphere of interest. If we as anthropologists believe that a hundred years of discussing how to understand and represent minority perspectives in writing has produced any insights on how best to do that—or perhaps at least some insights on how not to do it—then it is our professional responsibility to put those insights into use on platforms such as Wikipedia.

THE SUM OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE: THE IDEAL AND REALITY OF WIKIPEDIA

Wikipedia brands itself as “the encyclopedia that anyone can edit,” and its founder, Jimmy Wales, has stated that its goal is to be an online repository for “the sum of human knowledge.” This goal is to be achieved through “crowdsourcing,”

a collaborative process in which Internet users themselves contribute knowledge for consumption.

There is already a body of ethnographic studies of Wikipedia. Most of them study Wikipedia as phenomenon, as an organization, as a community of practice, as an Internet platform, as an element in the open access movement, or as an encyclopedic source of knowledge (see, e.g., Jemielniak 2014; O'Sullivan 2012; Reagle 2010). These works tend to pose Wikipedia's success as a paradox: How is it possible that volunteer amateurs can build one of the world's largest repositories of knowledge? To solve this paradox, these studies have focused on the social processes, values, and organizational structures that make Wikipedia "work." Dan O'Sullivan (2012) argues that Wikipedia is a new community of practice, which, enabled by the technological platform of the Internet, allows for new ways of sharing knowledge. Joseph Reagle (2010) poses that there is a powerful force in the community's positive value set that averts the risk that collaboration may spiral from productive forms of disagreement and conflict of opinion into destructive forms such as personal vendettas, power struggles, and name calling. Dariusz Jemielniak (2014), himself a longtime Wikipedia editor, describes in detail the everyday practices of Wikipedia and the ways that they are negotiated between the ideals of policy, the requirements of making the project work, and the social dynamics of editors with diverse viewpoints. Rather than focus on the project's social processes and organizational structure, or on explaining "why Wikipedia works," in this article I focus on an area in which Wikipedia currently does not work. I contend that in regard to the representation of minority topics, perspectives, and knowledges, Wikipedia's philosophy of knowledge, its preselected base of volunteer editors, and its organizational processes and values produce a systemic failure—one that I argue can only be remedied by extending the editor base to include experts specializing in representing such perspectives.

In addition to being a community of practice (O'Sullivan 2012), Wikipedia is also a hypertextual medium.² Each article contains links to other Wikipedia articles and to other texts online and offline. These links associate texts with each other in order to produce an encyclopedia as a hypertext; furthermore, links perform different functions in the Wikipedia text. They may authorize statements, produce "facts," and selectively draw in other voices from outside the article itself. In this way, an article does not merely represent already existing knowledge but also reconfigures it by connecting otherwise disconnected texts into a new, highly selective, context.

In theory, it is true that "anyone can edit" and write articles for the encyclopedia, because the only requirement for contributing is to be in possession of the basic technology to access the platform: a computer with an Internet connection and a sufficient degree of Internet literacy—as well as the time, interest, and self-confidence. In practice, however, these requirements rule out a substantial portion of the world's population and hence exclude the portion of

human knowledge to which those demographic groups might have privileged access. This structural exclusion of certain demographics and their concerns, interests, and knowledges is what Wikipedia refers to as "the systemic bias," a widely recognized problem. The problem of systemic, as well as deliberate, selection and exclusion of certain kinds of participation and certain kinds of knowledge is inherent in the project's design.

HOW ARTICLES ARE WRITTEN ON WIKIPEDIA

Anyone can start an article on Wikipedia, organizing its basic structure, selecting the sources on which it is to be based, choosing images, and writing the first draft. Subsequently, anyone else who has an interest in the article's topic can edit and change it in any way they see fit. Any individual who makes a change to an article is considered a "Wikipedia editor." Often an editor makes a single edit, changing a piece of information, correcting grammar, adding a link or a reference to a text they have read, or vandalizing an article, and then never edits again. At other times, editors take such an interest in the process that they decide to spend large amounts of time creating new articles, editing articles already written, and improving articles to continuously higher standards of quality. Such editors, who invest time, effort, and identity in editing the encyclopedia, are often called "Wikipedians," and they constitute the main community of practice and discourse that drives and organizes the encyclopedia. Editor demographics are not well known, but a 2009 survey showed a significant overrepresentation of relatively well-educated males in the age group 23–30, and the drastic underrepresentation of women is well known.³ There is no statistical information about the race or ethnicity of editors, but it is a fair assumption that the white, Anglo-American community is overrepresented and that most minorities, including Native Americans, are underrepresented. Currently 315 Wikipedia editors self-identity as Native American by labeling their user page with the category "Native American Wikipedians." Most of these accounts, however, are not active or do not edit articles related to Native American issues.

To facilitate the collaboration between editors with a wide range of perspectives, interests, and knowledges, Wikipedia employs a system of values, as well as both formal and informal policies, and has a relatively flat hierarchy in charge of enforcing them. The main value set is democratic and focuses on deliberation and consensus as the generators of collective decisions. Formal rules govern how to register, use accounts, and edit entries. Informal policies, or guidelines, govern the way that disputes and conflicts between editors can be resolved. Conflict resolution ideally takes place by getting more editors involved in the discussion to help build a consensus but also sometimes requires hindering problematic editors from causing disruption. All this takes place on the discussion pages connected to each article.

To motivate the production of high-quality content, Wikipedia also has several processes of internal peer review.

Editors can nominate an article that they are working on for a review by other editors, who will evaluate its compliance with certain criteria. If the article passes the benchmark for a set of criteria, it can either be awarded the status of Good Article (GA) or Featured Article (FA). In addition to establishing a degree of quality control, the process provides editors with motivation to produce better articles, because a certain prestige accrues to users with the ability and dedication required to write articles that pass peer review. GA status is achieved through a review in which a single volunteer editor determines if the article follows basic policies for article quality. The more prestigious FA status requires a thorough peer review in which an ad hoc group of editors forms a consensus about whether the article follows all of the policies and guidelines for article quality, including the style guide and whether it is written in “brilliant prose.” These are the processes for which specialist input is most valuable, because in contrast to academic peer review, the editors reviewing the articles are not generally topic experts. This means that sometimes reviewers limit themselves to following the editorial policies as an automatic checklist. They may judge the article’s formal appearance (grammar, style, formatting, citations, length) and thus ascertain its value without even bringing knowledge of the topic and its literature to bear on a critique of the content. This approach to reviewing emerges from Wikipedia’s own understanding of its primary task as being the distribution rather than production of knowledge; furthermore, its definition of *eligible knowledge* extends to any statement about a topic that can be supported with a citation to a sufficiently reliable published work.

