

Fake news, a construction of reality

»You can only find truth with logic, if you have already found truth without it.«

G.K.Chesterton

While we generally accept evolutionary mechanisms on the biological level, level of nature (gene interaction and replication), it seems that for human nature/nurture evolution rarely comes into play. Public relations research is especially prone to avoiding cross fertilization of not only natural sciences, but also evolutionary theory and philosophy in the wider sense of the term. It is one of the aims of this paper to point to various fields of knowledge that not only could but should serve as an important mental tool for any PR practitioner, not to mention researchers. Since we are confined to a memetic world, as it is going to be proven later, there are no obstacles for researchers of any field in understanding the findings from other fields from the (necessary) perspective limited by his so far acquired discourse.

The main aim of this paper is to challenge the most widely accepted malicious nature and consequences of fake news. This paper does not limit fake news to media news, which were originally branded with that name, but to all instances of communication when some news/information is taken and defined as fake.

It is not the purpose of this paper to go deeper into the genealogy of the term, which is interesting because fake is mostly assigned to opinion leaders. When public anonymous would say something that would be defined as fake if uttered by Donald Trump, we call this a lie. Already this curious distinction points into a direction of this paper. We might not define a “lie” of an opinion maker as a lie, as we might unconsciously accept that opinion makers do not only communicate about truth, but they primarily construct reality. Politicians serve only as the most vivid examples, but the mechanisms explained in this paper apply to all fields of human activity.

Leaving origins aside, this paper focuses on the widespread notion that fake news is bad, and as such something that we as conscious people (and especially media) should eradicate to make this world a better place to live in. Such a notion rests on the intuitive notion that reality is simple, one dimensional, and can be objectively proven or falsified. Reality is in fact complex, multidimensional and cannot be neither proven nor falsified. It can only be lived.

What is even more interesting is that the fact that the term fake news has appeared recently induces the notion that also the behaviour that it describes is something fairly recent. It is partly due to the disassociation of fake from lie, but mostly due to the global catastrophic nature of intellectuals that always see reality of today as much worse than that of yesterday. This phenomenon was precisely explained by Steven Pinker (Pinker 2018). Intellectuals tend to see the past as bright, the present as dark and the future as hell. So, if fake is bad, then one should not find it in the past as much as today, and even more so in the future “if we don’t counteract”.

If one wants to be a critical thinker, then it is necessary to ask what a negation of fake news is. What is non-fake news? The common sense answer would be: Non-fake news/information

relates to something that really is, that really happened, to something that is reality. But if fake relates to reality, what is the reality that the truth should be truth about?

The method used in this paper is associative. Each of the seven steps briefly unveils one of the possible (possible=actual) drafts related to memes of reality and fake news.

The thesis is: The objective world (both as physical and memetic real) is at the same time auto creative (genetic evolution, post big bang evolution...) and impenetrable. The memetic world as an emergence of mind and consciousness is auto creative as well, but such an emergence is not subjective but intersubjective, meaning it is not objective. As already said, objectivity is impenetrable regardless of fact, that it is auto created and co-constructed.

What does that mean for truth, post truth and fake news?

First draft: Poiesis / Plato and Aristotle

Poiesis as a concept (meme) was widely elaborated on in Ancient Greece, especially by Plato and Aristotle. In its essence, the meaning is quite straightforward: “activity that brings something into existence, that did not exist before”.

It is important to keep this simple meaning in mind, while already in the very beginning a controversy entered this apparently straightforward meme. The fact that Plato considered physis as the result of poiesis, Aristotle took poiesis as mere reflection/imitation of physis. This controversy is still alive today, though reformulated many times through different newly developed concepts. The question whether mind creates matter or matter creates mind still persists to this day. It is not the aim of this paper to dig deeper into this subject. What is of interest for this paper is only that both Plato and Aristotle accept one sort of poiesis as non-controversial.