VERIFIABILITY AND WIKIALITY

Among the most foundational policies of the project are those governing the creation of accurate and objective encyclopedic content. Wikipedia’s epistemological theory sees knowledge as a body of “facts” that can be transmitted directly from an original author to a reader, undisturbed by the Wikipedia editor who simply reproduces it. The policy regulating this transmission is the policy of verifiability, which requires that any piece of information inserted into the encyclopedia be “verifiable.” “Verifiable” means that “facts” should be supported by a citation to a “reliable source” or that, if a source for a given “fact” is not immediately supplied, it should be possible for other editors to find one. Unsupported information that is contested can be removed by any editor from any article, pending the provision of a reliable source to support it. “Original research”—the inclusion of knowledge that is the result of a personal investigation—is prohibited, because including this kind of research would threaten the transmission of “facts” and allow articles to be polluted by editors’ biases.

In practice, the policy on verifiability poses serious limitations on what counts as potentially encyclopedic knowledge: it cannot, for example, be personal experience or oral testimonies, traditional knowledge, and so forth, unless

such knowledge is published via a third-party medium that is considered a reliable source of factual information.

The verifiability policy is necessarily strict in order to avoid the risk of Wikipedia producing an alternative reality that is then circulated into the wider public sphere. There are many well-documented cases of the circulation of incorrect information from Wikipedia creating pockets of alternate reality with real-life consequences.⁴ This phenomenon, whereby something counterfactual is widely assumed to be true because Wikipedia says so, was famously dubbed “Wikiality” by satirist Stephen Colbert.⁵ Moreover, there is an actual threat of multifarious agendas maliciously using Wikipedia in attempts to manipulate reality, whether by promoting their ideologies, by praising themselves or their companies or products, or by smearing their enemies.

The result of the policy of verifiability is that Wikipedia does not really consider itself to be in the business of representation. Rather, what the project sees itself as doing is re-representing knowledge that has already been represented once. It does not consider its task to be knowledge production but, rather, knowledge distribution. In reality, however, due to the often-opaque selectivity involved in this “re-representation,” such a process is by necessity also creation of new knowledge—and with it, new realities. As long as Wikipedia is the first hit for almost any web search, Wikiality is effectively inescapable.

In the following, I describe and analyze a particular process of “re-representation” in which the possible contributions of anthropological insights in representation came to the fore. In the winter and spring of 2015, a number of Wikipedia editors, including myself, participated in writing the biographical article about the Mohave leader Irataba.

CONFESSIONS OF AN ANTHRO-WIKIPEDIOT

I have been a Wikipedia editor longer than I have been an anthropologist. Wikipedia was founded in 2003, and I registered an account in 2005, making my first edits trying to correct errors about Native American languages that I was then studying. This feeling of being able to correct misrepresentations of the aspects of the world that I know something about is what has kept me using countless hours contributing my knowledge and my writing to Wikipedia. Eventually, as an anthropologist, although my own research focus is in language and indigenous policy in Mexico, I branched out to take an interest in the representation of knowledge from all the four fields of anthropology. I am by now one of a small group of self-identified anthropologists among the ten to fifteen thousand regular editors of Wikipedia who often refer to themselves as Wikipedians—or, as some critics of Wikipedia would have it, “Wikipediots.” Here, then, I am writing about a community of which I am myself a member, with all the risks of one-eyedness and bias, as well as possibilities of insights, that autoethnography entails.⁶ Furthermore, the major argument that I am making here is that being a Wikipedia editor is something that should be normal and even common for anthropologists. I argue that representing

anthropological knowledge on Wikipedia, and in similar media platforms with a wide public reach, should be a concern and priority for anthropologists in general—in spite of the fact that this type of work is time consuming, unremunerated, and currently unacknowledged as a source of prestige or recognition within the academy.

REPRESENTING A MOHAVE LIFE: WRITING THE WIKIPEDIA ARTICLE ON IRATABA

Wikipedia's article on Irataba was created by an editor using the alias Rationalobserver on January 6, 2015. Rationalobserver was initially working exclusively from the work of Frank Waters (1993), through which the trope of prophetic vision as the pivot of Irataba's actions and tragic end was introduced. Waters's description of the vision is of course fictive; no primary source describes Irataba having such a vision. But when Rationalobserver cited Waters at the end of the paragraph, Irataba's vision was constituted as Wikiality, and Waters was the figure lending authority to this reality. After three days of editing on January 9, the article cited Waters 40 times and no additional sources.

The article at this point had grown from a mere paragraph to include the full biographical narrative, closely following Waters's narrative and even closely paraphrasing much of his language and literary tone. The manifest destiny motif came across clearly in one of the article's closing paragraphs, which stated:

Having returned from his trip to Washington, Irataba met with the Mohave still dressed in his major general's uniform, which was by now covered in medals. He wore a European-style hat and carried a long Japanese sword that was given to him during his visit. He told the tribe about his incredible journey and all the "new and strange things" he had seen, including the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, steam locomotives, granite skyscrapers that rivaled in height even the towering walls of the Mohave Canyon, and a seemingly endless population of white people. "So did my Great Dream foretell," he declared. "Now it has come true. With my own eyes I have seen it." Nevertheless, the Mohave did not believe what they had heard, and they mocked him and accused him of being the "biggest liar on the Colorado." [1993]

The version even reproduced direct quotes attributed to Irataba by Waters and ended with the mocking quote about the "biggest liar on the Colorado." By January 17, the article included several quotes from primary sources written by 19th-century explorers and journalists. It took on further aspects of the noble savage narrative, emphasizing Irataba's stature, "granitic" facial features, and gentle demeanor. As the article grew, it included photos, such as Timothy H. O'Sullivan's 1871 photo of two loincloth-clad Mohave men standing by the river. This photo is likely staged to show Mohave life in an original state of nature considering that another photo from the same visit shows the entire population of the Colorado River reservation all dressed in European clothing during the digging of a ditch (see Kelsey [2003] about the circumstances of O'Sullivan's Arizona photos). The article also included a section on the "Rose party massacre," describing vividly how "several white men were felled by arrows

and clubs, as the women frantically fled with their young ones to the protection offered by their covered wagons." It overstated the number of settler casualties (in reality, one) and entirely erased the 17 Mohave casualties. The article showed all the traits of having been written from a mainstream white U.S. perspective, focusing on the agency and suffering of white settlers and soldiers while stereotyping Native Americans. The representation of Irataba was more that of a one-dimensional literary character than of a living person. The focus on the Mohave's attack on the settlers (in which Irataba did not, in fact, participate) provided a convenient rationalization for the representation of Irataba as the "good, peaceful Indian" who, helped by a vision, saw the need to turn the Mohave away from their violent ways.