What is also interesting is that the most influential philosopher of all time, Aristotle, shifted the original meaning of poiesis from “creation as such” to mere poetry. Not that that would be his intention (who knows what his intention really was), but later interpretations dragged poiesis into the realm of art. What we now understand as poiesis is thus quite far from its original meaning that took poiesis as a principle related to all possible realities. Consequently, there is no surprise that a new term with almost the same meaning replaced poiesis in the midst of the 19th century and full elaboration in the 20th: emergence. Emergence is going to be put into the context of this paper later on.

What makes the legacy of Plato and Aristotle important for this purpose is the question of truth. According to Plato, truth (matter, objectivity) is created after the idea. According to Aristotle, on the other hand, poiesis reflects objectivity implying that better or worse reflections can co-exist. It is thus Aristotle that opened the option of news that is fake in relation to objective reality.

What is the nature of such reality?

Second draft: The Real / Jacques Lacan

There are many that entered the conundrum opened by idealists, like Plato, and realists or even materialists, like Aristotle. In both cases, dualism of matter and spirit is baffling. The great German philosopher Immanuel Kant was the one that once forever (at least it seemed so until recently) fixed the duality of "thing in itself" as something unknowable in contrast to "thing for us", perceived by us.

But Kant still did not really resolve this dualism for he thought that one should not assume the existence of a thing in itself as necessary since it is unknowable. Although there are many philosophers that dug into this subject after Kant, it was perhaps Jacques Lacan who precisely differentiated "the real" from "reality".

According to his writings and lectures, all perceivable phenomena emerge from the Real ("objet petit a" in Lacan terminology). The Real is impenetrable for humans, but at the same time real and objective. With that shift he strongly tied together the Real and reality albeit the former is inaccessible for us. The Real can only be "perceived" through symptoms, through reality; much alike to elementary particles as described by quantum mechanics, can only be perceived by traces they leave on detectors since it is impossible, in principle, to see them directly.

The conclusion that Lacan placed the agent of poiesis in physis as Aristotle, would be wrong. Physis is not the Real. Physis is already a symptom, reality. Reality according to Lacan is a result of poiesis/emergence. There is no basic difference between physical or psychical reality; both are emergencies.

Is real really impenetrable?

Third draft: quantum mechanics / by many

It is very difficult for the common mind to accept the impenetrability of real after a painful bump into the wall. If reality is "only" a symptom of something that we cannot grasp, what is the "bumped reality" when a head hits the wall?

Contemporary physics in a way proves Lacan's philosophical thesis. In search for the smallest particle of matter/energy, physicists found that what constitutes reality evades our everyday experience of reality.

Elementary particles or fundamental particles evade common perception of physical reality very much like Jacques Lacan's philosophical interpretation did. Among many spooky features like entanglement (two particles behaving like one in cosmic distances, nonlocality), probabilistic nature of their "place" is perhaps the most interesting for our case. Since elementary particles behave both like particles and waves, we can only draw probability densities of their position. In the world of human size, that would mean that it is more or less probable that my head bumps into the wall despite bumping into the wall. It is of course wrong to make analogies between elementary particles and human sized particles and it was

not my point to speculate about quantum mechanics. The point is that the deeper we go into reality, meaning the more we dissect particles into smaller and smaller, the more they are evasive, and less they are penetrable. They can only be presented to us by abstract mathematical formulas or computer interpretations. We can never see this real behind reality in which we indulge daily. We only see emergent properties, traces on a computer screen that are results of something behind which we do not and cannot see, hear or feel. Nothing solid (behind) creates the beauty of here. Reality is literary created ex nihilo.

But even more, quantum reality is in fact created by observation. The famous Schrödinger thought experiment explains that while the quantum cat unobserved can be both death **and** alive, the observation only really makes her dead **or** alive. The observation only collapses quantum probabilities into physical reality. The real is nothing but probability until it collapses into reality.

What is also important for contemporary physics and mainstream science is that what comes out from quantum mechanics is its demise of reductivism. Although the term has many parallel meanings its basic presumption is that it is possible to single out one principle that the Universe rests on. Reductivism states that the whole of reality can be explained by knowing all its parts, for instance, our mind/consciousness can be fully deduced from neural activity of our brains.

If reductivism as a theory was valid, then its consequence would completely disprove Lacan and quantum mechanics. Then the reality would be reduced to Real. The Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, taken as the best possible interpretation for more than three quarters of a century, literary denounced the possibility of final reduction. But even for human sized bodies, reductivism poses some serious troubles. If everything would be predestined in the moment of the Big Bang, there would be no place for poiesis, or creation. The idea that the whole is bigger than its parts would not make sense any more. Surprisingly, the results that various social entities produce, like families, companies and states, could be derived from the sum of individuals. Nothing could possibly **emerge** as a novelty from any social institution as everything produced would be predefined by characteristics of each individual constituting such a social entity.

But then how do we understand the fact that a majority of the scientists that, through quantum mechanics, proved the evasiveness of reality, believe in reduction? It seems that the whole scientific community is searching for a single principle, aligned forces under one rule that will clearly define all events from the Big Bang on.

Both reductivism and quantum mechanics cannot hold. Either smaller and smaller particles have to be more and more precise, or reductivism fails. But if reductivism proves itself, then we have a problem (at least) of how to explain emergencies that happen in social structures, clear and observable results of social entities that cannot be explained by the potentials.

Either quantum mechanics holds or reductivism. Both cannot be valid. So far there is much greater scientific support for the non-reductionist explanation of the Universe that at least, for the sake of this paper, this dilemma is already solved. Poiesis should not be understood on the memetic level, but on the physical level as well. The physical realm is autopoietic as much as the memetic one.

What about memetic reality?

Fourth draft: Susan Blackmore and memetics

According to Richard Dawkins (Dawkins 1976) memes evolved as a second replicator after genes. They are co-created in replication and mutation like genes. Dawkins concludes that memes became more and more important for human evolution and that they are even becoming more important than genes and physical reality. Consider fashion for instance: fashion trends not only spread around “mysteriously” by memes, but as such change us, sometimes even our bodies directly. Take foot binding in China or the long neck tradition in northern Thailand for instance; although it is wrong to search for fast changes in evolution, the influence of memes on genetic material is apparent taking longer periods of time into account.

With the help of Susan Blackmore (Blackmore, 1999), we can now understand memes and the mechanisms that run them much better. She made a coherent story about the second replicator: memes.

Take androgyny for instance. Androgyny was known and described many thousands of years back, but after the discovery and advancements in genetics was understood as a result of genetic mutations. While genetics certainly play a role in androgyny, its fast mutations clearly point to memetic causes. In contrast to genes, memes namely mutate much faster. The mutation of the androgyny meme, which became really fast and furious recently, is easy to see. While we still survive with two or at most three sexes on the genetic level, genders inflated to 63 or even more recently. Androgyny is one meme that prevailed so long in history that it is nowadays already old fashioned. Androgyny in relation to contemporary reality is like the Ford range of cars in 1908 in comparison to the diversity one hundred years after. Henry Ford proclaimed then that their only model should come in any colour, but only if that colour was black. Something similar is happening with genders. It will soon be possible to tailor-make your own gender as much as you can tailor-make your own car.

Memes, and their nature of being a second replicator, are crucial for the case of poetic nature of our reality. If bodies of living creatures are creation/emergence of genes, as Dawkins elaborated in many books, especially in *The Extended phenotype* (Dawkins, 1982), our culture is created by the emergence of memes. In accordance with evolutionary theory, it then follows that in relation to physical reality, all cultural reality is produced (evolved), and thus fake. Not that it comes from nothing, but it comes from the selfishness of memes to survive. It is their sustainability that produces us and our culture. We are, as Susan Blackmore claimed by the title of her book, “Meme machines” (Blackmore, 1999).

Memes do not reflect reality but produce reality; they produce that what happens in our mind. Memes put under question both Aristotelian and Platonistic ontology. Both Aristotelian objectivity producing mimesis, and the Platonistic one with a rigid copy of an idea as the only truth, gets dissolved by quantum mechanics and memetics.