TRACING MANIFEST DESTINY: A HISTORIOGRAPHY OF REPRESENTATIONS OF IRATABA AND THE MOHAVE

Here I will step back a little and dig deeper into the sources to understand the origins of the predestination trope. To do this, I need to trace the representations of Irataba from their original sources all the way up to Waters and, ultimately, to the Wikipedia article.

The Mohave, or *Pipa Aha Macav* (lit. "river dwellers"), are an indigenous Nation of the Yuman language group, whose traditional territories ran along the Colorado River in California and Arizona. Today, their main communities are on the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona and the Fort Mojave reservation in California. Irataba, or Yara tav, is the best known of the Mohave leaders who were active in the period when the current political organization began and the division of the Nation into two distinct tribes located on separate reservations took place. This period, during which contact with settlers and the U.S. government and its representatives intensified, is the best described period in Mohave history; a surprising number and varieties of historical sources describe Irataba and the contexts in which he lived and acted.

Although the Mohave had experienced occasional contacts with Europeans since the 17th century, the first intense encounters between Mohave people and settlers, and the process of colonial subjugation, began in the 1840s and 1850s, as the United States claimed California and began settling it. The first accounts of the Mohave by U.S. explorers are from the 1850s when a series of expeditions explored the Colorado River and its canyons, trying to survey the terrain to find the best routes for transporting goods and settlers to California. The Mohave received these early expeditions amiably, and Irataba, along with another Mohave leader called Cairook, served as a guide for three of them—for Lorenzo Sitgreaves in 1851 and for Amiel Whipple and J. C. Ives in 1854 and 1858 (Miller 1972). All of these explorers kept diaries and logs and mention their experiences with, and impressions of, Irataba and the Mohave. Typically, explorers' descriptions of the Indians concern their status as possible aids or obstacles in their travels; further,

in the naturalist tradition of cataloguing “wildlife” in the explored zones, their descriptions of Mohave people tend to be concerned with their physical aspects, such as stature and facial features. In many of the descriptions of Cairook and Irataba, the tone becomes emotional, evoking stereotypes of noble savages, gentle giants, and silent people of the desert. In terms of status, Cairook and Irataba are frequently described as “chiefs,” and Irataba is often described as a “trusted subchief” of Cairook—a description that implies and assumes that the Mohave had a hierarchy of ranks similar to that the explorers knew from the U.S. Army. Anthropologists of course have learned to be wary of the colonial tendency to consider whichever Native person was involved in direct communication with colonial officials to be “the chief.” Frequently this tendency has in fact created chiefs and reconfigured the political organization of indigenous societies and their historical representation. There is certainly good reason to be skeptical of these explorers’ accounts of Irataba’s position, as well as their description of Mohave political organization. There is also some reason to think that he became a leading figure exactly because of his ability and interest in maintaining friendly relations with the settlers.

In 1856, all of America heard of the Mohave through reports of the release of 19-year-old Mormon Olive Oatman, who had lived as a Mohave after having been captured by Yavapais and sold to a Mohave family in 1851. Explorers noticed the European-looking girl among the Mohave and told them to hand her over—lest they get in trouble for holding a white woman as a slave, which is how the whites interpreted the living arrangement. Oatman had lived five years with her Mohave family, she spoke Mohave, and her face was tattooed in the style of an adult Mohave woman. In her earliest accounts of her stay among the Mohave, she in fact described her status in the family as that of an adopted child. When she arrived on the East coast she was a sensation, and Royal B. Stratton, a minister, wrote a correspondingly sensationalist account of her life in “captivity among the savages,” deliberately painting the Mohave as gruesome and bloodthirsty barbarians (Derounian-Stodola 1998). Later, when Oatman met Irataba, who visited New York, she reported speaking with him on friendly terms and fondly remembering her Mohave family (Mifflin 2008).

Another set of sources are from 1858 to 1859—years that were fateful for the Mohave. In 1858, a large group of settlers, the Rose-Baley party, decided to travel through Mohave lands, crossing the Colorado River at a place close to Needles, California, location of the main Mohave settlement. The Mohave were considered “peaceful,” and so the settlers did not fear traveling with 20 wagons, 100 settlers, and 400 heads of cattle through their territory. Little did they know that, at this point, after conflicts with Mormons and their Indian allies, the Mohave community was less inclined to allow passage for settlers. When the Mohave saw the settlers by the river cutting down valuable cottonwood trees, the group of leaders who wanted to protect Mohave territory

gained the upper hand and launched an attack on the wagon train. Only one of the well-armed settlers was killed in the attack, whereas 17 Mohave warriors fighting with bows and arrows were killed by gunfire. Another family of settlers, who were traveling separately, were also killed in an attack that was blamed on the Mohave but was probably carried out by an independent band of Hualapai and Mohave. The attack on the Rose-Baley party was widely reported in the media as a “massacre,” and the U.S. Army subsequently decided that the Mohave had to be “pacified” to establish safe passage for travelers through their territory (Sherer 1994). They sent a detachment of soldiers commanded by Colonel Hoffman, who dominated the Mohave after brief skirmishes. He ordered the Mohave to stop all hostilities, to allow free passage of all white Americans through their territory, and to give up a member of each of the six clans as hostages, including the “chief” who had ordered the attack on the settlers (Hunter 1979). Nine Mohave warriors—including Cairook, Irataba’s son Tekse thume, Irataba’s nephew Qolho qorau, and Tokwatha (with whose family Olive Oatman had lived)—offered themselves as hostages and were imprisoned at Fort Yuma to the south in territory of the Quechan (Yuma) people. The soldiers established a fort at the location, called Fort Mojave, garrisoned by Major Lewis Armistead. A year later, most of the hostages escaped with the exception of Cairook, who was killed in the attempt, and Armistead launched a revenge attack on Irataba’s house and bean field, killing a boy. This led to a daylong battle between the Mohave and soldiers, remembered by the Mohave as a massacre, in which a large number of Mohave were killed (Sherer 1994).

With the Mohave now “pacified” under the control of the garrison at Fort Mohave, it seems that Irataba stepped up as an advocate for peaceful and collaborative relations with the whites. The hereditary leader of the Mohave, Homoseh quahote of the Malika clan (the traditional leaders of the Mohave nation), seems to have rather preferred ignoring whites as long as possible (Sherer 1965, 1966, 1994). The Mohave came within the authority of the superintendent of Indian Affairs of Arizona territory, Charles Debrille Poston, who seems to have worked closely with Irataba and considered him the general political representative of all of the Mohave (Caylor 2000). Poston put Irataba in contact with prospectors and miners who employed him as a guide, and they in turn arranged for Irataba to travel to Los Angeles and San Francisco and, later, to Washington, DC, and New York. Here, the media reported on Irataba’s visits. In Washington, he met President Lincoln; he was interviewed by anthropologists and photographed and treated as a celebrity. News coverage from this period also draw on the “noble savage” trope, describing his size, physical features, and quiet demeanor. They relished at the oddity of Irataba dressed in European clothing and carrying a samurai sword and a silver cane. J. P. Curry, explorer and military man, writing in *Harper’s Weekly*, quoted semi-philosophical statements about city life and attributed them to Irataba: “Mericanos too much talk, too much eat, too much drink; no work,

no raise pumpkins, corn, watermelons—all time walk, talk, drink—no good.” Phrased in stereotypical “Injun English” register (Meek 2006), the Irataba character represented here voiced what was probably Curry’s own critique of modern city life, lending it moral authority.

When he returned, Irataba found Poston determined that the best option for the Mohave would be to move to a reservation near Parker, Arizona, where he argued they could have an irrigation system and establish intensive agriculture. Poston convinced Irataba to advocate among his people that the Mohave relocate to the new reservation, and in 1865 a large group of Mohave followed Irataba south to what is today the Colorado River Indian Reservation. This caused the Mohave nation to split, as most stayed at Fort Mojave under the leadership of Homoseh quahote. The Colorado River reservation never received the irrigation system promised by Poston and turned out to be a harsh home for an agricultural people (Caylor 2000). Nonetheless, the southern tribe kept Irataba as their leader, and he continued to represent them in negotiations with the whites and in relations with other tribes until his death in May 1874, when he was replaced by his nephew Qolho qorau.

Newspapers occasionally reported on Irataba over his last decade. In 1867 news reported a defeat in a conflict with Paiutes, claiming that Irataba had been taken captive, stripped of his military uniform, and sent home naked and beaten. In 1872, he was involved in a “trial” against a group of Yavapai who were accused of attacking a stagecoach at Wickenburg. Irataba was coerced by the General George Crook to testify against the leader of the Yavapai, Ohatchecama, damaging the otherwise good relations between Mohave and Yavapai (Braatz 2003) (Figure 1).

At his death, the funeral rituals were reported as far away as in Omaha, Nebraska, with claims that the mourning was so intense that the Mohave burned down their own village as part of the ritual. In each of these cases, it is clear that the report is intended to serve as a humorous account of the exploits and excesses of the savages out West. Each of the depictions have a core of factuality: for example, Irataba did have a conflict with the Paiutes described also by Irataba’s granddaughter, Tcatc, who stated that he gave his uniform away as a peace offering (Devereux 1951), and the Mohave funeral ritual was elaborate and included burning of the deceased’s belongings (Stewart 1947). Newspapers cast Irataba and his people as comical entertainment for city dwellers. When Poston died in 1902, a friend of his published one of his reminiscences about Irataba. It related that while Irataba was away from the reservation, Poston received a photograph taken of him in Washington that he posted at the agency for the Mohave to see. The Mohave, however, thought that the photograph meant that Irataba was dead and proceeded to divide his belongings between his relatives. When Irataba returned, his belongings and wives were dispersed, and he was effectively homeless. Whether or not this story has a grain of truth to it as well is hard to say, but it clearly follows the same smug depiction of Irataba



FIGURE 1. Photograph of Irataba (right) and Yavapai leader Ohatchecama (left), taken by Carlo Gentile in 1872, probably at Fort Date Creek, Arizona. The occasion of the photo was a trial against Ohatchecama’s band of Yavapai, who were accused of attacking a stagecoach in Wickenburg. Irataba and Ohatchecama had previously been friends, but this photo marks the end of their friendship, as Irataba was coerced to give testimony against Ohatchecama. Sensing deceit, Ohatchecama made an escape back to his people, despite sustaining gunshot and bayonet wounds. He considered Irataba a traitor and reportedly vowed to kill him. The photo is held by the Library of Congress Photograph collection with the call number LOT 13024. The full photo page can be viewed at <http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/97516997/>.

and the Mohave as superstitious fools with no understanding of how the world really works.