But does that mean that reality is subjective? Does that mean that nothing holds true? Does this bring into play the absolute relativism in which A can equal B or C or D that Aristotle fought against so vigorously? Does this mean “whatever”?

No. But it will take us a couple of additional drafts to drag out the truth from apparent relativism coming from autopoietic nature of our memetic nature.

Fifth draft: Myths

Is the burning bush seen by Moses fake news? Is Penelope pretending to weave a burial shroud for Odysseus's fake news? Is Newton observing a falling apple fake news? Is Coca Cola fake news? Is me writing my first business plan for Radio Student on ZX Spectrum around 1985 fake news? Are 63 genders fake news?

Let's be precise: there are not 63 genders. If genders are creations of memes (in contrast to sexes as a creation of genes) then only the sky is the limit regarding how many of them can exist in theory. If not yet existent they will evolve sooner or later. So, is it fake news if a person was accordingly to the then valid memetic context described as gay while we now "know" that being gay denotes not much that would make sense nowadays, since now we have many modalities of being gay? Does this make E. M. Forster's "gay novel" Maurice written in 1913 fake?

I deliberately went a bit too far with the novel. A novel is fiction by definition so everything in a novel is fake in relation to reality? Is it really? We will come back to this issue later.

The rest of the introduced cases in this draft are myths. Most of them were elaborated in written form as well, but they are and were spread around in oral tradition most of the time of their existence. Answers to the question of whether they are fake in relation to reality or not have to be developed by first understanding the function of a myth.

Let me address this question by using my personal case, my personal myth. I am repeating a "story" of me writing my first business plan on ZX Spectrum quite often. So far no one repeated this story, so it does not match the most important criteria for myth: self-propagation. But it has many other features of a myth. First of all, I do remember that I certainly performed writing action on ZX Spectrum, but I do not remember if I have delivered the final version as a print. If no print version was produced, does the claim that I had written something reflect reality? Do I the fake reality if I keep repeating this story? I am certainly not lying. And what is even more important: it does not really matter. No one gains or loses in either case. Some historian might investigate this story while researching computer literacy advancement in the last years of Slovenia as a socialist country; though I doubt that such an insignificant event can really draw any attention. In any case, the explained personal myth performs exactly the same function as any cattle myth of the Maasai people of Eastern Africa.

My case that opens the question of reality a bit more than 30 years ago makes all other, real myths, including Coca Cola, a bit easier. It is not historical or physical reality that myths are related to. They are in fact related to nothing since they create their own reality each time they are repeated. The well-known blind taste test of Coca Cola known as Pepsi Challenge (<https://www.businessinsider.com/pepsi-challenge-business-insider-2013-5>) proves that physical reality of liquid called either Pepsi or Coca becomes only important as memetic reality for humans. It is a myth (a brand) that makes this or that liquid real for us. Some liquid exists for sure. So, the Coke myth cannot be subjective in a sense that it would be completely

detached from physical reality. But this physical reality makes literally no sense without the brand, the story that makes that physical reality something meaningful for us, humans. Not that myths/brands would exist in no relation to their physical reality, they construct that reality. Coke is made in some specific production facility, but Coke is created each time anew as an experience of taste and myth/brand.

And as much as Coke is constructed all other mentioned myths are as well. What for? What is the purpose of myth creation and repetition: our fitness. What my personal myth is about is only about me and my actual and future fitness. I “use” this story from the past to constitute my future being.

All myths serve one purpose only: to make us fitter in the fitness landscape (Kauffmann, 1993) we are living in. The purpose is to prepare us for the future reality, not to make us sure of what happened in the past. Who cares if Newton really got his grand gravity idea while sitting under a tree seeing an apple falling. It is the story about the importance of observation in the process of scientific exploration that makes this myth important. There are other important lessons “included” in the Newton myth, but nevertheless all what is important are lessons, not reality.

What is then the nature of truth?

Sixth draft: intersubjectivity

The quantum mechanics draft already explained how and why observation changes reality.