In the early 20th century, the Mohave became the subject of attention by anthropologists. A. L. Kroeber worked at the Fort Mojave reservation, collecting oral histories and mythological narratives, ethnographic information about dreams and kinship organization, and other of the topics of anthropological interest at the time (Kroeber 1902). Through interpreters, Kroeber interviewed Chooksa homar, an elderly warrior who had participated in many of the events surrounding the subjugation of the Mohave (Kroeber and Kroeber 1965). Leslie Spier worked on Mohave ethnology in the 1930s to 1950s, but his work was focused on understanding the deep culture history of the Yuman-speaking peoples, and he wrote little on politics or contact with the settler state

and did not mention Irataba (Spier 1933, 1953). Later, at the Colorado River Reservation, French ethnographer George Devereux did work in sexual and psychological anthropology, working from a largely Freudian theoretical framework. Devereux also interviewed Irataba's granddaughter Tcatc (Devereux 1951). In the 1950s and 1960s, anthropologist Lorraine Sherer worked with members of the Fort Mojave tribe, particularly Frances Stillman. She collected oral histories and described the political organization of the tribe. Sherer produced counternarratives to the prevalent tales of the Mohaves as savages whose "massacre" on the settlers led to their demise as an independent nation. She also clarified the description of their political organization and clan system. She focused on establishing the fact that Homoseh quahote (the ancestor of one of her informants Gwegwi nuor) was not a usurper of power who emerged among the Northern Mohave in opposition to Irataba, such as he comes across in official accounts by the U.S. military. Rather, in Sherer's account, as leader of the Malika clan Homoseh quahote was the Mohave Nation's hereditary leader, and Irataba, of clan Neolge, was more of a situational, or elected, leader.

Clifton Kroeber, son of A. L. Kroeber, published an account of Mohave Nationalism describing Irataba and the series of events in which he participated up to the establishment of the reservations as a deliberate effort of political agency—to maintain the political unity of the Mohave nation. He also edited and published his father's interviews with Chooksa homar, an account in which Irataba stands as a strong voice of peace in the relations between Mohave and the whites as well as with other tribes. In contrast to the accounts by explorers, soldiers, and journalists, anthropological accounts focus on accessing the Mohave people's perspectives on their own colonization, on ascribing them agency in the process, and on correcting erroneous views of the Mohave already in circulation.

FROM WOODWARD TO WATERS TO WIKIPEDIA: SELECTING THE WRONG SOURCES

The history just presented was not the one found in the earliest versions of the Wikipedia article, which built on Frank Waters's chapter on Irataba in his 1993 book, *Brave Are My People*. This book is one of two semifictionalized accounts of Irataba's life written for a popular audience published in the late 20th century (see Deloria 1993 on Waters's life and work). The other is that of Fulsom C. Scrivner (1970). These works in turn both rely mainly on two articles by archeologist Arthur Woodward (1938, 1953) that also tell Irataba's life as a tragedy ending with denunciation by his own people as "the biggest liar on the Colorado." Waters adds another layer to the prophetic motif by inventing a description of how Irataba first dreams of the city as a young man, then pursues his dream in friendly relations with white people, which takes him to the city, and finally how, when telling his people of the city, he is discredited and ostracized as a liar. Here Waters clearly draws on the literary trope of the

Indian life as a vision quest, found also in Henry Longfellow's *Hiawatha* (1899). The trope of Native American prophecy is also found prominently in Waters's more famous work, *Book of the Hopi* (1969), which made him a favorite among "New Age" minded Euro-Americans who tend to approach Native Americans via the Noble Savage stereotype (Geertz 1983). Scrivner's account follows the same pattern and, as is the case for Waters's books, seems to build mostly on Woodward's work. The authors of these popular works likely chose to use Woodward as a source because he frames his account as a biography of Irataba whereas the anthropological accounts extant at the time (Devereux 1939; Kroeber 1902; Kroeber and Kroeber 1973; Sherer 1966; Stewart 1947, 1969) only describe Irataba obliquely while providing a more general overview of the social and political history of the Mohave people.

Arthur Woodward's 1953 article in *Plateau* (the journal of the Northern Arizona Museum), "Irataba: Chief of the Mohave," mostly summarizes Irataba's life using the historical primary sources of journalists, explorers, and officials.⁷ Woodward did use the testimony of Tcatc published by Devereux, but he apparently saw it as his mission to correct the positive bias he saw as inherent in her account of her grandfather. As do the news articles, Woodward uses Irataba as a tragicomic character who rises to power through his friendly demeanor and good relations with the whites but who is transfigured by his visit to the East Coast. Following his return to the tribe, he becomes at once comical, the Indian who thinks he's European, and a Cassandra trope who knows that European modernity is on its way but whose people do not believe him. The quote calling Irataba "the biggest liar on the Colorado" is also included by Woodward, who gets it from the obituary of Irataba in the *Prescott Miner*, an Arizona newspaper. Describing Irataba as "the last independent chief of the Mohave," Woodward also seems to misunderstand the political situation caused by the split of the tribe. He interprets the fact that Homoseh quahote (or in English rendering, Sick-a-hoot) is cited by some sources as a Mohave chief as evidence that Irataba's influence was waning rather than as a sign of distinct leadership existing on the two reservations. Woodward also describes Irataba's "decline" to be the result of the Mohave disbelieving his accounts of Western superiority. Nevertheless, it must have been exactly on his return from the East Coast that Irataba's political influence was at its height because he was able to lead 800 Mohave onto the Colorado River reservation. Woodward was, like Waters and the Wikipedia article that built on his work, unable to see Irataba as a person within a politically complex historic context, instead turning him into a stock character in the easier narrative of "manifest destiny" and the "vanishing race." In doing this, they could rely on the sensationalist, populist, and ultimately highly racist accounts of 19th-century newspapers. If any of them had engaged seriously with the anthropological work of A. L. Kroeber (available to Woodward), Clifton Kroeber, or Lorraine Sherer (available to Waters), all of which provide a more nuanced account of

the Mohave and of Irataba's historical context, they very likely would have produced different stories.

WRITING ON: IRATABA REWRITTEN

Up until this point, the Wikipedia article had been the work of a single author with only a few minor additions by other editors, but on February 12 the article was nominated to be a Good Article. The review passed easily on February 15, because the sole reviewer, using the screenname "Jaguar," made only a few comments regarding phrasings and style.⁸

However, the day after the successful review, another Wikipedia editor, using the signature SarahSV, looked at the article. She noted some of the odd aspects of the article, such as the direct quotes attributed to Irataba by Waters. She alerted Rationalobserver to the fact that Waters's book is semifictional and hence not a good source from which to document historical events. The following excerpt of their exchange shows how Rationalobserver, the original author of the article, responded to the concerns about the use of sources. Note that the indentation, like the time-stamped signatures of the editor following each comment, is the way that Wikipedia allows readers to track who is responding to whom in a long discussion thread.

Are you suggesting that Waters is not a reliable source? Vine Deloria, Jr. wrote the foreword, where he praises the book and Waters's work in general. Are *all* sources that do not cite their sources in the text or footnotes also unreliable? Rationalobserver (talk) 18:30, 16 February 2015 (UTC)

I am not aware of any sources that describe Waters's sourcing method for this book or any others, so how would I cite a section that describes that Waters used all the available primary sources when writing his biographical history of Irataba? Rationalobserver (talk) 18:37, 16 February 2015 (UTC)

Based only on snippet view, I wouldn't use his book as a source (but I might change my mind once I had access to it). I would use academic historians as far as possible (who usually cite their sources), and I would use the primary sources when appropriate. Ives's report is online here. I don't know how much has been written about the Mohave, but I assume historians explain where information about them comes from, and it would be helpful to introduce the article that way. I'll leave it there for now, and you can perhaps give it some consideration. I hope the feedback hasn't been too discouraging. I do intend it to be constructive, but I know (from my own experience!) that these things can be hard to digest. Sarah (SV) (talk) 18:53, 16 February 2015 (UTC)

This exchange led the original author to remove all citations to Waters in the article on Irataba, substituting them instead with citations to Woodward and to the newspaper articles cited by Woodward. Waters himself had used these same sources, and so the tragic narrative arc remained. In this case then, the use of sources was to authorize the narrative arc that had already been chosen. This choice of keeping the text but changing the citations, simply moving them one step further back in a citation chain, shows one of the basic ways that Wikipedia works. Citations are used to authorize statements, and if a citation is deemed "unreliable,"

the statement can still be kept, as long as it can be plausibly authorized by a different source. In this case, Waters's book had been correctly identified as unreliable because of the stylistic traits in its writing that gave away the fact that it was largely fictionalized. But no one had noticed that Waters was even further unreliable because it built on Woodward, who in turn built on 19th-century newspaper accounts written by white colonists who were highly biased and prejudiced against the Mohave. Even when reading Woodward's article, an anthropologically untrained reader may not recognize this problem, because Woodward writes as a professional academic, published in a professional journal, and cites news articles as sources just as any historian might.

Having replaced all citations to Waters with citations to Woodward, Rationalobserver immediately proceeded to nominate the article for the status of Featured Article. The FA review received comments from five additional editors, none of whom commented substantially on the narrative or the sources used but, rather, critiqued the quality of writing and issues of style and grammar, and ultimately the article failed to be promoted as FA mostly due to concerns about the "quality of the prose." Rationalobserver, laudably intent on improving the article, now nominated the article for an informal peer review, another way for an article to attract commentary from other editors.⁹

At this point, however, a group of editors who had participated in a simultaneous discussion about the Rose-Baley settler party, for which they had found Waters's book to be a problematic source, now turned their attention to the article on Irataba. Here they provided critical commentary on the contents as well as the use of sources. One of them identified many instances in which close paraphrases of Waters's language remained in the article, in spite of the fact that he was no longer cited.

Among these editors were two who had particular experience with writing on Native American-related topics and who, while not identifying as Native, clearly considered themselves to have a certain understanding of the politics of representation. They were concerned about the description of Irataba's vision and the claims about the role of dreams and visions in Mohave society, which might be seen as exoticizing. They also commented on the description of Irataba as "chief" or "subchief," which they felt to be a possible misnomer and potentially offensive given the title's frequent misuse by whites as a racial slur, and they noted frequent use of newspaper quotes describing Irataba's appearance and character in patronizing and objectifying ways. The question about Irataba's actual political status motivated them to look at how Mohave leadership was described in the anthropological sources and in turn led to a recognition of the complicated political situation between the two competing Mohave factions.

Meanwhile, an editor requested my input in relation to the pronunciation of Irataba's Mohave language name, contacting me through my user page. I stated that I didn't know of any source that would allow the reconstruction

of a Mohave pronunciation based on the variant spellings and that doing this would in any case be “original research.” While perusing the article and its discussion page, I noted the ongoing debates in the peer review about sourcing and representational issues and was enticed to participate.

Through the intervention in the peer review of this group of outside editors (whom I later learned were in fact monitoring Rationalobserver closely because they mistakenly suspected her of wrongdoing against one of them), new sources were brought into play. These sources included Sherer 1966, Kroeber 1902, Caylor 2000, and Mifflin 2008. Nevertheless, the discussion largely stayed at the level of specific phrases and expressions, and the article retained the overall narrative arc. Therefore, the wider representational issues remained unidentified, even though a handful of outside editors arrived who correctly identified high-quality sources and minutely and critically examined the article.

As I began reading the various sources, finding more online, I noted that two of the arguably most significant aspects of Irataba’s life, at least in terms of their significance for his own people, were missing: his negotiation of the Colorado River Reservation and the ensuing split between the Northern and Southern Mohave tribes. These events provided the key to understanding Irataba’s political role within the Mohave nation as well as his ambiguous legacy. This aspect of the narrative, however, was only found in the anthropological literature, specifically Kroeber 1965, Kroeber and Kroeber 1974, Sherer 1966 and 1993, and Caylor 2000. It was entirely lost in the tradition relying on newspaper sources, official U.S. documentation, and popular accounts such as Woodward 1938 and 1953, Scrivner 1970, and Waters 1993. Together with Rationalobserver and with the participation of several of the critical editors, I participated in restructuring the narrative of the article to avoid the shadow of the trope of Manifest Destiny. Instead, we refocused the article around the narrative of Irataba’s significance to the Mohave people—as a skilled political leader with the ambiguous legacy of having been instrumental in causing the split of the Mohave Nation and in founding of the Colorado River Indian Reservation.