Among many implications coming from the now more than 100 years old turnaround of Newtonian predictability and the apparent objectivity produced, there is one that is particularly important for our case. If objectivity of the observed depends on subjectivity of the observer, then not only every objectivity can be changed, but it should even be changed by definition. Changed by the observer. Does that disapprove the law of identity? Does that mean that A does not equal A? If both of us observe A, your observation changes A differently than mine, so A is not only the same for both of us but is also changed for each of us.

Is such radical subjectivity necessary? This question is important not only because both philosophers, but even more scientists emerging from the Renaissance on persistently, fight against similar subjectivisms. If there exists namely even the slightest possibility of A not being A, then there is no place for science any more but for alchemy and occult only.

Can we in practice, or at least in theory, reconcile quantum uncertainty and the law of identity?

Easily: with the introduction of intersubjectivity and the peculiar nature of memes.

The theory and practice of branding, especially the standard branding model (Drapal, 2016, and before in practice), offers a fast track towards resolution. It has long been known in marketing literature that brands belong both to the brand “producer” and to the brand

“consumer”. Unfortunately, brand co-ownership was taken more as a metaphor pointing to the necessity of the measurement of potential customers’ preferences and in the fact that the image of the brand in the customers’ heads can be, and in most cases is, quite different from the one imagined by the producer.

The standard branding model takes brand shared ownership totally seriously and literally. We shouldn’t even talk about shared ownership since such a notion implies that there was a time in which a brand was owned by the producer only. A brand does not exist until it is co-created by a user. Surely there is a period, pre-launch period, when a brand cannot be co-created since the real users do not exist yet. But then such a brand is only brand potential. Such a brand is like a water behind a fully sealed dam. The water there only has potential energy. Only after the water is released does the potential energy transform in kinetic energy that moves and shakes. Only after a brand is released it reveals its real nature, its usable energy. Only after it is co-created by users, only after it is “changed by observation”, does it receive a unique identity. Identity is created each time anew with each use. But how?

With a little help from memes.

A brand is objectively co-created with each user interaction as much as reality is objectively co-created by each human observation. This co-creation, in the realm that is usually described as human culture, happens as memetic replication and sometimes as mutation. Brand memes occupy our brains. For that reason, it would be equally right to say that we are co-created by brands. We should thus take the saying that the “clothes make the man” literally, as long as we understand that both clothing and a man is such for us only memetic entities. As much as it is true that man (the author of this paper does not obey gender political correctness by principle and by theory explained in this paper!) created smartphone, it is true that each smartphone creates its user anew.

Coming from the brand example that helped us to explain the crucial role of memes in human interactions, it is not difficult to make at least semi-final conclusions about the nature of reality that leads to resolutions about truth and fake news.

Although brand is of memetic nature, it is very much objective in the sense that after the particular meme (meme-complex) about a particular smartphone found place among my personal sack of memes (“aufbildung”), it is very much objective regardless of not being universal. Each interaction makes a specific user experience, specific meme “shape” that is “agreed upon” between my sack of memes and the brand’s sack of memes.

Such agreements occur not only when brands are involved, but in every human interaction. With each exchange of memes, with each interaction (communication) we establish agreed upon new reality. In this sense each communication is a kind of myth creation. If we disagree, no common truth is established. In such case memes fail to reinforce each other in agreement, but also each of us stay socially (memetically) disconnected at least for this particular case.

The memetic explanation of how reality is construed explains also the human need for social cohesion, social interaction and the need of memes (and humans) to develop larger social units like companies, nations and states. Selfishness of memes that use us (Dawkins 1976) literally forces us to enter all kinds of social entities, many of them fully altruistic.

But since social construction is not the main topic of this paper, let us conclude this draft with couple of points:

- All memetic reality is construed (co-construed). That means that poetry has no worse relation to reality than science for instance.
- If all memes would be agreed upon multilaterally (by all), only then would fake news cease to exist. Fake is everything that is not agreed upon. Fake news is thus the bread and butter of human existence. The conclusion, which has nothing to do with relativism, has already been explained and is going to be proven later in this paper.
- I am here at this moment (as a memetic creature), but am also anywhere where remains of memes created or co-created by me can be found.