WHY WRITING “IRATABA” REQUIRED ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Gradually, as I was rebuilding the article to include more of the anthropological perspective and trying to describe Irataba’s life in terms of his political importance to his own people, I began thinking about why the article had originally adopted the narrative of the Woodward tradition. Considering the choice of Waters’s children’s book as the main source, I surmised that the author who had been primarily involved in the development of the article throughout the process had no background in anthropology or history. Waters’s and Scrivner’s accounts were simply the most accessible for a general reader, who may find them in a local library. In contrast to these books, the anthropological

accounts were relatively inaccessible in different ways. First, none of them are about Irataba as such; they are all ethnographic and ethnohistorical accounts of Mohave society in general. This means that they would not be among the first that a person would uncover when searching for literature specifically about Irataba. Second, anthropology is not easy for nonanthropologists to read. Ethnographic works often do not provide a clear narrative that a reader can follow; rather, they present ethnographical data and discuss its importance in relation to different theories that vary according to the period in which they are written. They also do not generally focus on providing “facts,” which in the ideology of knowledge that many Wikipedians espouse, and which is implicit in Wikipedia’s own inherent idea of “knowledge,” is the main matter constituting an encyclopedia. Moreover, for a lay reader it is often unclear how to evaluate and select information from anthropological works. Not all anthropological knowledge of the past is equally valuable today. Often it has been critiqued and subsequently rejected or superseded by newer perspectives, and often it needs to be read critically (see, e.g., Murray [2009] critique of Devereux’s Freudian analysis of Mohave sexuality or critiques of Kroeber’s ethnographical methods and problematic ideology of relations between Europeans and Native Americans [Buckley 1988; Clifford 1989; Field 1999]). All these obstacles make it highly unlikely that a general reader-writer-editor on Wikipedia will be able to independently use anthropological literature to achieve a reasonable representation of its inherent knowledge. In contrast, the least anthropologically sound sources, such as 19th-century newspaper articles and popular semifictionalized accounts, are readily accessible through a simple Google search, and they provide the reader-writer-editor with what seems to be clear-cut “facts,” ready for integration into the narrative of a Wikipedia article.

Therefore, the basic task of adequately selecting and contextualizing literature for this kind of topic requires an anthropologist to act as a steward who can locate anthropological knowledge of the past and translate it into an “encyclopedic” text. We, as anthropologists, must assume the responsibility to continue reinscribing anthropological knowledge into new contexts such as that of Wikipedia. Moreover, we must translate it into a kind of representation that can be readily understood by the reading public while also being accepted as accurate by historians and as a reasonable and valid representation by the subjects themselves and their communities.

In contradiction of Wikipedia’s projections regarding the promise of crowdsourcing, it is simply not reasonable to assume that the kind of lay readers on which Wikipedia relies are able to write accurate and sophisticated accounts of complex topics such as cultural and political history and representation of minorities. It is one thing to write articles about comic book characters, hurricanes, Midwestern towns, or football teams, but the political and ethical stakes are so much higher when it comes to the online

representation of minority groups. My experience as an anthro-Wikipedian testifies to the difficulty that non-anthropologists of mainstream Anglo-American extraction seem to have in escaping ethnocentrism and achieving nuanced and accurate depictions of cultural minorities. One example is the fact that the Wikipedia article about “Indian massacres” was once a list of documented attacks by Native Americans on colonists, whereas no corresponding list of massacres perpetrated against Native Americans existed. Another is the article on the Natchez revolt, which in one version described only the Natchez massacre of French colonists without describing the reasons the Natchez finally revolted or the genocidal extermination campaign subsequently wielded against them by the French. Similar cases exist in the description of many Native peoples. They also frequently exist in Wikipedia entries on other social issues close to anthropology, such as race, ethnicity, gender, kinship patterns, and sexuality, wherein anthropologically problematic perspectives that are fashionable in the wider public are often left to stand uncontradicted.

In some cases, such as for medical articles and for biographies of living persons, also areas for which the stakes are high, the Wikipedia community has created a set of heightened standards for sourcing and verifiability. In the case of anthropology, such a strategy would be hard to enact, and it might well have the exact effect of excluding those sources that are closest to providing the perspective of the groups that are studied. To succeed, the encyclopedic representation of cultural minorities does seem to require the sort of ethical considerations in which contemporary anthropologists are trained.

Wikiality is real and powerful. Understood as an online hypertext, Wikipedia can be categorized as just another website full of distortions, superficial knowledge, and puerile ideas and be simply dismissed. But when understood as a generator of alternate realities that are reproduced and circulated in the global public sphere, it can still be roundly criticized but then is hard to dismiss. There is little to suggest that Wikipedia is going away or that its influence fueled by Google is going to wane. Rather, it is by now without doubt the primary source through which ordinary people across the English-speaking world access knowledges, which they subsequently integrate into their own pre-existing knowledge and act upon. In comparison, academic online encyclopedias published by academic presses are of only ephemeral significance to the reading public at large, because they are mostly inaccessible to ordinary Internet users without access to an academic library, and they will never figure high in a list of Google search results.

If the knowledge produced by anthropologists past and present holds any potential value to the world, then we need their texts and voices to be woven well into the intertextual fabric of Wikipedia. We can do this by participating as editors of Wikipedia ourselves and by supporting and empowering the members of the communities with whom we collaborate to do so as well. Furthermore, we can strive to

publish in forms that are more accessible for the laypeople who participate in the circulation of anthropological knowledge on Wikipedia and elsewhere. Doing this work may not count for much in a tenure file, but it will increase the relevance of the discipline of anthropology and perhaps even contribute to making the world more just and better informed.

Magnus Pharao Hansen *Department of Anthropology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02906, and Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, UCSD, La Jolla, CA 92093; magnuspharao@gmail.com*

NOTES

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the scholars who commented on the first draft of this article at a session on academia.edu: Anthony Webster, Willem de Reuse, Kimberly Lewis, David Wright-Carr, Samuel Russel, and Citlalin Xochime. Thanks are also due to the Wikipedia editors involved in writing the article on Irataba, especially those editing under the usernames Rationalobserver, Dr. Blofeld, SlimVirgin, Montanabw, and Victoriaearle. I would also like to thank Wilene Fisher-Holt, director of the Colorado River Indian Reservation Museum, for her interest and attention. Finally, I thank the four anonymous reviewers of *American Anthropologist* as well as Editor-in-Chief Michael Chibnik for their thoughtful comments and critiques, which have greatly improved this work. Any errors or misrepresentations that remain are my own responsibility. The work for this article was carried out while I was a fellow at the Center for U.S.-Mexican studies at UCSD and was further supported by a travel grant from the Anthropology Department at Brown University.

1. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Irataba&oldid=647473773>.
2. Within linguistic anthropology, the term *hypertext*, used to describe the way that Internet texts form a web of linked texts, would usually be replaced by the more theoretically precise term *intertextual matrix*, drawing on the theorizations of intertextuality by Silverstein and Urban 1996. To make this article more accessible to an audience of general anthropologists, I do not introduce these concepts, and in any case the word *hypertext* serves to underscore that Wikipedia and other crowdsourced online media represent a radical degree of intertextuality when compared to traditional print media.
3. See https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/foundation/a/a7/Wikipedia_General_Survey-Overview_0.3.9.pdf.
4. An example is the detainment in a Canadian airport of Turkish German sociologist Taner Akçam after an anonymous Wikipedian editing his Wikipedia biography described him as a terrorist (Jemielniak 2014:228n8).
5. The episode of show in which the word *wikiality* is coined can be watched here <http://thecolbertreport.cc.com/videos/z1aahs/the-word-wikiality>.
6. A note on Wikipedia as an ethnographic “field.” Online ethnography is by now well established, but Wikipedia’s interactional

platform is different from Facebook, Second Life, Twitter, or most other online fora—particularly because it never forgets. In principle, every interaction, every statement, and every tiny revision of every article is kept in the archived versions of Wikipedia articles and their associated “talkpages” that can be accessed by anyone through the “history” tab of each Wikipage. Even information that is removed or deleted can be found in the archives in this way.

7. A previous article about Irataba by Woodward published in 1938, also based on news accounts, was titled “Ireteba: Big Injun of the Mohave.” In it, the racist depiction is fully developed, with copious invented “Injun English” dialogue and other aspects of racist humor. Woodward briefly studied anthropology with Kroeber, which must have spurred his interest in the Mohave; why he ignores Kroeber’s publications and insights is puzzling.

8. The article version that passed the review as GA can be read here: <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Irataba&oldid=647262415>.

The GA review itself can be read here: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Irataba/GA1>.

9. The entire peer review may be read here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Peer_review/Irataba/archive1#.

REFERENCES CITED

- Braatz, Timothy
2003 *Surviving Conquest: A History of the Yavapai Peoples*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Buckley, Thomas
1988 Kroeber’s Theory of Culture Areas and the Ethnology of Northwestern California. *Anthropological Quarterly* 61(4):15–26.
- Caylor, Anne
2000 A Promise Long Deferred: Federal Reclamation on the Colorado River Indian Reservation. *The Pacific Historical Review* 69(2):193–215.
- Clifford, James
1989 The Others: Beyond the “Salvage” Paradigm. *Third Text* 3(6):73–78.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1993 *Frank Waters: Man and Mystic*. Athens, OH: Swallow.
- Derounian-Stodola, Kahtryn Z.
1998 The Captive and Her Editor: The CIPHERING of Olive Oatman and Royal B. Stratton. *Prospects* 23:171–192.
- Devereux, Georges
1939 Mohave Culture and Personality. *Journal of Personality* 8(2):91–109.
1951 Mohave Chieftainship in Action: A Narrative of the First Contacts of the Mohave Indians with the United States. *Plateau* 23(3):33–43.
- Field, Les W.
1999 Complicities and Collaborations: Anthropologists and the “Unacknowledged Tribes” of California. *Current Anthropology* 40(2):193–210.
- Geertz, Armin W.
1983 Book of the Hopi: The Hopi’s Book? *Anthropos* 78(3–4):547–556.
- Hunter, Leslie G.
1979 The Mojave Expedition of 1858–59. *Arizona and the West* 21(2):137–156.
- Jemielniak, Dariusz
2014 *Common Knowledge? An Ethnography of Wikipedia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kelsey, Robin E.
2003 Viewing the Archive: Timothy O’Sullivan’s Photographs for the Wheeler Survey, 1871–74. *The Art Bulletin* 85(4):702–723.
- Kroeber, Alfred L.
1902 Preliminary Sketch of the Mohave Indians. *American Anthropologist* 4(2):276–285.
- Kroeber, Alfred L., and Clifton B. Kroeber
1973 *A Mohave War Reminiscence, 1854–1880*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth
1899 [1855] *The Song of Hiawatha*. New York: Henry Crowell & Co.
- Meek, Barbara A.
2006 And the Injun Goes “How!”: Representations of American Indian English in White Public Space. *Language in Society* 35(1):93–128.
- Mifflin, Margot
2008 *The Blue Tattoo: The Life of Olive Oatman*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Miller, David H.
1972 The Ives Expedition Revisited: A Prussian’s Impressions. *The Journal of Arizona History* 13(1):1–25.
- Murray, Stephen O.
2009 The Pre-Freudian Georges Devereux, the Post-Freudian Alfred Kroeber, and Mohave Sexuality. *Histories of Anthropology Annual* 5:12–27.
- O’Sullivan, Dan
2012 *Wikipedia: A New Community of Practice?* Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Reagle, Joseph M.
2010 *Good Faith Collaboration: The Culture of Wikipedia*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Scrivner, Fulsom C.
1970 *Mohave People*. San Antonio: Naylor.
- Sherer, Lorraine M.
1965 The Clan System of the Fort Mojave Indians: A Contemporary Survey. *Southern California Quarterly* 47(1):1–72.
1966 Great Chieftains of the Mojave Indians. *Southern California Quarterly* 48(1):1–35.
- 1994 *Bitterness Road: The Mojave, 1604 to 1860*. Maiki, CA: Ballena.

Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban

- 1996 The Natural History of Discourse. *In* *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, eds. Pp. 1–17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spier, Leslie

- 1933 *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
 1953 Some Observations on Mohave Clans. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 9(3):324–342.

Starn, Orin

- 2011 Here Come the Anthros (Again): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America. *Cultural Anthropology* 26(2):179–204.

Stewart, Kenneth M.

- 1947 An Account of the Mohave Mourning Ceremony. *American Anthropologist* 49(1):146–148.
 1969 A Brief History of the Mohave Indians since 1850. *The Kiva* 34(4):219–236.

Waters, Frank

- 1969 *The Book of the Hopi*. New York: Ballantine.
 1993 *Brave Are My People: Indian Heroes Not Forgotten*. Foreword by Vine Deloria Jr. Athens, OH: Swallow.

Woodward, Arthur

- 1938 Irataba: Big Injun of the Mohave. *The Desert Magazine* 1(3):10–12.
 1953 Irataba: Chief of the Mohave. *Plateau*. 25(3):53–68.