So much human reality is intersubjective, and nothing but intersubjective. Reality is objectively co-created with each human interaction. Such reality is not subjective (arbitrary), but objective, real. Since we co-construct reality with each interaction, no outside authority can exist that would prove or disprove such a reality. Only you and me can say: this is fake. But we cannot say that something we created is fake, since we created it. And there is no third body that can falsify our creation. Reality is poetic, unfalsifiable. Fake news as a social construct is such a co-constructed reality; but as any other social reality denotes nothing. As such, fake news exists from the very beginning of social creations and will exist as a constituent part of our identity forever.

Conclusion?

Seventh draft: No place for fake in blockchain?

Approaching the last draft of this paper, it is perhaps time to pay some attention to multiple drafts and how to read and understand them, in this paper at least.

Daniel Dennett described his theory of how consciousness “happens” in his book *Consciousness Explained* (1991). I used the verb “happens” deliberately for I find it as the most proper entering point into the realm of multiple drafts. There are many interpretations of Dennett’s theory and even his own elaboration is not easy to understand in its full potential. Theory, as expected for any theory of any use, provoked quite some criticism. It is not the intention of this paper to provide interpretation of the multiple draft scenario theory. Dennett’s theory is not there to be understood, but to be used!

Why the author of this paper takes Dennett’s theory extremely seriously? Because it was practically proved. Where? In this very paper. How? By applying it as methodological background. Is not that circular argumentation? Yes; and for that reason, the theory is proven.

Let me explain less elliptically. Consciousness happens as an emergence on the top of multiple layers of brain activities. No single activity has any sense for us. Sense “happens” (again that verb!) as a sort of “not intended” effect of multiplicity of activities. Consciousness emerges on the top of complex physical activities of brains. No one “runs” this emergence.

Consciousness happens to humans. Similarly, the message of this paper does not happen on the level of each specific draft, or even sentence, but happens as an emergence of all drafts being one on top of another as when a full colour happens when layers of monochromatic films are put one on top of another. Each draft has a certain point (meaning), but no single draft represents the message of the paper. Even if an additional draft that would try to summarize all other drafts would be put on the top of previous drafts, that additional draft would be “blind” about all other draft meanings. For instance, the draft about myths gets a completely different colour if put on top of the quantum mechanics draft and so much more if put on top of all other drafts.

But the use of the multiple draft scenario in this paper has also another tacit consequence in the support of the initial thesis about what is fake and what is reality. This methodology not only explained, but also displayed the in vitro poetic principle of reality creation through superposition of many “stupid” drafts. Reality happens by default, by autonomous memetic activity of humans. No outside authority neither produces nor interprets meaning. Meaning happens; as we have seen meaning happens between two memetic creatures sharing memes.

This method applied for the sake of this paper has its limitations, of course. Seven drafts are not enough to “produce” considerable emergence of additional meaning on the top of each draft’s meaning. But it should be illustrative enough.

Is it then possible to avoid blockchain as a final draft in respect to reality, construction of reality and truth? No.

Blockchain technology entered our lives as, at the moment, the highest intersubjective and poetic social activity. It is so blatantly intersubjective and auto creative that it is almost not worth explaining it. Each of us (those that participate in various blockchain activities) create a part of a blockchain that is then approved by another block, by another public key. Interaction of personal constructions (personal keys) with the help of a public key creates objective reality of global blockchain. Personal construction becomes real (objective) only after approved by another blockchain member. As such, blockchain is 100% intersubjective and an irrevocable objective. When approved block becomes objectively unchangeable. If no one replies to my block (approves it in this or another way), it becomes orphan.

In blockchain only orphan blocks are fake. All other blocks represent intersubjective reality. That means there exists no outside authority that would have privileged access to what is true and what is fake. Fake is all that is not approved. In such a world, fake is not even news any more. Fake in fact does not exist anymore. But from another point of view, all that information (news) that is considered as fake by any outside authority like the State, media, political organization or even individual that tries to put himself on the top of blockchain’s multiple drafts, loses its fake nature.

NB that blockchain is used both as an example of intersubjectivity of memetic reality and as analogy (it is both wave and particle at the same time!). As analogy, blockchain must not be confused with memetic reality. For example, blockchain has to be understood as a memetic creation that follows the principles of memetic evolution.

One could perhaps still object this picture with the claim that it may well describe blockchain/digital reality, but that there is no guarantee that digital would not fake somehow analogue reality. Such fear rests on supposition that one should not trust individuals in their respect toward analogue physicality, but collective organizations only. So, if certain

governmental organization, agency, NGO or some supranational collective organization says that the sky is blue, then this is true by definition, but if some individual claims the same, that has to be approved by some collective authority first. But such fear should go exactly in the opposite direction. There is much higher probability that any collective organization falls into the trap of the lowest possible denominator caused by the fact that no one in such a collective has “skins in the game” (N. Taleb, 2018) than the individual who can directly suffer from misinterpretation of reality.

Saying this peer review is the method of how scientific results are approved or disproved should be mentioned as the closest to blockchain method. Science has expelled outside authority a couple of hundreds of years ago with rationalism and enlightenment. One scientist approves another scientist’s block only. But one has to recognize that scientific peer review still rests on the assumption of some kind of scientific community. Only a member of that community can then serve as peers to distributed scientific memetic complexity.

This fact provokes the question whether outsiders are to be allowed to peer scientific blocks. According to the present state of affair not. The scientific community is tightly sealed. Public debate ends immediately when a certain participant is not recognized as “one of them”. And due to the fact that science developed so very much that even particular scientists understand only a very particular part of total science, such a rule seems good. But then: I do not know much more about baseball than about quantum mechanics. Why would I be more allowed (by whom) to co-define baseball reality than any other reality. Even if I would dare to fake some part of quantum mechanics, my block would not be approved by enough peers as much as my fake of baseball.

Blockchain thus opened not only a new draft of reality conception, but also a new view on how and who approves any kind of reality, even scientific.

Lesson for public relations and democracy?

Yes. We will have to start to live without outside authority that would play an arbitrator of truth. There are experts in certain fields, and there are scientists that employ falsification principles to explain reality. But it was our false presumption (fortunately only in the western mechanistic world for only the last 600 years) that any kind of outside authority exists. It cannot exist in principle. No outside help thus exists for PR practice either, and even less for what is fake.

From this we can conclude that we have only entered the field of Democracy. If all participants depend on any kind of outside authority, so long they perform anything but democracy. It is only when there is no outside point of reference there is a chance to relate to one another without obstacles. Only then each individual has not only full responsibility to approve reality, but also to construct it.

It is not hard to understand blockchain technology as a prime example of a system without a fixed background, without a third party authority; completely intersubjective. But to have it does not mean that we understand it and to accept it. It is not easy to live without a godfather. It is not so easy to live without an option to blame this one or that one for transmitting fake news, for such option makes an illusion of us as not necessarily responsible.

Conclusion in respect to this thesis

Apparently the fast and global spread of fake news is a result of memetic trends (ideology). Causes of the widespread fear about fake news was not addressed in this paper, but they are definitely worth a closer look. What can be concluded from this paper is that the fear about fake news as a memetic activity clearly produces a new reality (of fear). Fake news is thus not a story about the gap between objective reality and that what is then reflected through fake news, but production of new reality of fear about fake news.

Another conclusion should then also come as trivial. It is not antiscientism that produces fake news, since fake news has been a necessary part of human existence from the very beginning. It is in fact quite the opposite. Fake news as a meme is used as a kind of protection of the scientific community against unwilling outside peers. As much as any community has all rights to use all available legal resources for its own protection, so does all other communities to understand and guard against such acts, such creation of reality.

And finally, after historical and evolutionary consequences are comprehended, it is trivial to understand that the produced memetic reality is objective and as such unavoidable within democratic or any other society. On the contrary; blockchain as a prime example of decentralized, intersubjective reality introduced an important upgrade of social mechanisms that can enforce individual freedoms and responsibility and thus upgraded democracy; as the result of created memetic reality and/or fake news.